Detroit AI Pilot Guide

A practical four-week path from business problem to measured AI experiment

SELECT	BUILD	TEST	DECIDE
One repeatable task	A constrained workflow	With real examples	Using a scorecard

Built for Detroit-area teams that want useful AI without a vague transformation project.

Explore Google AI developer support in Detroit

Prepared August 20, 2026 | Otto

1. Pick a pilot with a clean boundary

A strong pilot begins with one repeatable business decision, not a department-wide promise. Choose work with a clear input, an observable output, and a person who already knows what acceptable quality looks like. Examples include classifying incoming questions, preparing a first-pass campaign brief, extracting fields from a known document format, or drafting a reply for human approval.

Pilot filter

Question	Green signal	Warning signal
Frequency	Occurs weekly or daily	Rare exception
Quality	Reviewer can score output	No shared definition
Data	Approved examples exist	Sensitive data is unclear
Recovery	Human can correct quickly	Error creates irreversible harm

Write the boundary in one sentence

Use this formula: For a defined input, the pilot produces a defined draft or recommendation, which a named reviewer approves before it affects a customer. This sentence prevents the project from quietly expanding into data migration, workflow redesign, and autonomous execution at the same time.

2. Build the smallest complete loop

The pilot needs enough structure to prove value: an intake format, a prompt or workflow, approved reference material, an output format, and a review step. Keep the first version intentionally narrow. Reliability comes from constraints and examples before it comes from adding more model calls.

Four-week sequence

Week	Deliverable	Decision
1	Problem statement, examples, privacy check	Proceed or reshape
2	Working prototype and review rubric	Ready for real samples
3	Ten to thirty representative trials	Fix recurring failure modes
4	Scorecard, owner, cost estimate	Scale, revise, or stop

Human review is part of the design

Name the reviewer, define what they check, and record corrections. A review step is not evidence that the pilot failed; it is the mechanism that produces trustworthy examples and reveals where automation is safe. High-impact or sensitive decisions should remain outside the pilot unless the organization has appropriate governance and expert oversight.

Measure correction patterns

Track whether reviewers change facts, tone, format, recommendation, or completeness. A single average score can hide a severe recurring problem. Pattern-level notes point directly to better instructions, better source material, or a narrower use case.

3. Decide with evidence

A pilot earns expansion when it reduces useful work without creating an unacceptable review burden. Compare the new workflow with the existing baseline on the same type of task. Include preparation and review time, not only the model's generation time.

Pilot scorecard

Measure	How to record it
Accuracy	Percent meeting the reviewer rubric without factual correction
Time	Minutes from intake to approved output, before and after
Consistency	Variation across similar examples and different reviewers
Safety	Privacy, permission, and escalation issues encountered
Cost	Model, integration, maintenance, and review time
Adoption	Whether the intended operator can use the workflow unaided

Three valid outcomes

Scale when quality and savings are repeatable. Revise when the concept is sound but failure patterns are concentrated. Stop when the use case remains ambiguous, the required data cannot be used safely, or review costs erase the benefit. Stopping a weak pilot is a useful result because it protects the next investment.

Next step

Use the live planning tools and consult the Detroit Google AI developer resource to turn the scorecard into a scoped implementation conversation.