

NAGE

NAGE / ENTERPRISE CONVERSATION

Knowledge you can inspect

Source-aware AI and independently
checkable records

KLM / SEDIM / Nage AI OS / Craton



The review problem

An AI answer enters a workflow. A reviewer needs to examine its basis.

Sources

Which documents, tool results or user inputs were presented?

Context

Which versions and system conditions applied?

Evidence

What can the reviewer check, and what remains unknown?

The Nage proposition

Nage develops the candidate record standard and operates its reference implementation.

The trust-anchor proposition: a shared record that another party can inspect within a stated scope.

The Nage architecture

One shared record contract across the service flow.

KLM / CANDIDATE RECORD STANDARD

Managed sources

Documents, versions
and lifecycle context



SEDIM

Grounding + inference;
source participation



Output + record

Answer, signals and
signature metadata

Nage AI OS carries the record to applications, reviewers and assurance tools

SEDIM today

The current service combines an existing base with grounding and record services.

Production base

Qwen3-8B occupies the FACIES role.

Managed sources

The service associates source and lifecycle information with outputs.

Development path

Trained VARVE weight injection is not yet the live inference path.

A record the reviewer can inspect

Source context, separate signals and an explicit verification scope.

Declared confidence

0.910

Grounded confidence

0.742

Confidence gap

+0.168

Retrieval relevance

0.9422

measured

Source authority

0.600

heuristic

Source freshness

null

unavailable: no source date

Illustration based on the included synthetic fixture. These values are not production measurements or calibrated probabilities.

Relevance and support

Finding a passage does not establish that it supports an assertion.

Retrieval relevance

Query-to-source similarity.

Claim support

The relation between an assertion and evidence.

Current limitation

The lexical method failed a constructed contradiction test. A new detector remains outside live gamma.

Verification scope

Different checks establish different properties.

Record checks

Signature, signed-body integrity and specified internal consistency.

Conditional checks

Selected signal recomputation when inputs and methods are disclosed.

Outside these checks

Answer truth and proof that the declared inference actually ran.

Try the included verifier

The package contains the sample, test keys, both verifiers and observed outputs.

Inspect

Show the record version, public-key identity and unavailable signals.

Verify

Run the declared checks with their required inputs.

Mutate

Alter signed content and demonstrate rejection.

Source history

Today's hash and historical provenance are different commitments.

7,230

Stored chunks with matching backfilled hashes, as reported by Nage.

Backfill origin

The hash identifies text held when the hash was computed.

Historical gaps

Source-file links and source/extraction hashes remain incomplete for older records.

Knowledge withdrawal

The removal boundary belongs in the product contract.

Serving path

Layer removal or zeroing is reported with consolidation tracking.

Durable artefacts

The same operation does not purge stored weight artefacts.

Other knowledge

Equivalent information may remain in the base or other sources.

Enterprise evaluation scenarios

Illustrative workflows for a focused discussion.

Internal policy

Review an answer against the policy version cited.

Research review

Inspect the evidence offered for a summary or recommendation.

Controlled updates

Observe what changes when a source is revised or retired.

A policy-review workflow

An illustrative evaluation that makes the record useful to a team.

01

→

02

→

03

Question

A team asks whether a policy applies.

Evidence

Inspect the cited version and its support for the claim.

Decision

A reviewer handles missing or conflicting evidence.

Proposed evaluation scenario. Agree baseline measures and acceptance criteria before making benefit claims.

Craton and Craton Pro

A base designed to reduce knowledge outside managed layers.

Craton

From-scratch base with deliberately constrained factual content.

Craton Pro

The larger class of the same architecture.

Current stage

Development and acceptance testing. General attribution-gap closure is not yet established.

A scoped evaluation

Start with one workflow and its reviewer.

Define

Source collection,
disclosure needs and
decision boundaries.

Measure

Task quality, record
usefulness, error handling
and operating
performance.

Decide

Integration scope and
readiness against agreed
acceptance criteria.

Evaluation proposal. Timing, service levels and commercial terms require a deployment-specific agreement.

Meet Nage

Bring a workflow. Let's examine the evidence it needs.

Enterprise teams

Explore the current service and a focused evaluation.

Technology partners

Discuss application, source and verification integration.