Agentic Value Model for Automation — Methodology Review

Dodone External Methodology Library | Source-faithful research brief | Version 1.0

31 October 2026

Document control

Field	Value
Document ID	DODONE-EXT-008
Originating publisher	Amazon Web Services
Source publication	7 October 2026
Research cut-off	31 October 2026
Status	Independent source review — not an external audit
Publication type	Agentic workflow business-case methodology
Source policy	Original public material only; no Dodone adaptation
Full source links	See section 14

Executive summary

AWS describes four economic value pools for agentic automation: released capacity, exception and error reduction, improved decisions, and change resilience/maintenance savings. These must be converted to realised business value and netted against implementation, runtime, monitoring, oversight and error costs.

Scope: Evaluate incremental economic value of agentic automation relative to manual or rule-based workflow execution.

Important: This paper documents published source material only. A missing equation or input is reported as not available in the reviewed sources; no substitute model or artificial worked example has been created.

1. Purpose and scope

Evaluate incremental economic value of agentic automation relative to manual or rule-based workflow execution. This paper is an independent explanatory analysis of published methodology; it is not endorsed by the originating publisher.

2. Counterfactual and baseline

Assess baseline workflow volume, handling time, labour cost, correction/error exposure, decision outcomes, and maintenance/downtime of existing automation. Distinguish baseline exposures from actual reductions attributable to agents.

3. Published model inputs and variables

- Transaction or case volumes, baseline minutes and loaded labour rates.
- Automated proportion and proportion of released capacity actually captured.
- Exception/error incidence, correction cost and reduction achieved.
- Value of better decisions, attributable share and decision volume.
- Avoided maintenance/break-fix and downtime.
- Agent runtime, integration, evaluations, oversight, governance, process redesign and introduced errors.

4. Cost methodology

AWS enumerates annualised implementation and runtime, integration, evaluation, human oversight, governance and change management; also losses from new errors introduced by the agent. It notes multi-year modelling should book implementation cost when paid rather than indiscriminately annualising it.

5. Benefit and value methodology

The four value pools must have distinct baselines and accountable owners. Released work counts only as realisable expenditure or a separately evidenced redeployed outcome. A correction-cost exposure is not itself the AI benefit; the measured reduction is.

6. Published formulas and calculation logic

- Publisher-described net annual value = realised capacity value + avoided correction/error costs + decision-outcome uplift + avoided maintenance/downtime - implementation and operating/oversight/governance costs - losses from new agent errors.
- Each benefit pool is sized from its baseline, expected change and realisation factor, with ownership assigned and overlap excluded.

7. Publisher-reported worked examples or results

AWS illustrates 200,000 claims per year at 12 minutes and $45/hour, producing $1.8m baseline labour cost; 70% routine automation releases 28,000 hours or $1.26m potential capacity. If only half is realised, the claimable capacity becomes ~$630k. An 8% correction exposure at 3.5×

base handling cost, with 40% reduction and 75% realisation, yields around $151k claimed correction benefit. These figures are published AWS examples.

8. Sensitivity, attribution and uncertainty

The framework requires realised benefit factors, workflow-specific error data and named owners. It describes a prioritisation matrix using task complexity and decision risk and advocates predefined investment stop rules.

9. Author-scope qualifications and methodological limitations

- Illustrative value pools require company evidence; not universal AI effect coefficients.
- Manual handling costs can double count rework if baseline time already includes corrections.
- Not all four pools apply to every deployment; software that introduces errors can destroy value.

10. Independent reproducibility assessment

Strong for the published illustrative cost examples and overall value-pool logic; partial for a universal agent model because operational inputs are workflow-specific.

11. Public-information gap register

Information unavailable or incomplete	Source review status
Universal default realisation factors, exception-cost distributions and discount rates: not supplied.	Not publicly available / insufficiently specified in reviewed source
Fully specified software implementation and standard numerical scenario library: not supplied.	Not publicly available / insufficiently specified in reviewed source

12. Independent reviewer observations

These observations address verifiability and scope; they are not additions to the publisher's financial method.

Confirm each numerical claim against the original publication before relying on it for an investment decision. Do not treat conceptual frameworks or opportunity estimates as if they were a reproducible company-level ROI algorithm.

Do not fill source gaps using assumed discount rates, value multipliers, proprietary weights, industry benchmarks, model code or synthetic test fixtures. An independent audit of calculations is possible only where sufficient primary data and methodology are disclosed.

13. Audit and publication checklist

- Primary publisher and publication dates have been identified.
- Source-specific equations are separated from descriptive process narratives.
- All author-reported numerical examples are identified as publisher examples.
- Unavailable parameters and proprietary elements are explicitly marked.
- No Dodone adaptations or fabricated examples have been introduced.
- Claims of complete numerical reproducibility are limited to publicly verifiable material.

14. Original source links and attribution

The following are the original publisher resources reviewed. Each link is clickable in the PDF and editable Word file.

S1 — Beyond hours saved: Building the business case for agentic automation — https://aws.amazon.com/blogs/machine-learning/beyond-hours-saved-building-the-business-case-for-agentic-automation/

Research cut-off: 31 October 2026. Access conditions and source text may subsequently change.

Attribution and editorial notice: Dodone independently summarises the original publisher's methodology. This paper does not reproduce the source publication in full, does not claim official endorsement and does not certify financial outcomes.