

# Reflexive Defensibility Check

## REFLEXIVE DEFENSIBILITY · PUBLIC RESEARCH COMPANION

A first-pass check of whether an organisation can explain how a bounded decision field was formed, evidenced, attributed and kept open to meaningful challenge.

**USE BOUNDARY** This is not a certification, audit opinion, legal assessment or diagnostic finding. It helps identify where a decision account may require deeper reconstruction.

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

### BOUND THE ROUTE

|                                  |                                  |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b>DECISION / ROUTE</b><br>_____ | <b>RECORD ID / DATE</b><br>_____ |
| <b>REVIEWER / OWNER</b><br>_____ | <b>COMMITMENT POINT</b><br>_____ |

#### 01 Reconstructability

Can the route be reconstructed beyond the final approval?

|           |                                                                                           |                           |                          |                               |                           |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>01</b> | Can you explain how the situation acquired the form presented for decision?               | <input type="radio"/> YES | <input type="radio"/> NO | <input type="radio"/> UNCLEAR | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| <b>02</b> | Can you identify the main transformations that shaped evidence, alternatives or priority? | <input type="radio"/> YES | <input type="radio"/> NO | <input type="radio"/> UNCLEAR | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| <b>03</b> | Can you show what the reviewer actually saw at the time?                                  | <input type="radio"/> YES | <input type="radio"/> NO | <input type="radio"/> UNCLEAR | <input type="radio"/> N/A |

#### 02 Evidence

Does the account survive contact with contemporaneous records?

|           |                                                                                                    |                           |                          |                               |                           |
|-----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>04</b> | Are key claims supported by records created during the route rather than reconstructed afterwards? | <input type="radio"/> YES | <input type="radio"/> NO | <input type="radio"/> UNCLEAR | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| <b>05</b> | Can system, version, timestamp or source provenance be established where relevant?                 | <input type="radio"/> YES | <input type="radio"/> NO | <input type="radio"/> UNCLEAR | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| <b>06</b> | Are unresolved gaps explicitly preserved as gaps rather than silently inferred?                    | <input type="radio"/> YES | <input type="radio"/> NO | <input type="radio"/> UNCLEAR | <input type="radio"/> N/A |

# Can the account withstand scrutiny?

## 03 Attribution

Can formative influence and final authority be distinguished?

- |    |                                                                                             |                           |                          |                               |                           |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 07 | Can formal decision authority be distinguished from upstream formative influence?           | <input type="radio"/> YES | <input type="radio"/> NO | <input type="radio"/> UNCLEAR | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| 08 | Can consequential contributions be attributed to a role, team, system, vendor or artefact?  | <input type="radio"/> YES | <input type="radio"/> NO | <input type="radio"/> UNCLEAR | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| 09 | Can responsibility claims be made without pretending a single actor formed the whole field? | <input type="radio"/> YES | <input type="radio"/> NO | <input type="radio"/> UNCLEAR | <input type="radio"/> N/A |

## 04 Contestability and limits

Could the route still be challenged where it mattered?

- |    |                                                                                           |                           |                          |                               |                           |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 10 | Could relevant evidence or alternatives still be recovered before commitment?             | <input type="radio"/> YES | <input type="radio"/> NO | <input type="radio"/> UNCLEAR | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| 11 | Could escalation materially change the trajectory rather than only document disagreement? | <input type="radio"/> YES | <input type="radio"/> NO | <input type="radio"/> UNCLEAR | <input type="radio"/> N/A |
| 12 | Can the organisation state what it cannot currently defend or reconstruct?                | <input type="radio"/> YES | <input type="radio"/> NO | <input type="radio"/> UNCLEAR | <input type="radio"/> N/A |

### BOUNDED DEFENSIBILITY STATEMENT

---

---

---

---

---

### STANDARD INTERPRETATION RULE

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.

### NEXT STEP

## Working with a live decision route?

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

[REQUEST SCOPE REVIEW →](#)