

COMMITTING AUTHORITY · PUBLIC FIRST-PASS CHECK

Committing Authority Reality Check

Test whether one bounded AI-assisted decision route shows who could review, who could commit the consequence, and how authority moved before operational effect.

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

Read

Listen

OPERATE

Intake

Review

Use one bounded consequential route. Answer from surviving records and the state available before commitment. Mark uncertainty openly; do not infer a score, invalid delegation or organisation-wide conclusion.

DECISION ROUTE / OPERATIONAL CONSEQUENCE

RECORD IDENTIFIER / DATE

REVIEWER / APPROVER ROLE

COMMITMENT POINT

01 Consequence and commitment state

Can the route identify what actually became organisationally committed?

1 Can the record identify the concrete operational consequence that became active, rather than only the workflow label or approval status?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

2 Can it locate the last ordinary point at which that consequence could still be changed, paused or stopped?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

3 Can it identify the reviewer or approver who acted before that point and what action they actually took?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

02 Bounded review authority

What was that actor actually authorised to do?

4 Does surviving evidence show the reviewer or approver's mandate and usable intervention rights at the relevant time?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

5 Can the record show whether the resulting consequence fell within that mandate for this class of case?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

6 Does it distinguish legitimate organisational authority from technical permission, task completion or seniority alone?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

CONTINUE THE SAME BOUNDED ROUTE

03

Committing authority and transition

Can authority move from review to commitment in time?

7

Can the record identify who or what had authority to commit the actual operational consequence?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

8

If a higher or different authority was required, is the handoff or delegation evidenced before commitment?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

9

If automation settled the route, is the governed delegation that allowed the system to commit the effect evidenced?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

04

Attribution and reconstruction

Can the commitment chain survive scrutiny?

10

Can the record connect actor, authority, action and consequence without relying on assumed role interpretation?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

11

Does it preserve who or what made the final attributable commitment and when that commitment occurred?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

12

Could another competent reviewer reconstruct the authority chain from surviving evidence without relying primarily on memory?

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ UNCLEAR ☐ N/A

EVIDENCE / UNRESOLVED GAP

INTERPRETIVE BOUNDARY

A No or Unclear answer indicates a bounded authority-evidence question requiring closer inspection. It does not establish invalid delegation, insufficient authority, a wrongful outcome, non-compliance or an IDΔAC™ diagnostic conclusion.

NEXT STEP

If one consequential route remains materially unclear, preserve the specific authority uncertainty, supporting record and any missing delegation or handoff evidence. Prepare that bounded route through Intake before requesting a Scope Review.

Source article: The Authority to Review Is Not the Authority to Commit



Source article



Resource Library



Scope Review



contact@iddac.eu