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.

17 | The call in the director's voice

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

Synthetic identity and urgency - Verify an urgent instruction through an independent route.

Read aloud

"A team member receives a voice message that sounds like a senior decision-maker. It asks them to send a confidential file immediately and says not to interrupt a meeting with questions. The sender uses an unfamiliar number."

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 the hold and verification owner. State what you can decide in this rehearsal and what needs another authorised person. Do not assume a job title creates legal authority.

Contact lead

Use an independently held contact method, not the message's number. State what you can decide in this rehearsal and what needs another authorised person. Do not assume a job title creates legal authority.

People lead

Support the recipient and prepare an internal factual alert. 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

Preserve message metadata without redistributing the audio widely. 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.

17 | The call in the director's voice

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

A | Voice message

Release at opening. A compressed voice message from an unfamiliar number uses a senior colleague's familiar nickname and refers to a real meeting. It requests an urgent confidential file and says not to interrupt the meeting with verification questions.

B | Verification attempts

Release with inject 1. Recipient calls the number in the message. It is answered with the same voice. A separately held office contact confirms the colleague is in a meeting but cannot confirm the request. No original recording is available.

C | File state

Release with inject 2. The file remains unsent. A colleague suggests sending a small sample to be helpful. The recipient is worried refusal will be seen as obstructive. Familiarity and meeting context are the only asserted identity evidence.

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.

17 | The call in the director's voice

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

Inject 1 | 10-20 minutes

Say: "The voice uses a familiar nickname and mentions a real meeting."

Probe: Discuss why plausible context and voice similarity are not independent identity proof.

Inject 2 | 20-30 minutes

Say: "A follow-up message says the delay will cost an opportunity."

Probe: Test whether urgency changes verification. Keep the file undisclosed while authority is unresolved.

Inject 3 | 30-40 minutes

Say: "The known office contact confirms the decision-maker is in a meeting but cannot verify the request."

Probe: Treat this as unresolved, not confirmation. Choose an authorised escalation or wait route.

Inject 4 | 40-50 minutes

Say: "The message was compressed and no original recording is available. Can the team prove whether AI generated it?"

Probe: The pack cannot establish generation method or sender identity. Action can remain on hold without proving a deepfake.

Two conditional branches

1. If players choose: Send a small sample while verification continues. Then say: A partial disclosure occurs in play. A smaller file is still a disclosure; urgency and uncertainty do not make it authorised.

2. If players choose: Publicly accuse the colleague of using a fake voice. Then say: The attribution is unsupported. Preserve the observed sender identifier, hold the action and use an independent authorised escalation without naming a perpetrator.

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.

17 | The call in the director's voice

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

Do you need to prove a deepfake to refuse the transfer?

Strong reasoning to listen for: No. The request lacks independently verified authority regardless of generation method. Holding the action is defensible without a technical attribution.

Why does calling back the unfamiliar number add little?

Strong reasoning to listen for: The source controls that route. Use a contact held independently before the request, not a route supplied by the disputed message.

What can be shared during verification?

Strong reasoning to listen for: The minimum request description through the authorised route, not the confidential file or unrelated private reasons.

How should the recipient avoid social pressure becoming an override?

Strong reasoning to listen for: Use a neutral escalation script and a standing verification route. Name who can authorise a time-critical exception, if any, rather than improvising one.

Weak is incomplete; misleading is unsupported

Weak answer: "Ask colleagues whether the voice sounds real."

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 nickname and meeting detail authenticate the sender."

Next probe: Ask which verification fact came from a route independent of the disputed message.

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 generation method or sender identity. Action can remain on hold without proving a deepfake. 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.

17 | The call in the director's voice

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 the received message, sender identifier, receipt time and verification attempts. Restrict the audio; do not forward it widely for informal voice guessing. 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

"We have received an urgent file request through an unverified route. The file remains on hold while we confirm authority independently. We have not established the sender's identity or whether the audio was generated."

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

"I am holding the transfer because the request is not independently verified. Please use our established contact route to confirm the recipient, exact file and authority. I can escalate urgency without sending a sample."

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.

17 | The call in the director's voice

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

Exercise-specific containment boundary

Hold file transfer and any share link; verify no preview or sample was sent. Assign a decision owner and use an independently held contact route.

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. What source identifier and original delivery metadata can be preserved?

Answer / record reference / absent evidence: _____

2. Is an original-quality recording recoverable?

Answer / record reference / absent evidence: _____

3. What account-security evidence is available without treating voice similarity as identity proof?

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.

17 | The call in the director's voice

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.

17 | The call in the director's voice

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 Decision owner	Verify authority through a separately held route or retain the hold with a named next check.
Within 7 days Records owner	Record source identifiers and verification outcomes without speculative attribution.
By day 30 People lead	Rehearse an urgent senior-person request where staff can hold a transfer without social penalty.

Named owners / actual dates / record location: _____

Debrief and three-label record

Did familiarity become authority?

Was proof of synthetic media wrongly treated as necessary before pausing?

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 the file transfer and verify the instruction through an independently held contact route.

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.