

RATIONALE TIMING · PUBLIC FIRST-PASS CHECK

AI Rationale Timing Readiness Check

Test whether one record shows when human reasoning existed and distinguishes it from explanation added after commitment.

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

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

Use on one bounded decision route. Answer from the record that survived at the relevant time. Mark uncertainty openly; do not total answers or infer misconduct, exposure severity or an organisation-wide conclusion.

DECISION ROUTE / OPERATIONAL CONSEQUENCE

RECORD IDENTIFIER / DATE

REVIEWER ROLE

COMMITMENT POINT

01 Event separation

Can the relevant moments be distinguished?

1 Are approval time, rationale creation time and later edit times preserved as distinct events? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

2 Can the record identify when the reviewer or organisation became committed to the selected route? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

3 Can it identify when the action was executed, communicated or became difficult to reverse? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

02 Contemporaneous judgement

Did material reasoning exist while intervention remained live?

4 For the bounded decision, was a human rationale captured before or at commitment rather than only after outcome? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

5 Did the contemporaneous record preserve material uncertainty, alternatives or contradictory evidence considered at that time? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

6 Does the record distinguish the system output or technical explanation from the human reviewer's own rationale? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

CONTINUE THE SAME BOUNDED RECORD

03

Version history and later commentary

Can later strengthening remain visible?

7

Is the first recorded rationale retained rather than overwritten by the latest version?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

8

Are material edits attributable to an actor and timestamped separately from the original decision event?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

9

Is retrospective commentary explicitly labelled as later clarification, audit note, incident analysis or post-outcome review?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

04

Reconstruction and timing

Can the evidentiary sequence be defended?

10

Can the reviewer-facing output, evidence state and available alternatives be reconstructed as they existed before commitment?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

11

Can the sequence from AI influence through review, commitment, operational effect and rationale event be rebuilt without relying primarily on memory?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

12

Can any rationale lag be described as an evidence condition without automatically treating a late rationale as false or backfilled?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

EVIDENCE / UNRESOLVED GAP

INTERPRETIVE BOUNDARY

A late or amended rationale may be useful and accurate. Several No or Unclear answers indicate uncertainty about when material reasoning entered the route; they do not establish dishonesty, non-compliance, system defect, exposure severity or an IDΔAC™ diagnostic conclusion.

Published 31 July 2026 · Derived from: When the Rationale Appears Too Late

NEXT STEP

Preserve the original decision state, relevant timestamps and material edits. Where one consequential route remains materially unclear, use the Decision Rationale Timeline Worksheet and prepare the route through Intake before requesting a Scope Review.

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