

AI SUPPRESSION VISIBILITY CHECK

What did not reach the reviewer?

PUBLIC OPERATIONAL ARTEFAC



A human review can only assess what remains visible.

Use this check to examine whether one bounded AI-assisted decision route reduced the visibility or practical availability of material cases, risks, evidence or alternatives before human review.

PURPOSE	First-pass inspection of one pre-review visibility boundary.
AUDIENCE	Legal, Risk, Audit, Product, Operations, AI Governance and decision owners.
CONCEPT	CC-027 - AI Suppression; related to AI Decision Influence and Decision Visibility.
RELATED ARTICLE	The Decisions Made Before the Human Review Begins.
NEXT STEP	Prepare one bounded route through Intake when material uncertainty remains.

How to use this visibility check

Select one decision route, one material consequence and one human review boundary. Do not answer for an entire organisation, platform or policy estate.

1	BOUND THE ROUTE	Name the decision, consequence, review population, reviewer and commitment point.
2	LOCATE THE VISIBILITY BOUNDARY	Identify where filtering, prioritisation, thresholding, routing, summarisation or hidden options may have changed what reached review.
3	ANSWER FROM SURVIVING EVIDENCE	Use records that exist at the relevant time. Do not substitute intended process, policy language or normal practice.
4	MARK UNCERTAINTY OPENLY	Use “Unclear” when the available evidence cannot support a reliable answer, and record where further evidence may exist.

Selected route

PROCESS / FUNCTION

DECISION AND CONSEQUENCE

AI CONTRIBUTION

HUMAN REVIEW BOUNDARY

OPERATIONAL COMMITMENT POINT

REVIEWER ROLE / AUTHORITY

POPULATION OR RECORD SET

SYSTEMS / EVIDENCE LOCATIONS

Public boundary

This resource supports first-pass evidence inspection and preparation.

- It does not provide a legal, compliance, fairness, assurance or technical conclusion.
- A “No” or “Unclear” answer does not prove that suppression occurred.
- AI suppression requires evidence that material content or options became less visible or less actionable.
- No numerical score, exposure class or diagnostic finding should be inferred from the response pattern.

01

Population and case visibility

Can the organisation show which cases reached review, which did not, and why?

QUESTION	YES	NO	UNCLEAR	EVIDENCE / NOTE
1. Can the original population of cases, records, applications, alerts or options be identified for the relevant decision window?				
2. Can the route show which items entered human review and which were excluded, delayed or deprioritised?				
3. Can the filtering, ranking, threshold or routing conditions in effect at the time be identified and attributed?				
4. Could an authorised reviewer or control function access the excluded or low-priority population before commitment?				
5. Are changes to the population, queue order, routing rule or threshold preserved with a reliable time and version history?				

Evidence cues

source population | queue export | routing record | threshold version | change history

Section observation

02

Evidence and context visibility

Can the reviewer-facing state be reconstructed without importing information that was only available later?

QUESTION	YES	NO	UNCLEAR	EVIDENCE / NOTE
1. Can the exact interface view, summary, alert, recommendation or system state presented to the reviewer be reconstructed?				
2. Can source evidence omitted, compressed or summarised before review be distinguished from what remained visible?				
3. Were uncertainty, limitations, dissenting signals, missing data or conflicting evidence visible within the decision window?				
4. Could material evidence exist elsewhere in the organisation but remain inaccessible through the reviewer's ordinary working route?				
5. Can post-commitment additions, corrected data or later explanations be separated from the evidence available before commitment?				

Evidence cues

interface capture | source-to-summary link | uncertainty notice | permissions | timestamps

Section observation

03

Alternatives and practical availability

Did the route preserve meaningful options, or only the appearance that alternatives existed?

QUESTION	YES	NO	UNCLEAR	EVIDENCE / NOTE
1. Were credible alternatives visible to the reviewer, including pause, request more evidence, reroute, modify, reject or escalate?				
2. Can the organisation identify options that existed in policy or system design but were hidden, disabled or impractical in the live route?				
3. Could the reviewer restore an excluded case, reopen a filtered record or request the underlying evidence before commitment?				
4. Were the permissions, justification burden and operational friction proportionate to the available decision time?				
5. Can the route show when an option became unavailable and whether that loss of availability affected the eventual decision?				

Evidence cues
option set | permissions | reopen control | override record | decision window

Section observation

04

Thresholds, routing and escalation

Could pre-review suppression alter destination, timing, control path or escalation?

QUESTION	YES	NO	UNCLEAR	EVIDENCE / NOTE
1. Were thresholds, prioritisation rules or automated routing conditions documented, versioned and owned for this specific route?				
2. Could below-threshold, low-ranked or non-routed cases be sampled, inspected or audited without exceptional access?				
3. Did routing alter who reviewed the case, when it was reviewed, or which control and escalation path applied?				
4. Could filtering, summarisation or thresholding prevent a material signal from triggering challenge, pause or escalation?				
5. Are exceptions, overrides and reasons for continuation or non-escalation visible and attributable before operational commitment?				

Evidence cues

configuration owner | sampling route | destination log | escalation trigger | exception record

Section observation

Interpretation without scoring

Use the response pattern to identify the next evidence question. Do not convert the checklist into a rating, diagnosis or inference of organisational failure.

VISIBLE AND REVIEWABLE REDUCTION

The organisation can identify what was reduced, why it was reduced, who or what produced the result, and how the exclusion could be inspected or reversed.

PARTIALLY EVIDENCED BOUNDARY

The route can be reconstructed in part, but one or more populations, rules, versions, alternatives or recovery paths remain fragmented.

MATERIAL UNCERTAINTY

The available record cannot establish what was absent, whether it mattered, or whether an ordinary actor could detect and question the reduction in time.

POSSIBLE SUPPRESSION SIGNAL

Evidence indicates that material content or options became less visible or less actionable before review. This is a question for bounded examination, not a public finding.

What this check can establish

IT CAN HELP IDENTIFY

- Where the pre-review visibility boundary appears to sit.
- Which exclusions, filters, thresholds or hidden options are evidenced or unclear.
- Whether one bounded route is ready for deeper evidence collection.

IT CANNOT DETERMINE

- Whether the system was lawful, fair, accurate or compliant.
- Whether suppression occurred across other routes or time periods.
- The severity of decision exposure or an IDAC™ diagnostic conclusion.

Prepare one route when uncertainty remains

Intake is the mandatory boundary before any Bounded Scope Review. It prepares one decision route for a fit and scoping decision without presuming a finding.



Intake may be appropriate when

ONE ROUTE

A consequential decision route and human review boundary can be identified.

UPSTREAM INFLUENCE

AI or automation may have shaped which cases, evidence or options reached review.

MATERIAL UNCERTAINTY

The surviving evidence does not clearly explain what was absent, why, or whether it could be recovered.

EVIDENCE ACCESS

A named internal sponsor can support access to the relevant record set, configuration history or workflow evidence.

PREPARE THE INTAKE

www.iddac.eu/resource-library/

Intake precedes Scope Review. Scope Review determines fit, boundary and readiness.

Related IDAC™ resources

The Decisions Made Before the Human Review Begins

Read when the central question is how AI may shape the decision environment before review.

AI Decision Influence Matrix

Use when you first need to locate whether AI informs, ranks, routes, summarises, recommends, frames or suppresses.

Human Oversight Reality Check

Use when the remaining uncertainty concerns what the reviewer could see, challenge and change.

Non-Escalation Exposure Reality Check

Use when the remaining uncertainty concerns why the route continued without escalation.