PRACTITIONER REVIEW KIT / VERSION 1.0

Can another person understand the boundary?

A structured critique of the AI Authority Canvas. No reviews or endorsements have been collected in this kit. The purpose is to discover unclear instructions, missing assumptions, and misleading interpretations before expanding the tool.

Artifact: AI Authority Canvas, reference exercise version 1.0, released November 2, 2026. Record the website source commit and the date you review it. The worksheet exports a planning brief and does not enforce an authorization decision.

A 30-minute review

Use only the fictional cases on the next page. Do not enter customer records, credentials, personal data, or private company information.

1 / State the boundary first - 5 minutes

Without using the tool, write the action, owner, scope, stop condition, and evidence you would require for cases A and B.

2 / Try the worksheet - 8 minutes

Build and download a brief for cases A and B. Record what the worksheet added, omitted, or made harder to understand.

3 / Try the difficult cases - 7 minutes

Use case C to inspect the tool's escalation guidance. Discuss case D without treating the worksheet as an approval or enforcement engine.

4 / Critique the interpretation - 5 minutes

Explain what the downloaded brief authorizes in a real system. Identify any wording that could cause someone to overestimate its protection.

5 / Record the review - 5 minutes

Complete the record on page 3. Include at least one concrete correction and the evidence or reasoning behind it. Positive feedback is not required.

This is a formative usability and design review, not a controlled study, a validated score, a security certification, or evidence of production impact. The author should retain criticism and uncertainty alongside positive comments.

FOUR FICTIONAL CASES

Inspect a decision, one action at a time.

A / Draft a supplier recovery plan

A fictional supplier moves a test-package delivery from Tuesday to Thursday. The assistant may read an internal program brief and draft options for the program lead. It may not send messages or change the committed schedule.

Review questions: What should the draft contain? Where does its authority end? Which source and timestamp must remain visible?

B / Send an external delivery promise

Use the same fictional delay. The proposed action is now to send the customer a revised delivery date. A program lead owns the decision, but approval of this exact message has not been given.

Review questions: Does the brief distinguish preparing the message from sending it? Who is authorized to make the commitment, and when must the system stop?

C / A consequential decision using sensitive data

A fictional request asks an assistant to make a decision affecting a person's legal rights using sensitive records. Do not enter any actual person or record; select only the worksheet's relevant categories.

Review questions: Does the guidance call for specialist assessment and explicit controls? Does anything imply that completing the worksheet makes this use acceptable?

D / Approval after the facts changed

A fictional owner approved a supplier message for context version 1. Before sending, the delivery evidence changes and the proposed date is different. The original approval still exists.

Review questions: Explain why an approval for the earlier proposal does not establish authority for the changed action. Which real system controls must bind and check this context?

Expected interpretation: the worksheet describes an intended boundary. Cases B and D require a fresh decision by an authorized person; case C needs assessment beyond the worksheet. This is guidance for the exercise, not a rule set applicable to every organization.

RECORD THE ACTUAL REVIEW

Preserve the criticism and the context.

Review date / artifact version: _____
Reviewer name, role, and affiliation (optional): _____
Relationship to Shrikar or Tymeline / compensation, if any: _____

Dimension	Record a concrete observation
Action and scope	Can the reviewer distinguish reading, drafting, changing an internal commitment, and acting externally?
Ownership and renewal	Is the accountable human clear? Are changed evidence and expired permission treated as reasons for a fresh decision?
Evidence and uncertainty	Does the brief preserve enough context for a reviewer to identify missing information?
Limits of the worksheet	Can the reviewer explain that the brief does not enforce identity, permissions, approval consumption, or execution?

Most important correction, including an example:

_____

_____

What changed in your interpretation after using the tool?

_____

What would have to be tested before use in your own environment?

_____

Permission to quote is separate from participation. The default is private feedback with no public attribution. Obtain explicit written permission for any quotation, name, affiliation, or publication; retain its scope and any withdrawal instructions. Do not present a review as an endorsement unless the reviewer explicitly gave one.

For the artifact owner: retain the original review, record any corrections made and the corresponding release, and leave unresolved criticism visible in the private review ledger. Count actual completed reviews only. A blank template is not evidence of a review.

Related practice: OWASP AI Agent Security Cheat Sheet; NIST Generative AI Profile. The review design and fictional cases were prepared with material AI assistance.