



RUNNING EXAMPLE

In September 2027 Rhena measures what six months of an agent have changed in its decision paths.

1 THE RULE • WHAT ACTUALLY MOVES

THE POWER TO CHALLENGE

Rarely the decision itself, almost always the power to challenge it. The person who used to decide keeps the title and loses the grip, while the person who configures the agent never received a mandate to decide and decides all the same.

A SETTING IS AN ACT

Setting a threshold decides thousands of cases in advance. Configuration is therefore a governance act and falls under the same rules as the decision it replaces.

2 WORKED EXAMPLE • RHENA • SIX MONTHS AFTER ANNA

DECISION	WHO DECIDED BEFORE	WHO ACTUALLY DECIDES	WHAT MUST BE RE-ESTABLISHED
Settle below €2,500	The handler, case by case	The agent, within the cap	Signed mandate (ACF-13), cap revisited at every validity review
Set the depreciation rate applied	The technical division, once a year	Whichever version of the schedule is loaded in the agent	Version entered in the register (ACF-09) and checked at every tariff revision
Decide that a file is complete	The handler	The agent's completeness check	Written rule, two reminders at most
Escalate a file	The handler	The model's confidence threshold	Documented threshold, revisited at every model version
Stop the agent	Not applicable	The DDAO for Europe, nobody for the subsidiary	Stop authority extended in writing to both entities

3 CHECK WHEN RE-READING

THE MIDDLE COLUMN

It is the only one that counts. If “who actually decides” holds neither a human nor a written rule, the organisation has delegated without knowing it.

WHAT THE CARD TRIGGERS

Every row where power moved with no written act ends in a mandate (ACF-13), a recorded exception (ACF-O8) or a step back. At Rhena the second row was written in September 2027, six months after a version of the schedule decided 430 settlements on its own.

Power does not vanish when a decision is automated, it changes hands and stops being discussed.