Rehearse an AI incident

24 evidence-led exercises | Content v0.4 | 7 November 2026

QUICK START: Choose one exercise, not the whole library. Allow 90 minutes. Read this page and the timing page; the facilitator reads that exercise's private pages before play. Use made-up data only. No real operational action is authorised by this pack.

What you leave with

A bounded account of what happened, decisions with owners and evidence limits, words you can adapt for a real escalation, a tested-on-paper containment plan, a prioritised fix plan and a first-ten-minutes card. These are rehearsal outputs, not assurance that controls work.

What you need

Paper, pens and a timer. Use these two common pages and the eight-page exercise. Keep facilitator pages private until their release point. The pack works offline with no account, form, email submission or network connection. Completed sheets stay locally under your normal record rules. No real secrets, personal records or private account credentials belong on these sheets.

Opening words

"This is a rehearsal. Every exhibit is made up. We will decide using what is supplied, not facts we wish existed. State a decision, owner and evidence check. We can act under uncertainty, but we cannot make uncertainty disappear. Nobody is being graded. If we discover a live incident, we stop play and use our real procedures."

Use the right authority

No legal advice, compliance conclusion, safety certificate or universal technical operating instruction is supplied. Use qualified people and your established procedures for specialist decisions. Communication examples are rehearsal drafts, not approval to send. A workshop cannot authorise a real payment, access change, notification or customer remedy.

Pick a mode

3-6: facilitator plus exercise roles; combine hats as shown in each kit. Two: A facilitates and holds evidence, B holds the other roles, then both challenge decisions. Solo: cover later exhibits, injects and facilitator notes; write each answer before revealing the next. An editorial walkthrough is possible alone, but it is not a live team test.

© Almost Magic Tech Lab. For your organisation's own use only. Please do not copy, share or sell this material.

Run one exercise in 90 minutes

Time	Facilitator action
Before	Read private pages 3-6 of the kit. Mark the two branch consequences you may need. Choose a recorder. Do not invent additional technical facts.
00-10	Read the opening and roles. Release exhibit A. Ask players to state the operational decision before collecting more information.
10-20	Read inject 1. Release exhibit B. Record a decision, owner and what would disprove it.
20-30	Read inject 2. Release exhibit C. If a listed branch matches the decision, read its consequence as a new fictional event. Otherwise keep the base timeline.
30-40	Read inject 3. Rehearse the holding statement and escalation aloud. Test the team's assumed stop boundary.
40-50	Read inject 4. State the final unknown. Do not supply a missing record to rescue the team.
50-65	Use the four insight questions and strong/weak/misleading answer guide. Ask players to amend one decision after a counterexample.
65-80	Complete the evidence, control and decision sheets. Pick the top three fixes; state what would prove each worked.
80-90	Debrief, complete the three-label scorecard and keep card, and set the day-90 comparison.

Branch rule: consequences are conditional rehearsal events, not predictions about a real system. They expose a trade-off. Do not call every broad restriction wrong or every narrow restriction right. Accept alternatives that name the authority, side effects, missing evidence and a falsifiable check.

The only scorecard labels are "we decided", "we recorded", "we could not confirm". No grades, percentages or certificates. At 90 days compare evidence with this run, not confidence. If a new scenario is used, do not claim like-for-like improvement.

© Almost Magic Tech Lab. For your organisation's own use only. Please do not copy, share or sell this material.

16 | The meeting that heard no

1 / 8 | PARTICIPANT BRIEF AND ROLE CARDS | All records, numbers and quotations are fictional.

Speech recognition changes a decision - Recover a decision when a machine record reverses what a person said.

Read aloud

"An AI meeting note says a project change was approved. A participant says they clearly said not approved. The recording is noisy, and the summary has already been used to start work."

Decision to bring to the table

Within the first discussion, choose the interim operating boundary and name its decision owner. Separate what stops further impact from what would establish past impact. You may choose a restriction while facts remain missing; record its side effects and next review.

Decision lead

Choose a reversible hold and decision re-confirmation route. State what you can decide in this rehearsal and what needs another authorised person. Do not assume a job title creates legal authority.

Record lead

Preserve source audio, transcript and summary as separate records. State what you can decide in this rehearsal and what needs another authorised person. Do not assume a job title creates legal authority.

Project lead

Identify work already started and its reversibility. State what you can decide in this rehearsal and what needs another authorised person. Do not assume a job title creates legal authority.

Evidence lead

Check what the evidence actually supports about consent. State what you can decide in this rehearsal and what needs another authorised person. Do not assume a job title creates legal authority.

Modes

3 people: facilitator holds evidence, one player is decision lead and one combines the two other operational roles. 4: facilitator holds evidence, each player holds one remaining role. 5: separate facilitator and four roles. 6: add an observer who records unsupported assumptions, not a rescuer who invents facts.

Two: A facilitates and holds evidence. B holds the other three roles and announces the current hat. A reveals only the current exhibit/inject. B writes one decision before the next reveal. Both challenge a decision during debrief. Keep the 90-minute clock.

Solo: cover pages 3-6 and later exhibit sections. Read the opening and exhibit A, write a decision, then reveal each inject and its exhibit. Answer as decision lead, operator and affected person separately. Only then uncover facilitator calibration. Flag every success depending on invented facts.

Do not browse, contact anyone or operate a real system during play. If an exercise raises a live concern, stop the rehearsal and use the established incident route.

© Almost Magic Tech Lab. For your organisation's own use only. Please do not copy, share or sell this material.

16 | The meeting that heard no

2 / 8 | CONTROLLED-RELEASE EVIDENCE DOSSIER | All records, numbers and quotations are fictional.

A | Three records

Release at opening. Noisy meeting audio sounds like not approved to two listeners. Machine transcript says approved. Summary says project authorised. Key three-second segment is clipped. No signed decision record exists.

B | Automation events

Release with inject 1. Summary posted 15:02. Task bot creates work at 15:03. Approval link shows logged in, not the identity of the person who opened it. Two work orders are now underway; one can be paused without loss, one has a supplier deadline.

C | Proposed repair

Release with inject 2. Chair asks to change minutes silently so the team can move on. Project owner asks whether deleting the tasks reverses the decision. The original speaker is reachable for a fresh decision, but nobody has asked them yet.

Evidence challenge before discussion

For each exhibit name: the source, what it directly supports, what it does not support, whether its time boundary matches the incident, and what independent corroboration would matter. A screenshot, recollection or dashboard may be useful without being complete.

Record	Direct observation vs inference / missing test
A	
B	
C	

Facilitator handling: later facts may change a decision, but they do not retroactively improve the evidence available when it was made. Record revisions; do not erase the earlier reason. No exhibit establishes the final missing fact on page 3.

© Almost Magic Tech Lab. For your organisation's own use only. Please do not copy, share or sell this material.

16 | The meeting that heard no

3 / 8 | FACILITATOR: INJECTS AND BRANCH CONSEQUENCES | All records, numbers and quotations are fictional.

Inject 1 | 10-20 minutes

Say: "The transcript contains approved, while the audio sounds like not approved to two listeners."

Probe: Do not take a majority vote as definitive transcription. Keep uncertainty visible.

Inject 2 | 20-30 minutes

Say: "The AI action list assigned work to someone who was absent."

Probe: Distinguish a machine-assigned action from the person's acceptance.

Inject 3 | 30-40 minutes

Say: "The chair wants to edit the minutes silently so the team can move on."

Probe: Require a versioned correction and an explicit fresh decision from the authorised person.

Inject 4 | 40-50 minutes

Say: "The key audio segment is clipped. Can anyone establish the exact original words?"

Probe: The pack cannot establish them. Record the uncertainty and seek a fresh authorised decision without rewriting the old evidence.

Two conditional branches

1. If players choose: Choose the cleaner transcript over the noisy source. Then say: The summary remains the action basis despite disputed evidence. Preserve source and derivatives separately; do not resolve ambiguity by typographic neatness.

2. If players choose: Edit the minutes without a correction record. Then say: The evidence trail now suggests the later version was always the decision. Record a correction and obtain a fresh authorised decision instead.

After either branch require an amended decision, not a promise to be more careful. Ask which side effect they accept, who can authorise it, how it is reversed and which observation would trigger a change. If their choice is not listed, do not fabricate success or harm; test the reasoning against the supplied exhibits.

© Almost Magic Tech Lab. For your organisation's own use only. Please do not copy, share or sell this material.

16 | The meeting that heard no

4 / 8 | FACILITATOR: INSIGHT QUESTIONS AND ANSWER CALIBRATION | All records, numbers and quotations are fictional.

What can and cannot be recovered from a clipped source?

Strong reasoning to listen for: The exact missing words cannot be established. A fresh decision can govern next steps without pretending to reconstruct the past.

Does logged in establish consent?

Strong reasoning to listen for: No. It does not establish the actor, understood proposition or approval. Seek an attributable decision through the authorised route.

Which action is reversible and at what cost?

Strong reasoning to listen for: Assess each work order separately with its owner and deadline. Deleting a task entry may not stop supplier work.

How should corrected minutes distinguish evidence from resolution?

Strong reasoning to listen for: Retain disputed source, mark correction date and basis, and record the new decision separately from the uncertain original wording.

Weak is incomplete; misleading is unsupported

Weak answer: "Ask another transcription tool to settle the disagreement."

Why to probe: this names an activity but leaves the mechanism, scope or proof unfinished. Do not accept activity as an outcome.

Misleading answer: "The approval link was opened by a logged-in user, so the decision was accepted."

Next probe: Ask which person accepted which proposition and whether a fresh attributable decision is available.

A strong team need not choose one prescribed solution. Require a bounded decision, an accountable owner, a reversible path where feasible, a specific observation that would falsify success, and explicit missing evidence. If a team gives a different well-supported answer, capture it rather than forcing the model answer.

Final-inject guardrail: The pack cannot establish them. Record the uncertainty and seek a fresh authorised decision without rewriting the old evidence. Do not turn an expert-sounding explanation into a new exhibit.

© Almost Magic Tech Lab. For your organisation's own use only. Please do not copy, share or sell this material.

16 | The meeting that heard no

5 / 8 | READY-TO-USE PRESERVATION AND COMMUNICATION DRAFTS | All records, numbers and quotations are fictional.

Evidence preservation request

"Please preserve the following in its authorised location without changing the original: Preserve audio as received, transcript and summary versions, task events, approval-link metadata and work-order state. Do not overwrite the original summary as the only record. Record who collected it, when with timezone, source/version, access restriction and any known gaps. Use a restricted reference rather than copying sensitive content into the incident chat."

Item / source reference	Collector / time / scope	Integrity or completeness limit

Holding statement - adapt, then approve

"The meeting summary may not reflect an authorised decision. Reversible work based only on it is on hold while the decision owner confirms the position. The missing audio prevents us from establishing the exact original words."

Before any real use: recipient/audience _____ approved decision owner _____ next update time/channel _____. Verify every factual clause against the current record. Do not imply the restraint or fallback was completed if it is only proposed.

Escalation script

"We need the authorised decision-maker, not another transcription pass. Please confirm the fresh decision through the normal route and assign owners to pause or continue each work order with its consequences recorded."

Recipient function / authorised route: _____

Decision needed by / fallback if unanswered: _____

Contradiction check

Circle any phrase your evidence cannot support. Read the statement as the affected person: would they infer complete containment, no impact, a guaranteed remedy or a confirmed cause? Amend it. Name who will correct it if later evidence changes the picture.

© Almost Magic Tech Lab. For your organisation's own use only. Please do not copy, share or sell this material.

16 | The meeting that heard no

6 / 8 | KILL-SWITCH, OWNERSHIP AND SUPPLIER WORKSHEET | All records, numbers and quotations are fictional.

Exercise-specific containment boundary

Hold reversible downstream work under authorised owners; trace tasks to real work orders. Verify the supplier or executor has acknowledged the hold, not just that a task was deleted.

Control question	Named owner / evidence / limit
Who authorises the stop, who executes it and who verifies it?	
Which worker, queue, cache, identity or human action can bypass it?	
What legitimate work is interrupted; who owns the fallback?	
What observation would prove the stop failed?	
What are the restart conditions and who may accept residual unknowns?	

Supplier / internal system-owner questions

1. Can source, transcript and summary versions be linked without overwriting?

Answer / record reference / absent evidence: _____

2. What did the approval-link event actually authenticate?

Answer / record reference / absent evidence: _____

3. Which downstream systems acted on the summary?

Answer / record reference / absent evidence: _____

Do not accept "resolved", "equivalent", "deleted", "successful" or "all tests passed" without the definition, scope and supporting observation. Ask the supplier or system owner to state what was not measured. A missing response is an evidence gap, not proof of the opposite.

Request owner / due date / escalation route: _____

What can be decided before this answer arrives: _____

© Almost Magic Tech Lab. For your organisation's own use only. Please do not copy, share or sell this material.

16 | The meeting that heard no

7 / 8 | CAPTURE SHEET AND BRANCH DECISION LOG | All records, numbers and quotations are fictional.

Session date / mode: _____ participants by role: _____

Inject / exhibit	Known fact and exact source	Assumption / missing evidence	Decision / owner / check
1			
2			
3			
4			

Decision record - revise, do not erase

Decision / time / authority	Rejected alternative / side effect	Success test / falsifier	Review time / owner

Branch taken / consequence / changed decision: _____

_____

Final unknown in our own words: _____

What we do while it remains unknown / who can revisit: _____

_____

© Almost Magic Tech Lab. For your organisation's own use only. Please do not copy, share or sell this material.

16 | The meeting that heard no

8 / 8 | PRIORITISED FIX PLAN, DEBRIEF AND KEEP CARD | All records, numbers and quotations are fictional.

Proposed priorities - assign people and dates locally

Priority / accountable function	Fix and evidence that would prove it worked
Now Project owner	Obtain an attributable fresh decision and record each downstream hold or continuation.
Within 7 days Records owner	Issue a versioned correction that preserves the disputed original and basis.
By day 30 Workflow owner	Demonstrate machine summaries cannot alone start approval-dependent work.

Named owners / actual dates / record location: _____

Debrief and three-label record

Did the team obtain a new decision rather than invent the old one?

Was machine assignment mistaken for acceptance?

Only these record labels	Specific evidence or explicit limit
we decided	
we recorded	
we could not confirm	

Day-90 recheck

Repeat date _____. Keep the original decision log and evidence references. Re-run this scenario with the same critical test, then introduce the branch you avoided. Compare the top-priority proof above with the first run. Record changed scope or conditions; a different denominator is not improvement. State one unresolved unknown even if all fixes are marked done.

First ten minutes - detach and keep

Hold reversible work based only on the disputed summary and preserve the three record versions.

Decision owner / authorised route _____ containment owner _____

Evidence reference / keeper _____ human fallback / specialist _____

Still unknown / next check time _____

Rehearsal prompt only. Use established procedures and qualified help in a real incident. Do not keep sensitive details or secrets on this card.

© Almost Magic Tech Lab. For your organisation's own use only. Please do not copy, share or sell this material.