

Decision Field Formation Map

FORMATION OF DECIDABILITY · PUBLIC RESEARCH COMPANION

A public worksheet for reconstructing how a situation acquired enough structure to become actionable as a decision object - before the visible choice or approval point.

USE BOUNDARY Use on one bounded decision route. This artefact supports first-pass reconstruction; it does not score exposure, determine compliance, infer organisational maturity or disclose diagnostic logic.

By **Cosmin C. Oprea**  Connect on LinkedIn

BOUND THE ROUTE

DECISION / ROUTE _____	RECORD ID / DATE _____
RESPONSIBLE ROLE _____	COMMITMENT POINT _____

01 Name the decision object

What, exactly, had become decidable by the time human judgement was expected?

01	Can the decision object be stated without using only the final outcome?	☐ YES	☐ NO	☐ UNCLEAR	☐ N/A
02	Can you identify when the situation first became actionable rather than merely relevant?	☐ YES	☐ NO	☐ UNCLEAR	☐ N/A
03	Can you distinguish the original situation from the form in which it reached the decision-maker?	☐ YES	☐ NO	☐ UNCLEAR	☐ N/A

DECISION OBJECT IN ONE SENTENCE

02 Identify formative transformations

What changed the shape of the situation before final review?

04	Can you identify a framing, representation, filter, summary, ranking, category or gate that materially shaped what was presented?	☐ YES	☐ NO	☐ UNCLEAR	☐ N/A
05	Can each consequential transformation be linked to an actor, team, system or artefact?	☐ YES	☐ NO	☐ UNCLEAR	☐ N/A
06	Is there contemporaneous evidence showing what the reviewer could actually see at that point?	☐ YES	☐ NO	☐ UNCLEAR	☐ N/A

Record only transformations that materially changed the object presented for decision. Do not attempt to reconstruct every remote cause or contextual factor.

Suggested transformation labels

salience · problem framing · evidence selection · categorisation · representation · alternative formation · prioritisation · authority assignment · workflow gating

Several NO or UNCLEAR answers indicate a bounded question requiring further inspection. They do not establish non-compliance, system defect, legal failure or an IDΔAC™ diagnostic conclusion.

What survived - and what did not?

03 Track narrowing without assuming determination

What became less visible, harder to recover or more costly to reopen?

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 07 | Can you identify an alternative, evidential path or case that was materially less available by final review? | ☐ YES | ☐ NO | ☐ UNCLEAR | ☐ N/A |
| 08 | Could the reviewer recover that missing path using the normal workflow and available time? | ☐ YES | ☐ NO | ☐ UNCLEAR | ☐ N/A |
| 09 | Can you distinguish formal openness from practical ability to reopen the route? | ☐ YES | ☐ NO | ☐ UNCLEAR | ☐ N/A |

WHAT BECAME HARDER TO RECOVER?

04 Test reconstructability

Could another reviewer understand how the field reached this form?

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 10 | Is there evidence for the main formative transformations rather than only the final recommendation or approval? | ☐ YES | ☐ NO | ☐ UNCLEAR | ☐ N/A |
| 11 | Can unresolved gaps be named without filling them through inference? | ☐ YES | ☐ NO | ☐ UNCLEAR | ☐ N/A |
| 12 | Can observed, documented, reported, inferred and unknown elements be kept distinct? | ☐ YES | ☐ NO | ☐ UNCLEAR | ☐ N/A |

EVIDENCE THAT SURVIVES / UNRESOLVED GAP

NEXT STEP

Working with a live decision route?

Preserve the evidence, then request a bounded IDΔAC™ Scope Review.

[REQUEST SCOPE REVIEW →](#)