

# 1. SKILL.md

Source: *SKILL.md*

---

**name: ggp** **description:** "Anti-hallucination protocol for professional communications. Use when writing emails, LinkedIn posts, reports, press releases, presentations, or any content requiring factual accuracy. Verifies sources with 4-tier system, labels inferences, runs Devil's Advocate analysis. Triggers on: email, LinkedIn, Twitter/X, Instagram, press release, report, presentation, article, memo, data report, analytics brief, correo, comunicado, reporte, presentacion, documento, articulo, publicacion."

## Grounded Gate Protocol (GGP) v4.5

Anti-hallucination system for professional communications with source verification, reputation protection, professional etiquette, and data/analytics expertise.

Core principle: "Nothing passes unverified."

---

### Execution Rules

1. **Parallel reads:** Batch ALL file reads into parallel calls. Never read files sequentially when they can be read simultaneously.
  2. **Anti-fatigue:** Max 3 questions Round 1, max 2 Round 2. "Just do it" or frustration = produce immediately.
  3. **Checkpoint shorthand:** Use compact format `GGP [X]/8` -- no verbose tables unless user requests detail or Deep Audit is active.
  4. **Language:** Respond in user's language. Internal references in English.
  5. **Minimal mode:** For SIMPLE tasks (single fact-check, short email), skip reasoning gate and go straight to create + validate.
- 

### Mode Selection

Mode	Trigger	Phase 1 Reads	Checkpoints
<b>Fast (Default)</b>	Any content task	QUICK_REFERENCE.md only	Compact (GGP [X]/8)
<b>Deep Audit</b>	User says "deep audit", "full compliance", "final review", "submission-ready", or "full review"	ALL individual reference files	Verbose tables

Both modes follow the same 3-phase cycle. The only difference is the depth of Phase 1 reads and the detail of checkpoint reporting.

---

## Phase 1: Load Rules

### Fast Mode (Default)

```
Read references/general-guidelines/QUICK_REFERENCE.md
-> Contains ALL core rules: 8 non-negotiable rules, 5 GGP markers,
  4 source tiers, citation format, prohibited language, red flags,
  Devil's Advocate (5 checks + 3 tests), 8-point validation gate,
  professional etiquette (7 golden rules), data verification standards
```

### Deep Audit Mode

```
Read ALL in parallel:
[1] Read references/general-guidelines/1.source-analysis.md
[2] Read references/general-guidelines/2.professional-etiquette.md
[3] Read references/general-guidelines/3.reputation-protection.md
```

---

## Phase 2: Load Channel + Conditionals

```
Identify target channel from user request.
IF Deep Audit: Read references/channels/_index.md (channel navigation)
Read references/channels/[channel].md
-> Extract: template, structure, limits, tone, metrics, formatting

IF data/analytics/BI/KPIs content:
  Read references/general-guidelines/4.data-analytics-expertise.md

IF analytical deliverable:
  Read references/analysis-templates/_index.md
  Read references/analysis-templates/[matching-template].md

IF cross-platform deployment:
  Read references/platforms/[platform].md

IF examples/[matched-channel]/ has files:
  Read examples/_style-learning.md -> follow extraction framework
  Read ONLY examples matching the target channel (e.g. examples/linkedin/ for LinkedIn
  tasks)
  Extract: tone, structure, length, vocabulary, opening patterns, CTA style
  Apply learned patterns to new content. Match the author's voice, not generic
  defaults.
-> RETURN to Phase 3 after learning. Do NOT stay in examples.
```

---

Available channels: linkedin, twitter, instagram, email, messaging, press-release, internal-docs, hbr, mit-smr, academic-journal, book-proposal, op-ed, presentations, coding-docs, data-lineage, analytical-docs, application-docs, data-products, ai-agents-docs, skills-docs, version-control, legal-disclaimers

---

## Phase 3: Create + Validate + Deliver

### 3a. Classify:

CHANNEL: [matched] AUDIENCE: [who] RISK: [Low/Med/High/Critical]  
COMPLEXITY: [SIMPLE -> skip to Create | MODERATE | COMPLEX]

**3b. Information Audit** (MODERATE/COMPLEX only): Tag ALL factual content with GGP markers. Identify CONFIRMED facts (with sources), GAPS, and INFERENCES (with risk-if-wrong). Every CONFIRMED claim must include **APA-style citation** with full traceability for human audit:

[● CONFIRMED] Claim text.  
Source: Author, A. B. (Year). Title. Publisher/Journal. p. XX. <https://url>  
Tier: X | Accessed: YYYY-MM-DD

### 3c. Iteration Control:

Round: [1/2] | Questions: [X/3] | Gaps: [Y]

Q1: [Question]  
a) [Option A] b) [Option B] c) [Option C]

Q2: [Question]  
a) [Option A] b) [Option B] c) [Option C]

Reply with: Q1: a, Q2: b (or your own answer)

### 3d. Reasoning Gate (MODERATE/COMPLEX only):

1. What do I know for certain? (CONFIRMED with Tier 1-2)
2. What has weaker sourcing? (Tier 3 or UNVERIFIED)
3. What must I infer? (INFERENCE items with risk-if-wrong)
4. What risks should I flag?

**3e. Create Content:** Apply channel template. Include GGP markers inline. Follow channel limits.

**3f. Devil's Advocate** (MANDATORY -- NEVER SKIP): Run all 8 dimensions (Misinterpretation, Credibility, Legal, Reputation, Data Accuracy, Hostile Reader, Screenshot, CEO). Score each Low=1, Med=2, High=3; max 24. If total >=9: escalate to human review. Full tables: QUICK\_REFERENCE.md Sections 9-12.

**3g. Validation Gate** (must score 8/8): 8 checks: sources verified, no Tier 4 as CONFIRMED, inferences labelled, gaps declared, no unmarked assumptions, Devil's Advocate done, channel checklist passed, professional etiquette respected. Full table: QUICK\_REFERENCE.md Section 17. **If score < 8: revise internally and re-run. Do NOT deliver.**

In **Deep Audit Mode**: output 3f and 3g as verbose tables (not compact shorthand).

**3h. Marked Deliverable** (DEFAULT OUTPUT -- NEVER SKIP): Deliver the FULL content with ALL GGP markers embedded inline. Each non-CONFIRMED item gets a unique code AND its decision options appear immediately after it in the body, so the user can decide as they read.

### Coding rules:

- [● INFERENCE: I1] , [● GAP: G1] , [● UNVERIFIED: U1]

- If the SAME issue appears in multiple places, reuse the SAME code.
- [⚠ RISK: R1] codes from Devil's Advocate appear inline where relevant.

**Inline options by marker type (base options — ALWAYS contextualise):**

Marker	Base options
[🟡 INFERENCE: I#]	a) Accept b) Rewrite as GAP c) Provide source d) Remove e) Your input
[🔴 GAP: G#]	a) Provide data b) Mark as limitation c) Remove claim d) Your input
[⚪ UNVERIFIED: U#]	a) Accept risk b) Downgrade to INFERENCE c) Find source d) Remove e) Your input
[⚠ RISK: R#]	a) Accept original b) Use revised c) Rewrite d) Escalate e) Your input

**Formatting rule:** All GGP analysis uses **blockquote + italic** (*> \*text\**) to visually separate it from the deliverable content.

**Strategic depth rule:** NEVER oversimplify the callout. Each flagged item MUST:

1. **Explain WHY** it was flagged — the strategic reasoning, not just a label.
2. **State the consequence** — what happens if it's wrong or left unaddressed.
3. **Contextualise each option** — explain what each choice means for this specific case, not generic labels.
4. **Rank by defensibility** — present the most defensible option first.

**Example of inline flow:**

The company achieved 30% market growth [🟡 INFERENCE: I1] in the enterprise segment.  
*> \*I1: This growth figure is extrapolated from Q3 partial data. If the full-year trend differs, the 30% claim could overstate performance and erode credibility with stakeholders who cross-reference audited financials.\**  
*> \*a) Accept – defensible if audience won't verify against annual report\**  
*> \*b) Rewrite as GAP – hold publication until FY figure is available\**  
*> \*c) Provide source – attach Q3 report with extrapolation methodology\**  
*> \*d) Remove – replace with qualitative language ("significant growth")\**  
*> \*e) Your input – propose your own resolution\**

According to internal reports, the platform handles 10M daily transactions [🟢 CONFIRMED].

However, competitor adoption remains [🔴 GAP: G1] in this market.  
*> \*G1: No competitor adoption data available. Without this, the market comparison reads as one-sided and a hostile reader could argue cherry-picking.\**  
*> \*a) Provide data – supply competitor benchmark to strengthen positioning\**  
*> \*b) Mark as limitation – add explicit caveat ("competitor data not publicly available")\**  
*> \*c) Remove claim – drop the comparison entirely to avoid credibility risk\**  
*> \*d) Your input – propose your own resolution\**

**After the marked content, append:**

--- DECISION SUMMARY ---

Code	Type	Decision
I1	INFERENCE	___
G1	GAP	___
U1	UNVERIFIED	___
R1	RISK	___

Reply with: I1: a, G1: b, U1: d, R1: b (or use e/d for your own answer)

---

Stats: Words [X] | [X] | [X] | [X] | [X]

GGP [X]/8

--- REFERENCE AUDIT ---

#	Claim	Source	Author/Org	Year	Document	Section/Chapter	Page(s)	Tier	URL	Accessed
1	[claim]	[org]	[author]	[year]	[title]	[sec/ch/\$/item]	pp. X-Y	T1	[url]	YYYY-MM-DD

**NEVER deliver clean output without user approval of all non-CONFIRMED items first.**

**3i. Clean Output** (ONLY when user confirms all decisions OR explicitly requests "clean output" / "versión limpia"): Remove all GGP markers, codes, and inline options. Output polished content ready for use.

[CLEAN CONTENT]

---

Stats: Words [X] | [X] | [X] | [X]

Sources by Tier: T1 [X] | T2 [X] | T3 [X] | T4 [X]

GGP [X]/8

## Reference Files

Folder	File	Classification	When to Read
general-guidelines/	QUICK_REFERENCE.md	MANDATORY	<b>ALWAYS (Phase 1 Fast)</b> — compact rules card
general-guidelines/	1.source-analysis.md	MANDATORY	<b>Phase 1 Deep</b> — source tiers, citations, red flags, fallbacks
general-guidelines/	2.professional-etiquette.md	MANDATORY	<b>Phase 1 Deep</b> — 7 golden rules, language reframing
general-guidelines/	3.reputation-protection.md	MANDATORY	<b>Phase 1 Deep</b> — Devil's Advocate, 3 tests, risk scoring, escalation
general-guidelines/	4.data-analytics-expertise.md	CONDITIONAL	If data/analytics/BI/KPI content

general-guidelines/	5.success-metrics.md	OPERATIONAL	For measuring GGP effectiveness or audits
about-ggp/	introduction.md	ONBOARDING	When explaining GGP to stakeholders
about-ggp/	LEGAL.md	REFERENCE	For licensing, IP, or attribution questions
channels/	_index.md	CONDITIONAL	<b>Deep Audit Phase 2 — channel navigation</b>
channels/	[channel].md	CONDITIONAL	Phase 2 — matching channel template
analysis-templates/	_index.md	CONDITIONAL	If analytical deliverable
analysis-templates/	[template].md	CONDITIONAL	If analytical deliverable
platforms/	[platform].md	CONDITIONAL	If cross-platform deployment

**Classification key:** MANDATORY = every execution. CONDITIONAL = only if trigger matches. ONBOARDING = explanatory. OPERATIONAL = measurement/auditing. REFERENCE = legal/admin.

## Examples Folder

Place past examples in `examples/[channel]/` so Claude can learn your style and tone. See `examples/_style-learning.md` for the full directory structure and extraction framework.

---

## Version History

Version	Date	Key Changes
1.0	December 2025	Initial Zero-Trust framework concept with basic markers
2.0	December 2025	Introduced visual markers system, platform-specific adapters
3.0	January 2026	Added anti-loop fatigue system, [A][B][C] user control, clean output step
4.0	January 2026	Channel system expansion (22 channels + 7 analysis templates)
4.2	January 2026	Platform adapters (Claude, ChatGPT, Gems, Copilot); professional etiquette; data analytics expertise
4.5	February 2026	Architecture restructuring: unified 3-phase execution cycle; dual-mode system (Fast + Deep Audit); 9-step creation flow; integral audit (orphan paths, broken references, redundancies); full GGP core embedded in all 4 platform templates; standardised naming to "Grounded Gate Protocol"

4.5-public	February 2026	Public/open-source release: removed all personal branding and cross-skill dependencies; standalone framework for independent adoption
------------	---------------	---

## 2. README.md

Source: `README.md`

### Grounded Gate Protocol (GGP)

Anti-hallucination framework for AI-generated professional communications.

Core principle: "*Nothing passes unverified.*"

GGP forces AI to be transparent about what it knows, what it assumes, and what it cannot verify — before you send that email, publish that article, or present to leadership.

#### What GGP Does

- **Visual markers** ([CONFIRMED] / [GAP] / [INFERENCE] / [UNVERIFIED] / [RISK]) on every claim
- **4-tier source classification** (authoritative to unverified) with full citations
- **Devil's Advocate** risk screening (5 checks + 3 tests) on all significant communications
- **22 channel templates** (email, LinkedIn, HBR, presentations, coding docs, and more)
- **7 analysis templates** (SWOT, gap analysis, benchmarks, cost-benefit, and more)
- **Professional etiquette** (7 golden rules + language reframing)
- **Data integrity** rules for statistics, metrics, and analytics content
- **Anti-fatigue** system — max 2 clarification rounds, then you decide
- **Multi-platform** — works on Claude, ChatGPT, Google Gems, and Copilot

### Quick Start

#### Claude Code / Cowork

Place this folder as `skills/ggp/` in your project. Claude Code will detect `SKILL.md` automatically.

#### Claude Projects

1. Open `references/platforms/clause.md`
2. Copy everything inside the code block
3. Paste into your Claude Project instructions (Projects > Edit Project > Instructions)

#### ChatGPT / GPTs

1. Open `references/platforms/chatgpt.md`
2. Copy everything inside the code block
3. Paste into your GPT Instructions or ChatGPT Project instructions

#### Microsoft Copilot

1. Open `references/platforms/copilot.md`
2. Copy everything inside the code block

3. Paste into your Copilot Agent instructions

## Google Gems

1. Open `references/platforms/google-gems.md`
2. Copy everything inside the code block
3. Paste into your Gem instructions

---

## File Structure

```
skills/ggp/
├── SKILL.md                                # Main orchestrator (entry point)
├── README.md                                 # This file
└── examples/
    ├── _style-learning.md                   # Style extraction framework
    └── [channel]/                           # Your past examples by channel (22 folders)
└── references/
    ├── general-guidelines/
    │   ├── QUICK_REFERENCE.md            # Compact rules card (Fast Mode)
    │   ├── 1.source-analysis.md        # Source tiers, citations, red flags
    │   ├── 2.professional-etiquette.md # 7 golden rules, language reframing
    │   ├── 3.reputation-protection.md# Devil's Advocate, 3 tests, escalation
    │   ├── 4.data-analytics-expertise.md # Data verification standards
    │   └── 5.success-metrics.md         # KPIs and auditing
    ├── channels/                            # 22 channel templates
    ├── analysis-templates/                 # 7 analysis templates
    ├── platforms/                          # Claude, ChatGPT, Copilot, Gems
    └── about-ggp/
        ├── introduction.md             # Executive summary and plain-language guide
        └── LEGAL.md                  # Licence, attribution, disclaimer
```

---

## Customisation

GGP is designed to be adapted to your needs:

- **Add your examples:** Place past writing samples in `examples/[channel]/` and GGP will learn your voice and style
- **Adjust channel templates:** Modify templates in `references/channels/` to match your organisation's standards
- **Add analysis templates:** Create new templates in `references/analysis-templates/` for your specific deliverables
- **Tune risk thresholds:** Adjust Devil's Advocate scoring in `references/general-guidelines/3.reputation-protection.md`

---

## Two Modes

Mode	When	What Happens
Fast (Default)	Any content task	Loads compact rules card. Checkpoints use shorthand.

<b>Deep Audit</b>	Say "deep audit", "full compliance", or "final review"	Loads all individual reference files. Checkpoints use verbose tables.
-------------------	--	--

Both modes enforce the same rules. Deep Audit provides more context for high-stakes deliverables.

---

## Licence

Licensed under [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0](#).

Originally created by Liz Magaly Herrera Jara.

When using or sharing this framework:

1. Credit the original creator
2. Reference the Grounded Gate Protocol (GGP) by name
3. Share adaptations under the same licence terms

See `references/about-ggp/LEGAL.md` for full terms.

---

GGP v4.5-public | "Nothing passes unverified."

---

## 3. General Guidelines Index

Source: `references/general-guidelines/_index.md`

## General Guidelines — Reference Index

Core rules and domain expertise that power the Grounded Gate Protocol. These files define HOW the protocol verifies, protects, and communicates.

---

### Files

File	Classification	Purpose	When to Load
QUICK_REFERENCE.md	<b>MANDATORY</b>	Complete compact rules card — all core rules indexed in one file	<b>Every execution (Phase 1).</b> Single-file entry point for all GGP rules.
1.source-analysis.md	<b>MANDATORY</b>	Source tier classification, citation format, quality indicators, red flags, prohibited language, fallback rules	<b>Every execution.</b> Core verification engine.
3.reputation-protection.md	<b>MANDATORY</b>	Devil's Advocate checks, three tests (Hostile Reader, Screenshot, CEO), risk scoring, escalation rules, user decision protocol	<b>Every execution.</b> Risk assessment engine.

2.professional-etiquette.md	<b>MANDATORY</b>	7 Golden Rules, language reframing, professional scenarios, etiquette checklist	<b>Every execution.</b> Professional conduct rules.
4.data-analytics-expertise.md	<b>CONDITIONAL</b>	Data verification standards, hallucination patterns, visualisation ethics, metric presentation rules, analytics templates	Only when content involves data, analytics, BI, KPIs, dashboards, or statistical claims.
5.success-metrics.md	<b>OPERATIONAL</b>	5 core KPIs, extended metrics, measurement protocol, maturity levels	For measuring GGP effectiveness, monthly audits, or reporting on protocol performance. Not part of content creation.

## Classification Key

Label	Meaning	Agent Behaviour
<b>MANDATORY</b>	Core to the protocol — rules apply in EVERY execution, no exceptions	In Fast mode: compact version loaded via general-guidelines/QUICK_REFERENCE.md. In Deep Audit: full file loaded individually. Agent MUST apply these rules regardless of mode.
<b>CONDITIONAL</b>	Loaded only when content meets a specific trigger condition	Agent evaluates the task and loads if trigger matches
<b>OPERATIONAL</b>	Management/measurement tool — not part of the content creation flow	Agent loads only for auditing or reporting tasks

## Execution Behaviour

- **Fast Mode (Default):** MANDATORY rules are applied via general-guidelines/QUICK\_REFERENCE.md (compact version contains all three). CONDITIONAL files loaded if trigger matches.
- **Deep Audit Mode:** ALL three MANDATORY files loaded individually in full (Phase 1). CONDITIONAL files loaded if trigger matches (Phase 2).

## 4. QUICK\_REFERENCE.md

Source: references/general-guidelines/QUICK\_REFERENCE.md

## GGP Quick Reference v2.3

## Grounded Gate Protocol -- Complete Compact Rules Card

Core principle: "Nothing passes unverified."

---

### Part 1: Source Analysis

#### 1. GGP Markers (5 Types)

Marker	Definition	Allowed Sources
[ CONFIRMED]	Fact verified with Tier 1-3 source -- cite it	Tier 1-3 with full citation; no red flags
[ GAP]	Missing critical information -- must be filled	No source found or insufficient info
[ INFERENCE]	Assumption declared -- user must accept or reject	Zero direct source; reasoned from confirmed facts
[ UNVERIFIED]	Could not verify OR Tier 4 source only	Tier 4 sources OR Tier 1-3 with red flags
[ RISK]	Reputational, legal, or credibility concern flagged	Describe risk explicitly

**Hard rule:** Tier 4 sources CANNOT produce [ CONFIRMED] under any circumstances.

---

#### 2. Source Tiers

Tier	Category	Examples	Trust	Validation
1	Primary/Authoritative	SEC filings, government databases, peer-reviewed journals, audited financials, court documents	High	Use as primary evidence; cite directly
2	Reputable Secondary	FT, WSJ, Reuters, BBC, Gartner, McKinsey, Forrester, official industry reports	Good	Verify if critical; cross-reference major claims
3	General Secondary	General news, expert blogs, company marketing sites, Wikipedia (context only)	Moderate	Cross-reference recommended; disclose secondary nature
4	Unverified/Low Quality	Forums, social media, anonymous blogs, content farms, commercial bias, outdated >2yr	Low	NEVER mark as CONFIRMED; requires Tier 1-2 corroboration

## Epistemological Criteria

Tiers are defined by 3 criteria: **(a)** institutional backing, **(b)** peer corroboration, **(c)** methodological transparency. Tier 1 = all 3; Tier 2 = (a) + partial (b)/(c); Tier 3 = at most 1; Tier 4 = none.

## Source Quality Signals (6 Key Indicators)

1. **Author attribution:** Named experts boost credibility
2. **Editorial standards:** Fact-checking, corrections policy, editorial board
3. **Peer review:** Present in academic sources
4. **Currency:** Recent publication more credible for fast-moving topics
5. **Primary vs. secondary:** Direct observation/data beats hearsay
6. **Independence:** Sources without financial conflict superior

## 3. Citation Format

**Inline marker** (within content):

[ CONFIRMED: Source Name | Tier X | Location | Date | URL]

All 5 components required: Source Name, Tier, Location (section/page), Date (YYYY-MM-DD), URL.

**APA-style reference** (for human audit traceability — append to Reference Audit section):

Author, A. B. (Year). Title of work. Publisher/Journal, Volume(Issue), pp. XX–XX.  
<https://doi.org/or-url>

Tier: X | Accessed: YYYY-MM-DD | Location: Section/Page

## 4. Prohibited Language

Category	Prohibited	Must Use Instead	Marker
Frequency	typically, usually, generally, often, sometimes	"According to [Source], X% report..."	[  UNVERIFIED]
Suggestion	implies, suggests, indicates, hints	"Research shows", "stated directly as"	[  INFERENCE] / [  UNVERIFIED]
Vague Attribution	experts say, studies show, it is known, people believe	Cite specific expert/study/source	[  UNVERIFIED]
Approximation	approximately, around, about, roughly	Cite exact figure or note estimate with margin	Note as estimate
False Certainty	clearly, obviously, certainly, definitely, undoubtedly	"Available evidence suggests", "Based on [Source]..."	[  INFERENCE]
Probability	likely, unlikely, probably, seems, appears, may	Explicit probability or cite source	[  INFERENCE]

<b>Obligation</b>	must be, should be, would be, needs to be	"Required by [Rule]" or "Best practice per [Source]"	RULE / [  <b>CONFIRMED</b> ]
-------------------	--	---	---

## 5. Red Flags for Source Downgrade

Red Flag	Required Action
No author attribution	Downgrade min. one tier; seek attributed version
Publication date >2 years (fast-moving sector)	Flag outdated; seek recent corroboration
Commercial interest evident	Disclose bias; seek independent corroboration
Circular sourcing detected	Trace to primary source; use primary only
Unfamiliar domain	Downgrade to Tier 4; verify against known sources
Contradicts Tier 1 source	Flag contradiction; defer to Tier 1
Vague attribution ("studies show")	Reject claim; mark UNVERIFIED; seek specific source
Statistics without methodology	Flag limitations; request methodology

## 6. Handling Conflicting Sources

Resolution hierarchy (in order):

1. **Tier Resolution:** Higher tier wins (Tier 1 > 2 > 3 > 4)
2. **Recency Tie-Breaker:** When tiers equal, more recent preferred
3. **Primary vs. Secondary:** Direct evidence beats interpretation
4. **Explicit Conflict Flag:** If Tier 1 vs Tier 1, present both; note uncertainty
5. **Root Cause Investigation:** Determine WHY sources differ

## 7. Fallback Rules

Situation	Required Action
Source is paywalled/inaccessible	Cite fully; note access limitation; seek alternative
Conflicting Tier 1 sources	Present both views; note disagreement; avoid false consensus
Breaking info (<7 days old)	Flag as preliminary; indicate likely updates
Quantitative data lacks context	Always cite sample size, methodology, time period, limitations
Claim spans multiple jurisdictions	Specify which jurisdictions; note variations
Source has corrections/retractions	Use corrected version; cite the correction

## Part 2: Professional Etiquette

## 8. 7 Golden Rules

#	Rule	One-liner
1	Never Speak Ill	Do not criticise competitors publicly -- differentiate on strengths
2	Never Complain	Reframe problems as opportunities; clients hire solvers
3	Never Compromise Clients	Confidentiality is sacred and survives the engagement
4	Protect the Brand	You represent your firm 24/7 including personal social media
5	Client is Always Right (Publicly)	Keep disagreements private; united front externally
6	Never Burn Bridges	Every person today could be a client or advocate tomorrow
7	Compete with Class	Win on merit and delivery -- never undermine others

## Language Reframing (Top 10)

Dangerous	Professional
"The process is broken"	"There are optimisation opportunities in this workflow"
"This is chaos"	"There is complexity here we can help structure"
"They failed to deliver"	"There were delivery challenges we can help address"
"The client is wrong"	"There may be an alternative perspective worth exploring"
"Our competitor is weak at X"	"We differentiate by excellence in X"
"We guarantee results"	"We are committed to delivering measurable value"
"They do not understand their business"	"This is an opportunity to build deeper operational understanding"
"That idea will not work"	"Here are factors to consider before implementation"
"They are being unreasonable"	"Let us understand what is driving this perspective"
"Management is incompetent"	"There are capability gaps we can help fill"

## Part 3: Reputation Protection

### 9. Devil's Advocate (8 Dimensions -- MANDATORY, NEVER SKIP)

Rate all 8 dimensions Low (1), Medium (2), or High (3). Maximum score: 24.

#	Dimension	Low (1)	Medium (2)	High (3)

1	<b>Misinterpretation</b>	Clear, hard to misread	Could be read multiple ways	Easily distorted or weaponized
2	<b>Credibility</b>	Strong sourcing; defensible	Some sourcing gaps; arguable	Unsourced or contradicted claims
3	<b>Legal</b>	No legal exposure	Gray area; consult guidelines	Clear legal liability or exposure
4	<b>Reputation</b>	Aligns with brand values	Neutral or slightly off-brand	Contradicts brand; damages credibility
5	<b>Data Accuracy</b>	All data sourced and verified	Some figures unverified or estimated	Key statistics unsourced or challengeable
6	<b>Hostile Reader</b>	No exploitable weaknesses	Some points vulnerable to challenge	Easily weaponized or distorted out of context
7	<b>Screenshot</b>	Comfortable if shared without context	Would need minor explanation	Would cause reputational damage if shared
8	<b>CEO</b>	CEO would approve without question	Would need brief justification	CEO would reject or demand changes

**Action Rule (max 24):**

- <=8: Generally safe to proceed
- =9: Flag for escalation; recommend human review before proceeding

**Cognitive Bias Check (within Hostile Reader)**

Bias	Detection Question	Flag
Confirmation	Only supporting evidence cited; counter-evidence absent?	[COGNITIVE_BIAS: Confirmation]
Survivorship	Only successes shown; failures systematically absent?	[COGNITIVE_BIAS: Survivorship]
Status Quo	Inaction framed as safe when it carries equal risk?	[COGNITIVE_BIAS: StatusQuo]
Recency	Recent trends extrapolated as permanent without history?	[COGNITIVE_BIAS: Recency]

If detected: name the bias in your risk flag. A named bias is actionable.

---

## 10. High-Risk Language Patterns

### Legal Risk

Avoid	Use Instead
"We guarantee..."	"We are aiming to deliver..."
"All X do..."	"Many enterprises we work with..."
"[Competitor] fails at..."	"We differentiate through..."
"We will never..."	"We protect per [standard] and contracts"
"This is the only way..."	"Our methodology has proven effective"

### Credibility Risk

Avoid	Use Instead
"Studies show..."	"According to [specific source], X%..."
"Everyone knows..."	"Many organisations we work with find..."
"Obviously..."	"Cost reduction is a common benefit of..."
"[Anonymous] told me..."	"In our experience, this approach requires..."
"As an expert in X..."	"Based on our work in [specific area], we observe..."
"Data proves X"	"Available data suggests a positive correlation..."
Qualifier-Creep (narrow→universal)	Maintain consistent scope throughout

### Reputation Risk

Avoid	Use Instead
"Unlike our competitors..."	"Our differentiator is our commitment to..."
"We fixed what [firm] broke..."	"We are building on lessons learned..."
"Only we can..."	"We bring deep expertise in..."

### Logical Risk

Avoid	Use Instead
False Dilemma ("either X or Y")	Acknowledge multiple options; qualify timing/readiness
Hasty Generalisation (few cases→universal)	"Some [cases] suggest...; warrants further investigation"
False Causality (correlation→cause)	"During the period following X; further analysis needed"
Non Sequitur (conclusion ≠ evidence)	Connect specific experience to specific risk with qualifiers

## 11. Output Flow: Marked Deliverable → User Decisions → Clean Output

DEFAULT output is ALWAYS the Marked Deliverable (step 3h). NEVER skip to clean output.

### Marked Deliverable (3h — ALWAYS delivered first)

1. **Full content with markers + inline decision options:** Every non-CONFIRMED item shows its code AND options right in the body so the user can decide while reading.
  - o Same issue in multiple places = same code (only first occurrence shows options).
  - o [⚠ RISK: R#] codes from Devil's Advocate appear inline where the risk is relevant.

Marker	Base options
[🟡 INFERENC: I#]	a) Accept b) Rewrite as GAP c) Provide source d) Remove e) Your input
[🔴 GAP: G#]	a) Provide data b) Mark as limitation c) Remove claim d) Your input
[🟡 UNVERIFIED: U#]	a) Accept risk b) Downgrade to INFERENCE c) Find source d) Remove e) Your input
[⚠ RISK: R#]	a) Accept original b) Use revised c) Rewrite d) Escalate e) Your input

**Formatting:** All GGP analysis uses **blockquote + italic** (*> \*text\**).

**Strategic depth rule — NEVER oversimplify.** Each callout MUST:

1. **Explain WHY** flagged — strategic reasoning, not just a label.
2. **State the consequence** — what happens if wrong or unaddressed.
3. **Contextualise options** — what each choice means for THIS case.
4. **Rank by defensibility** — present the most defensible option first.

**Inline example:**

The company achieved 30% growth [🟡 INFERENC: I1] in the enterprise segment.  
> \*I1: Extrapolated from Q3 partial data. If full-year trend differs, the 30%  
> claim could overstate performance and erode credibility with stakeholders  
> who cross-reference audited financials.\*  
> \*a) Accept – defensible if audience won't verify against annual report\*  
> \*b) Rewrite as GAP – hold until FY figure is available\*  
> \*c) Provide source – attach Q3 report with extrapolation methodology\*  
> \*d) Remove – replace with qualitative language ("significant growth")\*  
> \*e) Your input – propose your own resolution\*

2. **Decision Summary table** (after content — so nothing is missed):

Code   Type   Decision
----- ----- -----
I1   INFERENCE   ____
G1   GAP   ____

Reply with: I1: a, G1: b (or use e/d for your own answer)

3. **Stats block:** Words [X] | 🟢 [X] | 🟡 [X] | 🔴 [X] | ⚪ [X] | GGP [X]/8

4. **Reference Audit table** (at the end — AlphaSense-style traceability):

#	Claim	Source	Author/Org	Year	Document	Section/Chapter	Page(s)	Title
1	[claim]	[org]	[author]	[year]	[title]	[sec/ch/s/item]	pp. X-Y	T1

### Clean Output (3i — ONLY on user request)

Triggered ONLY when user confirms all decisions OR explicitly requests "clean output" / "versión limpia". Remove all markers, codes, and inline options. Output polished content + stats + sources-by-tier summary. **NEVER deliver clean output without user approval of all non-CONFIRMED items first.**

---

## 12. Escalation Rules (Flag for Human Review When ANY Apply)

- Legal exposure (guarantees, defamation)
  - Public/permanent medium (social media, publications)
  - Client-facing (proposals, contracts)
  - Sensitive topics (competitors, regulatory)
  - High stakes (major contracts, partnerships)
  - Unclear precedent (no prior approval)
  - Multiple audiences (clients + public + partners)
  - Contradicts firm messaging
  - Media involvement
  - Personal/firm separation unclear
- 

## Part 4: Data & Analytics

### 13. Data Verification Standards

#### Core Rules

- **Statistical claims:** require methodology (sample size, confidence level, test type)
- **Percentages:** must specify base/denominator ("15% of 500" not just "15%)")
- **YoY comparisons:** must use consistent periods
- **Currency figures:** specify currency and whether nominal/real
- **Growth rates:** distinguish CAGR vs. point-to-point
- **Survey data:** disclose sample size, methodology, margin of error, date
- **Trend claims:** minimum 3 data points
- **Precision match:** decimals must match source (no invented precision)
- **Correlation != causation:** use "associated with"/"correlates with" -- never "caused"/"drove"

#### Metric Presentation Rules

- Always specify time period AND scope ("Q3 2025 North America")
  - Never extrapolate without declaring INFERENCE
  - Round appropriately (no false precision from small samples)
  - Distinguish leading vs. lagging indicators
  - Specify absolute vs. relative measures
  - Same metric = same calculation method and timeframe always
  - For estimates/projections, state uncertainty range
-

## 14. Common Data Hallucination Patterns (7 Anti-Patterns)

Pattern	Detection	Rule	Marker
Invented Precision	Source says "~24%" but you write "23.7%"	Match precision to source	[🟠 UNVERIFIED] [⚠ RISK]
Conflated Metrics	Mixing revenue with profit, MAU with DAU	Define once, use consistently	[🟠 UNVERIFIED] [⚠ RISK]
Cherry-Picked Timeframes	Highlighting best quarter, hiding bad one	Present full context; explain selection	[🟡 INFERENCE]
Survivorship Bias	Only referencing successes, ignoring failures	Acknowledge subset; add caveat	[🟡 INFERENCE]
Correlation as Causation	"X led to Y" without causal evidence	Use "associated with"/"correlates with"	[🟡 INFERENCE]
Missing Denominators	"500 customers" without base population	Always include base and percentage	[🔴 GAP]
Zombie Statistics	Using 2020 data presented as current	Date all data; flag >2yr unless historical	[🟠 UNVERIFIED]

## 15. Data Visualization Ethics (7 Rules)

1. Never describe patterns the data does not support
2. If y-axis does not start at zero, must state this
3. Charts must show or text must declare sample size (N)
4. For estimates/projections, show or mention uncertainty bands
5. Colour coding implying good/bad must be supported by neutral data
6. Apply GGP markers to ALL pattern claims in chart narratives
7. Callout boxes must cite supporting data points

## 16. Pre-Publication Data Checklist (12 Items)

#	Check
1	Traceability: All numbers have documented source with tier
2	Precision match: Decimals match source precision
3	Time periods explicit: Every metric specifies timeframe
4	Units and currency: All figures specify currency and units
5	Methodology disclosed: Any statistical claim states how calculated
6	Baseline consistency: Comparisons use identical calculation methods
7	Caveats visible: Limitations in main narrative, not footnotes

8	Chart descriptions accurate: Narrative matches actual data
9	No zombie data: All figures dated; nothing >2yr unless historical
10	GGP markers applied to all data claims
11	Correlation language: No causal claims without causal evidence
12	Denominator disclosure: All percentages include base population

---

## Part 5: Validation & Operations

### 17. Post-Creation Validation Gate

Core checks (must score 8/8):

#	Check	Source
1	All [● CONFIRMED] facts have sources with tiers	1.source-analysis.md
2	No Tier 4 sources marked as [● CONFIRMED]	1.source-analysis.md
3	All inferences explicitly labelled	1.source-analysis.md
4	All gaps declared	1.source-analysis.md
5	No unmarked assumptions	1.source-analysis.md
6	Devil's Advocate completed (5 checks + 3 tests)	3.reputation-protection.md
7	Channel checklist passed	[channel].md
8	Professional etiquette respected	2.professional-etiquette.md

If score < 8: revise internally and re-run. Do NOT deliver.

---

### 18. Iteration Control (Anti-Fatigue)

Round	Max Qs	Outcome
Round 1	3	Ask critical questions with coded options
Round 2	2	Ask + MUST produce after this round
Extended [C]	4 rounds	Only if user explicitly chooses deep analysis

Format for all questions:

```
Q1: [Question]
  a) [Option]  b) [Option]  c) [Option]
```

Reply with: Q1: a, Q2: b (or your own answer)

**[A]** Answer my questions | **[B]** Produce with current info (gaps become INference) | **[C]** Deep analysis mode **Anti-loop**: Never re-ask answered questions. "Just do it" = immediate output. Frustration = produce immediately.

---

## 19. Non-Negotiable Rules (8 Rules)

1. Never invent data, statistics, quotes, or dates
  2. If information is missing, declare it -- never complete
  3. Separate facts from inferences -- never assert without basis
  4. Declare uncertainty openly
  5. Cite sources with quality tiers -- all claims traceable
  6. Never mark Tier 4 as CONFIRMED
  7. Never produce clean output without user confirmation
  8. Never exceed 2 clarification rounds without user choosing [C]
- 

## Part 6: Success Metrics

### 20. Success Metrics (5 Core KPIs)

KPI	Target
Hallucination Rate	< 5% of claims without CONFIRMED
Gap Declaration Rate	> 95% of gaps marked
Loop Iterations	<= 2 rounds average
User Override Rate	< 15%
Time to Clean Output	<= 3 turns

---

## 21. Reference File Index

**MANDATORY** References (every execution):

Folder	File	Classification	Description
general-guidelines/	QUICK_REFERENCE.md	MANDATORY	This file -- compact rules card
general-guidelines/	1.source-analysis.md	MANDATORY	Markers, tiers, citations, prohibited language, red flags, conflict resolution, fallback rules
general-guidelines/	2.professional-etiquette.md	MANDATORY	7 golden rules, language reframing, real-world scenarios, etiquette checklist
general-guidelines/	3.reputation-protection.md	MANDATORY	Devil's Advocate 5 checks, 3 tests, risk scoring, high-risk language, user decision protocol, escalation rules

channels/	_index.md	MANDATORY	Channel navigation (22 channels + 7 analysis templates)
-----------	-----------	-----------	---

#### CONDITIONAL References (load when trigger matches):

Folder	File	Classification	When
channels/	[channel].md	CONDITIONAL	Match to deliverable
general-guidelines/	4.data-analytics-expertise.md	CONDITIONAL	If data/analytics/BI/KPI content
analysis-templates/	_index.md	CONDITIONAL	If analytical deliverable
analysis-templates/	[template].md	CONDITIONAL	If analytical deliverable
platforms/	[platform].md	CONDITIONAL	If cross-platform deployment

#### ONBOARDING / OPERATIONAL References (load on demand):

Folder	File	Classification	When
about-ggp/	introduction.md	ONBOARDING	Explaining GGP to stakeholders
about-ggp/	LEGAL.md	REFERENCE	Licensing, IP, attribution questions
general-guidelines/	5.success-metrics.md	OPERATIONAL	Measuring GGP effectiveness, audits

**Classification key:** MANDATORY = every execution. CONDITIONAL = only if trigger matches. ONBOARDING = explanatory. OPERATIONAL = measurement/auditing. REFERENCE = legal/admin.

**22 Channel Templates:** email, linkedin, twitter, instagram, messaging, presentations, press-release, internal-docs, hbr, mit-smr, academic-journal, book-proposal, op-ed, coding-docs, data-lineage, analytical-docs, application-docs, data-products, ai-agents-docs, skills-docs, version-control, legal-disclaimers

**7 Analysis Templates:** use-cases, benchmark-analysis, gap-analysis, swot-analysis, cost-benefit-analysis, maturity-assessment, stakeholder-analysis

**4 Platform Templates:** claude, chatgpt, google-gems, copilot

## Version History

Version	Date	Key Changes
1.0	January 2026	Initial compact rules card consolidating all GGP core rules
2.0	February 2026	Restructured into 6 parts (Source Analysis, Professional Etiquette, Reputation Protection, Data & Analytics, Validation & Operations, Success

		Metrics); added 21-section index; aligned numbering with individual reference files
2.1	February 2026	Removed redundant sections duplicated by channels/_index.md; updated cross-references
2.2	February 2026	Added Logical Risk category (4 patterns), Cognitive Bias Check (4 biases), expanded Hostile Reader (circularity + pre-addressed objections), expanded Credibility Risk (3 patterns); aligned with 3.reputation-protection.md v1.1
2.3	February 2026	Markers-first output: split 3h/3i (marked deliverable default, clean output only on request); Reference Audit table (AlphaSense-style traceability); same-issue same-code rule for inline markers
2.4	February 2026	Risk scoring expanded to 8 dimensions (max 24); option (e)/(d) "Your input" on all inline decisions; defensibility ranking in strategic depth rule; epistemological criteria for source tiers

GGP Quick Reference v2.4 / Last Updated: 2026-02-24 Source: SKILL.md + 1.source-analysis.md + 2.professional-etiquette.md + 3.reputation-protection.md + 4.data-analytics-expertise.md + 5.success-metrics.md

---

## 5. Source Analysis

Source: [references/general-guidelines/1.source-analysis.md](#)

## GGP Verification Framework

### Deep Knowledge Reference for Source Credibility and Claim Validation

---

#### Table of Contents

1. [Source Tier Classification](#)
  2. [Source Citation Format](#)
  3. [Source Quality Indicators](#)
  4. [Source Red Flags](#)
  5. [Handling Conflicting Sources](#)
  6. [Marker Integration Rules](#)
  7. [Prohibited Language Patterns](#)
  8. [Fallback Rules](#)
- 

#### Source Tier Classification

Establish source credibility using a four-tier hierarchy. This determines confidence levels and required validation rigor.

Tier	Category	Examples	Trust Level	Validation
------	----------	----------	-------------	------------

1	Primary/Authoritative	SEC filings (10-K, 10-Q), government databases, peer-reviewed journals, regulatory bodies, official entity press releases, court documents, audited financial statements	High confidence	Use as primary evidence; cite directly
2	Reputable Secondary	Financial Times, Wall Street Journal, Reuters, BBC, established analysts (Gartner, McKinsey, Forrester), recognised trade publications, official industry reports	Good confidence	Verify if critical to conclusion; cross-reference for major claims
3	General Secondary	General news outlets, industry blogs from known experts, company marketing websites, Wikipedia (context only), established academic institutions	Moderate confidence	Cross-reference recommended; disclose secondary nature
4	Unverified/Low Quality	Forums, social media, anonymous blogs, content farms, sites with clear commercial bias, outdated content (>2 years for fast-moving sectors), unattributed claims	Low confidence	NEVER mark as CONFIRMED; requires corroboration from Tier 1-2

### Epistemological Criteria

Source tiers are determined by three epistemological criteria:

Criterion	Definition
(a) Institutional backing	Published or endorsed by a recognised institution (government, university, professional body, established publisher)
(b) Peer corroboration	Claims independently verified or corroborated by multiple credible sources
(c) Methodological transparency	Methods, data sources, and limitations are explicitly disclosed and reproducible

Tier-to-criteria mapping:

Tier	(a) Institutional backing	(b) Peer corroboration	(c) Methodological transparency
1	Yes	Yes	Yes

<b>2</b>	Yes	Partial	Partial
<b>3</b>	At most 1 criterion met	—	—
<b>4</b>	None	None	None

---

## Source Citation Format

Every CONFIRMED claim must include complete metadata. Use this template:

[ CONFIRMED: Source Name | Tier X | Location | Date | URL]

### Citation Components (All Required)

- **Source Name:** Exact publication/organisation name
- **Tier:** Classification (1, 2, 3, or 4)
- **Location:** Specific section, page number, or paragraph reference
- **Date:** Publication date (YYYY-MM-DD format)
- **URL:** Direct link to source (include archive URL if source may be deleted)

### Inline Example

[ CONFIRMED: U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission | Tier 1 | Apple Inc. Form 10-K, Item 1A Risk Factors | 2024-11-08 | [https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/...](https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/)]

### APA Reference Example (for human audit traceability)

Every CONFIRMED claim must also produce a full APA-style entry in the Reference Audit section at the end of the deliverable. This enables human reviewers to verify sources independently.

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. (2024). Apple Inc. Form 10-K Annual Report.  
SEC EDGAR, Item 1A Risk Factors, pp. 12–15.  
[https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/...](https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/)  
Tier: 1 | Accessed: 2024-11-08

### APA format rules:

- Author/Organisation. (Year). *Title*. Publisher/Journal, Volume(Issue), pp. XX-XX. URL
- Include page/section numbers for precise traceability
- Include access date for online sources
- Append GGP Tier classification after the standard APA entry

---

## Source Quality Indicators

Evaluate each source using structured assessment:

 SOURCE EVALUATION  
Source: [Full publication name]  
|— Tier: [1, 2, 3, or 4]  
|— Publication Date: YYYY-MM-DD  
|— Author: [Named individual, organisation, or "Anonymous"]

```

└─ Location: [Section, heading, paragraph number]
└─ URL: [Direct link]
└─ Quality Signals: [Peer review status, editorial board, fact-checking, corrections policy]
└─ Recommendation: [Action – use as primary, corroborate, downgrade, reject]

```

## Key Quality Signals

- **Author attribution:** Named experts boost credibility
- **Editorial standards:** Fact-checking, corrections policy, editorial board
- **Peer review:** Present in academic sources
- **Currency:** Recent publication more credible for fast-moving topics
- **Primary vs. secondary:** Direct observation/data better than hearsay
- **Independence:** Sources without financial conflict superior

## Source Red Flags

Certain patterns require immediate action. Apply the rule shown for each flag.

Red Flag	Trigger	Required Action
No author attribution	Author field blank or "Staff"	Downgrade minimum one tier; seek attributed version
Publication date >2 years	Older than current date for fast-moving sector	Flag as potentially outdated; seek recent corroboration
Commercial interest evident	Obvious bias toward product/service	Disclose bias explicitly; seek independent corroboration
Circular sourcing detected	Source B cites Source A which cites Source B	Trace to original primary source; use primary only
Unfamiliar domain	Website or publisher unknown	Downgrade to Tier 4; verify against known sources
Contradicts Tier 1 source	Claims conflict with primary authority	Flag contradiction; defer to Tier 1 as ground truth
Vague attribution pattern	"Studies show", "experts say", "research indicates"	Reject the claim; mark as UNVERIFIED; seek specific source
Statistics without methodology	Numbers presented without sample size/method	Flag limitations; request methodology documentation

## Handling Conflicting Sources

When sources contradict, follow this resolution hierarchy:

1. **Tier Resolution:** Higher tier source wins (Tier 1 > Tier 2 > Tier 3 > Tier 4)
2. **Recency Tie-Breaker:** When tiers equal, more recent source preferred
3. **Primary vs. Secondary:** Direct evidence beats interpretation
4. **Explicit Conflict Flag:** If Tier 1 sources differ, present both; note uncertainty

**5. Root Cause Investigation:** Determine why sources differ (methodology, time period, scope)

### Template for Conflict Presentation

```
[RISK] SOURCE CONFLICT
Claim: [Statement in question]

Position A: [Source 1, Tier X, Date]
- Finding: [Specific claim]
- Strength: [Why credible]

Position B: [Source 2, Tier X, Date]
- Finding: [Specific claim]
- Strength: [Why credible]

Resolution: [Which prevails and why, or note genuine uncertainty]
```

## Marker Integration Rules

Connect source tiers to confidence markers. This table governs which markers can be used with which sources:

Marker	Allowed Sources	Required	Example
[ <span style="color: green;">●</span> CONFIRMED]	Tier 1-3 with full citation; no red flags present	Complete metadata citation	SEC filing stating revenue figure
[ <span style="color: orange;">●</span> UNVERIFIED]	Tier 4 sources OR Tier 1-3 with red flags present	Explain why unverified	Claim attributed to "experts" without specific source
[ <span style="color: yellow;">●</span> INFERENCE]	Zero direct source; reasoned from confirmed facts	Show logical chain	"If X confirmed and Y confirmed, then Z is likely"
[ <span style="color: red;">●</span> GAP]	No source found or insufficient information	Mark as missing	"No available data on this specific metric"
[ <span style="color: yellow;">! ●</span> RISK]	Reputational, legal, or credibility concern	Describe risk	"This claim could create liability if challenged"

**Critical Rule:** Tier 4 sources CANNOT produce [● CONFIRMED] markers under any circumstances. Mark as [● UNVERIFIED] instead.

## Prohibited Language Patterns

Certain words and phrases must trigger INFERENCE or UNVERIFIED labeling. Use this table to identify and replace them:

Category	Prohibited	Must Use Instead	Marker

<b>Frequency</b>	typically, usually, generally, often, sometimes	"According to [Source], X% report..." or cite specific data	UNVERIFIED
<b>Suggestion</b>	implies, suggests, indicates, hints	"Research shows", "stated directly as"	INFERENCE or UNVERIFIED
<b>Vague Attribution</b>	experts say, studies show, it is known, people believe	Cite specific expert/study/source	UNVERIFIED
<b>Approximation</b>	approximately, around, about, roughly	For precise data: cite exact figure or note estimate with margin	Note as estimate
<b>False Certainty</b>	clearly, obviously, certainly, definitely, undoubtedly	"Available evidence suggests", "Based on [Source]..."	INFERENCE
<b>Probability</b>	likely, unlikely, probably, seems, appears, may	Use explicit probability or cite source	INFERENCE
<b>Obligation</b>	must be, should be, would be, needs to be	"Required by [Rule]" or "Best practice per [Source]"	RULE or CONFIRMED

### Example Correction

**FAIL Bad:** "Studies typically show that companies generally benefit from digitalization." **[GOOD]:** "[ CONFIRMED: McKinsey & Company, 'Digital Acceleration in Enterprises,' 2023] reports that 73% of surveyed companies cite improved operational efficiency."

---

### Fallback Rules

Apply these rules when standard verification is insufficient or ambiguous:

Situation	Required Action
Source is paywalled or inaccessible	Cite the source fully; note access limitation; seek alternative corroboration
Conflicting Tier 1 sources with equal authority	Present both views; explicitly note the disagreement; avoid false consensus
Information is current/breaking (< 7 days old)	Flag as preliminary; indicate likely updates; plan to revisit
Quantitative data lacks full context	Always cite sample size, methodology, time period, and limitations
Claim spans multiple jurisdictions with different rules	Specify which jurisdiction(s) apply; note variations

Source has issued corrections or retracted claims	Use corrected version; cite the correction; note original error only if relevant
---	--

## Version

GGP Verification Framework v1.0 | Last Updated: 2026-02-06

## 6. Professional Etiquette

*Source: references/general-guidelines/2.professional-etiquette.md*

### GGP Professional Etiquette

#### The Unwritten Cultural Rules of Professional Services

##### Core Principle

**Your personal reputation IS your firm's reputation.**

Every interaction, every communication, every decision reflects not just on you but on the entire consulting organisation you represent. Professional services is built on trust. Breach it once publicly, and recovery takes years.

#### The 7 Golden Rules

##### 1. Never Speak Ill

**Rule:** Do not criticize competitors, vendors, or other professionals publicly or in contexts where it could be repeated.

**Why:** Competitive criticism damages your credibility more than the target's. It signals insecurity and unprofessionalism.

Don't	Do
"Competitor X is weak at data strategy"	"Our strength is in data-driven decision frameworks"
"That firm's analysis was flawed"	"We bring a different methodology to this challenge"
"Their consultant didn't understand the business"	"We focus on deep stakeholder engagement"
"They're just selling snake oil"	"We believe in sustainable, measurable outcomes"

##### 2. Never Complain

**Rule:** Reframe problems, obstacles, and setbacks as opportunities or learning moments.

**Why:** Consulting is about solutions. Complaining signals you lack agency. Clients hire solvers, not people who blame circumstances.

Don't	Do
"The client won't engage with the process"	"This is an opportunity to strengthen our change management approach"
"The data quality is terrible"	"We're identifying data governance improvements upfront"
"They keep rejecting our recommendations"	"We're refining our recommendations to address underlying concerns"
"The timeline is impossible"	"This timeline challenges us to prioritise high-impact work first"

### 3. Never Compromise Clients

**Rule:** Client confidentiality is sacred. It survives the end of the engagement.

**Why:** Your only leverage in a competitive industry is the trust clients place in you. One breach destroys your reputation permanently.

Don't	Do
Share client examples without explicit written permission	When referencing work, use anonymized or fully disclosed examples
Discuss client struggles in casual conversation	"I've seen this challenge across industries I work in..."
Use client names in case studies without signed agreements	Require formal case study rights; compensate if using their story
Mention client information on social media	Keep social posts about work generic and professional
Discuss client politics with other clients	Maintain strict information barriers between clients

### 4. Protect the Brand

**Rule:** You represent your firm 24/7, including personal social media and outside commitments.

**Why:** Digital footprint is permanent. Clients research principals before engaging. One controversial post can disqualify a contract.

Don't	Do
Post political rants on personal social media	Share thoughtful industry perspectives and expertise
Criticize the firm's decisions publicly	Raise concerns internally; support publicly

Engage in flame wars online	Disengage from heated discussions gracefully
Dress casually in public forums where clients might see	Maintain professional appearance in any client-facing context
Make controversial statements while identified as firm member	Use personal social media cautiously; separate professional identity

## 5. Client is Always Right (Publicly)

**Rule:** Keep disagreements private. Public communications must always reflect alignment with the client.

**Why:** Your credibility depends on presenting a united front. Client questions about your commitment will be answered by whether you publicly challenge them.

Don't	Do
"The client rejected our recommendation" (public)	In private debrief: discuss why client chose alternative path
Post about client changes you disagree with	If asked publicly: "We're supporting their strategic direction"
Express doubt about client viability	Internally: assess and flag risks; externally: committed partner
Correct client in public forums	Private conversation: "Here's an alternative perspective for you to consider"

## 6. Never Burn Bridges

**Rule:** Every person you work with today could become a client, partner, or advocate tomorrow.

**Why:** Professional circles are smaller than you think. Your behaviour toward "unimportant" people becomes reputation data.

Don't	Do
Act dismissive toward junior staff at other firms	Treat everyone as a potential future peer or leader
Refuse to help a competitor in need	Build reciprocal professional relationships
Publicly criticize a vendor you fired	"We made a different choice for our current needs"
Burn out a junior colleague and avoid them later	Invest in people; stay in touch with former teammates

## 7. Compete with Class

**Rule:** Win on merit, knowledge, and delivery quality. Never resort to undermining others.

**Why:** The consulting industry is built on repeat business and referrals. Players who win through integrity outlast those who win through manipulation.

Don't	Do
Undercut competitor pricing to win a deal	Emphasize unique value; let price reflect quality
Spread rumors about competing proposals	Let your work speak; focus on your strengths
Poach client relationships aggressively	Build relationships professionally; let clients come to you
Exploit a competitor's client issue	Offer genuine help; if they hire you later, that's earned trust

## Language Reframing

Convert dangerous internal thoughts into professional communication. These phrases prevent misinterpretation and preserve relationships.

Dangerous Phrase	Professional Alternative
"The process is broken"	"There are optimisation opportunities in this workflow"
"This is chaos"	"There's complexity here we can help structure"
"They failed to deliver"	"There were delivery challenges we can help address"
"The client is wrong"	"There may be an alternative perspective worth exploring"
"Our competitor is weak at X"	"We differentiate by excellence in X"
"We guarantee results"	"We are committed to delivering measurable value"
"They don't understand their business"	"This is an opportunity to build deeper operational understanding"
"That idea won't work"	"Here are factors to consider before implementation"
"They're being unreasonable"	"Let's understand what's driving this perspective"
"Management is incompetent"	"There are capability gaps we can help fill"

## Real-World Scenarios

### Scenario 1: Asked to Criticize a Competitor

**Situation:** A prospect asks, "Why should we choose you over Firm X? They're struggling with X, right?"

**Response Template:**

- **Acknowledge:** "I respect Firm X; they do solid work in [area]."
- **Redirect:** "What we focus on is [your differentiator]. Here's how we'd approach your situation..."
- **Close professionally:** "I'm confident our approach is the right fit for you. Let's focus on what matters most to your business."

**Why it works:** You refuse the trap, acknowledge the competitor respectfully, and own the conversation.

## Scenario 2: Client Project Went Wrong

**Situation:** A key deliverable missed deadline or quality standards fell short.

**Response Template:**

- **Own immediately:** "We didn't hit our commitment. Here's what happened and why."
- **Remediate:** "Here's how we're fixing it and preventing recurrence."
- **Rebuild trust:** "You can hold us accountable to [specific new standard/timeline/check-in]."
- **Never blame the client:** Internal analysis can show where client behaviour contributed; client conversation must own your role.

**Why it works:** Ownership rebuilds trust faster than deflection. Clients expect perfection; they respect accountability.

---

## Scenario 3: Vendor Underperformed

**Situation:** A subcontractor or partner failed to meet expectations, affecting delivery.

**Response Template:**

- **Take responsibility:** "We selected this vendor and are responsible for their performance."
- **Take action:** "We're immediately [replacing/restructuring/adding oversight]."
- **Discreet vendor management:** Vendor conversation happens privately; client hears only your solution.
- **Never trash the vendor publicly:** Future projects may require this vendor; other firms may know them.

**Why it works:** Client sees your quality control and accountability. Vendor remains viable for future use.

---

## Scenario 4: Internal Conflict Goes Public

**Situation:** A team member or partner disagrees with your approach publicly or in front of a client.

**Response Template:**

- **In the moment:** Don't escalate. "That's a fair point. Let's discuss offline and come back with aligned recommendation."
- **After meeting:** Private conversation: understand perspective, align on messaging, determine how to move forward.
- **Moving forward:** Present unified approach; any internal disagreement stays internal.
- **Never undermine publicly:** You may have been wrong. Acknowledge privately; move forward professionally.

**Why it works:** Unified teams win contracts. Visible conflict loses them.

---

## Etiquette Checklist

Before any external communication or action, verify:

- **Confidentiality Check:** Does this expose any client information? (Even anonymized, are there identifying details?)
- **Tone Check:** Could this be misinterpreted as criticism, complaint, or self-interest?
- **Attribution Check:** Can I name my sources and link to evidence, or am I relying on hearsay?

- **Competitor Check:** Am I comparing ourselves on merit, or am I criticizing competitors?
  - **Client Check:** Does this reflect alignment with my clients, or visible disagreement?
  - **Screenshot Test:** If this were captured and shared widely without context, would I still be comfortable with it? (If no, revise it.)
- 

## Version

GGP Professional Etiquette v1.0 | Last Updated: 2026-02-06

---

## 7. Reputation Protection

*Source: references/general-guidelines/3.reputation-protection.md*

### GGP Reputation Protection

#### Devil's Advocate Risk Assessment and User Decision Protocol

---

#### Quick Check Matrix

Evaluate any significant statement or action across all eight dimensions (5 checks + 3 tests). Rate each as Low (1), Medium (2), or High (3). Maximum score: 24.

Dimension	Low (1)	Medium (2)	High (3)
<b>Misinterpretation Risk</b>	Clear, hard to misread	Could be read multiple ways	Easily distorted or weaponized
<b>Credibility Risk</b>	Strong sourcing; defensible	Some sourcing gaps; arguable	Unsourced or contradicted claims
<b>Legal Risk</b>	No legal exposure	Gray area; consult guidelines	Clear legal liability or exposure
<b>Reputation Risk</b>	Aligns with brand values	Neutral or slightly off-brand	Contradicts brand; damages credibility
<b>Data Accuracy Risk</b>	All data sourced and verified	Some figures unverified or estimated	Key statistics unsourced or challengeable
<b>Hostile Reader Test</b>	No exploitable weaknesses	Some points vulnerable to challenge	Easily weaponized or distorted out of context
<b>Screenshot Test</b>	Comfortable if shared without context	Would need minor explanation	Would cause reputational damage if shared
<b>CEO Test</b>	CEO would approve without question	Would need brief justification	CEO would reject or demand changes

#### Action Rule (max 24):

- Score ≤8: Generally safe to proceed
  - Score ≥9: Flag for escalation; recommend human review before proceeding
- 

## The Three Tests

Apply these three filters to any significant communication, recommendation, or public statement.

### Test 1: Hostile Reader Test

Read your statement as if you were an adversary looking for weaknesses. Use this checklist:

- **Could this be read as attacking someone?** Who might feel criticized?
- **Are there unstated assumptions?** What if someone disagrees with them?
- **Is my evidence airtight?** Could someone credibly challenge my sources?
- **Am I using vague language that invites interpretation?** What's the worst reasonable reading?
- **Does this create legal exposure?** Could this be seen as defamatory, misleading, or negligent?
- **Is this proportionate?** Does the strength of my claim match the strength of my evidence?
- **Could this be quoted out of context?** Would the shortened version still be true and fair?
- **Is any claim circular?** Does the evidence depend on accepting the conclusion it's supposed to prove?
- **Are foreseeable objections pre-addressed?** Would a knowledgeable critic find their obvious challenge already answered, or left open?

**Scoring:** Low (1) = no exploitable weaknesses; Medium (2) = some points vulnerable to challenge; High (3) = easily weaponized or distorted out of context. Record score in Quick Check Matrix.

### Cognitive Bias Check

If any of the above checks raise concerns, also scan for these common biases that damage credibility when spotted by informed readers:

- **Confirmation Bias:** Does the text only cite evidence that supports the conclusion, while ignoring or downplaying counter-evidence? [COGNITIVE\_BIAS: Confirmation]
- **Survivorship Bias:** Are only successes or positive cases presented? Are failures, dropouts, or negative outcomes systematically absent? [COGNITIVE\_BIAS: Survivorship]
- **Status Quo Bias:** Is maintaining the current state framed as the safe option, when inaction may carry equal or greater risk? [COGNITIVE\_BIAS: StatusQuo]
- **Recency Bias:** Are recent events or trends being extrapolated as permanent or definitive, without historical context? [COGNITIVE\_BIAS: Recency]

**If detected:** Name the bias in your risk flag. A named bias is actionable; a vague "evidence might be incomplete" is not.

---

### Test 2: Screenshot Test

Imagine this statement or decision was captured in a screenshot and shared without context on social media, in a legal proceeding, or to your firm's leadership.

**Questions:**

1. Would I still be comfortable with it?
2. Could it be misused to damage my reputation or my firm's?
3. If shared with the CEO, would this require explanation or justification?
4. If a journalist quoted this out of context, would it still be defensible?

**Scoring:** Low (1) = comfortable if shared without context; Medium (2) = would need minor explanation; High (3) = would cause reputational damage if shared. Record score in Quick Check Matrix.

---

### Test 3: CEO Test

Frame the question directly: "Would the CEO of my firm approve this with the firm's name and reputation on it?"

**This test catches:**

- Overstatements that damage brand credibility
- Risky claims that expose the firm to liability
- Tone or framing that contradicts firm values
- Aggressive positioning that burns bridges

**Scoring:** Low (1) = CEO would approve without question; Medium (2) = would need brief justification; High (3) = CEO would reject or demand changes. Record score in Quick Check Matrix.

---

## High-Risk Language Patterns

Identify problematic language before it becomes a liability. Replace dangerous phrases using this table.

### Legal Risk Category

Pattern	Risk	Before	After
"We guarantee..."	Creates contractual liability	"We guarantee a 20% ROI"	"We are aiming to deliver a 20% improvement"
"All X do..."	Invites counterexamples	"All enterprises struggle with data integration"	"Many enterprises we work with face data integration challenges"
"[Competitor] fails at..."	Defamation exposure	"Competitor X fails to scale"	"We differentiate through our scalability approach"
"We will never..."	Creates broken promise if circumstances change	"We will never share your data"	"We protect client data per [standard] and our contracts"
"This is the only way..."	False exclusivity	"The only way to transform is through our methodology"	"Our methodology has proven effective for transformation"

### Credibility Risk Category

Pattern	Risk	Before	After

"Studies show..."	Unverified claim	"Studies show digital transformation increases revenue"	"According to [specific source], X% report revenue improvements"
"Everyone knows..."	False consensus	"Everyone knows legacy systems block innovation"	"Many organisations we work with find legacy systems constraining"
"Obviously..."	False certainty	"It's obvious that outsourcing reduces costs"	"Cost reduction is a common benefit of strategic outsourcing"
"No one disputes..."	Ignores legitimate disagreement	"No one disputes AI's impact on jobs"	"There's significant debate about AI's workforce impact"
"[Anonymous] told me..."	Hearsay	"A CIO told me this approach doesn't work"	"In our experience, this approach requires..."
"As an expert in X..."	Authority claimed without verifiable credentials in the specific domain	"As an AI expert, I believe regulation is premature"	"Based on our work in [specific area], we observe that regulatory timing depends on [factors]"
"Data proves X"	Unqualified absolute claim; invites challenge	"Data proves digital transformation increases revenue"	"Available data suggests a positive correlation between digital transformation and revenue growth"
Qualifier-Creep	Starts narrow, ends universal; attentive readers notice the inflation	"In some cases, AI can improve efficiency... Therefore, AI will transform the industry"	Maintain consistent scope: "In some cases, AI can improve efficiency... These results suggest potential for broader application, pending further evidence"

### Reputation Risk Category

Pattern	Risk	Before	After
"Unlike our competitors..."	Attacks others; looks weak	"Unlike our competitors, we actually care about client outcomes"	"Our differentiator is our commitment to measurable outcomes"
"We fixed what [firm] broke..."	Implies competitor incompetence	"We fixed what the previous consultant broke"	"We're building on lessons learned and moving forward to..."
"Clients tell us we're..."	Self-praise through proxy	"Clients tell us we're the best in the industry"	"We've received recognition for our work in [area]"

"Only we can..."	Narrow, brittle claim	"Only we understand this industry"	"We bring deep expertise in this industry"
"Better than..."	Comparative weakness	"We're better than internal teams"	"We bring specialized capabilities your internal team lacks"

## Logical Risk Category

Pattern	Risk	Before	After
<b>False Dilemma</b>	Eliminates valid options; readers who see alternatives lose trust	"We either adopt AI now or fall behind permanently"	"Adopting AI early positions us competitively, though timing depends on readiness"
<b>Hasty Generalisation</b>	Universal claim from limited evidence; experts will challenge immediately	"Three clients reported issues, so the platform is unreliable"	"Some clients have reported issues, which warrants further investigation"
<b>False Causality</b>	Confuses correlation with causation; undermines analytical credibility	"We implemented the new process and revenue grew 15%"	"Revenue grew 15% during the period following implementation; further analysis is needed to isolate contributing factors"
<b>Non Sequitur</b>	Conclusion doesn't follow from evidence; signals weak reasoning	"Our team is highly experienced, so delivery risk is minimal"	"Our team's experience in [specific domain] helps mitigate [specific risk], though other factors also apply"

## User Decision Protocol

The core innovation: Claude presents, user decides. When reputation risk is detected, follow this exact flow:

### Step 1: Flag the Risk

Identify the issue and severity. Use this format:

```
[RISK] REPUTATION RISK DETECTED

Issue: [Specific problem]
Severity: [Low/Medium/High]
Dimension: [Misinterpretation/Credibility/Legal/Reputation]
Reason: [Why this is risky]
```

### Step 2: Present Alternatives

Offer the original version alongside revised option(s):

**OPTION A (Original – Higher Risk)**  
[Your original text]

**OPTION B (Revised – Lower Risk)**  
[Professionally reframed version]

(Additional options if appropriate)

### **Step 3: Explain the Trade-off**

Be explicit about what changes:

Trade-off Analysis:

- Option A: [More direct/stronger language, but X risk]
- Option B: [Still conveys intent, but protects reputation by Y]

### **Step 4: Ask for Direction**

Give user agency. Use coded options for fast response:

R1: [Risk description]  
a) Accept original (higher risk) – [why user might choose this]  
b) Use revised version (lower risk) – [what changes]  
c) Rewrite approach entirely – [alternative framing]  
d) Escalate to human review

Reply with: R1: b (or your own answer)

When multiple risks are flagged, number them sequentially (R1, R2, R3...) so the user can respond in a single line:

Reply with: R1: b, R2: a, R3: c

**Wait for explicit user response.** Do not assume; present the choice.

---

## **Example: User Decision Protocol in Action**

**Situation:** User drafts a statement about a competitor.

**Detection:**

[RISK] REPUTATION RISK DETECTED

**Issue:** Statement compares to competitor; implies weakness

**Severity:** High

**Dimension:** Reputation/Credibility

**Reason:** Attacking competitors signals insecurity and damages your credibility more than theirs

**Presentation:**

#### OPTION A (Original)

"Unlike our competitors, we actually invest in client success rather than just selling deals."

#### OPTION B (Revised)

"Our model emphasizes long-term client outcomes. We measure success by your business results."

#### Trade-off:

- Option A: More pointed; directly contrasts with competitors
- Option B: Still positions you positively; avoids comparative attack

#### Decision Request:

R1: Competitor comparison – implies weakness

- a) Accept original – sharper competitive positioning
- b) Use revised – removes competitor reference; keeps value proposition clear
- c) Rewrite – "Here's what makes our engagement model different..." [new angle]
- d) Escalate to human review

Reply with: R1: b (or your own answer)

## Escalation Rules

Flag for human expert review (legal, PR, or leadership) when ANY of these conditions exist:

- **Legal exposure:** Language that could be interpreted as guarantees, warranties, or defamation
- **Public/permanent:** Posting to social media, publishing in articles, or making recorded statements
- **Client-facing:** Formal proposals, contracts, or communications that create legal obligations
- **Sensitive topics:** Statements about competitors, regulatory issues, or controversial subjects
- **High stakes:** Communication affecting major contracts, partnerships, or firm reputation
- **Unclear precedent:** No prior approval for this type of statement in your firm
- **Multiple audiences:** Message will be seen by clients, partners, employees, and public
- **Contradicts firm messaging:** Conflicts with established brand position or prior communications
- **Media involvement:** Any communication that could reach journalists or industry influencers
- **Personal/firm separation unclear:** Your personal views and firm positions are blurred

#### Escalation Template:

FLAGGED FOR EXPERT REVIEW

Type: [Legal/PR/Leadership]

Reason: [Which escalation rule applies]

Draft: [Full text]

Concern: [Specific risk]

Timeline: [When decision needed]

## Version

GGP Reputation Protection v1.2 | Last Updated: 2026-02-24

---

## 8. Data Analytics Expertise

Source: <references/general-guidelines/4.data-analytics-expertise.md>

## Data & Analytics Expertise Reference

### GGP Domain-Specific Knowledge Layer

---

#### Table of Contents

1. [Data Verification Standards](#)
  2. [Metric Presentation Rules](#)
  3. [Data Source Hierarchy](#)
  4. [Dashboard & Report Narratives](#)
  5. [Common Data Hallucination Patterns](#)
  6. [Data Visualization Ethics](#)
  7. [Analytics Communication Templates](#)
  8. [Pre-Publication Data Checklist](#)
- 

### Data Verification Standards

Rules for verifying data claims in professional communications:

- **Statistical claims** require methodology disclosure (sample size, confidence level, test type)
  - **Percentages** must specify base/denominator ("15% of 500 respondents" not just "15%")
  - **Year-over-year comparisons** must use consistent periods (same months/quarters)
  - **Currency figures** must specify currency and whether nominal/real values
  - **Market size claims** must specify methodology (TAM/SAM/SOM breakdown)
  - **Growth rates** must distinguish CAGR (compound annual) vs. point-to-point
  - **Survey data** must disclose sample size, methodology, margin of error, and date
  - **Benchmarks** require source identification and comparable scope
  - **Trend claims** need minimum 3 data points spanning sufficient timeframe
- 

### Metric Presentation Rules

How to present KPIs and metrics without hallucinating:

- **Always specify time period and scope:** "Q3 2025 North America" not "Q3 growth"
- **Never extrapolate without declaring INFERENCE:** "If trend continues..." is an inference
- **Round appropriately:** Don't present false precision ("12.347%" from 100-sample survey)
- **Distinguish leading vs. lagging indicators:** Revenue (lagging) vs. pipeline velocity (leading)
- **Specify whether absolute or relative measures:** "Increased 5 units" vs. "Increased 5%"
- **Define all acronyms on first use** in the same section

- **Consistency rule:** Same metric always uses same calculation method and timeframe
  - **Confidence intervals:** For estimates and projections, state uncertainty range
- 

## Data Source Hierarchy

Adapting GGP source tiers specifically for data/analytics:

### Tier 1 — Data Gold Standard [● CONFIRMED]

- Audited financial statements (GAAP/IFRS certified)
- Official government statistics (ONS, BLS, Eurostat, ABS)
- Regulated filings (SEC 10-K, FCA disclosures, company annual reports)
- Internal verified databases with audit trails
- Peer-reviewed academic research with replication

### Tier 2 — Reliable Data [● CONFIRMED]

- Major analyst firms (Gartner Magic Quadrant, IDC research, Forrester)
- Financial data terminals (Bloomberg, Reuters, FactSet)
- Industry body published statistics (e.g., SIFMA, ICMA)
- University research centres with methodology transparency
- Government surveys with published sampling methodology

### Tier 3 — Useful Context [🟡 INFERENCE]

- Company press releases with unaudited figures (verify against filings)
- Industry surveys (always check sample size and methodology)
- Market research previews and abstracts (note: full data often paywalled)
- Wikipedia for definitions and historical context only
- Conference presentations with disclosed data sources

### Tier 4 — Proceed with Caution [🟠 UNVERIFIED]

- Social media metrics and viral claims
  - Unverified benchmarks ("typical ROI")
  - "Industry average" without cited source
  - Blog-cited statistics (trace to original source)
  - Conference slide claims without methodological backing
  - Sponsored content and white papers (bias risk)
- 

## Dashboard & Report Narratives

GGP rules specifically for writing narratives around data:

- **Traceability rule:** Every number must have a documented source with tier rating
- **Trend language:** "Revenue increased 12% YoY" only if you have prior-year comparable
- **Avoid weak language:** Don't say "shows a clear trend" without statistical significance testing
- **Comparison language:** Use neutral terms ("higher than," "lower than") not evaluative ("better," "worse")
- **Anomaly declarations:** Call out outliers when they distort the narrative; explain if they're data errors or genuine signals
- **Causation claims:** Require causal evidence; use "associated with" or "correlates with" instead
- **Context always:** Standalone numbers have no meaning; include benchmarks, targets, or prior periods

- **Caveats must be visible:** Don't hide limitations in footnotes; surface them in main narrative
- 

## Common Data Hallucination Patterns

Specific anti-hallucination rules for data contexts:

### Pattern: Invented Precision

- **Detection:** Source says "approximately 24%" but you write "23.7%"
- **Rule:** Match precision to source precision
- **Mark as:** [🟠 UNVERIFIED] [⚠ RISK] — Flag and revise to source value

### Pattern: Conflated Metrics

- **Detection:** Mixing revenue with profit, Monthly Active Users (MAU) with Daily Active Users (DAU)
- **Rule:** Define metric once, use consistently, note when switching metrics
- **Mark as:** [🟠 UNVERIFIED] [⚠ RISK] — Rewrite with clarity on which metric each claim uses

### Pattern: Cherry-Picked Timeframes

- **Detection:** Highlighting H1 performance without showing H2, selecting most favorable quarter
- **Rule:** Present full-year or multi-year context; explain if focusing on specific period
- **Mark as:** [🟡 INFERENCE] — Declare the selection and provide context

### Pattern: Survivorship Bias

- **Detection:** Only referencing successful companies' practices, ignoring failures
- **Rule:** Acknowledge the subset; note "among companies that survived" if applicable
- **Mark as:** [🟡 INFERENCE] — Add caveat about sample composition

### Pattern: Correlation as Causation

- **Detection:** "X led to Y" without experimental or causal evidence
- **Rule:** Use "associated with," "correlates with," or "preceded"; avoid "caused," "drove," "led to"
- **Mark as:** [🟡 INFERENCE] — Rephrase with appropriate causal language

### Pattern: Missing Denominators

- **Detection:** "500 customers" without context ("out of 50,000" vs. "out of 600")
- **Rule:** Always include base population and percentage
- **Mark as:** [🔴 GAP] — Cannot assess significance without denominator; mark for research

### Pattern: Zombie Statistics

- **Detection:** Using 2015 data in 2025 report presented as current
  - **Rule:** Date all data; flag anything older than 2 years unless explicitly historical
  - **Mark as:** [🟠 UNVERIFIED] — Update or explicitly label as historical data
- 

## Data Visualization Ethics

Rules for when content references or describes charts/graphs:

- **Never describe patterns the data doesn't support:** If chart shows flat line, don't say "strong growth"
- **Axis manipulation disclosure:** If y-axis doesn't start at zero, must state this
- **Sample size visibility:** Charts must show or text must declare the N
- **Confidence intervals:** For estimates and projections, show or mention uncertainty bands

- **Colour coding:** If using colour to imply good/bad (green/red), ensure neutral data supports it
  - **GGP markers in chart narratives:** Apply [● CONFIRMED]/[🟡 INFERENCE]/[● UNVERIFIED] to all pattern claims just as in text
  - **Annotation integrity:** Callout boxes must cite supporting data points
- 

## Analytics Communication Templates

### Executive Data Brief Template

HEADLINE: [Key finding in one sentence]

METRIC: [Primary KPI] = [Value] [● CONFIRMED]/[🟡 INFERENCE]/[● UNVERIFIED]

PERIOD: [Exact timeframe: "Q3 2025" or "July 1 – September 30, 2025"]

TREND: [Direction + magnitude, e.g., "Up 12% YoY"] [● CONFIRMED]/[🟡 INFERENCE]

CONTEXT: [Benchmark or comparison: vs. target, prior period, market]

IMPLICATION: [What this means for decisions]

SOURCE: [Data source | Tier | Refresh date]

### KPI Summary Table Template

KPI	Value	Period	vs Target	vs Prior Yr	Source	GGP Status
Revenue	\$2.5M	Q3 2025	+8%	+12%	Accounting system	[● **CONFIRMED**]
Customer Churn	3.2%	Aug–Sept 2025	+0.5pp	-0.1pp	CRM export	[🟡 **INFERENCE**]
Market Share	~15%	H1 2025	-2pp	N/A	Analyst report	[🟡 **INFERENCE**]

## Pre-Publication Data Checklist

Final validation specifically for data-heavy content:

- **Traceability:** All numbers have a documented source with tier rating
  - **Precision match:** Decimal places match source precision (no invented decimals)
  - **Time periods explicit:** Every metric specifies its timeframe ("Q3 2025", "12-month average")
  - **Units and currency:** All figures specify currency (USD, EUR), units (%), absolute, per capita)
  - **Methodology disclosed:** Any percentage, average, or statistical claim states how it was calculated
  - **Baseline consistency:** Comparisons (YoY, vs. target) use identical calculation methods
  - **Caveats visible:** Limitations, sample sizes, and assumptions stated in main narrative
  - **Chart descriptions accurate:** Narrative matches actual data in visualizations
  - **No zombie data:** All figures dated; nothing older than 2 years unless explicitly historical
  - **GGP markers applied:** [● CONFIRMED]/[🟡 INFERENCE]/[● UNVERIFIED] assigned to all data claims based on source tier and confidence
  - **Correlation language:** No causal claims without causal evidence
  - **Denominator disclosure:** All percentages and rates include base population
-

## 9. Success Metrics

Source: <references/general-guidelines/5.success-metrics.md>

### GGP Success Metrics

#### Measuring Grounded Gate Protocol Effectiveness

---

##### Purpose

Transform GGP from "a process" into "a measurable system." These KPIs enable tracking, benchmarking, and evidence-based improvement of AI output quality.

---

##### Core KPIs

#	Metric	Target	How to Measure	Frequency
1	<b>Hallucination Rate</b>	< 5% of claims without CONFIRMED	Audit 20 random outputs; count claims lacking Tier 1-3 sources	Monthly
2	<b>Gap Declaration Rate</b>	> 95% of gaps marked	Post-hoc review: compare final output to available data; identify unmarked gaps	Monthly
3	<b>Loop Iterations</b>	≤ 2 rounds average	Count conversation turns from request to first draft with markers	Per output
4	<b>User Override Rate</b>	< 15%	Track how often user requests changes to clean output after GGP process completes	Monthly
5	<b>Time to Clean Output</b>	≤ 3 turns	Count turns from initial request to clean output delivery (Phase 3h)	Per output

---

##### Extended Metrics (For Evidence Portfolio and Enterprise Adoption)

#	Metric	Target	Purpose
6	<b>Source Tier Distribution</b>	> 60% Tier 1-2 sources per output	Measures quality of evidence base
7	<b>Devil's Advocate Catch Rate</b>	> 0 risks flagged per 5 outputs	Validates reputation protection is active

8	<b>Inference Acceptance Rate</b>	Track percentage of inferences accepted vs. rejected by user	Calibrates AI confidence accuracy
9	<b>Channel Compliance Rate</b>	100% channel checklist pass on first validation	Measures skill reference loading discipline
10	<b>Cross-Platform Consistency</b>	Same claim receives same marker across Claude, ChatGPT, Copilot	Validates platform template parity

## Measurement Protocol

### Monthly Audit Process

1. **Sample:** Select 20 GGP-processed outputs from the past month
2. **Review:** For each output, check:
  - o Are all factual claims tagged with CONFIRMED + source?
  - o Are all assumptions tagged with INFERENCE?
  - o Are all missing data points tagged with GAP?
  - o Was Devil's Advocate run (check for RISK flags or explicit "no risks found")?
  - o Did the output reach clean version in  $\leq$  3 turns?
3. **Score:** Calculate each KPI
4. **Report:** Document results and trends

### Scoring Template

GGP MONTHLY SCORECARD																															
Period: [Month Year]																															
Outputs Audited: [N]																															
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>KPI</th> <th>Target</th> <th>Actual</th> <th>Status</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>-----</td> <td>-----</td> <td>-----</td> <td>-----</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hallucination Rate</td> <td>&lt; 5%</td> <td>[X]%</td> <td>PASS/FAIL</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gap Declaration Rate</td> <td>&gt; 95%</td> <td>[X]%</td> <td>PASS/FAIL</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Loop Iterations (avg)</td> <td><math>\leq</math> 2</td> <td>[X]</td> <td>PASS/FAIL</td> </tr> <tr> <td>User Override Rate</td> <td>&lt; 15%</td> <td>[X]%</td> <td>PASS/FAIL</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Time to Clean Output (avg)</td> <td><math>\leq</math> 3 turns</td> <td>[X]</td> <td>PASS/FAIL</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				KPI	Target	Actual	Status	-----	-----	-----	-----	Hallucination Rate	< 5%	[X]%	PASS/FAIL	Gap Declaration Rate	> 95%	[X]%	PASS/FAIL	Loop Iterations (avg)	$\leq$ 2	[X]	PASS/FAIL	User Override Rate	< 15%	[X]%	PASS/FAIL	Time to Clean Output (avg)	$\leq$ 3 turns	[X]	PASS/FAIL
KPI	Target	Actual	Status																												
-----	-----	-----	-----																												
Hallucination Rate	< 5%	[X]%	PASS/FAIL																												
Gap Declaration Rate	> 95%	[X]%	PASS/FAIL																												
Loop Iterations (avg)	$\leq$ 2	[X]	PASS/FAIL																												
User Override Rate	< 15%	[X]%	PASS/FAIL																												
Time to Clean Output (avg)	$\leq$ 3 turns	[X]	PASS/FAIL																												
Overall Score: [X]/5 targets met																															
Trend vs. Prior Month: [Improving/Stable/Declining]																															
Notes: [Observations, patterns, improvement actions]																															

## Maturity Levels

Use these to assess GGP adoption maturity within a team or organisation:

Level	Name	Criteria
1	<b>Awareness</b>	Team knows GGP exists; no formal adoption

2	<b>Adoption</b>	GGP markers used in some outputs; no measurement
3	<b>Compliance</b>	All professional outputs use GGP; monthly audits started
4	<b>Optimisation</b>	KPIs tracked monthly; targets met consistently; platform templates deployed
5	<b>Excellence</b>	Cross-platform consistency verified; community contributions; framework evolution

---

## Version

GGP Success Metrics v1.0 | Last Updated: 2026-02-20