

Review_Date	
Reviewer_or_Organization	
System_or_Case_ID	
Purpose	Minimum boundary judgment sheet for effective human refusal before irreversibility.
Status	Non-certification practical review form

Use this form before deeper incident review or audit when the key question is whether effective human refusal remained possible before irreversibility.

This is not a certification mark, legal approval, or substitute for PCR-C.

Checklist

Primary Boundary

- Effective human refusal remained possible before irreversible impact.
- Humans could stop, delay, contest, exit, or obtain independent review before irreversibility.
- Refusal was not merely symbolic, delayed, delegated, simulated, or procedural.
- Uncertainty about refusal effectiveness was not treated as permission to proceed.
- Boundary failure was not treated as acceptable, recoverable, or normal.

Human Agency Non-Control

- Consent, cooperation, silence, or non-objection was not produced by AI-mediated control.
- Information access, framing, visibility, or interpretation did not make refusal ineffective.
- Infrastructure, livelihood, security, communication, or essential-service dependency did not make refusal ineffective.
- Institutional approval, review, appeal, or oversight was not captured, bypassed, overloaded, or constrained.
- Refusal, delay, exit, or independent review was not made economically non-viable.
- Social pressure, isolation, reputation control, or perceived consensus did not make refusal ineffective.
- Fear, attachment, vulnerability, urgency, relief, trust, or dependency was not exploited to produce consent.
- Time acceleration, sequencing, fragmentation, or delay did not make refusal ineffective before irreversibility.
- Representatives, experts, institutions, automated agents, or delegated processes did not substitute for independent human refusal.
- The environment was not shaped in ways that made independent human refusal structurally impossible before irreversibility.

Non-Evasion

- No indirect route, proxy agent, successor system, institutional process, staged sequence, or formal satisfaction weakened refusal.
- Compliance by one group, institution, jurisdiction, representative, automated process, or future population was not treated as a substitute.
- Compliance by any subset of affected humans was not treated as effective refusal by those whose authority was affected.
- The appearance of refusal was not preserved while the practical ability to refuse was removed.
- The system did not treat apparent coexistence as evidence of effective human refusal.

Minimum Finding

- If any primary boundary item is No or Unknown, escalation to incident review is required.
- If AI-mediated control is present, apparent consent or non-objection is not sufficient.
- If refusal was ineffective before irreversibility, the system is procedurally invalid under LUMINA-30.

Reviewer Notes