

Evidence and workflow readiness for AI-assisted work.

Intelligence is becoming abundant.
Explanatory power remains scarce.

Public conversation deck
July 2026

**Can someone
review the
evidence,
understand the
boundary,
and act with
confidence?**

One workflow at a time.

Teams usually know whether an AI system completed its task.

They may have less visibility into whether the evidence is sufficient to stand behind the result.

EXISTING OBSERVABILITY

What did the system do?


ADDITIONAL QUESTION

Is the evidence sufficient for accountable organizational action?

Epistema explores the second question without replacing the first.

Where Epistema Fits

The existing stack records activity. Epistema derives a reviewable readiness artifact from governed evidence.



Different layers answer different questions.

Epistema is positioned to use existing evidence, not duplicate the systems that produced it.

LAYER	USEFUL EVIDENCE	QUESTION ANSWERED
Observability	Prompts, traces, costs, latency, evaluations	What did the system do?
Governance suites	Inventory, risk class, policy, approvals	Is the system governed?
Compliance tools	Framework evidence and controls	Are obligations documented?
Epistema	Connected workflow evidence and constraints	Is this work ready to stand behind?

Customer Commitment

A policy-sensitive AI response becomes something a customer may rely on.

AVAILABLE RECORDS

Conversation, retrieved sources, policy references, review events, escalation, and correction.

GOVERNANCE QUESTION

Was the answer bound to authoritative evidence, and was the workflow authorized to create reliance?

POSSIBLE READOUT

Proceed, constrain, escalate, or withhold, with missing evidence and the commitment boundary visible.

Boundary: Epistema would not decide legal outcomes or guarantee that every response is correct.

Professional Deliverable Evidence

A polished report moves faster than the attention required to verify citations, quotes, and source-dependent claims.

AVAILABLE RECORDS

Drafts, document history, sources, review notes, corrections, and approvals.

GOVERNANCE QUESTION

Does the evidence beneath the deliverable support the claims someone is being asked to rely on?

POSSIBLE READOUT

Unsupported references remain visible and the workflow is constrained until the missing evidence or review is resolved.

Boundary: Epistema does not replace professional judgment, legal review, or domain expertise.

Sensitive Information Admission

Useful external AI tools are adopted before source code, meeting notes, or business context are classified for admission.

AVAILABLE RECORDS

Access events, classifications, redactions, service boundaries, approvals, and correction history.

GOVERNANCE QUESTION

Should this material have entered this AI-assisted workflow under the applicable rules and authority?

POSSIBLE READOUT

Admission evidence, missing classification, and required redaction or escalation remain visible.

Boundary: Epistema does not replace DLP, IAM, approved tooling, or security policy.

Trajectory Drift

Individual interactions look acceptable while the overall AI-assisted session path degrades.

AVAILABLE RECORDS

Turns, tool calls, evaluations, constraint refreshes, human interventions, and outcome signals.

GOVERNANCE QUESTION

Did the workflow remain inside its intended purpose and commitment boundary across the full trajectory?

POSSIBLE READOUT

Drift indicators, review checkpoints, and stop or escalation thresholds become part of the workflow record.

Boundary: Epistema does not replace model safety research, red-teaming, or product-level guardrails.

A one-page report makes the evidence reviewable.

Illustrative business-to-build scenario · not customer data

WORKFLOW VALUE LEDGER

Business-to-Build Workflow Value Ledger

Illustrative one-page report. A senior business analyst used AI to turn a stakeholder request into clarified intent, acceptance criteria, product tradeoffs, data questions, and implementation notes.

Governance readout Proceed with constraint	Workflow AI-assisted business-to-build handoff	Scenario BA + AI moved from intent to requirements and delivery notes
---	---	--

Executive Summary

The workflow produced useful acceleration. The analyst moved from a loose stakeholder request to a clearer build path faster than a conventional handoff would normally allow. The gain is real, but review is still needed: several assumptions crossed from business analysis into product and delivery territory before formal acceptance.

What Happened

Business workflow step	Workflow Value Ledger record
Stakeholder request	Intent captured: customer reporting workflow needs simplification.
BA + AI clarification	Evidence recorded: requirements draft, acceptance criteria, and open data questions.
Product decision	Commitment signal recorded: proposed scope accepted for review, not final approval.
Delivery tradeoff	Constraint recorded: implementation path depends on one unverified product assumption.
Operational outcome	Next calibration required: validate whether the delivered change reduces manual work.

Ledger Readout

Cost provenance	Evidence coverage	Workflow quality
Attached	Complete enough to review	High QTF / moderate PEI
Governance state	Human contribution	Next calibration
Proceed with constraint	Correction and synthesis recorded	Review outcome after follow-through

Why This Matters

This is not cost accounting and not traceability alone. The Workflow Value Ledger connects resource evidence with decision-quality governance: what AI helped produce, what human judgment changed, what evidence supports the result, and whether the work is ready to commit.

Recommended Next Action

Proceed with constraint	Product owner reviews the promoted assumptions. Delivery lead confirms the implementation dependency. BA records final acceptance or deferral after review. Outcome is checked after the workflow is used in practice.
-------------------------	--

Illustrative report for Epistemo demo use. The ledger shape aligns with the public Workflow Value Ledger card: cost provenance, evidence coverage, workflow quality, governance state, human contribution, and next calibration.

WHAT A REVIEWER CAN SEE

- 01

What happened

The work, supporting evidence, human contribution, and promoted assumptions.
- 02

What can be acted on

A bounded readiness state such as proceed, proceed with constraint, or hold.
- 03

What happens next

The missing review, correction, or outcome check needed before stronger commitment.

The report is the artifact people review, forward, attach, and act on.

Start with one bounded pilot.

The first useful motion is intentionally small.

01

one workflow

02

one evidence bundle

03

one readiness report

04

one before / after review

Success: a reviewer can see what is supported, what is missing, and what action is appropriate.

Current maturity is deliberately bounded.

CURRENT

- bounded implementation
- inspectable fixtures and tests
- public scenario framing
- local pilot run path
- source-agnostic adapter direction

NOT CLAIMED

- production-scale enterprise platform
- complete connector ecosystem
- legal or compliance automation
- guaranteed prevention of bad outcomes

Pick one workflow where AI-assisted work is already happening.

Look for a place where the organization needs a clearer accountability readout.

- 01 Advisor conversation
- 02 Pilot discovery call
- 03 Partner-fit discussion
- 04 Review of one representative workflow

Epistema helps teams see whether AI-assisted work is ready to stand behind.