



THE WOLVERINE GROUP

Commercial GenAI for Public Sector Procurement

Purchasing Resources

For Prospective Learners and Their Approving Officials

Training Request

Letter Template for Your Approving Official

Most buyers need approval before they can spend. This gives you a letter that makes the case in your approving official's language — covering cost, risk, the changes to the work you do every week, and what the office gets back afterward.

WHAT THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS

- Part 1 — the three things that decide whether a request like this is approved
- Part 2 — how to estimate the time back, and why it is safer than it feels
- Part 3 — the letter, with fill-in fields
- Part 4 — a completed example you can read against your own situation
- Part 5 — vendor and course information your purchasing office will ask for

HOW TO USE THIS DOCUMENT

Everything shaded in [brackets] is yours to replace. Everything else can be sent as written — cut anything that does not apply to your office.

Send Part 3 only. Parts 1, 2 and 4 are for you; attach Part 5 if your approving official wants the vendor details.



PART 1 • WHAT DECIDES APPROVAL

Three things separate a request that gets signed from one that sits in an inbox. None of them is about the course.

Lead with risk, not with skills

Approving officials fund training that prevents a problem more readily than training that adds a capability. Staff in most procurement offices are already using commercial AI tools. This request is not about whether to start, but whether the use already underway is documented and defensible.

Show the return in the work, not in the abstract

"Improve AI skills" is not a justification. What persuades is a named task, a description of what changes about it, and an honest estimate of the time it takes. The letter gives you a small table for this. Fill it with the work on your desk this month, not a generic list — a supervisor recognizes their own backlog when they see it. Part 2 shows you how to build those numbers.

Offer the knowledge share, and mean it

The most compelling part of this letter is the conclusion: what the office gains after your work. Training one person benefits individually. When someone returns with a briefing, shared reference materials, and a suggested review step for AI-supported tasks, it represents an office-level control. This is a separate proposition, and it's the one that is signed.



PART 2 • ESTIMATING THE TIME BACK

The table in the letter asks for hours. That column is usually left blank for a good reason: nobody wants to be held to a number they made up. Here is how to build one you can defend, and why putting it in writing is safer than leaving it blank.

You already know how to do this

You produce independent estimates for a living. An estimate with a stated basis and assumptions is not a promise — it is a professional judgment about an uncertain quantity, offered with its reasoning. That is exactly what this is, and your approving official reads documents like that every week.

The mistake is not estimating imprecisely. The mistake is estimating without saying what the estimate rests on.

Why the number matters more than its accuracy

A supervisor reading a training request is deciding one thing: has this person thought about it, or are they asking me to think about it for them? A blank column answers that question poorly. A conservative number with a one-line basis answers it well — and it shifts the conversation from whether you deserve training to whether the arithmetic is right, which is a far better argument to be having.

A method that takes fifteen minutes

Step 1. Pick two to four tasks. Not everything you do.

Choose the ones you repeat and that involve drafting or research. Ignore anything that is mostly meetings, negotiation, or decision-making — those are not where this helps, and claiming otherwise weakens the rest.

Step 2. Count how often you do each one.

Per month, or per action if your volume is uneven. Use your last quarter rather than your impression of a normal month.

Step 3. Time the drafting stage from something real.

Open the last action you completed and estimate how long the research and first-draft stage took — not the whole action, just that stage. Your calendar and your file are better sources than memory.

Step 4. Split that time into assembly and judgment.

Assembly is gathering, structuring, and getting words onto a page. Judgment is deciding what is right. Only the assembly half is in scope. In most procurement drafting the split is closer to even than people expect.

Step 5. Take a conservative share of the assembly time, round down, and write it as a range.

A quarter to a half of the assembly time is a defensible claim. More than that is not, and you will be the one explaining it.

Worked through, for one task:

Market research for an IT services action	
How often	Roughly one action per month
Research and first-draft stage, today	About 10 hours per action, from the action I closed last month

Market research for an IT services action	
Of which: assembly	About 6 hours — finding sources, pulling them together, structuring the summary
Of which: judgment	About 4 hours — assessing what the market supports. Not in scope.
Conservative share of assembly	A third to a half of 6 hours
What goes in the letter	2–3 hrs. per action

Six hours of assembly became a two-to-three-hour claim. That is the shape you want: visibly conservative, with the reasoning available if anyone asks for it.

Language that keeps the estimate an estimate

Three habits, all of which your approving official will recognize as normal estimating practice rather than hedging:

- **State the basis.** "Estimated from the three actions I completed in August" turns a number into a judgment. One clause is enough.
- **Use ranges, not points.** "2–3 hours" reads as an estimate. "2.5 hours" reads as a measurement you did not take.
- **Say what would make it wrong.** "Assumes I can reach these tools from my workstation" is not weakness. It is the assumption line every estimate carries, and its absence is what makes a number look unconsidered.

UNDER-PROMISE. ALWAYS.

If you think the answer is six hours, write three to four. There is no upside to the higher number — the request gets approved either way at \$395 for Module 1— and there is real downside if someone remembers it in six months.

A modest claim that turns out to be right builds far more standing than an ambitious one that does not.

If you would rather not put hours in writing

That is a legitimate choice, and in some offices, it is the wise one. Do not leave the column empty — an empty column reads as an unanswered question. Use one of these instead.

- **Describe the change without quantifying it.** Delete the "Time back" column entirely and keep "What changes." The table still does most of its work.
- **Offer to measure it.** Write "to be measured on the next three actions" and mean it. This is often stronger than an estimate, because it commits you to the discipline rather than to the number.
- **Move it to elapsed time.** If hours are sensitive but throughput is not, say what moves instead: "first drafts ready for review in two days rather than five." Supervisors care about the calendar at least as much as the clock.

THE ONE THING NOT TO DO

Do not copy the numbers from the example in Part 4. They are illustrative, drawn from an invented docket, and they will not match yours. A supervisor who asks, "where did this come from?" and gets no answer has learned something about the request that you did not intend to teach them.



PART 3 • THE LETTER

Replace the shaded fields. Delete this line before sending.

Date: [Insert Date]

To: [Supervisor's Name]

From: [Your Name, Title]

Subject: Professional Development Request: Commercial GenAI for Public Sector Procurement

Dear [Supervisor's Name],

I am writing to request approval to enroll in Module 1 of Commercial GenAI for Public Sector Procurement, an online course from The Wolverine Group, Inc. The cost is \$395, with no travel or time away from the office. The material applies directly to work currently on my desk.

Expected return on investment

- **Risk mitigation and a defensible record. Commercial AI tools — ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, and Copilot — are already in use across procurement offices**, often by staff who have received no written guidance on what may be entered into them. The exposure is not the tools; it is undocumented use of them in work that must withstand a protest, an audit, or a public records request. This course covers data classification, what may and may not be entered, and how to document AI-assisted work so the file holds up. [Add one sentence on what you are seeing in our office.]
- **Return is built into the work I do every week. The bottleneck in most of my actions is not judgment — it is the first draft and the research that precedes it. This course is built for government procurement rather than adapted from commercial training, with content marked separately for federal, state, and local practitioners, and it targets exactly that stage. The table below sets out where I expect the time to come back.**
- **Cost-effective professional development. Module 1 is eligible for approximately 3.5 CLPs as self-directed study, subject to [our agency / my certifying body] approval. The Wolverine Group is not an accredited CLP/CEU provider. At \$395, with no travel and no time away from the office, this delivers those hours at a fraction of the cost of a conference or a classroom course.**

Where the return shows up

Estimated from [the actions I completed in the last quarter]. Assumes [I can reach these tools from my workstation].

Recurring task	What changes	Time back
	Synthesis of sources into a structured summary I then verify and cite, instead of assembling it from a blank page	[range]
	A first draft to edit against, built from requirements I supply, rather than drafting from scratch	[range]
	Faster construction of defensible criteria, with a documented rationale captured as I go	[range]



Judgment, warrant authority, and final approval remain unchanged and remain mine. The course is explicit that these tools assist and do not decide, and it treats verification of every output as a required step rather than an optional one.

The return is not just time. Work drafted with a documented review step produces a cleaner file, reducing rework and strengthening the record if an action is challenged. A single avoided rework cycle on a solicitation would more than cover the cost of this course.

Estimated investment breakdown

Expense item	Estimated cost
Course enrollment — Module 1	\$395
Airfare and travel	None — delivered online
Lodging	None
Meals and incidentals	None
Time away from the office	None — self-paced
Total estimated investment	\$395

Payment may be made by government purchase card or by purchase order with net 30 invoicing. A W-9 and a formal quote are available upon request. At \$395, this falls below the micro-purchase threshold of \$15,000 under FAR 2.101, effective 1 October 2025.

IF PAID BY PURCHASE CARD

The statement will read TEACHABLE, not The Wolverine Group. Enrollment is processed through Teachable, the course platform and merchant of record. An itemized receipt naming the vendor arrives by email at purchase and is the document to file for reconciliation. If our card program requires the statement merchant to match the vendor in the purchase file, a purchase order should be used instead.

What the office gets back

I am not asking to be trained in isolation. Within [two weeks] of completing the module I will do the following, and I would welcome being held to it.

- **Brief the team.** A 30-minute session covering what may and may not be entered into a commercial AI tool, the classification rules that apply to our work, and the documentation expected of anyone using these tools. Aimed at those already using them without guidance.
- **Share the reference materials.** The module includes a data-safety desk reference, a documentation log template, a compliance checklist, and a starter prompt set designed for procurement tasks. These materials support the briefing and give the office something concrete to work from rather than a set of verbal cautions.
- **Propose a written review step.** A short, practical rule for verifying and recording AI-assisted work in the file — drafted from the course material, tailored to how we work, and submitted to you for approval. If adopted, it closes the gap between what staff are already doing and what our records currently show.



- **Act as the point of contact. For questions from colleagues about whether a particular use is appropriate, so those questions land somewhere informed rather than being answered by guesswork or avoided entirely.**

That is the substance of this request. For \$395 and a few hours of my own time, the office gets a documented position on a set of tools it is already using, and one person accountable for keeping it current as the guidance evolves.

Thank you for considering this request. I would be glad to discuss it, and to start with the briefing commitment above if that would help you weigh it.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

[Your Title]

[Office / Organization]



PART 4 • COMPLETED EXAMPLE

The same letter, filled in. Names, dockets, and estimates are illustrative — build your own from Part 2 rather than reusing these.

Date: 14 September 2026

To: Marcia Ellery, Branch Chief, Acquisition Operations

From: J. Rivera, Contract Specialist, GS-1102-12

Subject: Professional Development Request: Commercial GenAI for Public Sector Procurement

Dear Ms. Ellery,

I am writing to request approval to enroll in Module 1 of Commercial GenAI for Public Sector Procurement, an online course from The Wolverine Group, Inc. The cost is \$395, there is no travel, and no time away from the office. The material applies directly to work currently on my desk.

Expected return on investment

- **Risk mitigation and a defensible record.** Commercial AI tools are already in use across our branch, frequently by staff who have received no written guidance on what may be entered into them. Two weeks ago a colleague asked me whether pasting a draft statement of work into ChatGPT would be a problem. I did not have a confident answer, and I could not point to any branch guidance. That question is the reason for this request.
- **Return in the work I do every week.** The bottleneck on my three open IT services actions is not judgment — it is the first draft and the research before it. The table below sets out where I expect the time to come back.
- **Cost-effective professional development.** Module 1 is eligible for approximately 3.5 CLPs as self-directed study, subject to our agency's approval. The Wolverine Group is not an accredited CLP/CEU provider. At \$395 with no travel, this delivers those hours at a fraction of the cost of a conference.

Where the return shows up

Estimated from the three actions I completed in August, taking roughly a third of the assembly time in each. Assumes I can reach these tools from my workstation.

Recurring task	What changes	Time back
Market research — three open IT actions	Structured source synthesis I verify and cite, rather than assembling from a blank page	2–3 hrs. / action
Performance work statements	A first draft to edit against, built from requirements I supply	2–3 hrs. / action
Evaluation criteria, Q2 solicitation	Defensible criteria built faster, rationale captured as I go	2 hrs.

Judgment, warrant authority, and final approval remain unchanged and remain mine. A single avoided rework cycle on the Q2 solicitation would more than cover the cost of this course.



Estimated investment breakdown

Expense item	Estimated cost
Course enrollment — Module 1	\$395
Airfare and travel	None — delivered online
Lodging	None
Meals and incidentals	None
Time away from the office	None — self-paced
Total estimated investment	\$395

I propose to pay by government purchase card. Note that the statement will read TEACHABLE rather than The Wolverine Group — enrollment runs through the course platform, which is the merchant of record. The itemized receipt naming the vendor arrives by email and will be filed for reconciliation.

What the office gets back

Within two weeks of completing the module I will brief the branch for 30 minutes on what may and may not be entered into a commercial AI tool and the documentation expected of anyone using them; circulate the data-safety desk reference, documentation log template, and compliance checklist the module provides; and draft a short written review step for AI-assisted work, sized to how our branch operates, for your approval. I will also act as the point of contact for questions from colleagues about whether a particular use is appropriate.

For \$395 and a few hours of my own time, the branch gets a documented position on tools it is already using, and one person accountable for keeping it current. I propose completing the module by 15 October, ahead of the second-quarter solicitation cycle.

Thank you for considering this request. I would be glad to discuss it, and to start with the briefing commitment above if that would help you weigh it.

Sincerely,

J. Rivera

Contract Specialist, GS-1102-12

Acquisition Operations Branch



PART 5 • VENDOR AND COURSE INFORMATION

What a purchasing office or approving official is likely to ask for. Attach this page or delete it.

Vendor

Legal name	The Wolverine Group, Inc.
UEI	VK81K1DMC6L5
CAGE	6BUU5
Business status	SBA-certified Woman-Owned Small Business
Other credentials	CMMC Level 2 · Top Secret Facility Clearance
Address	256 8th Street SE, Washington, DC 20003
Procurement contact	support@wolverine-group.com

Purchase

Product	Commercial GenAI for Public Sector Procurement — Module 1, Using GenAI Safely in Government Procurement
Price	\$395 (Module 1). Single transaction, not a subscription.
Access	Twelve months from the date access is granted, or ninety days past the release of Module 5, whichever is later.
Delivery	Online, self-paced. No travel.
Payment methods	Government purchase card · purchase order with net 30 invoicing · W-9 and formal quote on request
Group rates	Available for five or more seats from the same agency, department, or district. Quote on request.
Statement descriptor	TEACHABLE — enrollment is processed through Teachable, the course platform and merchant of record. The itemized receipt naming The Wolverine Group arrives by email at purchase and is the reconciliation record.
Refunds	72-hour cancellation before the first lesson is opened. Once course content is accessed, sales are final.

Content

Module 1	Five videos, approximately 3–4 hours including exercises
Topics	Data safety and classification · compliance and documentation · AI limitations and professional responsibility · guided first session



Deliverables	Data-safety desk reference, documentation log template, compliance checklists, starter prompt set.
Materials Retention	Downloadable materials are yours to keep after the access period ends, and may be shared with colleagues in your own immediate office.
Assessment	Knowledge check, document classification exercise, scenario analysis
Jurisdictions	Federal, state, and local content marked separately
Continuous learning	Eligible for approximately 3.5 CLPs as self-directed study, subject to agency approval — The Wolverine Group is not an accredited CLP/CEU provider.
Full program	Five modules, 32 videos. Module 1 available now; Modules 2–5 in production.
Where to find more	
Course details	wolverine-group.com/course-genai-procurement.html
Government purchasing	wolverine-group.com/government-purchasing.html
Purchase card guide	wolverine-group.com/resources/P-Card_Reconciliation_Guide.pdf
Questions	support@wolverine-group.com

BEFORE YOU SEND

Send Part 3 only, unless your approving official wants the vendor details attached. Replace every shaded field. Build the return table from your own docket using Part 2 — never from the example. Read the risk paragraph once more and make it about your office rather than procurement offices in general. That is the sentence that does the work.

The Wolverine Group provides this template for convenience. It is not legal, ethical, or procurement advice, and it does not replace your agency's training request procedures, purchase card rules, or approval chain. The



estimating method in Part 2 is guidance, not a warranty; time estimates are yours to make, and we make no representation about savings in any particular office. Continuous learning point estimates are the provider's and are subject to your agency's determination. Confirm the micro-purchase threshold and any category or vendor restrictions against your agency's card program guidance before purchasing.