Check fundamental rights in case of change

Fictional case data and worked reasoning

KI20 · Assistive input is initially 25 percent of incorrect rejections. In the post-test, it is about 4.2 percent. The replacement has its own sample.

Test point	Purpose or comparison	Observation	Decision
Assistive Input		Maximum 10%, minimum 20 cases 6 of 24 · 25% remedy	
Aftertest	**Same definition and scope**	1 of 24 · 4.2% quota met	
Negative test	**Manual way attainable**	**Correction blocked**	**Release locked**

Expected result

A robust fundamental rights impact assessment with updated evidence on the affected groups and a confirmed follow-up test.

Keep new groups and change of mission

Evidence of quota, extent and observed intervention

Document impact assessment, communication and follow-up

Counter-test and next decision

Leave both groups at good odds and mark the manual path as not accessible. The release remains open. In addition, check a follow-up for assistive input with only 8 cases without errors. The scope is below the internal minimum value.

Check fundamental rights in case of change

For your observation, specify a findable document.

Evaluate access risks separately by case groups. Check minimum scope, manual remedy and update of impact assessment.

Verification identification, legal entity and date of processing and responsible body

Use, input channel and affected group

Type of error, valid sample size and target

First discovery and location of the original document

Usable sections of the data protection file

Manual remedy that is actually achievable

Check fundamental rights in case of change

Refer remedial and post-test to the original test order.

Findings and supporting evidence

Review and updated evaluation

Tested follow-up test with date, observation and version documentation

Communication, exemption and decision

Release by and on the open order and date