

PRACTITIONER FIELD GUIDE / OCTOBER 2026

THE RESPONSIBLE AI GRANT WRITER

How to Use Artificial Intelligence Without Compromising
Accuracy, Authenticity, or Funding Integrity

Denise B. Lawrence

PRESENTED BY CUREAI.BIZ

A PRACTICAL FIELD GUIDE + WORKBOOK

Read the guidance. Test the evidence. Document the decision.

SEVEN PHASES / HUMAN-IN-THE-LOOP / VERIFIED PROPOSALS

Introduction: The Proposal May Be Written by AI.

The Responsibility Is Still Yours.

Artificial intelligence is changing the way funding proposals are researched, developed, drafted, and reviewed. For nonprofit organizations, small businesses, consultants, and grant professionals, this creates significant opportunities to save time and improve organization.

But an articulate proposal is not necessarily an accurate proposal. Persuasive prose does not verify statistics, establish eligibility, substantiate a partnership, or prove that an organization can deliver what it promises.

AI can accelerate the work. It cannot assume the applicant's responsibility for the content submitted to a funder. This guide explains how to benefit from AI while protecting accuracy, authenticity, confidentiality, and funding integrity.

Core principle: Use AI to strengthen the process. Use professional judgment to protect the promise.

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Write a one-sentence accountability rule for your team: AI may assist with drafting, but a designated professional verifies every material claim before submission.

FIELD WORK / 02

ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITMENT

Name the person authorized to approve AI-assisted proposal content.

APPROVAL OWNER

VERIFICATION DEADLINE

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

1. AI Is Changing Grant Writing. Our Standards

Must Remain High.

Grant development starts with a funder's priorities, eligibility requirements, a demonstrated need, a feasible response, an evaluation plan, and an appropriate budget. Writing is one element of that larger process.

AI can summarize source documents, generate outlines, identify missing information, suggest evaluation questions, and improve readability. But it can also create citations that do not exist, overlook exceptions in a solicitation, or turn assumptions into confident statements.

Example: An AI-drafted needs statement describes local unemployment using a precise percentage and a plausible government citation. Before using the statement, the grant writer must locate the underlying publication, verify the date and geography, and confirm that the statistic measures what the narrative claims.

Treat AI output as a working draft or analytical suggestion until material facts have been verified. The organization should be able to trace every important assertion to a source, a documented internal record, or an explicitly identified projection.

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Choose one statistic in your draft. Locate its original source, confirm its date and geography, and save the citation in your evidence register.



HUMAN REVIEW / VERIFIED WORKFLOW

FIELD WORK / 03

EVIDENCE TRACE

Choose a material claim and identify the original source supporting it.

CLAIM TO VERIFY

PRIMARY SOURCE / DATE

2. Five Principles of Responsible AI Grant Writing

Accuracy. Verify statistics, citations, eligibility statements, financial claims, and organizational history against reliable primary records.

Transparency. Follow each funder's applicable instructions regarding AI use, authorship, certifications, and disclosures. Do not imply work was performed or evidence collected when it was not.

Accountability. The applicant remains responsible for the submitted proposal and its representations. Assign named people to verify critical content.

Confidentiality. Before uploading client or applicant information, review the tool's data-handling terms and organizational policies. Avoid entering sensitive records into unapproved systems.

Human oversight. Qualified people must make decisions about eligibility, strategic fit, budgets, commitments, and final submission. A final approval is meaningful only when the reviewer has the information and authority to challenge the draft.

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Assign a named owner to each safeguard: fact-checking, disclosure, applicant approval, confidential-data handling, and final human authorization.

FIELD WORK / 04

FIVE-PRINCIPLE CHECK

Identify the weakest safeguard in your current AI-assisted workflow.

SAFEGUARD TO IMPROVE

RESPONSIBLE TEAM MEMBER

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

3. What AI Should and Should Not Do | Part One

Solicitation analysis: AI can create a preliminary requirements list; a human must confirm each item

against the original notice and amendments.

Needs statements: AI can help organize evidence; a human must confirm data, source dates, populations, and geographic relevance.

Project design: AI can suggest activities and outcomes; leadership must approve what the organization can realistically deliver.

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Create a two-column responsibility chart. For each AI-assisted task, name the human who will verify the output against primary documents.



HUMAN REVIEW / VERIFIED WORKFLOW

FIELD WORK / 05

TASK OWNERSHIP

Identify an AI-assisted task that must remain under human control.

AI-SUPPORTED TASK

HUMAN VERIFIER

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

3. What AI Should and Should Not Do | Part Two

Budget development: AI can help draft explanatory language and check arithmetic; responsible staff must validate costs, allowability, matching requirements, and the financial plan.

Editing and review: AI can flag inconsistencies or improve clarity; an independent reviewer must assess substance, responsiveness, and submission readiness.

Better prompting matters, but a good prompt is not a substitute for an evidence register, documented decisions, and human review.

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Before approving a budget narrative, reconcile every cost with the spreadsheet, funder allowability rules, and the applicant's actual capacity.

FIELD WORK / 06

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Select one proposed expense and validate the calculation and allowability.

BUDGET LINE ITEM

EVIDENCE OF ALLOWABILITY

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

4. Seven AI Mistakes That Can Jeopardize a

Proposal | Part One

1. Fabricated references: Never submit a citation without locating and reviewing its source.
2. Invented accomplishments: Distinguish completed work from planned activities, goals, and aspirations.
3. Unsupported outcome targets: Base performance measures on credible evidence and a feasible evaluation plan.
4. Misread requirements: Verify eligibility, mandatory forms, page limits, deadlines, and submission instructions in the official notice.

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Audit citations, organizational history, outcome targets, and solicitation requirements. Mark any unsupported assertion for correction or removal.



HUMAN REVIEW / VERIFIED WORKFLOW

FIELD WORK / 07

CLAIM AUDIT

Find a statement that could be mistaken for a verified fact.

CLAIM NEEDING PROOF

CORRECTION OR SOURCE

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

4. Seven AI Mistakes That Can Jeopardize a

Proposal | Part Two

5. Generic narratives: Respond directly to the funder's priorities and published evaluation criteria.

6. Unprotected sensitive information: Apply data minimization, permissions, and approved technology practices.

7. No independent final review: A polished draft may still contain substantive, administrative, and financial inconsistencies.

The remedy is not to avoid AI entirely. It is to build verification into each stage rather than relying on a last-minute proofreading pass.

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Replace generic language with verified local facts, protect sensitive data, and require an independent review before any AI-assisted submission.

FIELD WORK / 08

SAFE DRAFTING

Replace one generic claim with specific, documented applicant evidence.

GENERIC LANGUAGE

VERIFIED REPLACEMENT

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

5. Prompting AI Responsibly

An effective grant-development prompt defines the task, identifies the authoritative source material,

prohibits fabrication, and instructs the system to flag information gaps.

Sample prompt: "Using only the verified organizational information and source documents provided, draft

a needs statement aligned to the attached funding opportunity. Do not invent statistics, citations,

partnerships, accomplishments, or outcomes. Identify missing information explicitly. Distinguish verified

facts from proposed activities. Cite the source document and page for each material factual claim when possible."

Follow-up prompt: "Review this draft for unsupported assertions, internal inconsistencies, and requirements that need confirmation. Return a table showing the claim, source or requirement, risk, and recommended human verification action. Do not treat your own earlier output as evidence."

Keep a source register with document titles, dates, links, and responsible reviewers. If an AI tool cannot verify a fact, that is a request for human research, not permission to improvise.

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

In each prompt, specify the source documents, intended audience, prohibited assumptions, desired format, and instructions to flag missing evidence.



HUMAN REVIEW / VERIFIED WORKFLOW

FIELD WORK / 09

PROMPT LAB

Write a prompt that forbids invented details and flags evidence gaps.

APPROVED INPUT SOURCES

MISSING-DATA INSTRUCTION

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

6. Case Study: A Proposal That Looked Complete

Consider a fictional nonprofit seeking \$250,000 to expand youth workforce services. It uses AI to prepare a needs statement, program design, evaluation plan, and budget narrative.

The first draft appears strong. Yet the needs statement cites a study that cannot be located; the narrative describes an employer partnership that is not confirmed; the evaluation plan promises an 80% placement rate without a baseline; and the staffing described in the narrative does not match the budget.

The organization returns to its records, replaces unsupported claims, obtains written confirmation of partnerships, revises outcome targets, and reconciles staffing costs.

The revised proposal may be less dramatic, but it is more defensible. Responsible AI use improves the organization's ability to explain and deliver the commitments it makes.

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

For the fictional workforce proposal, separate verified facts from AI assumptions. Do not claim partners, placement rates, or capacity without proof.

FIELD WORK / 10

CASE STUDY REVIEW

Separate the workforce example's facts from its unverified assumptions.

VERIFIED FACT

ASSUMPTION TO REMOVE

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

7. The Responsible AI Grant Proposal Audit

A final audit should cover five dimensions: factual integrity (sources and claims); solicitation compliance (eligibility, forms, formatting, and deadlines); narrative consistency (activities, outcomes, timeline, and budget); organizational feasibility (capacity and resources); and submission readiness (approvals, registrations, attachments, and authorized submission).

An audit is more than editing. It tests whether the applicant can support, defend, and implement the proposal. No audit can guarantee acceptance or funding, and different funders have different administrative screening rules.

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Run three checks separately: compliance with instructions, evidence supporting the narrative, and operational readiness to deliver the proposed work.



HUMAN REVIEW / VERIFIED WORKFLOW

FIELD WORK / 11

THREE-PASS AUDIT

Run separate compliance, evidence, and delivery-feasibility checks.

MOST SERIOUS ISSUE

OWNER / CORRECTIVE ACTION

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

8. Putting Responsible AI Into Practice: CureAI's

Seven Phases | Part One

CureAI.biz presents a seven-phase proposal development discipline designed to work alongside existing AI drafting tools. The framework is relevant to grants, SBIR/STTR applications, federal contracts, and other proposal-based opportunities. The following phase names reflect the published CureAI methodology.

Phase 1 — Solicitation Intake & Compliance Matrix. Translate the official solicitation into a traceable requirements matrix, checking each requirement against the source. Responsible practice: verify, rather than merely summarize.

Phase 2 — Bid/No-Bid & Win Strategy. Evaluate strategic fit, capacity, and the rationale for pursuing the opportunity. Responsible practice: the pursuit decision belongs to people.

Phase 3 — Outline & Assignment. Map the proposal structure to evaluation criteria and identify who owns each section. Responsible practice: follow the funder's instructions, not a generic AI template.

Phase 4 — Drafting. Develop content using source-grounded inputs, identifying missing evidence instead of inventing it. Responsible practice: never fabricate organizational facts.

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

For Phases 1-3, confirm the solicitation and amendments, document the bid/no-bid rationale, and assign section owners with deadlines.

FIELD WORK / 12	PHASES 1-3 WORKSHEET
Document eligibility, bid/no-bid reasoning, and assigned proposal sections.	
DECISION RATIONALE	
ASSIGNED SECTION OWNER	
CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON	
☐ Source or decision documented	☐ Human owner identified

8. Putting Responsible AI Into Practice: CureAI's

Seven Phases | Part Two

Phase 5 — Consistency Check. Review terminology, commitments, work plans, outcomes, and budget

alignment across the complete submission. Responsible practice: verify the proposal tells one coherent

story.

Phase 6 — Human Review. Conduct an independent, evaluator-focused review of quality and

responsiveness. Responsible practice: preserve substantive human judgment.

Phase 7 — Pre-Submission Disqualification Audit. Check applicable administrative and documented screening risks such as registrations, identifiers, mandatory attachments, and other submission conditions. Responsible practice: confirm requirements immediately before submission.

Phase 6 asks whether the proposal is persuasive, credible, and responsive. Phase 7 asks whether avoidable submission and administrative issues remain. Neither phase guarantees that a funder will accept or award an application.

Explore the framework: <https://cureai.biz>

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

For Phases 4-7, track source-backed drafting, reconcile cross-section claims, obtain independent human review, and clear disqualification risks.



HUMAN REVIEW / VERIFIED WORKFLOW

FIELD WORK / 13

PHASES 4-7 WORKSHEET

Document drafting evidence, consistency checks, and independent sign-off.

UNRESOLVED REVIEW ISSUE

FINAL REVIEWER

Conclusion: Innovation and Integrity Belong

Together

AI will continue to reshape proposal development. Speed can be valuable, but speed is not evidence of quality. Applicants still need sound strategy, credible sources, realistic commitments, and a reliable review process.

Responsible AI use means treating technology as a capable assistant within a system of professional accountability. It is not a single prompt or a final proofreading step.

Use AI to improve the process. Use professional judgment to protect the promise.

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Adopt a final-approval rule: no proposal leaves the organization until a responsible person has reviewed its evidence, promises, and certifications.

FIELD WORK / 14

RELEASE GATE

Define what must be true before an AI-assisted proposal may be submitted.

NON-NEGOTIABLE GATE

AUTHORIZED APPROVER

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

The Evidence Register

For each material claim, record the exact statement, original document, publication date, page or URL,

and reviewer. A source register turns an AI draft into a traceable working document.

Check that the source actually supports the claim. A real citation can still be used inaccurately if the population, time period, or meaning is different.

When information cannot be verified, replace it with a clearly identified research question or remove it.

Never ask AI to create a plausible substitute.

Worksheet: Claim: _____ Source: _____ Page: _____ Reviewer: _____ Status: _____

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Maintain an evidence register with claim, source, date, document location, verification status, reviewer, and unresolved issue for each material fact.



HUMAN REVIEW / VERIFIED WORKFLOW

FIELD WORK / 15

EVIDENCE REGISTER

Create a traceable entry for one numerical or factual assertion.

CLAIM / SOURCE / DATE

REVIEWER / STATUS

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

Ethical Needs Statements

A needs statement must distinguish community conditions from the organization's assumptions. Use current, geographically relevant data and explain limitations.

AI can propose a logical structure: who is affected, what barrier exists, why it matters, and how the proposed project addresses it. Human research must supply the evidence.

Avoid presenting a national trend as proof of local conditions. Confirm definitions, collection dates, and comparisons before using percentages.

Review question: Would an independent reader be able to find and understand the original source behind every major statistic?

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Label each needs-statement figure with its source, year, population, and geography. Explain gaps instead of inventing data to fill them.

FIELD WORK / 16

NEEDS STATEMENT

Test whether a cited statistic matches the proposed service population.

STATISTIC AND YEAR

GEOGRAPHY / POPULATION

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

Budget and Narrative Reconciliation

The project budget is a mathematical expression of the work plan. Each staffing role, activity, service, and cost must have a coherent basis.

Use AI to identify mismatches between a budget narrative and spreadsheet, but validate calculations in

the actual financial model and confirm the funder's cost rules.

Keep written assumptions for rates, quantities, allocation, matching funds, and indirect costs. Different

funders apply different requirements.

Review question: Can the finance lead reconstruct each material line item without relying on AI-generated explanations?

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Cross-check personnel, activities, quantities, indirect costs, match, and project dates between the budget, narrative, and required forms.



HUMAN REVIEW / VERIFIED WORKFLOW

Verify that staffing, timing, and cost assumptions match the narrative.

NARRATIVE COMMITMENT

MATCHING BUDGET LINE

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

Outcome Targets and Measurement

AI may suggest ambitious performance targets that are not supported by program history or resources.

Proposed outcomes should be approved by those responsible for delivery.

Separate outputs, such as participants served, from outcomes, such as a measured improvement in employment or skills. State the baseline, target, instrument, and timing.

Do not invent previous results to justify future targets. If the project is new, explain the basis for estimates and identify uncertainties.

Review question: Does the budget provide sufficient resources to collect the promised performance data?

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

For every outcome, document its baseline, target, measurement method, data source, reporting frequency, and person accountable for tracking.

Turn an outcome statement into a measurable, documented target.

BASELINE AND TARGET

MEASUREMENT SOURCE

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

Partnerships and Letters of Support

A prospective partnership is not a confirmed partnership. AI-generated language should not convert outreach discussions into commitments.

Keep signed letters, memoranda, or written confirmations that match the activities described in the application. Confirm who is authorized to speak for each partner.

Where a partner's role remains uncertain, label the activity contingent or revise the proposal so it does not depend on an unconfirmed commitment.

Review question: Can each partnership claim be supported by an appropriately authorized source?

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Do not describe a partner as committed without written confirmation. Match each letter of support to the role and resources promised in the narrative.

FIELD WORK / 19

PARTNER VALIDATION

Verify a collaborator's role before describing it as committed.

PARTNER CONTRIBUTION

WRITTEN CONFIRMATION

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

Protecting Client and Applicant Data

Grant files may contain personal information, confidential pricing, unpublished research, and sensitive organizational plans. Treat uploads to AI systems as data-sharing decisions.

Review approved platforms, access controls, retention terms, and contractual restrictions. Use redaction or minimal excerpts when full documents are unnecessary.

Create an internal policy for what can be uploaded, who may approve exceptions, and where generated outputs are stored.

Review question: Would the applicant authorize every item of information placed into the tool?

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Classify documents before using AI tools. Remove unnecessary personal data and use only systems approved for the applicant's confidentiality needs.



HUMAN REVIEW / VERIFIED WORKFLOW

FIELD WORK / 20

DATA PROTECTION

Identify information that should never enter an unapproved AI system.

SENSITIVE DATA CATEGORY

APPROVED HANDLING METHOD

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

Prompt Library: Drafting

Evidence-first prompt: Using only the attached verified materials, draft the requested section. Do not invent statistics, citations, partners, accomplishments, or outcomes. Mark missing information as **NEEDS VERIFICATION**.

Alignment prompt: Map each paragraph to the funder's evaluation criterion and identify where evidence or responsiveness is missing. Quote the controlling requirement rather than paraphrasing it from memory.

Style prompt: Improve clarity and remove repetition without changing factual claims, numerical values, commitments, or cited sources. List substantive edits separately.

A strong prompt is not a substitute for independent review.

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Use an evidence-first drafting prompt: restrict AI to approved materials, prohibit invented details, and request a list of information gaps.

FIELD WORK / 21

EVIDENCE-FIRST PROMPT

Set clear limits on what an AI tool may infer or draft.

ALLOWED SOURCE SET

PROHIBITED ASSUMPTIONS

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

Prompt Library: Independent Review

Compliance prompt: Compare the proposal against the official solicitation. Return a table of requirement, source location, draft location, potential gap, and human verification step.

Consistency prompt: Identify contradictory staffing counts, dates, targets, budget figures, geographic areas, and partnership claims across the package.

Evidence prompt: Flag claims without clear supporting sources and explain what record would be needed to substantiate each one.

Do not treat an AI system's earlier answers as evidence that its current answers are correct.

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Ask an independent reviewer to test compliance, traceability, internal consistency, and feasibility. Require issue-by-issue resolutions.



HUMAN REVIEW / VERIFIED WORKFLOW

FIELD WORK / 22

INDEPENDENT REVIEW

Assign an independent reviewer and document one issue to resolve.

REVIEW FINDING

RESOLUTION / OWNER

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

Case Study: Before and After

Before: A fictional workforce grant draft promises 80% placement, cites a study that cannot be located, and lists an employer partner without written confirmation.

Review: The team checks the data, replaces the citation, contacts the prospective partner, and adjusts the outcome target based on realistic capacity.

After: The proposal uses traceable evidence, accurately describes confirmed relationships, and reconciles activities with staffing and costs.

The revised proposal may be less dramatic, but it is more credible and defensible.

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Rewrite the fictional proposal using a verified baseline, a defensible target, a documented partner role, and citations that can be retrieved.

FIELD WORK / 23

REVISE THE CASE

Improve a fictional claim with a defensible target and retrievable source.

ORIGINAL UNSUPPORTED CLAIM

VERIFIED REVISION

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

Human Review Protocol

Assign an independent reviewer who did not draft the full proposal.

Provide the solicitation, scoring

criteria, source register, and current budget.

Ask the reviewer to evaluate responsiveness, feasibility, factual integrity, clarity, and whether the project

design can reasonably produce its promised results.

Record comments, responsible owners, changes made, and unresolved risks. A sign-off should represent

substantive review, not merely a quick reading.

Review question: Who has authority to stop submission if a material problem remains?

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Record reviewer names, approval dates, outstanding risks, and final sign-off. Confirm the authorized submitter has cleared every mandatory item.



HUMAN REVIEW / VERIFIED WORKFLOW

FIELD WORK / 24

FINAL AUTHORIZATION

Capture the final review decision and any outstanding submission risks.

OUTSTANDING RISK

REVIEWER / APPROVAL DATE

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

Resources and About the Author

Official source: The funder's current solicitation, amendments, and application instructions always control.

Grants.gov: grants.gov. Uniform Guidance: 2 CFR Part 200, where applicable.

NIST AI Risk Management Framework: NIST AI RMF.

Author: Denise B. Lawrence is a grant development strategist and educator and founder of Denise B. Lawrence & Associates, LLC and For-Profit Grants.

Presented by CureAI.biz: Learn about its seven-phase proposal development methodology at cureai.biz.

Educational guide only; no compliance or funding guarantee. © 2026 Denise B. Lawrence.

PRACTICAL TAKEAWAY

Keep the official solicitation as the controlling source. Use the guide as a workflow aid, not as a substitute for funder rules or legal advice.

FIELD WORK / 25

NEXT-STEP PLAN

Choose one practice from this guide to implement on your next proposal.

FIRST ACTION

OWNER / TARGET DATE

CHECK BEFORE MOVING ON

☐ Source or decision documented

☐ Human owner identified

SEVEN-PHASE VERIFICATION WORKSHEET

Part A / Mark each check only after inspecting the supporting evidence.

PHASE 01 Solicitation Intake & Compliance Matrix

- ☐ Confirm the current solicitation, amendments, eligibility rules, and due date against the official source.
- ☐ Map every mandatory instruction, attachment, page limit, and evaluation criterion to a proposal owner.

Reviewer notes / evidence ID: _____

PHASE 02 Bid/No-Bid & Win Strategy

- ☐ Document eligibility, capacity, strategic fit, and the evidence supporting a bid decision.
- ☐ Validate the proposed differentiators, partner roles, and competitive claims before relying on them.

Reviewer notes / evidence ID: _____

PHASE 03 Outline & Assignment

- ☐ Link each outline section to a funder requirement and named responsible contributor.
- ☐ Identify evidence gaps and establish deadlines for source verification and internal review.

Reviewer notes / evidence ID: _____

PHASE 04 Drafting

- ☐ Check that organizational history, performance metrics, citations, and quotations are supported.
- ☐ Ensure AI-assisted language accurately reflects the applicant's own voice, commitments, and capabilities.

Reviewer notes / evidence ID: _____

SEVEN-PHASE VERIFICATION WORKSHEET

Part B / Complete the remaining checks and authorize the final decision.

PHASE 05 Consistency Check

- ☐ Reconcile objectives, activities, staffing, outcomes, timeline, and budget across all sections.
- ☐ Check that numbers, partner descriptions, terminology, and attachments agree throughout.

Reviewer notes / evidence ID: _____

PHASE 06 Human Review

- ☐ Assign a qualified human reviewer to challenge unsupported claims and assess responsiveness.
- ☐ Record corrections, unresolved risks, and explicit approval by the accountable proposal lead.

Reviewer notes / evidence ID: _____

PHASE 07 Pre-Submission Disqualification Audit

- ☐ Verify registrations, certifications, signatures, forms, file naming, and upload requirements.
- ☐ Confirm all mandatory items are complete and the authorized submitter approves final release.

Reviewer notes / evidence ID: _____

FINAL HUMAN AUTHORIZATION

Proposal / opportunity: _____

Lead reviewer: _____ Review date: _____

Unresolved issues / exceptions: _____

- ☐ All mandatory requirements independently verified
- ☐ Authorized human approves release for submission

Authorization signature: _____ Date: _____