



CORNER ITALIANO | OFFICIAL RESOURCES

Davide Case

Full record, exit, and reopening

COMPLETED EXAMPLE OF THE 2050 TEST

Aligned with the revised English interior · Documentary snapshot July 2026 · Resource version EN-US-R2.3

<https://www.corneritaliano.com/en/2050/resources/>

HOW TO READ THIS NARRATIVE SCENARIO The record distinguishes evidence status from the organizational decision. Even when all seven questions are documented, Do not delegate remains available. A capable product can leave too little benefit to justify oversight and dependence, including the work of exiting the service, in the particular context.

Case timeline

Moment	Evidence and decision
Before the pilot	The exit test fails: logs are readable, but configurations and permissions cannot be reconstructed. The pilot does not begin.
Second exit test	The team reopens a case in a separate environment, reassigns permissions, and continues without the primary service.
Launch	Decision: Limit and test for ninety days, first in shadow mode and then only in Proposes mode; no autonomous execution.
During the pilot	The system finds useful precedents. A plausible error reuses a clause without the agreed limitation. No contract is sent.
October 15, 2050	The net benefit remains modest and irregular after oversight, training, apprenticeship, and exit. Decision: Do not delegate.
October 16, 2050	The record also captures the cost of saying no: queued proposals, nonbillable hours, the provider balance, and one lost client.
Closure	Final export, access revocation, and random reopening of one case without provider assistance.
April 15, 2051	Reopening for a narrower proposal: precedent search only, closed cases, shadow mode, no external effect, and the continuing possibility of saying no.

Record as of October 15, 2050, with follow-up

Field	Record as of October 15, 2050, with follow-up
System and decision	Operational twin for contract work. Decide whether to adopt it after a ninety-day pilot, first in shadow mode and then, if the evidence holds, in Proposes mode.
Context and exposed people	Davide’s small business; the contract lead; a younger colleague in apprenticeship; the commercial director; clients and counterparties bound by proposals.
Purpose - Sufficient	Reduce backlog and preparation time without increasing missed exceptions, late corrections, or commitments that are not understood. The organizational alternative is assessed against the same need.
Mandate - Sufficient	The twin compares precedents, flags deviations, and formulates alternatives. No Decides or Executes mode: it neither sends nor signs; shifts, prices, personnel, and contractual commitments remain excluded. Each supervisor follows no more than twelve open processes, a scenario threshold to be reviewed under actual load.
Evidence - Sufficient	Closed cases including costly exceptions, shadow use, later Proposes mode, a simulated incident, and actual load. The system finds many useful precedents and makes one plausible error at the decisive point; the benefit is real, modest, and irregular.
Distribution - Sufficient	Gross savings are separated from expert hours, training, apprenticeship, client delays, and exit work. The younger colleague receives protected time to reconstruct cases.

Record as of October 15, 2050, with follow-up - continued

Field	Record as of October 15, 2050, with follow-up
Harm - Sufficient	Plausible failure: a clause omits a limitation or transfers risk before the source and exception are understood. Signature leaves a control window; it does not make the harm negligible.
Redress - Sufficient in the pilot	No external effect is automatic. The contract lead can reopen, modify, block, and suspend; interventions remain recorded. The commercial director's dissent is retained but does not replace the counterparty's Redress.
Exit - Blocking, then Sufficient	The first export does not reconstruct configurations and permissions, so the pilot does not begin. In the second test, the team reopens a case in a separate environment and continues without the primary service. At closure, it exports logs and configurations, reopens a random case without provider help, and revokes access.
Provisional decision	Limit and test: ninety days, first in shadow mode and then in Proposes mode; no autonomous execution; oversight, control, and apprenticeship count against the benefit.
Monitoring	The team records improved times, exceptions, interventions, expert hours, and reconstruction of origin. The system remains technically capable; when oversight is performed in practice, the net advantage does not sustain that process and volume.
Final decision - October 15, 2050	Do not delegate. Do not renew even Proposes mode, activate exit, and retain an alternative. Davide signs and assumes a choice that forgoes a real benefit.
Alternative retained	Collection of approved clauses, exceptions identified at intake, earlier involvement of the expert, and protected hours for reconstructing cases.
Cost of saying no	Queued proposals, nonbillable hours, provider balance, lower margin, and one lost client. The business retains readable case files and more distributed competence.
Responsible person and review	Davide. Closing record dated October 16, 2050; review scheduled for April 15, 2051.

Reopening: April 15, 2051

Six months later, the review reopens the question while preserving the first decision and its reasons. Davide considers a narrower proposal through a new test, separate from purchase. He can still say no again.

Field	Reopening on April 15, 2051
New proposal	Search precedents without generating offers, at lower cost and with no access to open case files.
Test scope	New shadow test on closed cases; no purchase authorized and no external effect.
Evidence and costs	Waiting time, late corrections, margin, expert hours, oversight, training, and apprenticeship remain in the same account.
Threshold and stopping	The success criterion, responsible person, and stop authority are fixed before launch; the test can be stopped without purchasing the system.
Decision	Reopening the comparison does not revoke the first no. At the end, Do not delegate and the concrete possibility of saying no again remain available.

Transferable criterion

THE POINT OF THE CASE A useful product can still leave too little benefit to justify oversight and dependence in a particular process, including the work of exiting the service. Where a better organizational alternative exists, Do not delegate records the refusal of that power at that time. Keep the reasons and costs visible so the decision can be reopened.

Questions for transferring the case

Question	Evidence to seek in your own context
Does the success criterion measure the need or only the volume produced?	
Which power must remain in Assists or Proposes mode?	
Who pays for oversight, training, waiting, and exit?	
Which plausible error is elegant, convincing, and wrong at the decisive point?	
Does the exit test also reconstruct configurations and permissions?	
Which organizational alternative addresses the same need?	
What change would justify reopening without erasing the first no?	