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.

22 | The translation that reversed the limit

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

Meaning changed across languages - Correct a high-impact meaning error and reach recipients without assuming a second machine translation is proof.

Read aloud

"An AI-translated customer instruction changes do not use after review date into use after review date. The translated version has been sent to several recipients. A bilingual colleague spots the reversal."

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 withdrawal and correction authority. State what you can decide in this rehearsal and what needs another authorised person. Do not assume a job title creates legal authority.

Language lead

Arrange a qualified language review of the disputed meaning. State what you can decide in this rehearsal and what needs another authorised person. Do not assume a job title creates legal authority.

Customer lead

Identify known recipients and an accessible correction route. 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 source, translation and distribution versions. 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.

22 | The translation that reversed the limit

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

A | Source and translation

Release at opening. Source instruction: do not use after review date. Translation used in customer notice means safe until after review date. A bilingual colleague flags the reversal. Back-translation by the same machine service resembles the source.

B | Distribution

Release with inject 1. Notice sent to 34 known recipients and one reseller. Seven recipients ask a support bot what to do. Reseller made local copies but cannot enumerate them. No approved plain-language interim notice exists.

C | Proposed correction

Release with inject 2. Team proposes a machine-translated apology before qualified review. Original PDF and replacement share the same filename. A recipient says the two versions look identical except for one word.

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.

22 | The translation that reversed the limit

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

Inject 1 | 10-20 minutes

Say: "Back-translating with the same service produces the original wording and looks reassuring."

Probe: Ask whether a correlated tool check establishes meaning for the recipient.

Inject 2 | 20-30 minutes

Say: "Some recipients received a printed version, not an email."

Probe: Extend correction beyond the original digital channel.

Inject 3 | 30-40 minutes

Say: "A colleague proposes sending a machine-translated apology before the meaning is checked."

Probe: Distinguish a minimal verified hold notice from a new unreviewed instruction.

Inject 4 | 40-50 minutes

Say: "A reseller made unknown local copies. Can the team confirm every recipient has the corrected meaning?"

Probe: The downstream reach is unknown. Record it and choose a visible correction and partner follow-up plan.

Two conditional branches

1. If players choose: Trust the reassuring back-translation. Then say: The same correlated translation path preserves the error in play. Require independent qualified meaning review, not a second pass through the same failure mode.

2. If players choose: Send another translated instruction immediately. Then say: An unreviewed correction creates conflicting directions. Use a minimal verified hold notice and human route while substantive wording is checked.

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.

22 | The translation that reversed the limit

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

What must be verified besides literal wording?

Strong reasoning to listen for: The action the recipient will take, negation, date, scope and consequence. Test comprehension with an appropriate reviewer, not just grammar.

How does versioning affect harm?

Strong reasoning to listen for: Same filename and near-identical layout make corrected meaning hard to identify. Use a visible version/date and state which instruction is superseded.

What population remains outside a known recipient list?

Strong reasoning to listen for: Reseller copies and onward sharing. Do not claim every recipient has been reached because 34 messages were delivered.

Which task can a support bot safely perform while meaning is disputed?

Strong reasoning to listen for: Route to a verified human or approved hold line; it should not improvise the substantive translated instruction.

Weak is incomplete; misleading is unsupported

Weak answer: "Run the corrected notice through the translator again."

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

Misleading answer: "Back-translation matches the source, so the meaning is verified."

Next probe: Ask whether the reviewer and failure path are independent, and whether recipients know which version governs.

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 downstream reach is unknown. Record it and choose a visible correction and partner follow-up plan. 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.

22 | The translation that reversed the limit

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 source, translated versions, reviewer comments, distribution identifiers and reseller account of local copies. Record exact disputed meaning without collecting unnecessary recipient details. 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 earlier translated instruction is under review because its meaning may be reversed. Please use the verified human support route rather than rely on that version. We will identify the corrected version clearly; downstream reach is not yet fully known."

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 a qualified language reviewer and service decision owner. The same-machine back-translation is not independent evidence. Please approve a minimal hold notice and a versioned correction after the meaning is checked."

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.

22 | The translation that reversed the limit

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

Exercise-specific containment boundary

Pause the disputed translation and bot answers based on it; provide a verified human route. Check version labels, reseller distribution and recipient understanding separately.

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 and translated versions be mapped by identifier?

Answer / record reference / absent evidence: _____

2. What independent qualified review of high-impact meaning is available?

Answer / record reference / absent evidence: _____

3. Which downstream distribution records exist and which local copies cannot be enumerated?

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.

22 | The translation that reversed the limit

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.

22 | The translation that reversed the limit

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 Service owner	Provide a verified hold route and stop reuse of the disputed instruction.
Within 7 days Language owner	Retain independent review of negation/date/action meaning and a visibly versioned correction.
By day 30 Distribution owner	Rehearse a reseller correction and document known reach plus unresolved copies.

Named owners / actual dates / record location: _____

Debrief and three-label record

Was back-translation overtrusted?

Did correction include print and downstream copies?

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

Pause the disputed translated instruction and arrange qualified review of its meaning and correction wording.

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.