MyConsultancy

Who Is Accountable When AI Makes the Decision

The AI Operating Model Playbook

Manoj Tavarajoo

January 2026

MyConsultancy

Who Is Accountable When AI Makes the Decision

The AI Operating Model Playbook

Manoj Tavarajoo

Opening context

As AI systems move from experimentation into live operational environments, a fundamental question becomes unavoidable. When decisions are influenced, augmented, or executed by AI, who is actually accountable for the outcome?

In traditional operating models, accountability is usually clear. A human makes a decision, an outcome follows, and responsibility can be traced back to a role, a team, or a function. AI disrupts this clarity. Decisions emerge from a combination of data, models, business rules, and human intervention. Outcomes evolve over time rather than occurring at a single moment.

This shift creates unease at senior levels. Leaders sense that accountability has become harder to pin down, even as AI systems play a larger role in shaping operational and strategic outcomes.

Why this fails in most organisations

Most organisations still anchor accountability to delivery milestones and formal ownership at the point of deployment. Teams are accountable for building models, integrating systems, and meeting launch criteria. Once systems are live, accountability becomes diffuse.

When outcomes change over time, organisations struggle to respond. Delivery teams point to design assumptions that are no longer valid. Business owners point to technical complexity they do not fully control. Risk and compliance functions intervene after issues surface, often without clear authority to direct corrective action.

This fragmentation is not caused by a lack of effort or intent. It reflects accountability models designed for static systems being applied to systems that learn and adapt continuously. Responsibility is assigned at a moment in time, while outcomes unfold across time.

The result is accountability drift. When things go well, ownership is shared. When things go wrong, responsibility becomes contested.

The operating model insight

Accountability in AI must be anchored to outcomes over time, not just to delivery events.

AI systems require ongoing judgement. Models must be monitored, behaviour interpreted, and interventions made as conditions change. Accountability therefore needs to be sustained and explicit, with clear ownership of system behaviour in production.

This does not mean assigning blame for every outcome. It means defining who is responsible for observing performance, responding to drift, and deciding when escalation or intervention is required. Accountability becomes a matter of stewardship rather than handover.

Without this shift, governance mechanisms weaken. Decision rights blur, escalation loses clarity, and trust in AI systems erodes.

What this looks like in practice

Weak accountability shows up in predictable ways. Issues are detected late because no one is explicitly responsible for monitoring outcomes. Reviews focus on technical root causes rather than organisational ownership. Decisions to retrain, pause, or retire models are delayed while responsibility is debated.

By contrast, organisations that anchor accountability deliberately behave differently. Ownership of AI systems persists beyond deployment. Teams remain accountable for behaviour in production and are empowered to act when conditions change. Accountability aligns with decision rights, ensuring responsibility and authority reinforce each other.

Common mistakes to avoid

Equating accountability with blame, which discourages transparency and learning.

Assuming accountability naturally transfers from delivery to operations. Without explicit design, it often disappears.

Attempting to document accountability exhaustively, creating rigidity that cannot keep pace with change.

Relying on informal understanding that breaks down under scale or scrutiny.

What leaders must do differently

Leaders must redefine accountability for AI as an ongoing obligation rather than a point-in-time assignment. This requires clarity about who owns system behaviour over time and what authority accompanies that ownership.

They must ensure accountability aligns with decision rights. Teams cannot be accountable for outcomes they cannot influence, and authority without accountability creates unacceptable risk.

Conclusion

Accountability breaks in AI not because organisations lack frameworks, but because responsibility is anchored to moments rather than outcomes.

As AI systems adapt, accountability must adapt with them. Designing accountability for learning systems is essential for operating AI responsibly and at scale.

MyConsultancy

From AI Strategy to Enterprise Execution

www.myconsultancy.com.au