

AI INFLUENCE · PUBLIC FIRST-PASS MATRIX

AI Decision Influence Matrix

Locate where AI first shaped attention, evidence, sequencing, routing, interpretation or practical options before human commitment.

By **Cosmin C. Oprea**  [Connect on LinkedIn](#)

[Read](#)
[Listen](#)
[OPERATE](#)
[Intake](#)
[Review](#)

Use on one bounded decision route. Answer from surviving records and the reviewer-facing state. Mark uncertainty openly; do not infer a score, causal conclusion or organisation-wide pattern.

DECISION ROUTE / OPERATIONAL CONSEQUENCE	RECORD IDENTIFIER / DATE
REVIEWER ROLE	COMMITMENT POINT
INFLUENCE FORM	
☐ Inform ☐ Rank ☐ Route	☐ Summarise ☐ Recommend ☐ Frame ☐ Suppress

01 Entry point and influence form

Where did AI first shape the route?

- Can the organisation identify the specific AI output, ranking, route, summary, recommendation, framing or suppression that entered the pathway?

☐ YES
 ☐ NO
 ☐ UNCLEAR
 ☐ N/A
- Can the first point at which that contribution altered the route be located before human commitment?

☐ YES
 ☐ NO
 ☐ UNCLEAR
 ☐ N/A
- Can the original output, presentation state or system-shaped view be reproduced from surviving evidence?

☐ YES
 ☐ NO
 ☐ UNCLEAR
 ☐ N/A

02 Reviewer-facing effect

What changed for the human reviewer?

- Can the record show whether AI changed what evidence, uncertainty or alternatives were visible?

☐ YES
 ☐ NO
 ☐ UNCLEAR
 ☐ N/A
- Can it show whether AI changed sequence, priority, destination or the allocation of human attention?

☐ YES
 ☐ NO
 ☐ UNCLEAR
 ☐ N/A
- Can it show whether any option became easier, harder or practically unavailable before commitment?

☐ YES
 ☐ NO
 ☐ UNCLEAR
 ☐ N/A

CONTINUE THE SAME BOUNDED RECORD

03

Challenge and practical authority

Could the route still be questioned or changed?

7

Could the reviewer distinguish the AI contribution from the underlying evidence and exercise independent judgement?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

8

Could the reviewer challenge, modify, reject, reroute or escalate the system-shaped route in ordinary time?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

9

Where material information was filtered or deprioritised, could that reduction be detected and investigated?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

04

Evidence and reconstruction

Can the influence be defended without assumption?

10

Does the record preserve which actor, rule, interface or configuration produced the relevant influence?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

11

Can the AI contribution be connected to a practical change in the decision route or reviewer-facing state?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

12

Can the route be reconstructed from AI influence through human review and commitment without relying primarily on memory?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

EVIDENCE / UNRESOLVED GAP

INTERPRETIVE BOUNDARY

This matrix locates observable influence conditions in one bounded route. Several No or Unclear answers indicate an unresolved evidence question; they do not establish causation, non-compliance, model defect, unfairness, exposure severity or an IDΔAC™ diagnostic conclusion.

Published 31 July 2026 · Derived from: The Decisions Made Before the Human Review Begins

NEXT STEP

Preserve the specific influence point, reviewer-facing state and supporting record. Where one consequential route remains materially unclear, prepare that bounded route through Intake before requesting a Scope Review.

[Source article](#)
[Resource Library](#)
www.iddac.eu
contact@iddac.eu