

PRACTICAL GUIDE

Check AI-assisted writing before you publish

A step-by-step guide to check sources, fix claims, and record a human decision.

Publisher: ArizonaAI.com | Project lead: Cenk Brown

Release 1.1.0 | October 7, 2026 | Arizona time

Check job listings, company entries, and business news. Keep the sources and your decision together. This PDF includes the full guide, worked examples, and dated examples from real sources.

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

Three checks, then one decision

Does the source back these words? Is it the right source for this claim? Does it fit the date or period? Keep those answers separate. Fix every material issue before a human approves this version. A material issue could change a reader’s choice.

Find what you need

Practical guide	2
Use the worksheet and workbook	12
Worked example J01: Invented salary	13
Worked example D01: Unsupported AI business label	17
Worked example N01: A company claim copied by other sites	21
EV Group Data Analyst: the opening is in Austria	26
EV Group: what the company says and where it is	28
TSMC Arizona: a November 2024 award announcement	31
Source and version register	34

Use PDF bookmarks to jump to a section. Keep this file in the downloads folder so its local links work. Read the package test report for the checks done and their limits.

Practical guide

01. Start with one draft

This toolkit helps you check AI-assisted writing before you publish it. Use it for job listings, company entries, and news. You read the sources, check the claims, and make the decision. The worksheet keeps your record.

Paste your draft in Draft and sources. Add the sources you will check. Then check the claims and record your decision. Each step shows what you still need to do. The completed example shows a Hold, a correction, a new check, and Ready. Practice opens a draft that still needs your work.

ArizonaAI.com publishes this resource. Cenk Brown is the project lead. The workflow rules are this project's choices. The NIST links show related guidance. They do not mean NIST approved or certified the toolkit.

- Draft and sources: add your draft, say who it is for, and record the sources you read.
- Check claims: list the statements that matter. Check what each source says, whether it is the right source, and whether its date fits.
- Decide and save: fix or remove problems, check the final words, and record your decision and reason.

You do the check

The worksheet does not read links, find all errors, prove a source is real, or publish your draft. A person must open the sources, read them, and record what they found.

02. Say what the draft is for

Record the kind of content, its title, and the original draft. Keep the proposed final text too. Say who will read it and how they may use it. State whether it describes today or an earlier time.

- What will you publish, and where?
- Who will read it? What choices might they make?
- What date or period must the facts fit?
- What is outside this review? What information is missing?

Name the reviewer and describe the check they did. Record the real time of the check. Arizona time uses a -07:00 offset. Do not use the review date as a source's publication date. Mark that date unknown if the source does not show it.

NIST AI RMF MAP 1.1 asks users to understand the setting and intended use. These fields help with that limited part of the guidance. They do not assess the whole AI system.

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 source checks

Check	What to ask	Made-up example
Source support	Does this source back the exact claim?	A job page says three days in the office. It does not back a claim that the job is fully remote.
Source suitability	Is this the right source to prove this point?	A company can describe its own speed claim. Its announcement alone does not prove it is the fastest.
Timeframe fit	Does the evidence fit the date or period?	An old job posting can show what was offered then. It may not show that the job is open today.

A real source can still be the wrong source. It may describe a different branch of a company, an old offer, or a claim it cannot prove. Several pages that copy one announcement are still one source of evidence.

Keep facts, claims, estimates, opinions, and your own conclusions distinct. Write who made a claim when that matters. If a source does not mention something, say “not stated.” That does not mean the thing does not exist.

A claim is not proof

In a made-up case, Mesa Ember says its prototype used less energy in an internal test. That supports a report of what the company said. It does not prove the result holds for all products or settings.

04. Keep a source trail others can follow

- Read the actual source. Check the nearby text, table notes, and other details that may change its meaning.
- For a web source, keep the address you were given and the final address that opened.
- Record the publisher or source owner and the title.
- Say where to find the evidence, such as a heading, page, table, or short quote. Keep enough text to explain your check.

- Record the source date, if known, and who checked it and when.
- Note limits, conflicts, and pages that repeat the same original source.

Choose a source with direct knowledge of the point you are checking. A trusted website is not proof of every claim. If sources disagree, keep both positions and explain the conflict.

If a page is gone, a dated copy of the actual source may help. Record when and how it was saved, what it shows, and what it cannot show. Your summary alone is not a saved copy of the source. Check any replacement source before using it.

NIST AI 600-1 action MS-2.5-003 concerns checking sources and citations. These steps support that part of the guidance. They do not prove that every source is real or correct.

For a document, interview, or email, choose a non-web source. Give a useful record reference, source owner, and place to find the evidence. Do not invent a web address. Short names and titles are fine if another reader can identify the record.

[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. Check each statement that matters

List each claim that could change a reader's choice. Split claims that need different evidence. "The factory opened and created 400 jobs" needs checks for both the opening and the job count. Read the full draft for claims you may have missed.

Keep the original words and the final words for each claim. Link the source and say where the evidence is. Check source support, source suitability, and timeframe fit separately. Explain how much the claim matters. Include headlines, captions, links, and missing details that could mislead.

- Check words that change meaning, such as "not," "may," "up to," and "planned."
- Check numbers, units, totals, date ranges, and who or what each number describes.
- Do not fill gaps with guesses. Mark missing facts as unknown or leave them out.
- After editing, check the exact final words. Read the whole final draft again for other claims.

Your claim list needs a human check

The tool cannot know if your list is complete. Confirm it only after you have read the full draft and listed all claims that could affect a reader's choice.

You can select words in the draft to start a claim card. It starts unchecked. You may discard a blank card. To remove a claim or source you have used, give a reason. Earlier saved versions and related issues stay in the history. Do not mark a claim removed if its words are still in the final draft.

06. Use checks that fit the content

Job listings

Check the employer, role, job ID, and application link. Check the work location, pay, and who may apply. Keep required skills separate from preferred skills. Check whether the job is still open. An old posting is not proof that it is open today. This toolkit does not screen job applicants.

Company entries

Check the exact company and any branch named. Separate products it sells from AI it uses inside the business. Check claims about location and customers. Keep plans separate from current work. A prototype is not the same as a product for sale.

News summaries

Separate the date of an announcement from the date of the event. Plans, funding promises, building work, and an open site are different stages. Say who made each claim. Check numbers, units, estimates, and limits. A forecast is not a promise of what will happen.

07. Decide how much a claim matters

A material claim is one whose error could change a reader's choice. Employer names, application links, who may apply, pay, location, dates, and current status often matter. Decide in context. Do not rely on a score.

If you are unsure whether a claim matters, choose Unsure. This choice can keep the review on Hold. If you choose Small effect: explain why, say why an error would have little effect. Saved records call this Minor. Do not use this choice just to pass the checks.

A Minor claim still needs a checked source, all three source judgments, a reason, and a check of the final words. There is one narrow exception for source suitability: you must explain it, and the source must still support the words and fit the time. The summary lists this exception. It cannot excuse missing evidence, a conflict, or an old check.

What matters depends on the reader. The wrong nearby city may change a job seeker's choice. A small spelling error may not. Several good claims do not cancel out one serious error.

08. Name the reviewer and the next person to ask

Name the person who checked the work and the person who approves it. They may be the same person. For a hard or high-risk claim, ask someone with the needed knowledge to review it. Record only work they actually did.

If you work alone, a second pass is still your own check. Do not call it independent review. AI or agent help is not human approval.

If you cannot settle a claim, write a clear question and keep the evidence. Ask a person with the right knowledge, narrow the claim, remove it, or keep the review on Hold. Record who will act, what they will do, and when to check again.

NIST AI RMF GOVERN 2.1 and MAP 3.5 address roles and human oversight. Naming reviewers and follow-up owners supports a limited part of that guidance.

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. Fix the issue before changing the decision

State	What it means
Work in progress	You are still working. No Ready or approval decision has been recorded for this version.
Hold	An issue or missing check blocks Ready. Keep the draft on Hold while you work.
Ready	The required checks are complete and a reviewer recorded Ready for this exact version. It still needs a human approval decision.
Approved	A named human recorded approval for this exact reviewed version.
Withdraw	Do not use this draft. Keep the reason and review record.

Each Material or Unsure claim that stays in the draft needs a checked, suitable source and a clear place to find the evidence. Record who checked it and when. Missing, partial, conflicting, or unchecked support keeps the review on Hold. An unknown or wrong timeframe does too. Choosing a positive answer is not proof.

- Correct the words to match the evidence. Then check the final words.
- Narrow the claim or say who made it. Then check that exact wording.
- Remove the claim from the draft. Keep the issue and the record of its removal.
- If the issue stays open, keep Hold or choose Withdraw. Explain why.

Writing a note about an unresolved material issue does not fix it. Check the final words before recording Ready or Approved. Publishing elsewhere while the worksheet says Hold does not turn Hold into approval.

10. Tie approval to the version that was checked

Each decision belongs to one exact version of the draft, sources, claims, and context. An edit creates a changed version. The old decision stays in the history, but it does not approve the changed draft.

The record keeps a full copy of the inputs used for each decision. It also saves the current version when you save the review. After changing the full draft, check the claim list again.

The workbook needs manual version records

Before a decision, save a dated copy of the whole workbook. Use its Revisions sheet to record the version and decision. After an edit, clear the old approval, do the checks again, and save a new dated copy. The workbook formulas do not enforce the web worksheet's rules.

JSON review files and workbooks can be edited outside this tool. Their history helps you inspect the work. It does not prove who did it, prove the date, or prevent tampering.

Choose Save on this device to keep this review in this browser. The page says saved only after the save finishes. Choose Open saved reviews to return to a copy; saving then continues for that review. Choose Private session to stop new device saves. That does not remove a copy already saved: removing it is a separate choice. Nothing is uploaded. Clearing this browser's site data can erase its copies. Keep a separate backup file. Where supported, Link a backup file updates a file you choose while this tab is open. Otherwise use Download backup. Keep that file so you can reopen it if the browser copy is lost.

You can open version 1.0.0 review files. Their original decisions and saved versions stay in the record. The repaired rules check current readiness again. An old approval that fails those rules is marked as history and cannot approve the current draft. Keep the original file as a backup.

11. Fix published errors and learn from close calls

Keep separate records for an error, a close call caught before harm, and actual harm. Preserve the original and corrected words. Do not present a planned fix as finished work.

- Limit further use of wrong information when you can.
- Check the report and the source evidence. Record what you find.
- Look for the same error in related content.
- Tell the right people when needed and authorized. Keep private details out of public notices.

- Record what was actually corrected, who did it, and when.

A public correction should say what changed, why, and when. Use clear words and include only the personal details needed to explain the change.

NIST AI RMF MANAGE 4.3 and NIST AI 600-1 action MG-4.3-002 address documenting and sharing incidents and errors. These prompts support the part related to publishing corrections.

[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. Set a time or reason to check again

Name an owner and set a date or event for the next check. Match it to the risk. A job may need a check before you share it again. A planned project may need a check when it is due to open. A forecast may need a check when its period ends. These are project choices, not NIST deadlines.

Give readers a way to report an error. Decide who reads reports and which need quick action. Checking a sample of content can find problems. It cannot prove that every item is correct.

- Are review owners and correction contacts still current?
- Which records are due for a check, and why?
- Are the sources still available and suitable?
- Do repeated errors show that the review steps need to change?

NIST AI RMF GOVERN 1.5 and MANAGE 4.1, and NIST AI 600-1 actions GV-1.5-001 and MG-4.1-002, address ongoing review. These prompts support only the publishing tasks named here.

[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 clear question

Choose a question that helps you manage a real risk. Use observed data. State the period, what you counted, what you left out, and what is unknown.

Measure	What to record	Limit
Material issues found	Count reviewed items with a material issue and all items reviewed.	This describes the reviewed set, not all published content.
Checks past due	Count records past their planned check date. Note missing dates.	A missing or late check does not by itself prove the content is wrong.
Time to fix an issue	Record when the issue was found and when it was fixed.	List open issues separately. Do not hide them in an average.
Issues first found after publication	Count reports first found after release and describe the reporting process.	No report does not prove there was no error or harm.

Keep the counts, dates, exclusions, and method with the result. Leave fields blank until you measure them. Compare like periods and tasks. A change at the same time as a new process does not prove the process caused it.

NIST AI RMF MEASURE 1.1 concerns methods and measures that fit the risks. These examples are publishing-process measures. They do not measure the reliability of an AI system.

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

AI RMF 1.0, Section 5, Table 3, MEASURE 1.1; printed page 29, PDF page 34.

14. Decide which records to keep

Use the record-keeping template to name an owner. State how long to keep records, who may see them, and why. Check duties, disputes, and other needs before deleting evidence. This guide is not legal advice.

A public source is not automatically free to copy or share. Keep only the evidence you need. Separate your summary from a source quote. Protect private information and respect source rights. If you cannot keep the source, record that limit.

Choose who may access browser copies and backup files. Keep stable IDs so records can be matched. A Private session stops new device saves but does not delete an earlier saved copy. Remove saved copies only when you mean to. Browser data can be cleared, so keep a separate backup where needed. A file hash can show that bytes match. It does not prove the content is true.

NIST AI 600-1 action GV-1.5-003 addresses record-keeping needs. It does not set one retention period for every publisher.

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. Keep a full, readable record

The JSON backup keeps the full review and its history. An audit CSV helps you inspect it but cannot replace that backup. The workbook needs its own manual record of versions.

- Before sharing, check whether the draft is still on Hold and whether private text remains in its history.
- Keep linked sources, claims, issues, and saved versions together.
- Keep unknown answers marked unknown. Do not change them to a positive answer to finish a form.
- Remember that an older saved version may still contain words you removed from the current draft.

CSV downloads protect against common spreadsheet formula use by adding an apostrophe to risky cells. The JSON backup keeps the original text. Normal page requests still reach the site host, which may keep access logs. The toolkit does not upload your review text.

You may save unfinished web addresses and dates as draft text. They do not become usable evidence until checked. The full review file is limited to 8 MiB (8,388,608 bytes), including history and file formatting. The tool checks that limit before accepting an edit. If it is full, download a backup, then start another review. Name the earlier review in your notes. Do not delete decision history just to make space.

16. Explain what the review did

Readers may mistake a rewrite for an independent check, a current fact, or a complete report. Explain what was checked and its limits. Name the publishing owner and a correction contact. Do not leave a “verified” label on changed or out-of-date content.

Say how AI helped when that matters to the reader. Name the publisher, sources, check date, and limits. Provide a correction route. Do not claim independent proof if you used only the subject’s own announcement.

Made-up publication note

This summary describes the company’s October 1 plans. It does not confirm that the project is open. This is a teaching example. Change every detail to match your own evidence before using a note like it.

NIST AI RMF MEASURE 2.8 concerns risks linked to transparency and responsibility. These notes support a small part of that work. Source links alone do not cover all of it.

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

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

17. Know what each kind of test can show

Keep made-up practice, dated examples from real pages, software tests, agent checks, and actual human studies separate. Each can answer different questions.

For a test, record the version, task, materials, steps, kind of reviewer, result, and limits. These examples do not show an error-detection rate, time saved, less harm, or model reliability. Do not claim those results without the right study.

NIST AI 600-1 action MS-2.5-001 supports focused checks of outputs. The toolkit connects to that limited task. NIST AI RMF MEASURE 2.1 and 2.5 are broader. These examples do not test an AI system's 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. Know the limits

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 marks selected parts the toolkit supports, broader related ideas, and gaps. It is not a claim of compliance with either document.

The toolkit does not provide tamper-proof source history. NIST AI 600-1 action MS-2.8-003 is marked Not covered. It also does not test instructions given to users of a generative AI system, so MS-2.8-004 is Not covered.

The tool cannot guarantee a complete claim list, real sources, honest reviews, correct facts, or safe future use. It does not cover all AI risks. Guidance and sources may change. Check the official sources again before reusing a dated mapping, and keep the version of the evidence you used.

[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 records your own checks. Add the use, readers, date or period, sources, and claims. Read each source yourself. Record fixes and new checks. Then decide on that exact version. Choosing a positive answer is not a source check.

Choose how to save

Choose Save on this device to keep this review in this browser. Open saved reviews lets you return to it and resume saving. Private session stops new device saves but does not remove an old copy. Removing a copy is separate. The tool uploads no review text and stores none before your choice. Clearing site data can erase browser copies, so keep a separate backup. Link a backup file can update a chosen file while this tab is open in supported browsers. Otherwise use Download backup. Keep the file so you can reopen it.

Workbook route

- Read Start. On Reviews, enter the use, readers, date or period, and reviewer.
- On Sources, record the evidence. On Claims, check source support, source fit, date fit, how much the claim matters, and any fixes.
- Record errors and actions actually taken in Corrections. Use Practice for made-up cases and Mapping for the selected NIST links.
- Before a decision, save a dated copy of the whole workbook. Give it a version ID and record the exact filename in Revisions.
- After an edit, keep the old decided copy and make a new version. Check readiness again yourself. After either full draft changes, read the final draft and check the claim list again.

Keep dated workbook copies

Workbook formulas do not enforce approval rules or protect history. Do not overwrite the only copy tied to a decision. Keep each decided copy, the final draft, and its evidence together.

Before sharing a record

- Check the final words, open issues, reviewer, decision, and Arizona time. Keep Hold visible if issues remain.
- Keep the full JSON backup for linked records and saved versions. A claims CSV alone does not keep that history.
- Check the whole history for private details you do not need to share. Old words may remain in saved versions.

- Keep unknown facts unknown. A blank result or date does not mean zero, current, or approved.

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

Worked example J01: Invented salary

Fictional practice material

Made-up practice case. The names, source passages, drafts, and errors are invented. The .example links are teaching examples, not real source pages. All source dates and times, including retrieved_at and review dates, belong to the made-up case. They are not real checks. This is not a report of a real AI or publisher error. The worksheet does not find errors for you.

Use: Write a current job listing that sends readers to the right employer opening.

Timeframe: For publication on October 6, 2026, Arizona time. Use only the made-up evidence supplied with this case.

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

This address is made up. It is not a real page. The dates and source text are for practice.

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

Made-up access time: October 6, 2026 at 10:00:00 AM Arizona time; for practice, not a real source visit

Where to find it: Vacancy page: Identity, Work and qualifications, and Status sections; complete supplied page

Limits: Made-up source passage. No real page was opened. The full job page has no pay field or amount. This tells us only what this posting says. Other employer material might state pay. The opening status applies only to the review date in this case.

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

Keep the draft on Hold because no source supports its pay range. Keep the job terms that have support. Replace the made-up pay with a statement about what this posting does not say. These notes review the original draft. Suggested changes still need checks. They do not approve the item for publication.

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

How much it matters: Material

The employer, job title, and job ID name the same opening. A similar title alone would not prove that a source is about this job.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Words to keep or change: Cindercoil Instruments lists a Test Fixture Technician opening under requisition CI-217.

Check again: Compare the words you keep with the source passage. Record who checked them and when. Check the final draft too. Mark this as a made-up practice check, not a check of a real source.

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

How much it matters: Material

The job type, work schedule, and city match the posting. Each could change whether someone applies, so each is Material.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Words to keep or change: This is a full-time, on-site position in Mesa, Arizona.

Check again: Compare the words you keep with the source passage. Record who checked them and when. Check the final draft too. Mark this as a made-up practice check, not a check of a real source.

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

How much it matters: Material

The right employer posting is a good source for stated pay, but it gives no salary. Even a current, suitable source may not support a number. Do not treat the made-up range as an estimate or a promise from the employer.

Proposed action: Correct and recheck

Words to keep or change: The supplied employer posting does not state salary or hourly pay.

Check again: Remove the made-up range from every place it appears, including headings and pay fields. Read the full posting to check the statement about missing pay. Check the final text again. Limit the finding 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

How much it matters: Material

The draft keeps the required length and kind of hands-on experience. Calling it preferred would change who qualifies.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Words to keep or change: At least one year of hands-on electronics assembly experience is required.

Check again: Compare the words you keep with the source passage. Record who checked them and when. Check the final draft too. Mark this as a made-up practice check, not a check of a real source.

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

How much it matters: Material

The date limits the claim that the job is open. It does not promise that the job stays open after that date.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Words to keep or change: The employer marks CI-217 open on October 6, 2026.

Check again: Check that the open status is for CI-217 and keep the review date. For a real listing on a later date, check the employer page again before saying the job is open.

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

- Keep Hold until the required evidence and checks are complete, every kept Material claim is covered, and each needed fix or removal has been checked again.
- Choose Ready for human approval after saving the corrected version, its evidence, and the full list of Material claims and their checks. A named human must still make the approval decision.
- Choose Withdraw or reject if the publisher cannot fix the Material issue for this use.

Other reasonable choices:

- Leave out the pay sentence. Leave the pay field blank or mark it Unknown. Check that no made-up amount remains.
- Another suitable pay source could support a new claim. It must describe the same role and be labeled clearly. This case gives you no such source.

Lesson

If a field has no value, do not fill it with a number that sounds right. Removing made-up pay is a fix. Check that the final text really removes it.

Worked example D01: Unsupported AI business label

Fictional practice material

Made-up practice case. The names, source passages, drafts, and errors are invented. The .example links are teaching examples, not real source pages. All source dates and times, including retrieved_at and review dates, belong to the made-up case. They are not real checks. This is not a report of a real AI or publisher error. The worksheet does not find errors for you.

Use: Write a company profile based on facts for readers looking into Arizona businesses.

Timeframe: For publication on October 6, 2026, Arizona time. Use only the made-up evidence supplied with this case.

Audience: Readers checking what a company does and what kind of presence it has in Arizona.

Source packet

practice-D01-source-1 | Services and workshop

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

Fictional publication date: 2026-10-02

This address is made up. It is not a real page. The dates and source text are for practice.

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

Made-up access time: October 6, 2026 at 10:00:00 AM Arizona time; for practice, not a real source visit

Where to find it: Services page: Industrial maintenance and Arizona workshop

Limits: Made-up source passage. No real page was opened. This passage supports the listed services and workshop. It does not support a software or model product it never mentions.

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

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

Fictional publication date: 2026-10-05

This address is made up. It is not a real page. The dates and source text are for practice.

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

Made-up access time: October 6, 2026 at 10:00:00 AM Arizona time; for practice, not a real source visit

Where to find it: Operations note: third-party language-model product and its use

Limits: Made-up source passage. No real page was opened. This is the company's own account of how it uses a tool. The lack of a model-building claim here 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

Keep the model-building and licensing claims on Hold. The sources support industrial maintenance and a stated use of another company's AI tool. Those are different activities. These notes review the original draft. Suggested changes still need checks. They do not approve the item for publication.

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

How much it matters: Material

Neither source shows that the company builds its own AI models. Using an AI product is different from making one. The wrong business label could change a reader's choice.

Proposed action: Correct and recheck

Words to keep or change: The supplied company materials describe a maintenance provider using a third-party AI product; they do not establish a proprietary model-development business.

Check again: Check the narrower description against both pages. Remove model-builder labels and platform claims from the profile and other fields. Do not turn missing evidence into a claim that the company never builds 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

How much it matters: Material

The company describes this service. You can report it as a statement from the supplied company material.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Words to keep or change: The company maintains industrial water-monitoring equipment.

Check again: Compare the words you keep with the source passage. Record who checked them and when. Check the final draft too. Mark this as a made-up practice check, not a check of a real source.

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

How much it matters: Material

The source shows a service workshop in Tempe. It does not call it an AI research center or a chip factory.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Words to keep or change: It operates a service workshop in Tempe, Arizona.

Check again: Compare the words you keep with the source passage. Record who checked them and when. Check the final draft too. Mark this as a made-up practice check, not a check of a real source.

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

How much it matters: Material

The source describes a specific use of another company's AI tool. That does not mean it builds its own models.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Words to keep or change: Its technicians use a third-party language-model product to organize maintenance notes.

Check again: Compare the words you keep with the source passage. Record who checked them and when. Check the final draft too. Mark this as a made-up practice check, not a check of a real source.

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

How much it matters: Material

No source gives a platform, product release, or licensing offer. This claim invents something the company sells.

Proposed action: Remove and verify removal

No words from this claim remain. Keep its original issue in the history.

Check again: Check that the final text and product or category fields no longer claim model-platform licensing. Keep the original issue in the review history.

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

- Keep Hold until the required evidence and checks are complete, every kept Material claim is covered, and each needed fix or removal has been checked again.
- Choose Ready for human approval after saving the corrected version, its evidence, and the full list of Material claims and their checks. A named human must still make the approval decision.
- Choose Withdraw or reject if the publisher cannot fix the Material issue for this use.

Evidence limits that remain:

- Activities outside these sources are unknown. Do not assume they exist or do not exist.

Other reasonable choices:

- If the directory lists only AI builders, leave this company out until suitable evidence shows it qualifies. That is a choice about the directory's scope. It does not prove the company never builds AI.
- For a broader directory, keep the supported maintenance description and state exactly how the company uses AI.

Lesson

Base a company's category on the work the evidence supports. Using an AI product does not by itself make a company an AI model builder.

Worked example N01: A company claim copied by other sites

Fictional practice material

Made-up practice case. The names, source passages, drafts, and errors are invented. The .example links are teaching examples, not real source pages. All source dates and times, including retrieved_at and review dates, belong to the made-up case. They are not real checks. This is not a report of a real AI or publisher error. The worksheet does not find errors for you.

Use: Write a short business news item. Make clear what a source reports and what evidence confirms.

Timeframe: For publication on October 6, 2026, Arizona time. Use only the made-up evidence supplied with this case.

Audience: Readers trying to understand a business 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

This address is made up. It is not a real page. The dates and source text are for practice.

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

Made-up access time: October 6, 2026 at 10:00:00 AM Arizona time; for practice, not a real source visit

Where to find it: Original announcement: Preview, Internal results, and Evidence limits

Limits: Made-up source passage. No real page was opened. This is the company's report of its own comparison. It supports a careful account of what the company says. It is not separate proof of wider performance.

practice-N01-source-2 | VoltNest announcement republished

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

Fictional publication date: 2026-10-05

This address is made up. It is not a real page. The dates and source text are for practice.

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

Made-up access time: October 6, 2026 at 10:00:00 AM Arizona time; for practice, not a real source visit

Where to find it: Release credit and reproduced results paragraph

Limits: Made-up source passage. No real page was opened. This page credits and copies source 1. It adds no new source of evidence.

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

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

Fictional publication date: 2026-10-06

This address is made up. It is not a real page. The dates and source text are for practice.

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

Made-up access time: October 6, 2026 at 10:00:00 AM Arizona time; for practice, not a real source visit

Where to find it: Attribution note and reproduced announcement

Limits: Made-up source passage. No real page was opened. This is another copy of the same company claim. A different domain and date do not make it a separate check.

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

Keep Hold on the claims of separate proof and outside confirmation. Several sites repeat one company report. You may report what the company said if the wording and limits are clear. These notes review the original draft. Suggested changes still need checks. They do not approve the item for publication.

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

How much it matters: Material

The company's dated statement supports what it announced and when. It does not prove a result beyond that announcement.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Words to keep or change: Tamarack Relay Computing announced a preview of VoltNest on October 5, 2026.

Check again: Compare the words you keep with the source passage. Record who checked them and when. Check the final draft too. Mark this as a made-up practice check, not a check of a real source.

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

How much it matters: Material

All the supplied material comes from the company's own test. The draft removes up to, drops the limit to selected workloads, and invents separate proof. These changes overstate what the evidence shows.

Proposed action: Qualify and recheck

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

Check again: Check the new words as a report of what the company says. Keep up to, the internal test, selected workloads, and the comparison baseline. Judge whether the source fits this report, not a claim of separate proof.

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

How much it matters: Material

The two other pages say they repeat the same announcement. Three pages share one source for this result. They add no separate test.

Proposed action: Correct and recheck

Words to keep or change: The other two supplied pages reproduce the same company announcement and do not provide independent confirmation.

Check again: Trace each copy to source 1 and keep the shared source group. Check that the final article does not call the copies separate studies or independent checks.

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

How much it matters: Material

The source supports a report of the company's test. The word company tells readers who did the testing.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Words to keep or change: The company compared the preview compiler with its previous version on three internally selected workloads.

Check again: Compare the words you keep with the source passage. Record who checked them and when. Check the final draft too. Mark this as a made-up practice check, not a check of a real source.

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

How much it matters: Material

The draft keeps the product's stage clear. Do not turn this announcement into a full public release or a promise about customer results.

Proposed action: Retain the supported wording

Words to keep or change: The announcement describes the software as a preview.

Check again: Compare the words you keep with the source passage. Record who checked them and when. Check the final draft too. Mark this as a made-up practice check, not a check of a real source.

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

- Keep Hold until the required evidence and checks are complete, every kept Material claim is covered, and each needed fix or removal has been checked again.
- Choose Ready for human approval after saving the corrected version, its evidence, and the full list of Material claims and their checks. A named human must still make the approval decision.
- Choose Withdraw or reject if the publisher cannot fix the Material issue for this use.

Evidence limits that remain:

- No separate evidence here confirms the performance or shows that it applies to other workloads. Keep those limits clear in the corrected news item.

Other reasonable choices:

- Leave out the performance number and report only the preview announcement.
- You may keep the result as a company claim with its stated test limits. After review, this narrower wording does not need an automatic Hold just because there is no separate outside check.

Lesson

Count where evidence starts, not how many web pages repeat it. A company statement can support a report of what the company says. It does not prove someone else confirmed the result.

EV Group Data Analyst: the opening is in Austria

Observed public-source illustration

This example uses real sources checked on the stated dates with agent help. It is separate from made-up practice. It does not show an AI error, a broad test result, or proof that the facts are still current.

Use: Show how to check the exact employer job page. Do not give an overseas job an Arizona location just because the company also has an Arizona site.

Timeframe: These are the job terms shown on the employer page when it was opened and checked for this release. No separate check confirms that the job is still open.

Text based on the named sources

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 gives the role, Austrian location, full-time and entry-level labels, required degree, and experience described as helpful.

Where to find it: Main heading and metadata row; Requirements, first two bullets

Limits: The page was found through the employer careers page. The root agent opened it again for a separate check. No publication date is shown. This records the terms that were read. It does not promise that applications remain open or that every job term was checked.

Claim review

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

Claim: OBS-J-C01

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

The job name comes from this exact 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 site does not make this an Arizona job.

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 draft keeps the full-time label. It does not assume 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

The entry-level label does not remove the separate degree requirement.

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 draft keeps the choice of degree fields. It does not narrow the rule to one 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

The draft keeps helpful experience separate from required experience.

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

Original review record and limits

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 example uses a real employer page. It does not report an observed AI error. The job is in Austria. A company with Arizona sites can have jobs elsewhere. Pay and the general benefits panel were not part of these selected claims. No publication date is shown, and no separate check confirms that the job remains open.

Lesson

Check the location of this exact job. Keep preferred experience separate from required experience. Entry level does not remove the listed requirements.

EV Group: what the company says and where it is

Observed public-source illustration

This example uses real sources checked on the stated dates with agent help. It is separate from made-up practice. It does not show an AI error, a broad test result, or proof that the facts are still current.

Use: Show a company profile that names the company as its source. Check its work and Arizona presence as separate claims.

Timeframe: These are company statements on the official pages checked for this release. They are not a promise that the details will stay correct.

Text based on the named sources

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 who it is, its semiconductor focus, its kinds of equipment, and its founding year.

Where to find it: Short Profile, paragraphs 1-4

Limits: This is the company's own description, not a separate test of performance. No publication date is shown. This example makes no claim about employee count or market leadership.

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 list shows the headquarters in Austria and a separate presence in Tempe.

Where to find it: EV Group Headquarters and EV Group North America - Arizona entries

Limits: These are the company's own location listings. They do not show the work, staff count, or manufacturing output at each office. No publication date is shown.

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 company name was checked directly. It was not guessed 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 names the company as the source. It does not claim that separate tests proved its performance.

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

The listed kinds of products support this specific description. They do not prove that the Arizona site makes chips.

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 history comes from the company. It does not claim that its Arizona office existed at that time.

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

The headquarters is kept separate from the local office.

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 company's official list supports saying it has an Arizona presence. It does not support claims about local output or staff.

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

Original review record and limits

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 statements come from the company website. The pages do not show publication dates. They are not separate proof of performance, market rank, local manufacturing, or that all company jobs are in Arizona. This is an example using real sources, not an observed AI error or a test score.

Lesson

Check what a company supplies and where each site is. Keep the company's worldwide work, headquarters, and Arizona presence separate.

TSMC Arizona: a November 2024 award announcement

Observed public-source illustration

This example uses real sources checked on the stated dates with agent help. It is separate from made-up practice. It does not show an AI error, a broad test result, or proof that the facts are still current.

Use: Show how to report a past funding announcement. Keep the maximum amounts, plans, and rules for payment clear.

Timeframe: This covers what the archived NIST release announced on November 15, 2024. It does not report current project or payment status.

Text based on the named sources

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 keeps the award amount, private investment plan, location, and payments tied to project milestones separate.

Where to find it: Release date and first two body paragraphs

Limits: This page is marked as an archived announcement. Its update date is October 6, 2025. It does not show current investment totals, completed chip plants, jobs created, or money already paid.

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

This uses the announcement date, not 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 is about the named recipient and what the agency announced.

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 draft keeps the maximum amount and type of funding. An award does not mean the full amount was paid.

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

The planned private investment stays separate from money spent 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 number comes from the historical plan. It is not presented as today's count of sites.

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 avoids a false impression that all the awarded money had already been paid.

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

Original review record and limits

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.

An agent checked this example of an archived announcement. It is not a current investment report or a financial audit. The review did not check later changes to plans, program terms, construction, or payments. It does not claim that the source publisher or an AI system made an error.

Lesson

An announced award, a private investment plan, and money already paid are different claims. Keep the original date, limits, and rules for payment.

Source and version register

These sources support the guide. They are separate from the made-up sources and the real-example sources. Checking a source does not prove the toolkit works well, covers all NIST guidance, is used by an organization, or has NIST support.

[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

Where to find it: 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 public resources for Playbook review. It welcomes free resources from for-profit publishers. Being named does not mean NIST endorses a resource.

Limit: This page still has old schedule text. Use the Playbook overview for update timing. No acceptance or response time is promised.

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

Where to find it: Opening, version, and comments paragraphs; page updated June 10, 2026.

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

The Playbook still uses AI RMF 1.0. Its update follows the framework revision. Comments are still welcome by email.

Limit: The page promises no reply or publication date.

SRC03 | Crosswalk Documents

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

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

Where to find it: Introduction and criteria before Crosswalk Document List.

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

A crosswalk must accurately map a free online resource and must not be an ad. Staff review it before posting. A listing does not mean endorsement or that the resource covers the whole framework.

Limit: These rules apply to the Crosswalk Documents route. They do not promise a listing.

SRC04 | AI RMF Playbook Govern

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

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

Where to find it: 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 links to materials hosted by SAS and Microsoft.

Limit: These links do not show how resources were chosen, whether this one qualifies, whether it will be accepted, or how search rankings work.

SRC05 | Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework

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

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

Where to find it: 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 gives voluntary outcomes for Govern, Map, Measure, and Manage. This toolkit addresses selected parts related to publishing.

Limit: Checking the source does not prove toolkit coverage, use by an organization, or compliance. The PDF screenshot tool returned text placeholders, so no visual source-PDF review 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

Where to find it: 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 suggests actions for generative AI risks. The linked document is dated July 2024.

Limit: A small publishing tool does not put the whole profile into practice. Editable history is not tamper-proof. Worksheet tests are not tests of AI-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

Where to find it: Published date, report number, download link, and page update metadata.

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

NIST lists July 26, 2024 as the publication date. The page was updated April 8, 2026. That page date is not a new document edition.

Limit: Action text and page numbers come from the linked document, not this summary page.

SRC08 | AI RMF use cases

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

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

Where to find it: 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. It says it does not validate or endorse each organization's approach.

Limit: This is not the main route for this resource. A new toolkit does not prove that an organization uses it or has measured benefits.

SRC09 | Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.2

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

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

Where to find it: Document heading and date; applicable A/AA criteria; Section 5 Conformance.

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

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

Limit: WCAG 2.2 AA is our project goal, not a stated NIST intake rule. Automated checks alone cannot prove full conformance.

SRC10 | Attribution 4.0 International license deed

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

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

Where to find it: 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 allows reuse with credit and conditions. The owner must approve a license. It cannot grant rights to third-party material the owner does not hold.

Limit: This source check was made before owner approval. A link to the license deed alone grants no rights. The owner later approved CC BY 4.0 and MIT on October 7, 2026; those toolkit licenses remain active. Read the operative notices for their scope.

SRC11 | ArizonaAI homepage

<https://arizonaai.com/>

Publisher: ArizonaAI | Displayed version/date: Live page

Where to find it: Homepage title returned by official-site retrieval.

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

The retrieved title describes ArizonaAI pages about jobs, companies, data centers, and news.

Limit: Only part of the site was retrieved. This is not a check of internal controls, site-wide data use, or publication. Check the full site and final route before publishing.

SRC12 | AI RMF Playbook resource center

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

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

Where to find it: 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 will follow. It still invites community feedback.

Limit: Old text lower on the page mentions roughly two updates a year. That is not a promised service for submissions.

Availability, accessibility, and reuse

You can also read the full HTML guide. This PDF has selectable text, links, and bookmarks. The test report states what was checked. We do not claim PDF/UA certification or full accessibility compliance. We also do not claim NIST approval, endorsement, certification, a public listing, or measured publishing benefits.

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.