



Poor Fit

Executive conflict mediation depends on human judgment, trust, and leadership influence — AI is not the right tool.

BUSINESS OVERVIEW

Industry Context

INDUSTRY

Professional Services

CHARACTERISTICS CONSIDERED

- Partnership cultures place high weight on trust and personal credibility.
- Executive disputes ripple quickly into client-facing teams.
- Confidentiality expectations at the C-suite are absolute.
- Coaching and facilitation are well-established interventions in this sector.

KEY ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS

- Any visible AI involvement is likely to be read as a loss of trust by the parties.
- Resolution timelines are driven by people, not by tooling cadence.
- External coaches typically deliver faster, safer outcomes than internal mediation.

INDUSTRY-SPECIFIC RISKS

- Partner-level attrition cascading to client departures.
- Reputational damage if AI involvement leaks externally.

INDUSTRY GOVERNANCE CONSIDERATIONS

- Board-level visibility on senior leadership disputes.
- Documented coaching engagements as the formal intervention record.

INDUSTRY VALUE DRIVERS

- Leadership stability
- Client confidence
- Talent retention at partner level

Executive Summary

Executive conflict mediation depends on human judgment, trust, and leadership influence — AI is not the right tool.

INVESTMENT SIGNAL

Do not proceed

TIME TO VALUE

Not applicable — AI is not recommended for this problem.

FIT SCORE

14 / 100 — Poor Fit

WHY NOW

- Conflict is already affecting decisions; the right intervention is human, not technical.
- Introducing AI now would set an unhelpful precedent for how the firm handles sensitive people issues.

SITUATION

A 1,200-person professional services firm is experiencing recurring conflict between two executive committee members that is slowing decisions, eroding team confidence, and creating coalitions in the leadership layer below them. The CHRO is exploring whether an AI tool could mediate, summarize positions, or recommend resolutions.

RECOMMENDATION

Do not pursue AI for this use case. Invest instead in a qualified executive coach, structured facilitation, and a clear escalation path owned by the CEO. AI tooling would not address the trust, motive, and power dynamics at the centre of the conflict and could materially worsen the situation if executives feel surveilled or judged by a system.

TOP VALUE DRIVER — NO DURABLE VALUE DRIVER IDENTIFIED

The benefits that matter — restored trust, alignment on strategy, and authentic accountability between two senior leaders — are produced by human relationship work, not by software.

KEY RISK — REPUTATIONAL AND TRUST DAMAGE IF AI IS INTRODUCED

Executives perceiving AI mediation as surveillance or as the CEO outsourcing a hard conversation would damage trust further and likely accelerate departures.

Assessment Confidence

CONFIDENCE — HIGH

The problem description is clear and falls into a well-understood category of issues where AI is not an appropriate intervention.

Why This Recommendation Was Generated

- Score 14/100 reflects fundamental category mismatch between AI capability and the problem.
- Resolution depends on trust and motive, which AI cannot influence directly.
- Confidentiality and legal exposure raise the cost of any AI involvement well above any benefit.
- Visible AI involvement is likely to make the situation worse, not better.
- There is no version of this problem at smaller scope that becomes a good AI fit.

Assessment Assumptions

- Conflict involves two specific senior executives, not a structural team-design problem.
- There is no regulatory mandate forcing the use of AI in HR processes here.
- The firm has access to qualified executive coaches.
- The CEO is positioned to own the escalation, and is not a party to the conflict.
- Confidentiality of executive-level discussions is a non-negotiable constraint.

Opportunity Sizing

VERDICT — TOO AMBITIOUS

Attempting to mediate executive disputes with AI overshoots what current AI systems can reliably and safely do.

Information That Would Improve This Assessment

- Whether either executive has already engaged a coach.
- Whether the board has been informed.
- Whether there are underlying structural issues (e.g. overlapping remits) that should also be addressed.

Assessment Limitations

This assessment is based on the information provided and generated using Bodhvega's structured evaluation framework. Results may vary depending on industry-specific requirements, regulatory constraints, organizational maturity, data quality and availability, existing technology landscape, and business operating model. This assessment should be used as decision-support guidance and not as a substitute for detailed business, architectural, legal, or regulatory review.

AI OPPORTUNITIES

Business Value Map

There is no credible AI-driven value pathway here. The dimensions below are scored Low because the problem is fundamentally a human-relationship and leadership-process problem.

Leadership Effectiveness Limited

Risk Reduction

Resolution depends on motive, trust, and willingness to change — none of which AI can influence directly.

Timeframe: Not applicable

Executive Throughput Limited

Operational Efficiency

Even perfectly summarized positions will not move a decision the parties are unwilling to make.

Timeframe: Not applicable

Culture & Engagement Limited

Customer Experience

Staff want to see leadership behave like leaders, not delegate the work to a tool.

Timeframe: Not applicable

Talent Retention Limited

Risk Reduction

Senior leaders typically respond poorly to algorithmic assessment of their behaviour.

Timeframe: Not applicable

Cost Avoidance Limited

Cost Reduction

Executive coaching engagements at \$40K–\$90K dominate any AI investment on every dimension that matters.

Timeframe: Not applicable

Information Security Limited

Risk Reduction

Highly sensitive conversations should not be sent to third-party LLM systems under any circumstances.

Timeframe: Not applicable

Audit Readiness Limited

Compliance Improvement

Written records of executive disputes can become discoverable in future litigation.

Timeframe: Not applicable

Strategy Execution

Limited

Operational Efficiency

Strategic disagreements between executives are resolved by the CEO, the board, or by departure — not by tooling.

Timeframe: Not applicable

PRIORITY RECOMMENDATION

Priority Recommendation

RECOMMENDATION

Workflow

Even framed as a lightweight workflow, the underlying task is unsuitable for AI automation. Recommendation is to NOT pursue AI and to engage a qualified executive coach with a clear CEO-owned escalation path.

Is the task multi-step with branching logic?

No

The core work is a confidential, relational conversation between two people — not a decomposable process.

Are the inputs structured and predictable?

No

Inputs are emotion, motive, history, and unspoken context. None are reliably structured.

Are mistakes recoverable?

No

A single tone-deaf AI suggestion to a senior executive could be career- and culture-damaging and is not easily recovered.

Is the value of automation high relative to risk?

No

There is no measurable upside, and the downside includes trust damage, attrition, and legal exposure.

GOLDILOCKS CHECK — OUT OF SCOPE FOR AI

This is not a scoping problem to be made smaller — it is a category mismatch. No version of AI mediation is appropriate here.

IMPLEMENTATION OPTIONS

Platform Comparison

No platform recommended

Suitability 0/100

Monthly cost: \$0 — no AI spend recommended · Scalability 1/5 · Robustness 1/5

Bodhvega does not recommend any AI platform for this use case. The right investment is in a qualified executive coach and structured facilitation, not software.

RECOMMENDED BECAUSE

- Recommending a platform here would imply that AI is appropriate. It is not.

Claude

Suitability 8/100

Monthly cost: Not applicable — not recommended · Scalability 4/5 · Robustness 5/5

Strong general-purpose model, but using it on confidential executive disputes is inappropriate regardless of provider quality.

RECOMMENDED BECAUSE

- Not recommended because the use case itself is unsuitable for AI, not because of platform limitations.

AWS Bedrock

Suitability 8/100

Monthly cost: Not applicable — not recommended · Scalability 5/5 · Robustness 5/5
Enterprise-grade infrastructure does not change the underlying suitability problem.

RECOMMENDED BECAUSE

- Even VPC isolation cannot make this problem an appropriate AI use case.

Microsoft Copilot Studio

Suitability 6/100

Monthly cost: Not applicable — not recommended · Scalability 4/5 · Robustness 4/5

Tenant-level governance does not address the human-judgment requirements at the centre of this problem.

RECOMMENDED BECAUSE

- Use case mismatch outweighs platform capabilities.

Google Vertex AI

Suitability 6/100

Monthly cost: Not applicable — not recommended · Scalability 5/5 · Robustness 5/5

Multimodal capability is not relevant here; the issue is fitness-for-purpose, not capability.

RECOMMENDED BECAUSE

- Platform strengths do not change the recommendation.

ACTION PLAN

Blueprint Canvas

TASK / GOAL

Not applicable — AI is not recommended for this problem.

TOOLS

No AI tools recommended

ENVIRONMENT

No AI environment recommended.

FEEDBACK LOOP

Not applicable.

AUTONOMY LEVEL

1 / 5

WHEN TO STOP

AI should not be initiated. Engage a qualified executive coach and route escalations through the CEO and board chair.

RISKS & EDGE CASES

- Trust damage if executives feel surveilled by an AI system.
- Confidentiality breach by sending sensitive content to third-party LLMs.
- Legal discoverability of AI-generated mediation notes.

Rollout, Oversight & Success Measures

OBJECTIVE

Not applicable — Bodhvega's recommendation is to NOT build an AI agent for this problem.

TOOLS

No AI tools should be used. Engage human-only interventions.

APPROACH

Replace any AI exploration with: (1) a qualified executive coach, (2) structured facilitation, (3) CEO-owned escalation and accountability.

CONSTRAINTS

Do not deploy any AI system that records, analyses, or recommends actions on executive interpersonal disputes.

SUCCESS

Conflict is resolved or escalated through human means; no AI artefacts are created or stored.

QUALITY CHECKLIST

- Recommendation against AI is explicit and prominent
- Human alternative path is concrete and actionable
- Confidentiality and legal risks are called out
- No agent objective, tools, or success metrics are defined
- Door is left open for re-assessment of a different framing

GOVERNANCE

Guardrails & Governance Controls

Overall Risk: High

Risk of pursuing AI on this problem is high across confidentiality, legal, cultural, and reputational dimensions. The recommendation is to not proceed.

HUMAN OVERSIGHT REQUIRED

Yes — The recommendation is full human ownership end-to-end. No AI system should be inserted into this workflow.

REGULATORY FLAGS

GDPR

Data Privacy High

Executive disputes contain highly sensitive personal and strategic information that should not be processed by third-party LLMs.

MITIGATION

Do not send any executive dispute content to AI systems.

Human-in-the-Loop High

There is no meaningful human-in-the-loop pattern that makes this problem suitable for AI. The entire intervention should remain human-only.

MITIGATION

Replace any AI exploration with a qualified executive coach and CEO-owned escalation path.

Hallucination Risk High

An AI system fabricating motive, intent, or summary about a real executive is professionally and legally hazardous.

MITIGATION

Do not use AI to characterise executive behaviour, motive, or intent.

Audit Logging High

Written records of executive disputes — even AI-generated — are discoverable in future litigation.

MITIGATION

Avoid creating AI artefacts of executive disputes in the first place.

Full Deployable Prompt

Recommendation: Do Not Pursue AI

Bodhvega does not recommend building an AI workflow or agent for executive conflict mediation.

Why

- The work that resolves this problem – restoring trust, surfacing motive, and committing to behaviour change – is fundamentally human.
- Introducing AI is likely to be perceived as surveillance and to accelerate the very dynamics the firm is trying to repair.
- The information involved is highly sensitive and should not be processed by third-party LLM providers.

Recommended human path

1. Engage a qualified executive coach with experience in C-suite mediation.
2. Have the CEO (or board chair, if the CEO is one of the parties) own the escalation and resolution path.
3. Use structured facilitation for the next 2-3 leadership team meetings.
4. Set clear behavioural expectations and a defined review point at 90 days.

What NOT to do

- Do not deploy a chatbot, summary tool, or "mediator" agent on this problem.
- Do not record or transcribe executive disputes into AI systems.
- Do not use AI to "score" or evaluate executives on this conflict.

Bodhvega will gladly re-assess if the problem is reframed – for example, a generic leadership 360-feedback synthesis use case may be appropriate and would be evaluated on its own merits.