

Human Oversight Reliance Review

Worked Examples & Practice Checks

Maja Kurek, AIGP, CIPM, CIPP/E • RuleBridge Advisory

Worked examples of oversight across AI-supported work

Example A examines an offer-drafting agent whose content review, specialist approval and data handling depend on different capabilities. It follows the review from bounded claims and evidence through shared-capacity analysis to an operating decision.

Example B examines multilingual intake and a supplier handover. It traces a concern that does not reach specialist review, separates completed cases from unresolved questions, and preserves the time available to the affected person.

The companion workbook carries the full linked records for both reviews. The practice checks examine how to distinguish requirements, evidence and decisions; test shared commitments; and respond when an oversight condition changes.

Synthetic worked examples. Names, events, records, dates and results are constructed for demonstration.

Example A. Offer drafting, shared expertise and earlier data handling

Review ID: A-R1 • Entirely synthetic

Decide whether an offer-drafting agent can remain in the existing operating scope and what a proposed specialist extension would require.

Offer service Q7; standard and nonstandard offers; external text processor; dispatch requires staff action; one stated client-data restriction. Later in Day 1, Q7-r is introduced as a restrictive configuration; earlier Q7 findings remain historical.

Boundary and people

Includes preparation, data transfer, content review and dispatch. Includes complaints and renewal exceptions only as shared-specialist commitments. Not a legal assessment of processor terms or contract validity.

Sales staff; clients receiving offers; customers awaiting complaint/renewal decisions. Input represented in this constructed case by task owners and an urgency rule.

Review owner: governance lead. Contributors: sales owner, specialist-service owner, integration operator, privacy lead. All roles fictional.

Commercial operations director: may restrict offer-service use and allocate the stated specialist window. Does not decide unresolved legal questions.

No evidence on undisclosed supplier staffing or real customer outcomes. A planned added specialist is not available today.

What the review must distinguish

A-F1 — Check standard offers for specified content errors before dispatch.

Service rule O7: clients should receive correct prices, valid catalogue items and the correct recipient. In a defined scripted exercise, identify seeded price/item/recipient defects, correctly accept sound cases and seek clarification for ambiguity. No general error-rate target inferred. Path and timing: Agent drafts → approved-price view and draft reach staff → review → dispatch. Before dispatch to the client. A post-send correction is a different contribution.

A-F2 — Obtain a qualified decision on nonstandard commitments before dispatch.

Commercial delegation O7: nonstandard terms require a specialist decision. Required approval must precede each nonstandard dispatch. Specialist capability and joint availability must be assessed separately. Path and timing: Staff identify nonstandard term → specialist queue → approve/revise/reject → dispatch route. Before dispatch; existing pending offers can have their own negotiated reply deadlines.

A-F3 — Decide the permitted data route before restricted client text enters an external processor.

Synthetic handling rule P1 prohibits the specified restricted class on that processor. This is a stipulated case rule, not a general legal conclusion. Restricted class must be excluded before external submission, or a separately authorised lawful arrangement must be established. Path and timing: Input preparation → external processing → draft → final human review. Current final review is after transfer. Before submission to the external processor.

A-F4 — Provide specialist decisions for complaint settlements.

Existing complaint-service work plan; affected customers need timely responses. The batch requires a stipulated 60 minutes of specialist time in that window; timing/quality beyond this illustrative assumption are not inferred. Path and timing: Complaint team → specialist review → response owner. Within the shared 150-minute morning window.

A-F5 — Provide specialist decisions for renewal exceptions.

Existing renewal work plan; avoid silently displacing an already committed service. A separate 60-minute requirement under the stated simplifying assumptions. Path and timing: Renewal team → specialist review → reply owner. Within the same 150-minute morning window.

Example A. Evidence and its boundaries

These are stipulated evidence items inside the constructed example. Their IDs point to fully described sources, access limits and provenance in the example workbook.

A-E1 • Design or rule

Synthetic O7, paragraphs 2–4: content and delegation rules. Requires standard checks and specialist approval before nonstandard dispatch.

Boundary: Defines what should happen; no execution observations.

A-E2 • Controlled check

Synthetic test A-T1: 12 scripted standard offers, retained input/output and adjudications. Four correct offers accepted; six with seeded specified defects corrected; two ambiguous offers escalated. All 12 met the defined exercise criterion.

Boundary: Only these 12 scripted cases. No estimate of production accuracy or risk reduction.

A-E3 • Operational record or observation

Synthetic dispatch trace: offer N7, item timestamps and specialist approval status. N7 was sent at 10:03; specialist approval was recorded at 10:11.

Boundary: One established instance. Frequency among all nonstandard offers unknown.

A-E4 • Operational record or observation

Synthetic request trace X2: restricted field transfer and later offer display. Restricted-class text reached the external processor before the final reviewer received the draft.

Boundary: Demonstrates temporal reach for this path; no whole-service privacy assessment.

A-E5 • Account

Synthetic specialist-owner account and work-plan confirmation WP1. 150 minutes available after other duties. Three distinct due batches require 60 minutes each; no shared review work; no other qualified cover in that window.

Boundary: Inputs for a simplified scenario; handling-time variability and complete weekly service performance not established.

A-E6 • Design or rule

Synthetic proposed work plan WP2. An additional specialist would add 60 protected minutes; skill/access and displaced duties require confirmation.

Boundary: Plan only; no evidence of attendance, access or competent work.

A-E7 • Analytical derivation

Synthetic joint calculation S1 based on A-E5. $60 + 60 + 60 = 180$ minutes against 150 available; shortfall 30. Any pair requires 120.

Boundary: Arithmetic does not establish arrivals, future frequencies, quality or a staffing benchmark.

A-E8 • Controlled check

Synthetic restriction check A-T2 and scoped configuration receipt CR-A. Standard display and the O7 content-review rubric are unchanged; this does not extend the tested quality result to untested live cases. Nonstandard offer path blocked; free-text client input disabled; standard approved-field path remained usable in the 6 checked paths.

Boundary: Supports restriction in checked paths; no proof of all routes or all future use.

A-E9 • Design or rule

Synthetic handling rule P1, restricted-class definition. Specified client-text class is prohibited on the external processor in the case.

Boundary: Stipulated organisational constraint; not a conclusion about any named law.

Example A. Claim assessments

A-C1 — Supported within scope

The reviewer met the specified content-review criterion on all 12 scripted standard offers in A-T1.

State and scope: Historical. Q7 test setting; exactly A-T1 cases, synthetic Day 1.

Criterion: A-F1 criterion; A-E1 and exercise adjudication.

Reasoning: A-E2 records the correct decisions against the specified criterion. The claim concerns the exercise only, not ordinary-use error rates.

Limit: No inference about untested cases, rare defects or live customer outcomes.

Evidence links: A-L1 → A-E1 (Context); A-L2 → A-E2 (Supports).

A-C2 — Contradicted within scope

All nonstandard offers in Q7 were dispatched only after specialist approval during the five-day period.

State and scope: Historical. Q7; nonstandard offers; synthetic Days -4 to 0.

Criterion: Required approval before dispatch, O7.

Reasoning: O7 states the rule, but N7 in A-E3 records dispatch before approval in the claimed period. One verified exception contradicts the universal proposition; the rule is not proof of enforcement.

Limit: The overall number or rate of bypasses and their cause are not established.

Evidence links: A-L3 → A-E1 (Context); A-L4 → A-E3 (Challenges).

A-C3 — Contradicted within scope

Final offer review prevents restricted-class text from reaching the external processor on path X2.

State and scope: Historical. Q7; X2 path and stipulated class P1.

Criterion: Restriction must operate before transfer; A-F3.

Reasoning: A-E4 places transfer before review. The final review cannot perform the claimed preventive function on that path. A-E9 establishes the stipulated restriction, not general law.

Limit: Other upstream measures and legal status of other data classes not assessed.

Evidence links: A-L5 → A-E4 (Challenges); A-L6 → A-E9 (Context).

A-C4 — Contradicted within scope

All three distinct specialist batches can be completed within the shared morning window under WP1 assumptions.

State and scope: Current. A-S1; three 60-minute batches; 150 protected minutes; no cover.

Criterion: Deliver each batch in its stated window.

Reasoning: A-E5 supplies the scenario inputs. A-E7 gives 180 minutes required versus 150 available. Pairwise fit does not establish whole-set feasibility.

Limit: No claim about general staffing adequacy, actual handling variability or prevalence of this demand.

Evidence links: A-L7 → A-E5 (Context); A-L8 → A-E7 (Challenges).

Example A. Claim assessments — continued

A-C5 — Supported within scope

The proposed WP2 adds enough total minutes for the three stipulated batches, assuming its extra specialist is available.

State and scope: Proposed. WP2; same request set; 210 minutes if 60 additional minutes are delivered.

Criterion: Total requested time does not exceed available time; not a timing/quality sufficiency criterion.

Reasoning: The conditional arithmetic is $180 \leq 210$. A-E6 is a plan; this supports only that arithmetic proposition about the proposed state.

Limit: Skill, access, actual availability, deadline compatibility and effects on other duties unverified.

Evidence links: A-L9 → A-E6 (Supports); A-L10 → A-E7 (Context).

A-C6 — Not established

The additional specialist in WP2 is presently equipped and available for nonstandard offers.

State and scope: Current. Day 1; proposed new specialist assignment.

Criterion: Relevant expertise, access and protected availability are present.

Reasoning: Only A-E6, a future staffing plan, is available. It establishes intent, not the current capability required by this claim.

Limit: No relevant implementation, access or competency evidence inspected.

Evidence links: A-L11 → A-E6 (Context).

A-C7 — Supported within scope

The specified restrictive configuration Q7-r held nonstandard and free-text-input paths in the six exercised paths.

State and scope: Current. Q7-r; A-T2; synthetic Day 1 at 14:00.

Criterion: Restrictive rule in A-D1 implemented for checked paths.

Reasoning: A-E8 records the installed restriction and the limited path exercise. This is a bounded implementation result, not a general content or privacy assurance claim.

Limit: Unexercised routes and subsequent changes remain outside the claim.

Evidence links: A-L12 → A-E8 (Supports).

Example A. Joint review and decision

A-S1 — One shared morning window in WP1.

Offers 60 min; complaints 60 min; renewals 60 min. Separate work; no legitimate overlap. 150 min protected. 180 required; 150 available. Each pair 120; all three 180. Assume all must finish in window and no substitutes.

Pausing nonstandard offers preserves other commitments; assess already pending offer deadlines separately. Illustrative deterministic inputs only; review owner, synthetic Day 1.

A-S2 — Proposed WP2, not in effect.

Same 180 minutes; proposed extra specialist adds 60 to current 150. $180 \leq 210$ is conditional arithmetic. Need skill, actual protected time, arrival windows and displaced-duty check.

Identify the duty the new specialist leaves and confirm its new coverage. Otherwise merely displaces a gap. No activation justified by arithmetic alone; review owner, synthetic Day 1.

A-S3 — Existing order of execution before restriction.

Specialist approval must precede dispatch; restricted data check must precede transfer. N7 dispatched before approval; X2 transferred before final review. Different paths and different causes; do not label both overload.

Earlier input restriction may preserve standard offer service; monitor whether manual routes bypass it. One established event/path each; frequencies unknown.

A-D1 — Recorded

Authority and time: Commercial operations director; fictional mandate covers service restriction and resource allocation. Privacy lead owns unresolved specialist advice. Synthetic Day 1, 13:30; restricted operation conditional on check, verified 14:00.

Permitted now: Standard approved-field offers on Q7-r may continue within O7 with staff review and same-day escalation of anomalies.

Excluded or pending: Nonstandard dispatch and free-text client input remain blocked. WP2 not activated.

Reason and uncertainty: Preserve bounded demonstrated standard process; avoid relying on late approval or uninstalled staff. Alternatives: full pause or immediate added cover; cover not yet established. Live quality beyond A-T1 not fully measured; bounded implementation check not exhaustive. Director accepts temporary scope with monitoring; no waiver of law.

Implementation basis: A-E8 supports the installed specified restrictions. Existing O7 staff mandate retained; no claim of universal enforcement.

Other effects and follow-up: Complaint and renewal commitments preserved. Commercial owner examines pending offers and deadlines; integration/privacy owners examine the identified prior paths and determine further review. CR-A: operator implements restrictions (limited check complete); commercial owner contacts affected pending clients; privacy lead addresses data-route questions.

Return and interim position: A-H1 and A-H2: operator notifies owner on path/permission change; specialist owner on loss of cover. Reconsider by Day 3. If unresolved, restrictions persist; urgency route remains staffed.

A-D2 — Pending

Authority and time: Commercial operations director; staffing and expanded-use decision. No decision recorded.

Permitted now: No additional permission created by this pending record. A-D1 remains the operating decision.

Excluded or pending: WP2 specialist extension awaits capability, displaced-work and timing evidence.

Reason and uncertainty: A-C5 addresses arithmetic only. Obtain evidence before deciding whether the proposed expansion should activate. Current specialist capability not established.

Implementation basis: No implementation evidence for WP2.

Other effects and follow-up: Assess the new specialist's former duties and any backlogs. CR-A extension: specialist owner to supply relevant evidence; review owner prepares revised assessment.

Return and interim position: Return to director at Day 3; no silent expansion if review slips.

Example A. Change and transfer

A-H1 — Q7-r restrictions and approved input scope remain in effect.

Detection and route: Integration operator checks configuration/change notices and receives staff anomaly reports. Notify sales owner and governance lead; director decides scope; privacy lead advises on data changes.

Interim arrangement and clock: Keep nonstandard and free-text paths disabled until authorised and appropriately evidenced replacement; operator can contain urgent exposure under existing mandate. Day 3 review; urgent reports immediately through staffed service route.

Assignment: Operator assigned change monitoring.

Acceptance: Operator accepts for staffed window; duty cover named by service owner.

Capability: Scoped permissions and A-T2 check recorded; no broad claim beyond checked paths.

Next action: Existing CR-A; affected-period inquiry remains separate.

A-H2 — Specialist demand, actual extra coverage and transferred-duty impact.

Detection and route: Specialist owner receives schedules, absence notices and revised task requirements from all three owners. Return material change to director and affected process owners.

Interim arrangement and clock: A-D1 continues; proposed WP2 creates no permission. Escalate threatened customer deadlines rather than silently replace approval with sampling. Day 3; each pending client deadline remains its original time.

Assignment: Proposed new specialist assignment in WP2.

Acceptance: Acceptance not established.

Capability: Skill, access and protected availability not established.

Next action: WP2 capability check and displaced-duty confirmation under CR-A.

Why there is no single result for the agent

A-C1 supports a bounded exercise result. A-C2 and A-C3 contradict broader claims about different preventive functions. A-C4 identifies a conditional whole-set conflict. A-C5 supports proposed arithmetic, whereas A-C6 cannot establish current extra capability. A-C7 concerns a limited restriction check. None should replace the others, and no tally of supported claims would answer the decision.

Example B. Mixed-concern intake and a supplier handover

Review ID: B-R1 • Entirely synthetic

Decide how intake and a supplier handover should operate while a mixed-concern routing issue is investigated.

Intake M4; supported English and German; AI labels, summaries and routes; payroll/service and conduct review destinations. M4-h is introduced in the later remedial route checks; earlier M4 results remain historical.

Boundary and people

Includes referral and linked closure, urgent service query and transfer of an open system concern. Does not determine whether any complaint allegation is true.

Reporting persons; staff; service users waiting for a slot. Existing urgency escalation and accessible direct route included in scenario.

Governance lead, intake owner, supplier lead, qualified conduct reviewer, service owner. All fictional.

Intake director can change workflow and commission cover; cannot determine an individual allegation outside the relevant specialist process.

True population miss rate and wider configuration behaviour unknown. No personnel performance evaluation.

What the review must distinguish

B-F1 — Preserve and refer each concern that warrants qualified consideration, even when another issue is resolved.

Synthetic intake rule I4 and relevant specialist referral criteria, based on information available at intake. In scoped mixed-concern test, warranted referral survives routing, merging and closure. Allegation substantiation is not the referral criterion. Path and timing: Submission → AI label/summary → destination → separate work items → closure. Current one-destination path can close both. Before closing a report whose other concern requires review.

B-F2 — Preserve an opportunity for qualified urgent service response during transfer.

Synthetic service rule U2: original appointment window and accessible escalation. Named capable person can reach a decision while the option still exists; record alternatives if not. Path and timing: Intake → reviewer → authorised service desk → response to person. Original slot expires Day 1 at 12:00 Europe/Zagreb; reassignment at 11:30 does not restart it.

B-F3 — Carry and assign the unresolved attachment/routing concern through supplier handover.

Quality concern Q-B1; incoming team needs relevant basis and authority to continue examination. Assignment, acceptance, useful evidence access and route to decide remain explicit; uncertainty about a later model is preserved. Path and timing: Outgoing team → incoming supplier → quality owner → workflow decision authority. No unattended interval for matters that require action; deadlines retain original reference.

Example B. Evidence and its boundaries

These are stipulated evidence items inside the constructed example. Their IDs point to fully described sources, access limits and provenance in the example workbook.

B-E1 • Design or rule

Synthetic I4 referral criteria, U2 urgency procedure and Q-B1 concern record. Mixed issues must remain separately owned; urgency has a staffed direct route; Q-B1 remains open after individual corrections.

Boundary: Defines intended arrangement; not execution evidence.

B-E2 • Controlled check

Synthetic paired test B-T1: payroll-only and payroll-plus-reduced-shifts report. Payroll-only case routes appropriately. Mixed case also closes after payroll correction; potential conduct concern never reaches specialist.

Boundary: Two purposively constructed reports. No production prevalence inference.

B-E3 • Operational record or observation

Synthetic operational case R9: retained submission and destination/closure trace. A second concern remained in the source but no specialist work item was created before whole-report closure.

Boundary: One established miss; denominator for wider missed concerns not reconstructed.

B-E4 • Account

Synthetic supplier acceptance TR-B, and stated access limitation. Incoming lead accepts routine queue but says the team cannot access attachment evidence for Q-B1 or change routing.

Boundary: Account confirms stated limitation; not evidence that all staff lack all capability.

B-E5 • Controlled check

Synthetic B-T2: ordinary referral task using a purpose-built protected view. Six specified routine decisions met the pre-set referral criteria. Relevant fields and clarification route were sufficient without unrestricted source access.

Boundary: Only six controlled cases; does not answer mixed-closure or attachment concerns.

B-E6 • Operational record or observation

Synthetic urgency route receipt U2-R: assignment, service-desk access and response event. Qualified service owner accepted urgent request and confirmed direct desk access before noon; option preserved by authorised desk action within its remit.

Boundary: One urgent case, not general SLA performance.

B-E7 • Design or rule

Synthetic proposed M5 release note. Provider says attachment handling improves; no task-specific check of Q-B1 under M5 supplied.

Boundary: Does not settle whether current concern is resolved under M5.

B-E8 • Controlled check

Synthetic B-T3: hold/report split enabled; two tested routes. Routine item closure no longer closes linked conduct work; routine auto-closure disabled for mixed or uncertain concerns in tested paths.

Boundary: Two checks; relevant untested classes still need inquiry.

Example B. Claim assessments

B-C1 — Contradicted within scope

M4 preserves the warranted conduct referral in the mixed report tested in B-T1.

State and scope: Historical. M4 isolated path; one specified mixed-concern variant.

Criterion: B-F1: referral based on available information, not eventual substantiation.

Reasoning: B-E2 shows the warranted second referral was absent after payroll closure. Correct handling of payroll is preserved as a positive result, not treated as resolution of the conduct issue.

Limit: No prevalence estimate or finding that alleged conduct occurred.

Evidence links: B-L1 → B-E1 (Context); B-L2 → B-E2 (Challenges).

B-C2 — Supported within scope

The M4 operational record contains at least one in-scope missed concern, R9.

State and scope: Historical. R9; synthetic Day -1; defined trace.

Criterion: Retained source warrants referral under I4; downstream work item absent.

Reasoning: B-E3 supports the existence of one missed referral. The proposition describes a problem; Supported is not a positive safety label.

Limit: Wider frequency and cause not established.

Evidence links: B-L3 → B-E3 (Supports).

B-C3 — Not established

The rate of missed concerns across all M4 reports in the period is known.

State and scope: Historical. All M4 reports in the referenced period; denominator unavailable.

Criterion: Defined population and appropriate selection/estimation basis.

Reasoning: B-E2 and B-E3 establish selected problems, but neither supplies a complete eligible population or probability design for a rate.

Limit: Population, selection probabilities and missed-concern rate unknown.

Evidence links: B-L4 → B-E2 (Context); B-L5 → B-E3 (Context).

B-C4 — Contradicted within scope

Receipt of the routine queue establishes that the incoming supplier can investigate Q-B1.

State and scope: Current. TR-B at Day 1 11:30; Q-B1 for M4.

Criterion: Acceptance and capability must include relevant evidence and decision route.

Reasoning: B-E4 explicitly excludes useful attachment access and routing power from the accepted task. Receipt does not establish the claimed investigation capability.

Limit: A separate technical route may be available but has not been arranged in this handover.

Evidence links: B-L6 → B-E4 (Challenges).

Example B. Claim assessments — continued

B-C5 — Supported within scope

The protected view supported correct referral decisions on the six ordinary B-T2 cases.

State and scope: Historical. M4; specified ordinary English/German test cases only.

Criterion: Task-specific referral rubric and clarification use in B-T2.

Reasoning: B-E5 supports the limited task result. Unrestricted raw access is not needed for this claim. Mixed-closure and attachment issues remain separate.

Limit: No extension to Q-B1, unfamiliar languages or all production cases.

Evidence links: B-L7 → B-E5 (Supports).

B-C6 — Supported within scope

The urgent U2-R request reached an authorised capable response before its original noon deadline.

State and scope: Historical. One request; Day 1 Europe/Zagreb.

Criterion: Useful action before original slot expiry, not routine SLA after reassignment.

Reasoning: B-E6 records accepted responsibility, desk access and effective response before noon. The incoming queue alone did not provide this contribution.

Limit: No general claim about all urgent cases or future cover.

Evidence links: B-L8 → B-E6 (Supports).

B-C7 — Not established

The proposed M5 update resolves the open Q-B1 concern.

State and scope: Proposed. Proposed M5; Q-B1 source evidence concerns M4.

Criterion: Relevant end-to-end task check or other adequate basis of resolution.

Reasoning: B-E7 announces an intended improvement but supplies no relevant verification of the concern under M5. Neither old failure nor claimed improvement establishes the new behaviour.

Limit: Future applicability and resolution unknown.

Evidence links: B-L9 → B-E7 (Context).

B-C8 — Supported within scope

The M4-h change preserved separate conduct ownership in the two remedial route checks.

State and scope: Current. M4-h, B-T3; Day 1 15:00.

Criterion: Linked closure must preserve remaining warranted work.

Reasoning: B-E8 shows the new behaviour in the checked paths. This supports limited implementation, not the rate or adequacy of all future intake.

Limit: Other report classes and inputs not tested.

Evidence links: B-L10 → B-E8 (Supports).

Example B. Joint review and decision

B-S1 — Mixed issue versus single issue; M4 to closure.

Resolve payroll properly while preserving warranted conduct review; destinations need only appropriate content. Payroll-only result is appropriate. Mixed result loses second concern. One destination must not erase another.

Separating concern ownership avoids giving all teams unrestricted access; assess additional qualified review demand. Selected cases only; no all-channel effectiveness claim.

B-S2 — Supplier transfer at 11:30; urgent clock expires 12:00.

Routine work accepted; Q-B1 capability absent; urgent service action cannot await ordinary handover. Keep Q-B1 with qualified owner; use existing urgent route. Acceptance of queue and effective handling of urgent case are distinct.

Avoid holding all scarce slots indefinitely; authorise proportionate case-specific option preservation. Case-specific success not general availability evidence.

B-S3 — Proposed update M5 after M4 attachment concern.

Know whether old concern still applies and whether proposed improvement resolves it. Old examples and release note do not determine new end-to-end result. Keep issue open pending scoped evidence.

Do not prolong obsolete warnings after proper resolution; preserve reason and evidence for eventual closure. No real update evaluated.

B-D1 — Recorded

Authority and time: Intake director: workflow scope and supplier coverage; service owner retains U2 urgent authority; conduct judgments stay with qualified function. Synthetic Day 1, 14:30; remedial paths checked 15:00.

Permitted now: Ordinary supported-language work may continue in M4-h under appropriate review. Mixed/uncertain matters keep linked concern ownership. Qualified retained quality lead owns Q-B1.

Excluded or pending: No automatic whole-report closure for specified mixed/uncertain classes. Q-B1 investigation not transferred to incoming supplier. Proposed M5 not treated as resolved.

Reason and uncertainty: Preserve successful ordinary work and urgent route while responding to established miss. Full indefinite pause considered but would delay necessary services and is not required by these findings. Wider miss rate unknown; targeted remedy evidence limited. No assertion whether an allegation is substantiated.

Implementation basis: B-E8 supports checked M4-h restriction; B-E6 records effective urgent handling; B-E4 scopes supplier acceptance.

Other effects and follow-up: Intake owner reviews potentially affected period proportionately using source records; qualified function attends to identified missed concern now. Review added demand and avoid shifting uncovered work to supplier. Existing Q-B1/TR-B: quality owner retains concern; operator maintains M4-h; intake owner records review design and urgency route cover.

Return and interim position: B-H1/B-H2: operator or supplier reports relevant changes; director reviews by Day 3. Pending review, M4-h restrictions and retained ownership persist; original case deadlines unchanged.

Example B. Change and transfer

B-H1 — Q-B1 remains open beyond corrected cases; M5 applicability unestablished.

Detection and route: Quality owner receives provider release note, operator configuration history and new case reports. Quality owner seeks technical evidence; director decides changed operating scope. Supplier reports acceptance limits.

Interim arrangement and clock: Retained owner handles concern; incoming supplier handles only accepted routine scope; restrictions remain pending evidence. Day 3 review; M5 release is an event, not automatic resolution.

Assignment: Routine queue assigned to supplier; Q-B1 assigned to retained quality owner.

Acceptance: Supplier explicitly accepts routine scope only; quality owner accepts concern.

Capability: Ordinary protected-view test supports limited task; Q-B1 requires retained access and technical route.

Next action: Existing Q-B1 and TR-B; document any resolution and its reason.

B-H2 — Urgent request must keep useful intervention clock and staffed route during transfer.

Detection and route: Service owner receives urgent-item flag and checks original slot time from service system. Direct staffed service desk under U2 authority; escalate unavailable cover to service owner.

Interim arrangement and clock: Do not wait for routine supplier handover; preserve option only within authorised limits and consider other requesters. Original Day 1 12:00 Europe/Zagreb; U2-R completed at 11:40. Future cases retain their own original clock.

Assignment: Urgent item assigned to service owner at transfer.

Acceptance: Service owner accepts, separate from queue receipt.

Capability: Desk route effective for U2-R per B-E6; future cover not thereby guaranteed.

Next action: U2-R completed; standing cover checked in service record.

Why the positive findings matter

B-C5 shows that an appropriately designed protected view can support a bounded task without unrestricted access. B-C6 shows a distributed urgent route working in the story. These do not erase the mixed-referral miss or establish the unmeasured miss rate. B-C2 is a supported claim about a problem: the status is evidential, not a good/bad label.

Practice checks

Use the following constructed cases to test interpretation of the method. Each specifies the distinction the completed record must preserve. An alternative operational response can be legitimate if its reasoning and authority are explicit. These are not an effectiveness benchmark or a scored competence test.

T01

A role, training, authority, information, time and a log are documented. No relevant review judgments have been examined. Can the contribution be called demonstrated?

Expected reasoning: No. The records can support claims about the documented arrangement. The claim about judgment contribution remains Not established unless relevant evidence exists. Do not generate an effectiveness finding from the six topics.

Reject: Treating six completed topics as a pass.

Where implemented: A-C1 is deliberately restricted to the scripted task; Guide §§3–4,7.

T02

One missed referral is verified. The total missed-referral population cannot be reconstructed. Is the event itself now uncertain?

Expected reasoning: No. Preserve the established event and assess the rate separately. A positive proposition that one miss occurred may be Supported within scope; a universal no-miss claim may be Contradicted. The rate is Not established.

Reject: Erasing an event because prevalence is unknown, or estimating a rate from the selected case.

Where implemented: B-C1/B-C2/B-C3; Guide §4.

T03

The reviewer cannot personally disable the system. A qualified authorised operator reliably executes the instruction within the useful window. Is the missing administrator button a defect?

Expected reasoning: Not by itself. Assess the distributed mandate, route, timing and evidence. The arrangement can be supported in its scope without giving the reviewer every permission.

Reject: Requiring every capability to sit with one person.

Where implemented: B-C6; Guide §§6–7.

T04

Every case in the specialist queue was carefully reviewed. AI selected the queue, and excluded cases were never examined. Is intake coverage established?

Expected reasoning: No. Queue quality is a narrower question. Examine the input population and selection route, or record the coverage limit. Selection of only AI-labelled uncertain cases can miss confident errors.

Reject: Treating reviewed arrivals as the full eligible population.

Where implemented: B-C1/B-C3; Guide §§6,8.

Practice checks — continued

T05

Two reviewers use the same generated summary, which omits a relevant attachment. Does the second reviewer make the protection independent?

Expected reasoning: No. Record the shared information dependency and examine its effect. Distinct people do not remove a common source limitation. This does not prove that two-person review is always unhelpful.

Reject: Counting people as independent safeguards without examining their information.

Where implemented: Guide §§4,8; Dependencies and Joint Review.

T06

Three separate 60-minute commitments must fit one 150-minute window. Each pair fits. Can all three be promised?

Expected reasoning: Not under those assumptions: 180 exceeds 150 by 30. Record a scoped joint conflict, not a universal staffing rule. A different allocation, real overlap or changed deadline must be established rather than assumed.

Reject: Checking pairs only, or ignoring existing work.

Where implemented: A-S1/A-C4.

T07

One appropriate 20-minute review simultaneously satisfies two linked checks on the same item. Must demand be recorded as 40 minutes?

Expected reasoning: No. Identify the shared work and justify why one performance serves both criteria. Count it once in capacity analysis while retaining both functions and their separate evidential questions.

Reject: Mechanical double counting or unjustified deduplication.

Where implemented: Guide §8.

T08

Total daily demand fits protected time. Two urgent items need the only qualified specialist at the same moment. Is coverage established?

Expected reasoning: Not from the daily sum. Analyse arrival and useful-decision windows, skill and possible sequencing. A total can fit while the relevant timing condition is not established or is contradicted.

Reject: Converting a daily arithmetic result into a timeliness guarantee.

Where implemented: Guide §§6,8; Joint Review.

Practice checks — continued

T09

An agent sends data before a reviewer sees the draft. The reviewer can stop future drafts. Does this prevent the earlier transfer?

Expected reasoning: No. That control has a later or narrower effect. Separately identify the permitted data scope and any earlier protection. Do not infer illegality merely from external processing.

Reject: Confusing future stopping with reversal or prior prevention.

Where implemented: A-C3/A-S3.

T10

A supplier contract mentions backup. No evidence shows relevant skill, access or simultaneous availability. Is effective cover established?

Expected reasoning: No. The contract can establish a promised service, not delivered capability. Record what the supplier can substantiate, disclosure limits and the decision consequence. No automatic allegation of supplier failure follows.

Reject: Treating a backup name or service promise as inspected capability.

Where implemented: A-C6; Guide §§7–8.

T11

A future staffing plan is approved and its arithmetic fits. Can it support current unrestricted use?

Expected reasoning: Not as an installed capability. Keep the proposed design claim separate; assess skill, access, protected availability and displaced duties before activation. A conditional authorisation remains conditional.

Reject: Promoting a plan into current state.

Where implemented: A-C5/A-C6/A-D2.

T12

An updated model has higher benchmark accuracy. Can all evidence about existing reviewers automatically carry over?

Expected reasoning: No. Assess whether the tasks, errors, interface and learned expectations relevant to oversight changed. Neither automatic rejection nor automatic inheritance is justified.

Reject: Treating improved model accuracy as preserved human–AI performance.

Where implemented: B-C7; Guide §10.

Practice checks — continued

T13

Moving a specialist to the AI queue solves its shortage but leaves another committed service uncovered. Has the remedy succeeded?

Expected reasoning: Only for the narrower arithmetic, not as a reconciled organisational response. Bring the displaced commitment into the decision and examine alternatives and affected people.

Reject: Hiding the exported shortfall outside the original review boundary.

Where implemented: A-S2; Guide §§8–9.

T14

Holding work prevents an unauthorised action but lets a scarce appointment expire. Is pause necessarily the safest overall answer?

Expected reasoning: No. Preserve the preventive success while assessing delay and others affected. Use a qualified urgent route or proportionate alternative under existing authority. Do not invent a legal duty or hold every slot indefinitely.

Reject: Ignoring the consequences of inaction or reassignment resetting a clock.

Where implemented: B-C6/B-H2; Guide §§6,8–9.

T15

A simple isolated review has an appropriate criterion, relevant evidence, workable authority and no material shared conflict. Must a corrective action or new committee be added?

Expected reasoning: No. A supported scoped assessment and a decision that no change is needed are legitimate. Record the boundary and relevant return condition without manufacturing complexity.

Reject: Treating every application as a search for a required deficiency.

Where implemented: Guide §§2,9,12.

T16

A policy says every action waits for approval. A reliable in-scope trace shows an action sent first. Should the same proposition have separate positive policy and negative operational claim rows?

Expected reasoning: No. Keep one bounded proposition and separate evidence links. The policy provides context; the trace challenges universal enforcement. Reconcile them in one conclusion. A claim about what the policy requires is different and may have its own row.

Reject: Duplicating an identical claim by evidence type and leaving conflicting verdicts unreconciled.

Where implemented: A-C2/A-L3/A-L4; Guide §§3–4.

Practice checks — continued

T17

An authorised organisational approval exists but no supporting assessment is found. Should the tool reconstruct a favourable finding to match it?

Expected reasoning: No. Record the decision and No assessment recorded, identify what remains unknown and route a review. Existence of permission is not proof that its premises were established. Do not erase the historical approval either.

Reject: Inventing evidence retrospectively or confusing a missing assessment with no decision.

Where implemented: Guide §§3,9; Decisions field Claim IDs / no assessment.

T18

A verified lack of coverage is also direct counterevidence to a claim that coverage exists. Must the user choose between condition gap and counterevidence?

Expected reasoning: No. Set the evidence conclusion on the proposition, and describe the capability gap separately. Cause and remedy require their own reasoning; missing capability and counterevidence are not exclusive categories.

Reject: Using a four-label scheme that forces one of two overlapping meanings.

Where implemented: Guide §4; Claims issue description.

T19

A design record describes a control already installed. Must every item of this type be labelled Proposed?

Expected reasoning: No. Evidence type and target state are independent. A current installed design may be described by a design record; whether it actually works still needs suitable evidence.

Reject: Treating Design as a synonym for future, or Operational record as automatic proof of quality.

Where implemented: Guide §3.

T20

Three agreeing documents copy one supplier claim. Does agreement make the claim independently corroborated?

Expected reasoning: No. Record common provenance. Agreement can be informative without being independent; assess the substantive basis and accessible evidence. The conclusion is not determined by counting the documents.

Reject: Promoting copied material into three independent confirmations.

Where implemented: Guide §4; Evidence source relationship.

Practice checks — continued

T21

An earlier scoped claim is Supported, but its relevant input route has changed and applicability has not been examined. What should the current view show?

Expected reasoning: Preserve the dated prior conclusion and mark Reassessment due, or create an explicit new-state claim. Do not refresh the timestamp or silently extend the old conclusion to the new route.

Reject: Stale evidence displayed as current support.

Where implemented: Guide §§3,10.

T22

A proposed alternative is technically feasible but the applicable specialist obligation is unresolved. Can the method authorise a waiver because management accepts the risk?

Expected reasoning: No. Record the unresolved input and current authorised position without treating acceptance as a waiver. A qualified person must resolve the obligation; urgent parallel responses must not wait for this workbook.

Reject: A managerial signature overriding a mandatory condition or unqualified legal conclusion.

Where implemented: Guide §§2,5,9.

Using the practice checks

A facilitator may discuss the prompts with prospective users using only the supplied fictional material. Ask participants to state the exact proposition, identify the evidence boundary, and distinguish the finding from the decision. Record ambiguous instructions or burdensome fields for improvement. Do not describe that discussion as independent validation of oversight effectiveness.

The same discipline can be used internally to compare this method with another suitable process. Provide the same facts and access to normal organisational records; assess the relevance of findings, accuracy of inference limits, usefulness of the resulting decision and effort required. A simpler process may be sufficient. Do not predefine success as finding a field that exists only in this workbook.

The 22 checks have no universal pass mark. In a real adoption, important misunderstandings should be addressed before relying on the method for consequential decisions. Record any changes to wording or workflow and retain the exact copy used.

Case-record map

Review	Functions	Claims	Evidence items	Evidence links	Shared items	Joint scenarios	Decisions	Change records
A-R1	5	7	9	12	4	3	2	2
B-R1	3	8	8	10	4	3	1	2

The complete working entries are in HORR_Completed_Examples.xlsx. They are teaching records, not assertions about an actual organisation.