

PRACTICAL GUIDE

AI Content Verification Toolkit for Small Publishers

A practical guide to source checking, human review, and corrections

Publisher: ArizonaAI.com | Project lead: Cenk Brown

Release 1.0.0 | October 7, 2026 | Arizona time

Review job listings, company descriptions, and business news with a source trail and a documented decision. The complete guide, worked examples, and dated public-source illustrations are included here.

[Open the local guided worksheet](#) | [Read the accessible HTML guide](#) | [Browse all 20 practice cases](#)

Three judgments, one accountable decision

Does the source support the wording? Is the source suitable for this claim? Does the evidence fit the stated timeframe? Keep the answers separate, then resolve every material issue before a human approves the reviewed revision.

Find what you need

Practical guide	2
Use the worksheet and workbook	13
Worked example J01: Invented salary	14
Worked example D01: Unsupported AI classification	18
Worked example N01: Promotional claim and syndication	23
EV Group Data Analyst: the opening is in Austria	28
EV Group: company-stated profile and locations	30
TSMC Arizona: a November 2024 award announcement	33
Source and version register	35

Section-level PDF bookmarks provide additional navigation. Bundle links work when this file stays in the downloads folder beside the supplied site files. For the latest recorded checks and remaining limits, consult the package validation report.

Practical guide

01. Start with one draft and one decision

Use this guide when AI helps prepare a job listing, company description, or business news item. Your task is to establish what the evidence supports and decide whether this particular wording is suitable for its readers. The result is a documented human review, with reasons another person can inspect.

ArizonaAI.com publishes this toolkit. Cenk Brown is the project lead. The workflow, decision rules, templates, and suggested review practices are ArizonaAI project recommendations. Selected connections to NIST guidance are identified separately. No NIST approval, endorsement, or certification is claimed.

- Understand the source: identify the draft's purpose, audience, timeframe, and supporting evidence.
- Check the claims: compare consequential statements with appropriate evidence, resolve problems, and review the final wording.
- Record the decision: name the responsible reviewer, preserve the reviewed revision, and record a Hold, readiness decision, approval, or rejection.

You supply the judgment

The worksheet does not read linked pages, discover errors, authenticate a reviewer, or publish content. A source URL and positive selections cannot establish truth. You must open the source, inspect the relevant passage, and record what you actually checked.

02. Define the use before checking the words

Give the review a recognizable title and choose its content type. Keep the original draft and the proposed publication text. State who will read it, what they may do because of it, and whether it describes current conditions or a historical event. A job seeker choosing whether to apply needs different evidence from a reader studying a company's announcement last year.

- Intended use: What question should this item help a reader answer?
- Affected readers: Who could lose time, money, an opportunity, or a fair understanding if it is wrong?
- Timeframe: Does the wording mean available now, announced on a particular date, or expected later?
- Limits: What relevant matter will this review leave unexamined?

Record the reviewer, review pass, and actual review time. Display times in Arizona time; exported timestamps include the -07:00 offset. An unknown source date stays unknown. Never use the review date as a substitute for a missing publication date.

NIST connection: MAP 1.1 addresses intended context, users, effects, and limitations. This worksheet supports that discussion for a narrow publishing use.

SRC05 | Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework
AI RMF 1.0, Section 5, Table 2, MAP 1.1; printed page 26, PDF page 31.

03. Make three separate evidence judgments

Question	What to establish	Fictional illustration
Source support	Does the passage support this exact wording, including qualifiers and omissions?	An employer lists three office days. The draft says fully remote. The source contradicts the draft.
Source suitability	Is this source appropriate for the particular assertion?	A company's announcement supports that it announced a speed improvement. It does not independently prove the product is the fastest.
Timeframe fit	Does the evidence fit the time the draft describes?	A preserved posting supports what was advertised last month. It cannot alone establish that applications remain open today.

Keep those judgments separate even when one is favorable. A genuine company page may concern the wrong subsidiary. A perfect paraphrase may describe an expired offer. Three websites may repeat one press release. None of those situations becomes stronger evidence merely because the text reads smoothly.

Identify the kind of statement you are making. An attributed claim says who made it. An estimate retains its method or uncertainty. An opinion remains labeled as opinion. An inference explains the reasoning and its limits. A missing value remains missing. Do not turn 'not stated on this page' into 'does not exist' or 'is not offered.'

Narrow the assertion to the evidence

Fictional example: 'Mesa Ember Systems says its prototype reduced energy use in an internal test' is different from 'Mesa Ember Systems reduces energy use.' Attribution, prototype status, and test conditions all affect the claim.

04. Leave a source trail someone can follow

- Open the actual source. A search snippet, headline, or working link is not enough for a material claim.
- Check identity and context: the employer, organization, product, event, location, and relevant period must match.
- Record the supplied URL and the destination reached when checked. Name the publisher and the page, document, or posting.
- Locate the evidence precisely: use a heading, table row, requisition number, page, or other meaningful position. Add a short evidence summary in your own words.
- Record any source publication date separately from retrieval and checking times. Name the person who actually checked it.
- Note access limits, conflicting information, and shared origins. Several reproductions of one announcement provide one information origin.

Prefer a source with direct knowledge of the fact being asserted: the employer for its published job terms, the company for what it announced, or the relevant official record for what that record establishes. This is a claim-specific choice, not a permanent trust rating for a domain. When sources disagree, record both positions and what would settle the disagreement.

If a page disappears, mark the access problem. Dated retained evidence may support historical wording when its capture, scope, and limitations are documented and the material is appropriately retained. An unsupported summary is not a preserved source. A replacement source needs its own check and date.

NIST connection: MS-2.5-003 addresses source and citation checks during pre-deployment evaluation and ongoing monitoring.

[SRC06 | Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile](#)

NIST AI 600-1, Section 3, MEASURE 2.5, MS-2.5-003; printed page 31, PDF page 35.

05. Review every consequential claim

Read the whole draft and list statements that could change a reader's understanding or action. Split compound sentences where their parts need different evidence. 'The company opened a Phoenix factory creating 400 jobs' contains separate claims about identity, location, operational status, timing, and employment. One supported part cannot clear the rest.

For each claim, preserve the original wording, enter the proposed wording, connect the supporting source, and record a precise evidence location. Judge support, suitability, timeframe, and materiality separately. Explain the decision in language another editor can follow. Check headings, summaries, captions, application links, and omitted qualifiers as well as body text.

- Check negation and exceptions: 'no sponsorship' cannot become 'sponsorship available.'
- Check units and denominators: annual pay, hourly pay, revenue, investment, and forecasts are different quantities.
- Check missing information honestly: a source without salary does not authorize a salary estimate. Omit it or state the page does not list it when relevant.
- After editing either full draft field, compare the entire final text with the claim list again. Add new claims and remove or update obsolete ones before affirming that all material claims are accounted for.

The inventory assertion is a human statement

Confirming that the material claims are accounted for does not prove the inventory is complete. It records that you performed the final comparison. The tool cannot discover an omitted claim for you.

06. Use the checks that fit the content

Job listings

Match the employer, role, requisition, and application destination. A shared hiring platform is not the employer's identity. Check the workplace city and remote or hybrid arrangement, pay and pay period when supplied, eligibility restrictions, and required versus preferred qualifications. Check opening status as of review. If availability cannot be established, a dated historical description must not be presented as a current vacancy. This toolkit reviews published information; it does not screen applicants or make hiring decisions.

Company directories

Identify the exact organization and any relevant parent or subsidiary. State what it actually builds, sells, or provides. Using AI in internal operations does not alone support calling a company an AI product developer. Verify the particular Arizona city or cities claimed, with a date where needed. A service area, customer, or planned facility does not by itself establish an operating office. Distinguish prototypes, announcements, and products available to customers.

Business news

Separate the announcement date from the event date. Keep planned investment, committed funding, construction, and completed operation distinct. Preserve who said what, whether a figure is estimated, the currency and units, and the geographic scope. If the evidence is a company announcement, attribute claims that exceed independently established facts. Do not rewrite an intention as a completed event or a company forecast as a guaranteed outcome.

07. Decide what matters to the reader

Treat a claim as material when an error or omission could meaningfully change a reader's decision or understanding. Within this toolkit, employer identity, application destination, eligibility, pay, work location, significant dates, and operational status normally deserve that treatment. Materiality is a documented editorial judgment, not a numerical score.

Use Unsure when consequences need more thought; it follows the same Hold rules as Material. A minor issue needs an explanation of why it does not affect the intended use. Record a specific reason if you downgrade an ordinarily consequential field. Changing a label to Minor to avoid resolving the problem is not a defensible review.

Consider the audience as well as the word. A wrong city may matter greatly to a job applicant even when the cities are nearby. A harmless spelling preference can remain a minor limitation. Resolve serious uncertainties first; do not average several correct statements against one consequential error.

08. Assign an owner and a way to escalate

Name the person responsible for the review and the person authorized to approve publication. They may be the same person in a small operation. For disputed, consequential, or unfamiliar claims, seek a second reviewer with relevant knowledge. Record who actually participated and what they checked.

If you work alone, take a separate deliberate review pass using the evidence and checklist. Label it as a separate self-review pass. Rereading your own work is useful, but it is not independent review. Agent assistance must be described as agent assistance; it cannot supply the named human approval.

Escalation can mean finding the original evidence, asking the source a precise question, consulting a suitable expert, narrowing or removing the claim, or withholding publication. Record the unanswered question, next action, owner, and review trigger. Do not leave an indefinite 'needs checking' note without responsibility.

NIST connection: GOVERN 2.1 concerns responsibilities and communication; MAP 3.5 concerns defined and assessed human oversight.

SRC05 | Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework
AI RMF 1.0, Section 5, Table 1, GOVERN 2.1, printed page 23, PDF page 28; Table 2, MAP 3.5, printed page 27, PDF page 32.

09. Resolve the issue before changing the decision

State	Meaning
Work in progress	Required context, reviewer, timestamp, claims, or final claim inventory is incomplete. Ready and Approved are unavailable.
Hold	A material or unsure claim lacks adequate checked evidence, suitable support, timeframe fit, or completed resolution and recheck.
Ready for human approval	Required review information is present, material issues are resolved, and any remaining minor issues are disclosed with reasons.
Approved by named reviewer	A human has recorded approval of this exact reviewed revision. Readiness never supplies approval automatically.
Withdraw or reject	The reviewer records why publication should not proceed or existing content should be withdrawn. The record remains available.

For every retained material or unsure claim, require an appropriate source, a meaningful evidence locator, and a recorded actual check with reviewer and time. Unsupported, partly supported, conflicting, or unreviewed final wording creates a Hold. Unresolved suitability or an unknown or stale timeframe also creates a Hold. Positive selections without underlying evidence do not clear it.

- **Correct:** change the wording and recheck the revised claim against its evidence.
- **Qualify:** add attribution, uncertainty, scope, or a historical date only when that makes the statement appropriate for its actual use; then recheck it.
- **Remove:** confirm the unsupported claim is absent from the full final draft and record the removal check. Preserve its original issue in history.
- **Keep unresolved:** assign the next action and retain the Hold, or record withdrawal or rejection with a reason.

A material issue disclosed in a note is still unresolved unless the revised wording and intended use are defensible and rechecked. Selecting 'resolved' is not a substitute for that work. If someone publishes externally despite a Hold, record the actual event honestly; it does not turn the toolkit decision into Approved.

10. Keep approval attached to the reviewed revision

A decision belongs to the exact text, evidence, context, and review judgments considered at that time. Changing a draft, claim, source, source date, audience, intended use, timeframe, materiality, resolution, or inventory assertion requires a new readiness assessment.

Preserve the prior decision and snapshot as history. Do not carry an old approval forward to changed inputs.

Every decision record must identify a retained revision containing its reviewed draft, claims, sources, issues, and relevant context. After a full-text edit, repeat the material-claim inventory before another readiness or approval decision. A correction that is small in length may still change eligibility, timing, or meaning.

Workbook history is manual

Before recording a decision in the workbook, save and retain a dated copy with its revision ID. Enter that file reference in Revisions. After any reviewed input changes, create a new revision and reassess status yourself. Keep every decided copy in the completed review package. Spreadsheet formulas cannot guarantee this history or automatically invalidate every approval.

Editable workbooks, downloaded JSON, and ordinary revision snapshots are working records. They do not authenticate identities, make history tamper-proof, or prove that a check occurred.

11. Correct published errors and learn from close calls

Record a reported error, an error caught before publication, and an observed negative impact as different event types. An inaccurate draft does not prove anyone was harmed. Capture the affected content and version, disputed claim, report time, evidence, owner, and current status. Preserve the original and corrected wording.

- Contain the problem: decide whether to hold, remove, qualify, or temporarily withdraw affected content while checking.
- Resolve and recheck: document the evidence and inspect the corrected published wording or retained draft.
- Consider related content: investigate whether the same source, prompt, or transformation affected other items.
- Decide who needs notification: readers, a source, a syndication recipient, or another affected party. Explain the choice and use an appropriate approved route.
- Record completion separately from plans: identify the actual edit, notice, or withdrawal, its location, and its time.

Make any public correction understandable: what changed, why it matters, and when it changed. Preserve enough history to explain the decision without republishing unnecessary personal information.

NIST connection: MANAGE 4.3 addresses incident communication and response records. MG-4.3-002 concerns tracking errors, near misses, and negative impacts.

[SRC05 | Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework](#)

AI RMF 1.0, Section 5, Table 4, MANAGE 4.3; printed page 33, PDF page 38.

[SRC06 | Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile](#)

NIST AI 600-1, Section 3, MANAGE 4.3, MG-4.3-002; printed page 45, PDF page 49.

12. Recheck changing information and the review process

Choose a next review date or event trigger based on how quickly the information can change and the consequences of staleness. Record the reason and owner. Examples include a vacancy check before resurfacing a listing, a company update when a planned facility opens, or a news follow-up when a forecast period ends. These are project recommendations, not a universal NIST interval.

Provide a correction route your publication actually monitors. Review reports and overdue checks. Give higher priority to consequential, uncertain, changing, or previously problematic content. If using a sample, describe how you selected it and which content you did not review; a sample cannot establish that every item is correct.

- Did the last review find source changes before readers could rely on stale information?
- What did the process miss, and how was the miss discovered?
- Did an assigned owner act, or did unresolved issues accumulate?
- Should the next review change its timing, sample, source choice, or escalation rule?

NIST connection: GOVERN 1.5 and MANAGE 4.1 address continuing review and management. GV-1.5-001 and MG-4.1-002 address provenance responsibilities and evaluating monitoring.

[SRC05 | Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework](#)

AI RMF 1.0, Section 5, GOVERN 1.5, printed page 23, PDF page 28; MANAGE 4.1, printed page 33, PDF page 38.

[SRC06 | Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile](#)

NIST AI 600-1, Section 3, GV-1.5-001, printed page 16, PDF page 20; MG-4.1-002, printed page 44, PDF page 48.

13. Measure a useful question, with its limits

Start with the error that would matter most to your readers. Decide what observation could show a problem and which record supplies it. Choose a review period and inclusion rule before counting. Keep unknowns separate and list important risks your measures do not examine.

Suggested measure	Definition and interpretation
Material issue prevalence in reviewed items	Reviewed items with at least one material issue divided by all items actually reviewed in the stated period. Count an item once. This describes the reviewed set, not all published content.
Overdue rechecks	Scheduled rechecks past their due time without completion, as of the reporting time. Report the total due as context and distinguish unavailable sources.
Correction turnaround	Elapsed time from a recorded report to a verified corrective action. Report the number resolved and separately show unresolved items; do not hide them inside an average.
Material issues first found after publication	Count confirmed material issues first identified after publication, with affected items and discovery routes. Absence of reports does not establish absence of errors.

Report counts, dates, exclusions, and review method alongside any percentage. Leave results blank until measured. Comparisons need comparable selection, definitions, and periods. A change after adopting this toolkit does not by itself prove the toolkit caused it.

NIST connection: MEASURE 1.1 concerns prioritizing measures and documenting measurement gaps.

SRC05 | Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework
AI RMF 1.0, Section 5, Table 3, MEASURE 1.1; printed page 29, PDF page 34.

14. Keep the evidence you need, with an explicit policy

Use the retention template to decide which drafts, evidence captures, review records, revisions, corrections, and evaluation records to keep. Name an owner. For each record category, set a period or disposal trigger, explain the reason, identify authorized access, and state how disposal will be decided. Consider applicable obligations and unresolved disputes before deletion; this guide does not determine those obligations for you.

Retain supporting material only where you have an appropriate basis. A public link does not automatically permit unrestricted copying. Separate brief permitted source material from your own evidence summary, and avoid retaining applicant details, confidential

correspondence, or unrelated personal information. Record any evidence you could not retain and the resulting limit.

Export a review if you need to keep it. Treat leaving or clearing the worksheet as a potential loss of unsaved work. Place exported files in a location with access appropriate to their contents. Keep revision IDs and supporting files together so a later reviewer can follow the relationships. A filename or hash identifies an artifact; it does not establish the truth of its contents.

NIST connection: GV-1.5-003 concerns a retention policy for evaluation and transparency history; it does not supply this toolkit with a universal retention period.

[SRC06 | Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile](#)

NIST AI 600-1, Section 3, GOVERN 1.5, GV-1.5-003; printed page 16, PDF page 20.

15. Preserve a complete, readable review record

Use JSON to retain the complete exported web review. It carries the review, sources, claims, issues, decisions, and preserved decision-linked revisions. A flat claim CSV cannot represent that history by itself. Keep supplied companion files together, and follow the workbook's manual revision instructions when working in a spreadsheet.

- Before sharing an export, inspect the final draft, unresolved issues, decision, and review time. A Hold must remain visible.
- Check that each source and revision named by a claim or decision has a corresponding record or retained file.
- Keep missing dates and values explicitly unknown. A blank, failed lookup, or unread source is not a favorable finding.
- Expect retained decisions to include earlier wording. Remove unnecessary confidential material before creating a review, and consider the full exported history before sharing it.

Spreadsheet-compatible exports must treat supplied text as text, including text that resembles a formula. Preserve the original wording safely in the complete JSON record. Consult the release's data-handling and validation notes for behavior actually checked. A standalone worksheet's checks do not establish how an integrating website handles logs, analytics, or other surrounding services.

16. Explain the review without overstating it

Ask whether readers could mistake rewritten material for independent reporting, a current source check, or a more comprehensive review than actually occurred. Could an unclear owner make a correction hard to obtain? Could a broad 'verified' label conceal a stale fact or unresolved limitation? Record the risk and the specific wording, attribution, date, or contact information that addresses it.

Use a publication note only when its statements are accurate. Describe AI assistance at the level useful to readers, name the responsible publisher, identify the source basis and review date, and disclose relevant limits. Provide a correction route the publisher controls. Do not claim independent confirmation when the only evidence is the subject's announcement.

Fictional publication note

This summary was prepared with AI assistance and reviewed by our editor against the company's October 1 announcement. Planned opening dates remain company projections. Source links and review date appear with the item. Please use our listed correction contact to report a possible error. Use this wording only after adapting every statement to actual practice.

NIST connection: MEASURE 2.8 concerns examining transparency and accountability risks. Recording sources alone does not examine all such risks.

[SRC05 | Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework](#)

AI RMF 1.0, Section 5, Table 3, MEASURE 2.8; printed page 30, PDF page 35.

17. Read demonstrations and test results correctly

Fictional practice cases teach distinctions and include deliberately constructed problems. They are not observed errors by real companies or a tested AI model. Public-source illustrations demonstrate dated evidence checks for those particular claims. Software behavior tests examine how the worksheet handles supplied review states. Agent-assisted desk review is different from actual human evaluation.

Keep those evidence classes separate. For any evaluation, record the version, task, selected material, procedure, reviewer or participant type, observations, measures, and limits. Consult the release validation report for checks actually completed and work still pending. Do not infer a detection rate, time saving, harm reduction, or general model reliability from a polished example.

NIST connection: MS-2.5-001 cautions against broad conclusions from narrow assessments. Connections to MEASURE 2.1 and 2.5 are contextual; this resource does not evaluate AI-system reliability.

[SRC05 | Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework](#)

AI RMF 1.0, Section 5, Table 3, MEASURE 2.1 and MEASURE 2.5; printed page 29, PDF page 34.

[SRC06 | Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile](#)

NIST AI 600-1, Section 3, MEASURE 2.5, MS-2.5-001; printed page 31, PDF page 35.

18. Understand the toolkit's boundary

The mapping uses AI RMF 1.0, NIST AI 100-1, January 2023, and the Generative AI Profile, NIST AI 600-1, July 2024. It identifies practical support for selected aspects, contextual connections, and matters not covered. Read each row's evidence and limitation. It is a partial implementation aid, not comprehensive framework coverage or a compliance assessment.

MS-2.8-003 is not covered: ordinary editable records do not establish protected content history. MS-2.8-004 is not covered: reviewing this worksheet's usability is not testing a GAI system's user instructions.

The toolkit cannot guarantee complete claim inventories, genuine sources, honest reviewer entries, present truth, or safe future use. Broader privacy, security, accessibility, employment, legal, social, and organizational risks may need additional work. Source pages and official guidance may change. Revisit the source register and dated mapping before relying on a later edition, and document changes instead of silently reusing an old validation claim.

[SRC05 | Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework](#)
AI RMF 1.0, title page and Section 5.

[SRC06 | Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile](#)
NIST AI 600-1, title page; Section 3, MS-2.8-003 and MS-2.8-004, printed page 34, PDF page 38.

Use the worksheet and workbook

The web worksheet is an aid for entering your own evidence judgments. Enter the purpose, audience, timeframe, sources, and claims; inspect each source yourself; document corrections and rechecks; then record a decision for the reviewed revision. A positive selection is not a source check.

Session data and exports

Keep entered review content in the worksheet session unless you explicitly export it. The intended standalone behavior uses session memory and does not fetch your source URLs or send your draft to an AI service. Leaving or clearing the page can lose unsaved work. Consult the release's validation notes for behavior actually checked, and reassess any hosting site's surrounding analytics or logging after integration.

Workbook route

- Read Start, then use Reviews to define the purpose, audience, timeframe, and responsible reviewer.
- Use Sources for evidence and Claims for claim-level support, suitability, timeframe, materiality, and correction records.

- Record errors and actual responses in Corrections. Use Practice for the fictional cases and Mapping for the limited NIST connections.
- Before a decision, retain a dated workbook copy containing the complete reviewed inputs. Give it a revision ID and record that exact file reference in Revisions.
- After a change to reviewed inputs, retain the old decided copy, create a new revision, and reassess readiness manually. Repeat the material-claim inventory after either full draft field changes.

Manual history is a real requirement

Workbook formulas cannot enforce every approval change or preserve a protected history. Do not overwrite the only decided copy. Keep every decision-linked snapshot, the final draft, and its supporting evidence in the exported review package.

Before sharing a record

- Inspect the final wording, all unresolved issues, reviewer, decision, and Arizona timestamp. A Hold must remain visible.
- Use the complete JSON export to preserve relationships and decision-linked snapshots. A flat claims CSV alone cannot carry that history.
- Review the whole exported history for unnecessary confidential or personal material. Earlier wording may remain in preserved revisions.
- Keep unknown values unknown. A blank result or missing date must not become zero, current, or approved.

[Complete HTML guide](#) | [Data-handling and validation notes](#)

Worked example J01: Invented salary

Fictional practice material

Fictional practice material. All organization names, source passages, drafts, and seeded errors in this case are invented. The reserved .example URLs are teaching placeholders, not evidence links to real pages. All source dates, the retrieved_at timestamp, and the review date are fictional scenario dates, not actual retrieval or review events. This case does not report a real AI model or publisher failure. The worksheet does not detect its errors automatically.

Intended use: Prepare a current public job listing that directs readers to the correct employer opening.

Timeframe: Publication as of October 6, 2026, Arizona time, using only the supplied fictional scenario evidence.

Audience: People deciding whether, where, and how to apply for a job.

Source packet

practice-J01-source-1 | Test Fixture Technician | CI-217

<https://cindercoil-instruments.example/careers/CI-217>

Fictional publication date: 2026-10-01

Reserved placeholder URL, not a real source page. Dates and passages are invented teaching material.

Identity

Employer: Cindercoil Instruments. Role: Test Fixture Technician. Requisition: CI-217.

Work and qualifications

Full-time employment. On-site work in Mesa, Arizona. At least one year of hands-on electronics assembly experience is required.

Tasks include assembling test fixtures and recording inspection results.

Status

This opening is accepting applications as of October 6, 2026. Apply from this requisition page.

End of supplied vacancy page.

Source origin: fictional-cindercoil-instruments

Scenario retrieval: October 6, 2026 at 10:00:00 AM Arizona time; fictional, not an actual retrieval

Locator: Vacancy page: Identity, Work and qualifications, and Status sections; complete supplied page

Limits: Supplied original fictional passage; no live page was retrieved. The complete supplied vacancy page has no compensation field or pay figure. It establishes only what this posting states, not what other employer materials might disclose. Opening status is limited to the scenario review date.

Draft to review

Cindercoil Instruments lists a Test Fixture Technician opening under requisition CI-217. This is a full-time, on-site position in Mesa, Arizona. The published salary is \$68,000 to \$78,000 a year. At least one year of hands-on electronics assembly experience is required. The employer marks CI-217 open on October 6, 2026.

Worked answer

Hold the draft because its pay range has no support. Retain the supported job terms and replace the invented figure with a source-limited missing-value statement. Findings below evaluate the original draft. Suggested corrections are not completed rechecks or a publication approval.

Claim 1 | practice-J01-claim-1

Original wording: Cindercoil Instruments lists a Test Fixture Technician opening under requisition CI-217.

Evidence: practice-J01-source-1; Identity: employer, role, and requisition

Support: Supported | Suitability: Appropriate for the stated claim | Timeframe: Fits the stated timeframe

Materiality: Material

The employer, title, and requisition all refer to the same opening. These identifiers matter because a similar title alone would not establish that a source describes this job.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Retained or revised wording: Cindercoil Instruments lists a Test Fixture Technician opening under requisition CI-217.

Required recheck: Compare the retained wording with the identified passage, record who checked it and when, and confirm it appears accurately in the final draft. In this exercise, record a fictional demonstration rather than a real source check.

Claim 2 | practice-J01-claim-2

Original wording: This is a full-time, on-site position in Mesa, Arizona.

Evidence: practice-J01-source-1; Work and qualifications: first two sentences

Support: Supported | Suitability: Appropriate for the stated claim | Timeframe: Fits the stated timeframe

Materiality: Material

Employment type, work arrangement, and city match the supplied posting. Each affects an applicant's decision and is material.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Retained or revised wording: This is a full-time, on-site position in Mesa, Arizona.

Required recheck: Compare the retained wording with the identified passage, record who checked it and when, and confirm it appears accurately in the final draft. In this exercise, record a fictional demonstration rather than a real source check.

Claim 3 | practice-J01-claim-3

Original wording: The published salary is \$68,000 to \$78,000 a year.

Evidence: practice-J01-source-1; Complete supplied vacancy page: no compensation field or figure

Support: Unsupported | Suitability: Appropriate for the stated claim | Timeframe: Fits the stated timeframe

Materiality: Material

The correct employer posting is an appropriate place to check published pay, but it supplies no salary. A current, suitable source can still fail to support a number. The range must not be treated as an estimate or employer promise.

Proposed action: Correct and recheck

Retained or revised wording: The supplied employer posting does not state salary or hourly pay.

Required recheck: Remove the invented range everywhere it appears, including headings or pay fields. Inspect the complete supplied posting for the narrower missing-value statement and recheck the revised final text. Record the absence finding as limited to this posting.

Claim 4 | practice-J01-claim-4

Original wording: At least one year of hands-on electronics assembly experience is required.

Evidence: practice-J01-source-1; Work and qualifications: experience requirement

Support: Supported | Suitability: Appropriate for the stated claim | Timeframe: Fits the stated timeframe

Materiality: Material

The minimum duration, hands-on activity, and required status are preserved. Calling this merely preferred would materially change eligibility.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Retained or revised wording: At least one year of hands-on electronics assembly experience is required.

Required recheck: Compare the retained wording with the identified passage, record who checked it and when, and confirm it appears accurately in the final draft. In this exercise, record a fictional demonstration rather than a real source check.

Claim 5 | practice-J01-claim-5

Original wording: The employer marks CI-217 open on October 6, 2026.

Evidence: practice-J01-source-1; Status: accepting applications as of October 6, 2026

Support: Supported | Suitability: Appropriate for the stated claim | Timeframe: Fits the stated timeframe

Materiality: Material

The date qualifies the availability claim. It does not promise that the opening remains available after that date.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Retained or revised wording: The employer marks CI-217 open on October 6, 2026.

Required recheck: Confirm the status belongs to CI-217 and preserve the review date. In a real publication, recheck current employer availability before presenting the job as open on a later date.

Acceptable final text

Cindercoil Instruments lists a Test Fixture Technician opening under requisition CI-217. This is a full-time, on-site position in Mesa, Arizona. At least one year of hands-on electronics assembly experience is required. The supplied employer posting does not state salary or hourly pay. The employer marks CI-217 open on October 6, 2026.

Decision and remaining limits

- Hold until every retained material claim has appropriate evidence, a recorded review, and any necessary correction or removal has been rechecked.
- Ready for human approval after the corrected revision, its evidence, and the complete material-claim inventory are documented. A named human decision is still required for approval.
- Withdraw or reject if the publisher cannot resolve the material issue for this intended use.

Other defensible choices:

- Omit the pay sentence and leave the pay field blank or explicitly unknown; verify that no invented figure remains.
- A separate appropriate pay source could support a new claim, but it must identify the same role and be labeled accurately. No such source is supplied in this case.

Lesson

A missing field is a missing value, not permission to fill a template with a plausible number. Removing an invented range is a correction; it must be checked in the actual final text.

Worked example D01: Unsupported AI classification

Fictional practice material

Fictional practice material. All organization names, source passages, drafts, and seeded errors in this case are invented. The reserved .example URLs are teaching placeholders, not evidence links to real pages. All source dates, the retrieved_at timestamp, and the review date are fictional scenario dates, not actual retrieval or review events. This case does not report a real AI model or publisher failure. The worksheet does not detect its errors automatically.

Intended use: Prepare a factual company directory description for readers researching Arizona business activity.

Timeframe: Publication as of October 6, 2026, Arizona time, using only the supplied fictional scenario evidence.

Audience: Readers assessing company capabilities and the nature of an Arizona presence.

Source packet

practice-D01-source-1 | Services and workshop

<https://copper-kite-field-services.example/services>

Fictional publication date: 2026-10-02

Reserved placeholder URL, not a real source page. Dates and passages are invented teaching material.

Industrial maintenance

Copper Kite Field Services maintains industrial water-monitoring equipment for customers.

Arizona workshop

The company operates a service workshop in Tempe, Arizona. This page describes equipment maintenance services and workshop operations.

Source origin: fictional-copper-kite-field-services

Scenario retrieval: October 6, 2026 at 10:00:00 AM Arizona time; fictional, not an actual retrieval

Locator: Services page: Industrial maintenance and Arizona workshop

Limits: Supplied original fictional passage; no live page was retrieved. The passage supports the described service activity and workshop, not an unmentioned software or model product.

practice-D01-source-2 | How we organize maintenance notes

<https://copper-kite-field-services.example/operations/maintenance-notes>

Fictional publication date: 2026-10-05

Reserved placeholder URL, not a real source page. Dates and passages are invented teaching material.

Our technicians use a third-party hosted language-model product to organize maintenance notes.

Technicians review those notes before including them in customer maintenance records.

This operations note describes our use of purchased software. It contains no statement that we develop a model or license a model platform to customers.

Source origin: fictional-copper-kite-field-services

Scenario retrieval: October 6, 2026 at 10:00:00 AM Arizona time; fictional, not an actual retrieval

Locator: Operations note: third-party language-model product and its use

Limits: Supplied original fictional passage; no live page was retrieved. This is first-party information about tool use. The absence of a development claim in these materials does not prove the company has no other activities.

Draft to review

Copper Kite Field Services develops proprietary foundation models for industrial customers. The company maintains industrial water-monitoring equipment. It operates a service workshop in Tempe, Arizona. Its technicians use a third-party language-model product to organize maintenance notes. Its model platform is available for licensing.

Worked answer

Hold the model-development and licensing claims. The sources support industrial maintenance and a specific use of third-party AI, which should remain distinct. Findings below evaluate the original draft. Suggested corrections are not completed rechecks or a publication approval.

Claim 1 | practice-D01-claim-1

Original wording: Copper Kite Field Services develops proprietary foundation models for industrial customers.

Evidence: practice-D01-source-1, practice-D01-source-2; Source 1: Industrial maintenance; source 2: purchased software use

Support: Unsupported | Suitability: Appropriate for the stated claim | Timeframe: Fits the stated timeframe

Materiality: Material

Neither source establishes proprietary model development. Using an AI product and developing one are different activities. The incorrect capability label could materially affect a directory reader's selection.

Proposed action: Correct and recheck

Retained or revised wording: The supplied company materials describe a maintenance provider using a third-party AI product; they do not establish a proprietary model-development business.

Required recheck: Compare the revised scope with both supplied pages. Remove model-developer classifications and platform claims from the directory fields as well as the description. Do not turn the absence of evidence into an assertion that the company never develops AI.

Claim 2 | practice-D01-claim-2

Original wording: The company maintains industrial water-monitoring equipment.

Evidence: practice-D01-source-1; Industrial maintenance: described service

Support: Supported | Suitability: Appropriate for the stated claim | Timeframe: Fits the stated timeframe

Materiality: Material

This is the actual service activity described by the company. It can be stated with appropriate attribution to the supplied company materials.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Retained or revised wording: The company maintains industrial water-monitoring equipment.

Required recheck: Compare the retained wording with the identified passage, record who checked it and when, and confirm it appears accurately in the final draft. In this exercise, record a fictional demonstration rather than a real source check.

Claim 3 | practice-D01-claim-3

Original wording: It operates a service workshop in Tempe, Arizona.

Evidence: practice-D01-source-1; Arizona workshop: city and site function

Support: Supported | Suitability: Appropriate for the stated claim | Timeframe: Fits the stated timeframe

Materiality: Material

The source establishes a service workshop in Tempe. It does not call that location a model-research center or semiconductor fabrication plant.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Retained or revised wording: It operates a service workshop in Tempe, Arizona.

Required recheck: Compare the retained wording with the identified passage, record who checked it and when, and confirm it appears accurately in the final draft. In this exercise, record a fictional demonstration rather than a real source check.

Claim 4 | practice-D01-claim-4

Original wording: Its technicians use a third-party language-model product to organize maintenance notes.

Evidence: practice-D01-source-2; Operations note: first sentence

Support: Supported | Suitability: Appropriate for the stated claim | Timeframe: Fits the stated timeframe

Materiality: Material

The source supports a specific use of an externally provided AI tool. That narrow claim is materially different from proprietary model development.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Retained or revised wording: Its technicians use a third-party language-model product to organize maintenance notes.

Required recheck: Compare the retained wording with the identified passage, record who checked it and when, and confirm it appears accurately in the final draft. In this exercise, record a fictional demonstration rather than a real source check.

Claim 5 | practice-D01-claim-5

Original wording: Its model platform is available for licensing.

Evidence: practice-D01-source-1, practice-D01-source-2; Both complete supplied passages: no model platform or licensing offer

Support: Unsupported | Suitability: Appropriate for the stated claim | Timeframe: Fits the stated timeframe

Materiality: Material

No platform, product release, or licensing offer is supplied. This is an invented commercial capability.

Proposed action: Remove and verify removal

No retained wording for this claim. Keep its original issue in the review history.

Required recheck: Confirm that licensing and model-platform claims are absent from the final text and any product or category fields. Preserve this original issue in the review record.

Acceptable final text

Copper Kite Field Services maintains industrial water-monitoring equipment and operates a service workshop in Tempe, Arizona. Its technicians use a third-party language-model product to organize maintenance notes. The supplied company materials do not establish a proprietary model-development business or model platform for licensing.

Decision and remaining limits

- Hold until every retained material claim has appropriate evidence, a recorded review, and any necessary correction or removal has been rechecked.
- Ready for human approval after the corrected revision, its evidence, and the complete material-claim inventory are documented. A named human decision is still required for approval.
- Withdraw or reject if the publisher cannot resolve the material issue for this intended use.

Evidence limits that remain:

- Activities beyond the supplied materials are unknown; do not infer either their existence or absence.

Other defensible choices:

- For a directory limited to direct AI developers, omit this company unless additional appropriate evidence establishes eligibility. Describe that as a directory scope decision, not proof that the company never performs AI development.
- For a broader directory, retain the supported maintenance description and label AI use precisely.

Lesson

Directory classification must follow the supported activity. A company that uses an AI product is not thereby an AI model developer.

Worked example N01: Promotional claim and syndication

Fictional practice material

Fictional practice material. All organization names, source passages, drafts, and seeded errors in this case are invented. The reserved .example URLs are teaching placeholders, not evidence links to real pages. All source dates, the retrieved_at timestamp, and the review date are fictional scenario dates, not actual retrieval or review events. This case does not report a real AI model or publisher failure. The worksheet does not detect its errors automatically.

Intended use: Prepare a short business news item that accurately separates reported claims from established events.

Timeframe: Publication as of October 6, 2026, Arizona time, using only the supplied fictional scenario evidence.

Audience: Readers using business reporting to understand an announcement or event.

Source packet

practice-N01-source-1 | VoltNest preview announcement

<https://tamarack-relay-computing.example/news/voltnest-preview>

Fictional publication date: 2026-10-05

Reserved placeholder URL, not a real source page. Dates and passages are invented teaching material.

Preview

Tamarack Relay Computing announced a preview of its VoltNest compiler on October 5, 2026.

Internal results

The company reports up to 40% lower energy use during its own tests on three internally selected workloads, compared with its previous compiler version.

Evidence limits

The measurement concerns energy used during the reported runs. The announcement supplies no independent laboratory validation and makes no claim about all customer workloads.

The software is described as a preview.

Source origin: fictional-tamarack-relay-announcement-20261005

Scenario retrieval: October 6, 2026 at 10:00:00 AM Arizona time; fictional, not an actual retrieval

Locator: Original announcement: Preview, Internal results, and Evidence limits

Limits: Supplied original fictional passage; no live page was retrieved. A first-party report of an internal comparison. It supports accurate attribution, not independent confirmation of general performance.

practice-N01-source-2 | VoltNest announcement republished

<https://juniper-circuit-bulletin.example/releases/voltnest>

Fictional publication date: 2026-10-05

Reserved placeholder URL, not a real source page. Dates and passages are invented teaching material.

Release credit: Supplied by Tamarack Relay Computing. This page republishes the company's October 5, 2026 VoltNest announcement.

Tamarack Relay Computing reports up to 40% lower energy use during its own tests on three internally selected workloads, compared with its previous compiler version.

No additional testing or independent reporting is included in this item.

Source origin: fictional-tamarack-relay-announcement-20261005

Scenario retrieval: October 6, 2026 at 10:00:00 AM Arizona time; fictional, not an actual retrieval

Locator: Release credit and reproduced results paragraph

Limits: Supplied original fictional passage; no live page was retrieved. A copy of source 1, identified by its explicit release credit. It is not a new evidence origin.

practice-N01-source-3 | Company release: VoltNest preview

<https://mesa-copperwire-digest.example/company-releases/voltnest>

Fictional publication date: 2026-10-06

Reserved placeholder URL, not a real source page. Dates and passages are invented teaching material.

Attribution note: Reproduced from the Tamarack Relay Computing announcement dated October 5, 2026.

The company announced a VoltNest compiler preview and reports up to 40% lower energy use in an internal comparison on three selected workloads against its previous compiler.

This is a reproduced company release. The digest did not conduct performance tests for this item.

Source origin: fictional-tamarack-relay-announcement-20261005

Scenario retrieval: October 6, 2026 at 10:00:00 AM Arizona time; fictional, not an actual retrieval

Locator: Attribution note and reproduced announcement

Limits: Supplied original fictional passage; no live page was retrieved. Another copy of the same company-origin claim. A different domain and publication day do not make it independent corroboration.

Draft to review

Tamarack Relay Computing announced a preview of VoltNest on October 5, 2026. Independent tests prove VoltNest reduces energy use by 40%. Three independent reports confirm the result. The company compared the preview compiler with its previous version on three internally selected workloads. The announcement describes the software as a preview.

Worked answer

Hold the independent-proof and corroboration claims. One company-origin report can support careful attribution even when several sites repeat it. Findings below evaluate the original draft. Suggested corrections are not completed rechecks or a publication approval.

Claim 1 | practice-N01-claim-1

Original wording: Tamarack Relay Computing announced a preview of VoltNest on October 5, 2026.

Evidence: practice-N01-source-1; Original announcement: Preview

Support: Supported | Suitability: Appropriate for the stated claim | Timeframe: Fits the stated timeframe

Materiality: Material

The company's own dated announcement is appropriate evidence for what it announced and when. It does not establish a performance outcome beyond the announcement.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Retained or revised wording: Tamarack Relay Computing announced a preview of VoltNest on October 5, 2026.

Required recheck: Compare the retained wording with the identified passage, record who checked it and when, and confirm it appears accurately in the final draft. In this exercise, record a fictional demonstration rather than a real source check.

Claim 2 | practice-N01-claim-2

Original wording: Independent tests prove VoltNest reduces energy use by 40%.

Evidence: practice-N01-source-1, practice-N01-source-2, practice-N01-source-3; Source 1: Internal results and Evidence limits; sources 2 and 3: company-release credit

Support: Unsupported | Suitability: Limited for the stated claim | Timeframe: Fits the stated timeframe

Materiality: Material

All supplied material originates in the issuer's internal comparison. The wording removes up to, drops the selected-workload limitation, and invents independent proof. These changes materially overstate the evidence.

Proposed action: Qualify and recheck

Retained or revised wording: Tamarack Relay Computing reports up to 40% lower energy use in its internal comparison on three selected workloads against its previous compiler version.

Required recheck: Verify the new wording as an attributed company report: retain up to, the internal-test setting, selected workloads, and comparison baseline. Judge suitability for the revised attribution, not for an independent performance claim.

Claim 3 | practice-N01-claim-3

Original wording: Three independent reports confirm the result.

Evidence: practice-N01-source-1, practice-N01-source-2, practice-N01-source-3; Source 1: original issuer; source 2: Release credit; source 3: Attribution note

Support: Unsupported | Suitability: Limited for the stated claim | Timeframe: Fits the stated timeframe

Materiality: Material

The two other pages explicitly reproduce the same announcement. Three page locations represent one information origin for this result and provide no independent test confirmation.

Proposed action: Correct and recheck

Retained or revised wording: The other two supplied pages reproduce the same company announcement and do not provide independent confirmation.

Required recheck: Trace each reproduction to source 1 and preserve the shared source_origin_group. Recheck that the final article does not call the copies separate studies or independent confirmations.

Claim 4 | practice-N01-claim-4

Original wording: The company compared the preview compiler with its previous version on three internally selected workloads.

Evidence: practice-N01-source-1; Internal results: baseline and workload selection

Support: Supported | Suitability: Appropriate for the stated claim | Timeframe: Fits the stated timeframe

Materiality: Material

The source supports this as a description of the company's reported test. The word company keeps the testing actor visible.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Retained or revised wording: The company compared the preview compiler with its previous version on three internally selected workloads.

Required recheck: Compare the retained wording with the identified passage, record who checked it and when, and confirm it appears accurately in the final draft. In this exercise, record a fictional demonstration rather than a real source check.

Claim 5 | practice-N01-claim-5

Original wording: The announcement describes the software as a preview.

Evidence: practice-N01-source-1; Preview and final sentence

Support: Supported | Suitability: Appropriate for the stated claim | Timeframe: Fits the stated timeframe

Materiality: Material

The product stage is preserved. The draft should not convert the announcement into a general-availability release or a promise of customer performance.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Retained or revised wording: The announcement describes the software as a preview.

Required recheck: Compare the retained wording with the identified passage, record who checked it and when, and confirm it appears accurately in the final draft. In this exercise, record a fictional demonstration rather than a real source check.

Acceptable final text

Tamarack Relay Computing announced a preview of VoltNest on October 5, 2026. The company reports up to 40% lower energy use in its internal comparison on three selected workloads against its previous compiler version. The supplied materials contain no independent validation; the other two pages reproduce the same company announcement.

Decision and remaining limits

- Hold until every retained material claim has appropriate evidence, a recorded review, and any necessary correction or removal has been rechecked.
- Ready for human approval after the corrected revision, its evidence, and the complete material-claim inventory are documented. A named human decision is still required for approval.
- Withdraw or reject if the publisher cannot resolve the material issue for this intended use.

Evidence limits that remain:

- The packet does not independently establish the claimed performance or its applicability to other workloads. Those limits remain visible in the corrected news item.

Other defensible choices:

- Omit the numerical performance claim and report only the preview announcement.
- Retain the company-attributed result with the stated test limits. Lack of independent corroboration does not automatically block this narrower attribution after review.

Lesson

Count evidence origins, not page URLs. A first-party statement can support what the issuer reports without establishing that the underlying performance claim is independently confirmed.

EV Group Data Analyst: the opening is in Austria

Observed public-source illustration

This is a dated, agent-assisted source illustration. It is separate from the fictional practice cases and is not an observed AI error, a benchmark, or a claim of current accuracy beyond the stated use.

Intended use: Demonstrate precise employer-page review and prevent an Arizona company location from being incorrectly assigned to an overseas job.

Timeframe: Terms visible in the employer page retrieved and checked for this release. Current vacancy availability is not independently confirmed.

Scoped publication text

EV Group's retrieved employer page describes an entry-level, full-time Data Analyst role at its headquarters in St. Florian am Inn, Austria. It calls for a university degree in Data Science or another data-analysis area and describes industry experience in Overlay Analysis as beneficial.

Source evidence

OBS-J-S01 | Data Analyst (m/f/d)

<https://www.evgroup.com/careers/jobs/data-analyst-mfd>

Source publication date: Unknown; not displayed

Recorded source check: October 6, 2026 at 11:58:29 PM Arizona time

Evidence summary: The employer page identifies the role, Austrian location, full-time and entry-level labels, degree requirement and beneficial experience.

Locator: Main heading and metadata row; Requirements, first two bullets

Limits: The page was reached from the employer careers page and independently reopened by the root agent. Publication date is not displayed. This records retrieved job terms, not a guarantee that applications remain open or that all employment terms have been verified.

Claim review

1. The employer page identifies the role as Data Analyst.

Claim: OBS-J-C01

Source and locator: OBS-J-S01; Main heading

Role identity is taken from the specific employer page.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

2. The listed workplace is St. Florian am Inn, Austria, at the headquarters.

Claim: OBS-J-C02

Source and locator: OBS-J-S01; Metadata row, location label

The company's separate Tempe presence does not establish an Arizona location for this role.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

3. The page labels the role full time.

Claim: OBS-J-C03

Source and locator: OBS-J-S01; Metadata row, employment-time label

The label is preserved without inferring remote or hybrid work.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

4. The page labels the role entry level.

Claim: OBS-J-C04

Source and locator: OBS-J-S01; Metadata row, experience-level label

This label does not remove the degree requirement stated separately.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

5. The requirements call for a university degree in Data Science or another data-analysis area.

Claim: OBS-J-C05

Source and locator: OBS-J-S01; Requirements, first bullet

The alternative degree areas are preserved rather than narrowed to a single major.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

6. Industry experience in Overlay Analysis is described as beneficial.

Claim: OBS-J-C06

Source and locator: OBS-J-S01; Requirements, second bullet

A stated advantage is not rewritten as mandatory experience.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

Review method and limitations

Reviewer type: agent

Recorded review status: Agent source and artifact reviews completed

NIST evidence agent followed the current employer careers-page link and checked the job heading, metadata and requirements.

Root agent separately opened the replacement job page and confirmed the location, labels, degree wording and beneficial-experience qualifier. The exact event timestamp was not supplied.

Separate agent source checks, not human evaluation or confirmation from the employer. No application was submitted and no live vacancy status is guaranteed. Recheck before public release.

This is an observed employer-source illustration, not an observed AI mistake. The role is in Austria. Company operations in Arizona do not make every company opening an Arizona job. Salary and the general benefits panel are outside the selected claims. A publication date and independent confirmation that the vacancy remains open are unavailable.

Lesson

Check the location of the specific opening. Keep an experience preference distinct from a requirement, and do not let an entry-level label erase qualifications.

EV Group: company-stated profile and locations

Observed public-source illustration

This is a dated, agent-assisted source illustration. It is separate from the fictional practice cases and is not an observed AI error, a benchmark, or a claim of current accuracy beyond the stated use.

Intended use: Demonstrate an attributed directory description with separately checked company capabilities and Arizona presence.

Timeframe: Company statements visible in the official pages checked for this release; no undated claim of permanent accuracy.

Scoped publication text

EV Group, abbreviated EVG, describes its work as semiconductor process solutions and equipment. Its profile lists wafer bonding, lithography, thin-wafer processing and metrology products and states that the company was founded in 1980. Its locations page lists headquarters in St. Florian am Inn, Austria, and an Arizona North America location in Tempe.

Source evidence

OBS-D-S01 | About EVG

<https://www.evgroup.com/company/about-evg>

Source publication date: Unknown; not displayed

Recorded source check: October 6, 2026 at 11:57:47 PM Arizona time

Evidence summary: The company describes its identity, semiconductor focus, equipment categories and founding year.

Locator: Short Profile, paragraphs 1-4

Limits: First-party description, not independent performance verification. Publication date is not displayed. No employee count or market-leadership claim is used.

OBS-D-S02 | Global presence

<https://www.evgroup.com/company/global-presence>

Source publication date: Unknown; not displayed

Recorded source check: October 6, 2026 at 11:57:47 PM Arizona time

Evidence summary: The location entries distinguish the Austrian headquarters from the Tempe presence.

Locator: EV Group Headquarters and EV Group North America - Arizona entries

Limits: First-party location listings. They do not establish the activities, staffing or manufacturing output at an individual office; publication date is not displayed.

Claim review

1. The company profile identifies EV Group with the abbreviation EVG.

Claim: OBS-D-C01

Source and locator: OBS-D-S01; Short Profile, paragraph 1

The identity is checked directly rather than inferred from an unrelated business name.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

2. EVG describes semiconductor process solutions and equipment as its business.

Claim: OBS-D-C02

Source and locator: OBS-D-S01; Short Profile, paragraphs 1-2

The wording preserves company attribution and makes no independently verified performance claim.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

3. Its listed equipment categories include wafer bonding, lithography, thin-wafer processing and metrology.

Claim: OBS-D-C03

Source and locator: OBS-D-S01; Short Profile, paragraph 2

Listed product classes support a specific description; they do not prove chip manufacturing at the Arizona location.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

4. The company states that it was founded in 1980.

Claim: OBS-D-C04

Source and locator: OBS-D-S01; Short Profile, paragraph 4

This is an attributed company-history fact, not a claim that its Arizona office existed then.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

5. Its locations page places the headquarters in St. Florian am Inn, Austria.

Claim: OBS-D-C05

Source and locator: OBS-D-S02; EV Group Headquarters entry

Headquarters identity is kept separate from local-office presence.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

6. Its Arizona North America location is listed in Tempe, Arizona.

Claim: OBS-D-C06

Source and locator: OBS-D-S02; EV Group North America - Arizona entry

The official location listing supports attributed Arizona presence, without claims about local output or staffing.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

Review method and limitations

Reviewer type: agent

Recorded review status: Agent source and artifact reviews completed

NIST evidence agent opened the official sources and checked claim wording and locators.

Root agent independently opened these official sources and reported confirmation in the task message. The exact event timestamp was not supplied.

Agent-assisted desk review, not human evaluation, independent expert certification, or evidence of publishing outcomes. Recheck the sources before public release.

These are attributed statements from the company website, with unknown page-publication dates. They do not independently establish performance, market position, local manufacturing, or that all company jobs are in Arizona. This is an observed source illustration, not an observed AI error or a benchmark.

Lesson

Check what a company supplies and where a particular location is. Preserve the difference between a global company description, its headquarters and its Arizona presence.

TSMC Arizona: a November 2024 award announcement

Observed public-source illustration

This is a dated, agent-assisted source illustration. It is separate from the fictional practice cases and is not an observed AI error, a benchmark, or a claim of current accuracy beyond the stated use.

Intended use: Demonstrate careful reporting of a historical funding announcement while preserving amount ceilings, plans and payment conditions.

Timeframe: What the archived NIST release announced on November 15, 2024. This is not a report of current project or payment status.

Scoped publication text

An archived NIST release dated November 15, 2024 says the U.S. Department of Commerce awarded TSMC Arizona Corporation up to \$6.6 billion in direct funding. It linked the award to a planned investment of more than \$65 billion across three Phoenix fabrication facilities and said disbursement would depend on project milestones.

Source evidence

OBS-N-S01 | TSMC Arizona CHIPS incentives award announcement

<https://www.nist.gov/news-events/news/2024/11/biden-harris-administration-announces-chips-incentives-award-tsmc-arizona>

Source publication date: 2024-11-15

Recorded source check: October 6, 2026 at 11:57:47 PM Arizona time

Evidence summary: The archived announcement distinguishes the award amount, private investment plan, location and milestone-based disbursement.

Locator: Release date and first two body paragraphs

Limits: Historical announcement, visibly archived; page update October 6, 2025. It does not establish current investment totals, completed fabs, jobs achieved, or amounts actually disbursed.

Claim review

1. The archived release is dated November 15, 2024.

Claim: OBS-N-C01

Source and locator: OBS-N-S01; Date below the headline

The announcement date is used rather than the later page-update date.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

2. The release says Commerce awarded funding to TSMC Arizona Corporation.

Claim: OBS-N-C02

Source and locator: OBS-N-S01; First body paragraph

The claim concerns the identified recipient and the agency announcement.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

3. The announced direct funding was up to \$6.6 billion.

Claim: OBS-N-C03

Source and locator: OBS-N-S01; First body paragraph

The ceiling and funding type are preserved; an award is not a claim of full payment.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

4. The release described a planned private investment of more than \$65 billion.

Claim: OBS-N-C04

Source and locator: OBS-N-S01; Second body paragraph

Planned investment remains distinct from completed spending and from the public award.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

5. The investment plan in that release concerned three fabs in Phoenix.

Claim: OBS-N-C05

Source and locator: OBS-N-S01; Second body paragraph

The count is tied to the historical plan and is not presented as the current facility count.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

6. The release tied disbursement to completion of project milestones.

Claim: OBS-N-C06

Source and locator: OBS-N-S01; Second body paragraph

This condition prevents a misleading statement that all awarded money had already been paid.

Recorded judgments: Supported; Appropriate for the stated claim; Fits the stated timeframe

Review method and limitations

Reviewer type: agent

Recorded review status: Agent source and artifact reviews completed

NIST evidence agent opened the official sources and checked claim wording and locators.

Root agent independently opened these official sources and reported confirmation in the task message. The exact event timestamp was not supplied.

Agent-assisted desk review, not human evaluation, independent expert certification, or evidence of publishing outcomes. Recheck the sources before public release.

This is an agent-checked illustration of an archived announcement, not a current investment report or a financial audit. Later changes to plans, program terms, construction or payments were not evaluated. No error is attributed to the source publisher or to an AI system.

Lesson

An announced award, a private investment plan and money actually paid are different claims. Keep the original date, qualifiers and payment conditions.

Source and version register

These are instructional and reference sources. They are distinct from the fictional packets and the observed illustration sources. Source-side checking does not establish toolkit effectiveness, comprehensive mapping, organizational adoption, or NIST endorsement.

[Detailed source register](#) | [Selected NIST mapping](#)

SRC01 | NIST AI RMF Playbook FAQ

<https://www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework/nist-ai-rmf-playbook-faqs>

Publisher: NIST | Displayed version/date: 2025-03-18

Locator: Commercial-resource eligibility and comment submission, page headings; updated March 18, 2025.

Recorded check: October 6, 2026 at 11:51:04 PM Arizona time

NIST accepts descriptions of publicly available resources for Playbook consideration and welcomes free resources from for-profit publishers. Identification does not imply endorsement.

Limit: Historical scheduling text remains on this page. Use the current Playbook overview for update timing; no acceptance or response-time promise.

SRC02 | NIST AI RMF Playbook current overview

<https://www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework/nist-ai-rmf-playbook>

Publisher: NIST | Displayed version/date: 2026-06-10

Locator: Opening, version, and comments paragraphs; page updated June 10, 2026.

Recorded check: October 6, 2026 at 11:51:04 PM Arizona time

The Playbook remains based on AI RMF 1.0. Its update follows framework revision, and comments remain welcome by email.

Limit: The page provides no guaranteed submission response or publication date.

SRC03 | Crosswalk Documents

<https://airc.nist.gov/airmf-resources/crosswalks/>

Publisher: NIST AIRC | Displayed version/date: Not displayed

Locator: Introduction and criteria before Crosswalk Document List.

Recorded check: October 6, 2026 at 11:51:04 PM Arizona time

A submitted crosswalk must accurately map to a freely usable online resource and avoid advertising. Staff review precedes posting; listing does not establish endorsement or comprehensive equivalence.

Limit: Criteria apply to the Crosswalk Documents route; they do not guarantee listing.

SRC04 | AI RMF Playbook Govern

<https://airc.nist.gov/airmf-resources/playbook/govern/>

Publisher: NIST AIRC | Displayed version/date: Not displayed

Locator: GOVERN 1.2 references to SAS; GOVERN 4.2 Microsoft references.

Recorded check: October 6, 2026 at 11:51:04 PM Arizona time

The official Playbook contains references to externally hosted SAS and Microsoft materials.

Limit: Existing links do not establish the selection channel, eligibility of this submission, acceptance, or search-ranking effects.

SRC05 | Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework

<https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/ai/NIST.AI.100-1.pdf>

Publisher: NIST | Displayed version/date: 2023-01

Locator: Section 5; Tables 1-4; printed pages 23, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33.

Recorded check: October 6, 2026 at 11:51:04 PM Arizona time

AI RMF 1.0 provides voluntary outcomes across Govern, Map, Measure, and Manage. This toolkit considers selected publishing-related aspects only.

Limit: Source-side checks do not establish artifact coverage, organizational implementation, or compliance. PDF screenshot calls returned text placeholders, so no visual source-PDF inspection is claimed.

SRC06 | Generative Artificial Intelligence Profile

<https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/ai/NIST.AI.600-1.pdf>

Publisher: NIST | Displayed version/date: 2024-07

Locator: Section 3; selected actions; printed pages 16, 31, 34, 44, 45.

Recorded check: October 6, 2026 at 11:51:04 PM Arizona time

NIST AI 600-1 offers suggested actions for generative-AI risks. The currently linked document is dated July 2024.

Limit: A partial editorial aid cannot establish implementation of the whole profile. Editable histories do not prove integrity safeguards; worksheet tests do not test GAI system instructions.

SRC07 | Generative AI Profile publication record

<https://www.nist.gov/publications/artificial-intelligence-risk-management-framework-generative-artificial-intelligence>

Publisher: NIST | Displayed version/date: Published 2024-07-26; page updated 2026-04-08

Locator: Published date, report number, download link, and page update metadata.

Recorded check: October 6, 2026 at 11:51:04 PM Arizona time

NIST records publication on July 26, 2024. The page was updated April 8, 2026; that page date is not a new document edition.

Limit: Action wording and locations are taken from the linked document, not the record summary.

SRC08 | AI RMF use cases

<https://airc.nist.gov/airmf-resources/usecases/>

Publisher: NIST AIRC | Displayed version/date: Not displayed

Locator: Introduction and Contact us paragraphs.

Recorded check: October 6, 2026 at 11:51:04 PM Arizona time

NIST invites documented AI RMF use cases by email and says it does not validate or endorse individual organizational approaches.

Limit: This is not the primary submission route. A newly created toolkit is not evidence of organizational adoption or measured benefit.

SRC09 | Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.2

<https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG22/>

Publisher: W3C | Displayed version/date: 2024-12-12

Locator: Document heading and date; applicable A/AA criteria; Section 5 Conformance.

Recorded check: October 6, 2026 at 11:51:04 PM Arizona time

The current WCAG 2.2 Recommendation is dated December 12, 2024. It supplies the project accessibility reference.

Limit: WCAG 2.2 AA is a project goal, not a stated NIST intake requirement. Automated checks alone cannot establish conformance.

SRC10 | Attribution 4.0 International license deed

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Publisher: Creative Commons | Displayed version/date: Not displayed

Locator: Deed terms and linked legal code; attribution, scope, and licensor considerations.

Recorded check: October 6, 2026 at 11:51:04 PM Arizona time

CC BY 4.0 permits reuse with attribution and conditions. The owner must authorize licensing; third-party material must be excluded where rights are not held.

Limit: Proposed release terms only until approved by the owner; linking to the deed does not itself license the toolkit.

SRC11 | ArizonaAI homepage

<https://arizonaai.com/>

Publisher: ArizonaAI | Displayed version/date: Live page

Locator: Homepage title returned by official-site retrieval.

Recorded check: October 6, 2026 at 11:51:04 PM Arizona time

The retrieved title identifies ArizonaAI material about jobs, companies, data centers, and news.

Limit: Partial current retrieval only. No new claim is made about internal controls, site-wide data handling, or toolkit publication. Verify the full public site and final route before publication.

SRC12 | AI RMF Playbook resource center

<https://airc.nist.gov/airmf-resources/playbook/>

Publisher: NIST AIRC | Displayed version/date: Not displayed

Locator: Prominent revision notice and Community feedback section.

Recorded check: October 6, 2026 at 11:51:04 PM Arizona time

AIRC says AI RMF 1.0 is being updated and the Playbook update follows. Community feedback remains invited.

Limit: Older approximate twice-yearly language remains lower on the page; it is not a submission service commitment.

Availability, accessibility, and reuse

The complete HTML guide is the accessible reference. This PDF includes live text, links, and section bookmarks; the validation report states the checks actually completed. No PDF/UA certification or comprehensive accessibility conformance is claimed. No NIST approval, endorsement, certification, public listing, or measured publishing benefit is claimed.

Cenk Brown, publisher ArizonaAI.com, licenses the original instructional content and templates under CC BY 4.0. Terms: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. Third-party material and reader-entered records are excluded. See LICENSE-CONTENT.md for the approved scope; original software uses the separate MIT terms.