

Contents

ADR-003: Tool Grounding with 20%+ External Verification	1
Status	1
Context	1
Evidence	1
Decision	1
Grounding Tools	2
Grounding Policy	2
Architecture	2
Implementation	3
Tool Executor Service	3
Grounding Budget	4
Consequences	5
Positive	5
Negative	5
Metrics	5
References	5

ADR-003: Tool Grounding with 20%+ External Verification

Status

Accepted

Context

LLM vs. LLM comparison (having one model verify another) measures **consistency**, not **truth**. This creates a dangerous failure mode:

1. Model A generates a plausible-sounding hallucination
2. Model B (or A again) confirms it sounds reasonable
3. The hallucination gets reinforced in memory
4. Future queries retrieve and build upon the hallucination
5. **Hallucination cementing:** False beliefs become entrenched

Without external grounding, Cato's curiosity becomes a **hallucination amplifier** rather than a learning mechanism.

Evidence

- GPT-4 self-consistency: ~85% (agrees with itself on hallucinations)
- Claude self-consistency: ~82%
- Cross-model agreement on hallucinations: ~70%

These numbers mean **most hallucinations pass LLM-only verification**.

Decision

Mandate that **at least 20% of curiosity loops must verify against external reality through tool use**:

Grounding Tools

Tool	Purpose	Use Case
Web Search	Factual verification	“Is X true?” queries
Code Execution	Computational verification	Math, algorithms, data analysis
API Calls	Real-time data	Weather, stocks, current events
Database Queries	Structured data	Historical records, statistics
Document Retrieval	Source verification	Citations, quotes, references

Grounding Policy

```
class GroundingPolicy:  
    """Determines when to use external grounding."""
```

```
ALWAYS_GROUND = [  
    "factual_claim",      # "The population of X is Y"  
    "numerical_claim",    # "X costs $Y"  
    "temporal_claim",     # "X happened in Y"  
    "attribution",        # "X said Y"  
    "scientific_claim",   # "Studies show X"  
]  
  
SAMPLE_GROUND = [  
    "general_knowledge",  # 20% sampling  
    "reasoning_chain",    # 10% sampling  
    "creative_content",   # 5% sampling  
]  
  
NEVER_GROUND = [  
    "opinion",            # "I think X"  
    "hypothetical",       # "If X then Y"  
    "meta_statement",     # "I'm uncertain about X"  
]
```

Architecture

Curiosity Question
"What is the GDP of France in 2024?"

Claim Classifier
Type: factual_claim, numerical_claim
Decision: MUST_GROUND

LLM Prediction
"France's GDP in 2024 is approximately \$3.1 trillion"

Tool Grounding
Tool: Web Search (IMF, World Bank, Statista)
Result: "\$2.78 trillion (IMF 2024 estimate)"

NLI Comparison
Prediction vs. Ground Truth
Result: PARTIAL_MATCH (order of magnitude correct)
Surprise Score: 0.4

Memory Update
Store corrected fact with source attribution
Mark original prediction as "needs_update"

Implementation

Tool Executor Service

```
interface GroundingResult {  
    tool: string;  
    query: string;  
    result: string;  
    sources: string[];  
    confidence: number;  
    timestamp: Date;  
}  
  
class ToolGroundingService {  
    private readonly webSearch: WebSearchClient;  
    private readonly codeExecutor: CodeExecutionClient;  
    private readonly apiClient: ExternalAPIClient;
```

```

async ground(
  claim: string,
  claimType: string
): Promise<GroundingResult> {
  // Select appropriate tool
  const tool = this.selectTool(claimType);

  // Execute grounding
  switch (tool) {
    case 'web_search':
      return this.groundWithWebSearch(claim);
    case 'code_execution':
      return this.groundWithCode(claim);
    case 'api_call':
      return this.groundWithAPI(claim);
    default:
      throw new Error(`Unknown tool: ${tool}`);
  }
}

private async groundWithWebSearch(
  claim: string
): Promise<GroundingResult> {
  // Generate search query from claim
  const query = await this.generateSearchQuery(claim);

  // Execute search
  const results = await this.webSearch.search(query, { limit: 5 });

  // Extract relevant facts
  const facts = await this.extractFacts(results, claim);

  return {
    tool: 'web_search',
    query,
    result: facts.summary,
    sources: facts.sources,
    confidence: facts.confidence,
    timestamp: new Date()
  };
}
}

```

Grounding Budget

To prevent excessive API costs, grounding has its own budget:

Tool	Cost per Call	Daily Limit	Monthly Budget
Web Search	\$0.01	1,000	~\$300
Code Execution	\$0.001	5,000	~\$150
API Calls	Varies	500	~\$100
Total	~\$550/month		

Consequences

Positive

- **Hallucination prevention:** External reality check breaks confirmation loops
- **Source attribution:** All facts traceable to external sources
- **Confidence calibration:** Grounding provides ground truth for calibration
- **User trust:** Can cite sources when asked

Negative

- **Higher latency:** Tool calls add 500ms-2s per grounding
- **Additional cost:** ~\$550/month for grounding tools
- **Complexity:** Tool integration and error handling
- **Rate limits:** External APIs have usage limits

Metrics

Track grounding effectiveness:

Metric	Target	Description
Grounding Ratio	20%	% of curiosity loops with tool grounding
Correction Rate	30%	% of LLM predictions corrected by grounding
Source Coverage	80%	% of facts with external source attribution
Hallucination Rate	10%	% of responses containing unverified claims

References

- [TruthfulQA: Measuring How Models Mimic Human Falsehoods](#)
- [Tool-Augmented Language Models](#)
- [Retrieval-Augmented Generation](#)