



Update-DIFF Gate – checklist

For any proposed change to an *EXISTING* article — AI-drafted or human. This gate is where trust is won or lost: silent edits to trusted knowledge are how confident wrong answers are born. Target: ≤ 5 minutes.

1 – Why does this change exist?

- [] The trigger is stated and real: product change, drift signal, contradiction report, review date, or a correction. (An update with no stated trigger goes back to its proposer.)
- [] The trigger actually implies *this article* — check the article's applicability fields against what changed.

2 – Review the diff, side by side

- [] **Only intended sections changed.** A resolution tweak must not also silently rewrite the environment. Reject collateral edits.
- [] **The new content is accurate** — verified against the trigger (release notes, the contradicting case, the SME). Can't verify → escalate to the article's `owner`, 5-day cap.
- [] **Customer language survived the edit.** Corrections tend to creep toward support-speak; push back.
- [] **The meaning-change test:** if the *old* resolution remains true for older versions, this isn't an update — it's a **new article** for the new version, with a `# supersedes` link between them. Never overwrite truth that some of your users still live under.

3 – Metadata moves with the content

- [] `version` bumped.
- [] `last_validated` updated — by this review, which is a human validation act.
- [] Applicability fields (`product_version`, `platform`, `fixed_in` ...) match the post-change reality.
- [] `links` still point at live, relevant articles.
- [] The KO- id is **unchanged** — citations out in the world must keep resolving.

4 – Disposition

- [] Accept / accept-with-edits / reject — with reason code and edit-distance (for AI-proposed diffs).
- [] Prior version retrievable (git history / platform versioning) — confirm, don't assume.
- [] Decision log row written: date, actor, KO- id, decision, reason, trigger.