



WikiSure Use Case Map

What's Evidenced, What's Plausible, What's Vision

Version 1.0 — June 2026

Sales / Investor Appendix — Supporting Material

Core pitch: AI Governance, Compliance, and Regulatory Meaning Conflicts (Tier 1). This document shows why that beachhead can grow into a larger infrastructure category — it does not replace or widen the core pitch itself.

Prepared by SynsureTech

Looked at as just a definition registry, WikiSure seems narrow. Looked at as infrastructure for figuring out which meaning governs in a given context, a much wider set of use cases opens up. Not all of them carry the same weight of evidence, though, and this document tries to be honest about which is which.

The Core Finding, Restated

Earlier versions of this argument leaned on a clean, singular claim: that the problem is never meaning, only applicability. The evidence from the Coverage, Risk, and Customer investigations doesn't back that up. What it supports instead is narrower, and harder to knock down:

- Genuine meaning conflicts exist. Sometimes two authoritative sources are pointing at different things entirely, not just looking at the same thing from different angles.
- Legitimate applicability variation exists too. Sometimes the same concept is correctly bound to different evaluation frames for different, equally valid purposes.
- Most organizations have no reliable way to tell the two apart.
- That inability is what actually produces conflicting decisions, inconsistent data, and unreliable AI output — not meaning variation by itself.

Every use case below gets read through this corrected lens, not the simpler one this work started with.

TIER 1 — EVIDENCED TODAY

Directly supported by the Coverage, Risk, and Customer investigations. These are the use cases WikiSure can argue for today, with public, falsification-tested evidence behind them.

1. AI Governance & the EU AI Act

Most conversations about AI reliability focus on hallucination. In many organizations, the failure happens a step earlier: a model is handed a term — Customer, Risk, Claim, Coverage, Exposure — and no one has specified which authorized meaning should govern. Before any AI workflow runs, WikiSure can identify the terms in play, resolve the authorized meaning, attach provenance, and surface unresolved ambiguity rather than silently picking one sense. This reduces hallucination-adjacent failures and, separately, the governance exposure that follows from acting on an unverified meaning.

Directly evidenced: the Customer investigation showed that an AI system defaults to whichever sense dominated its training data — typically the CRM sense — even when accounting, privacy, or compliance obligations require a different one.

2. Compliance & Audit

Auditors routinely ask which definition was used for a given decision. The honest answer, most of the time, is whatever the team happened to know at the time — not a documented, approved source. WikiSure provides versioning, governance history, approvals, and provenance, making it possible to show which meaning applied, when, and under whose authority.

Directly evidenced: the Risk investigation found that NAIC, ISO 31000, and IRMI never cross-reference each other — there is no audit trail showing which of three legitimate senses governed a given judgment.

3. Regulatory Translation

Particularly relevant for insurance, banking, and pharma. EIOPA, BaFin, Solvency II, and IFRS frequently use overlapping vocabulary with different scope and legal force. WikiSure can resolve and compare these regulatory meaning spaces explicitly, rather than leaving the mapping to whoever last reconciled two filings by hand.

Directly evidenced: the Risk investigation found a clean applicability split between ISO 31000's general definition and the Solvency II SCR module structure — same root concept, different regulatory aggregation frame.

TIER 2 — PLAUSIBLE EXTENSION

Logically consistent with the evidence, and likely true — but the current public investigations were not run in these domains. These should be argued with appropriate hedging, not presented as already proven.

4. M&A / Post-Merger Integration

One of the largest hidden cost centers in mergers: the same terms — Customer, Policy, Revenue, Product, Active User — mean different things in each organization. Two companies often believe they are comparing the same numbers. Frequently, they are not. WikiSure could map meanings across both organizations and surface where the divergence is a real conflict versus a difference the combined entity can simply govern explicitly going forward.

Plausible, not yet evidenced: no M&A-specific public investigation has been run; the inference is drawn from the Customer investigation's general pattern, not from merger data.

5. Enterprise Architecture

Enterprise architects spend enormous effort connecting systems. The technical mapping is often the easy part. The meaning mapping — confirming that two systems mean the same thing by a shared field name — usually is not. WikiSure could sit alongside business glossaries, reconcile system-level terms, and make the downstream impact of a definition change visible before it breaks something.

Plausible, not yet evidenced: directionally consistent with the Coverage investigation's finding that a single, agreed term can still produce divergent legitimate use across systems.

6. Data Governance & Data Quality

Many data quality problems are, underneath, meaning problems. “What counts as a customer,” “what counts as an active contract,” “when is something considered closed” are answered differently by different teams — and not always because anyone is wrong. Some of these are genuine conflicts that need a governance decision. Others are legitimate, purpose-driven variations that a single canonical answer would actually break. WikiSure could function as a semantic layer over existing data catalogs that classifies which is which, rather than forcing every divergence toward one definition.

Plausible, evidenced pattern but not evidenced domain: this is the corrected framing — the original version of this use case implied every divergence was a quality defect to fix, which the Customer investigation's ASC 606 / HubSpot pairing directly contradicts.

7. Contract Analysis

Genuinely promising. Many contract disputes are not disputes over facts — they are disputes over how a term was meant. WikiSure could extract defined terms from contract text, compare them against governed meaning spaces, and flag both outright conflicts and places where two readings are each defensible, so a reviewer knows which kind of problem they are looking at before a dispute escalates.

Plausible, not yet evidenced: consistent with the Totalschaden applicability matrix (BGH case law vs. GDV Kasko model wording), but that artifact is explicitly framed as category evidence, not contract-AI evidence.

TIER 3 — STRATEGIC VISION

Interesting, directionally consistent with the underlying thesis, and currently better suited to a white paper appendix or research agenda than to a sales conversation. No case material yet supports these as argued use cases.

8. Knowledge Management

Most wikis store what an organization knows. WikiSure stores which meaning is authorized. “What do we know” and “which meaning governs” are different questions, and most knowledge management tooling is built to answer only the first one.

Vision: a reframing of the category, not yet a demonstrated use case with its own evidence base.

9. Multi-Agent AI Systems

A likely growth area over the next several years. When an underwriting agent, a claims agent, a compliance agent, and a legal agent operate together, exchanging information is not sufficient — they need to either share the same understanding of a term or know explicitly that they don't. WikiSure could function as the shared semantic reference layer those agents query.

Vision: directionally implied by the Classification architecture (Section 6.2 of the WikiSure Architecture White Paper), but no multi-agent deployment evidence exists yet.

10. Semantic Debt Management

Likely the largest long-term category. Organizations already manage technical debt, data debt, and security debt as named, measured categories. Semantic debt — the accumulated, unmanaged cost of unresolved meaning divergence — is not yet managed as one, anywhere. This is where WikiSure's differentiation from glossaries and data catalogs is sharpest, because neither of those tools was built to measure this at all.

Vision: the strongest long-term differentiation, and the most appendix-appropriate claim in this document — it describes a category that does not yet exist as a managed practice, anywhere, in any organization.

The Long-Term Reframe

The Coverage, Risk, and Customer investigations point at something larger than any single use case above. The actual problem is usually not meaning variation alone, but the inability to distinguish a genuine meaning conflict from a legitimate applicability variation. It is the absence of a mechanism that can first determine whether a divergence is a real conflict at all, and only then — if it is not — determine which interpretation applies for a given purpose.

An earlier version of this argument reached for a DNS analogy: WikiSure as infrastructure that resolves a name to the one correct address, the way DNS resolves a domain to an IP. That analogy no longer fits what the evidence shows. DNS presupposes a single authoritative answer waiting to be found. The Coverage and Customer investigations show the opposite: the same query can legitimately have more than one correct answer at once, depending on purpose — and treating that as an error to be resolved away would destroy a distinction organizations actually depend on.

The more accurate description: WikiSure is not a layer that tells people, systems, and AI the one right meaning. It is a layer that first establishes whether two diverging answers are a genuine contradiction or two legitimate answers to two different questions — and only resolves “which one applies here” once that prior question has been answered.

Related Materials

WikiSure Architecture White Paper, Section 2 (Public Evidence) — the Coverage, Risk, and Customer investigations referenced throughout this document, with full source citations. Tier 1 use cases above are read directly off that evidence; Tier 2 and Tier 3 are not.

MeaningRoom Applicability Matrix series (Category Evidence Artifacts) — independent illustrative evidence pieces, published separately under MeaningRoom, that extend the same Meaning Conflict / Applicability Variation distinction into additional domains.