

## Verify vs. traditional multilingual-content workflows

Dimension		Traditional workflow	Verify
© Speed to publish		Linear hand-offs; queues and re- reviews stretch timelines.	Al translate → instant quality score; only low-confidence segments go to humans.
Cost model		Mostly per-word (plus rush fees for tight deadlines).	Usage-based AI tokens; spend human verification only where needed.
Quality visibility		No objective, pre-publish quality signal. (Relies on reviewer judgment.)	Built-in quality evaluation on every file/segment.
<b>A</b> Human involvement		Blanket human review across whole files to manage risk.	Targeted human verification triggered by rules/thresholds.
<b>Pa Automation</b>		Email and portal steps; manual routing and follow-ups.	Orchestrate no-code workflows; condition-based routing.
Example Workflows			
Simple & Fast: Perfect for campaign content where speed matters most.			ontent where speed matters most.
		Translate → Quality Check ←	d or above  Return to me to publish  Quality Boost
Quality-Driven: Ideal for regulated industries or sensitive messaging.			
Transla		te $\longrightarrow$ Quality Check $\longrightarrow$	f Good or above  Ality Boost → Send for Human Review  Return to me to publish
	Cost-Controlled: Designed for teams under strict budget oversight.		ns under strict budget oversight.
		Translate → Quality Check → Qual	ity Boost → Return to me to publish
ట్ Collaboration		Reviews in email/doc attachments; version chasing.	Collaborate: shared editor, segment-level edits and assignments.
Where work happens		Mostly in vendor portals and inboxes.	Native apps for Slack and Microsoft Teams; status and actions in-channel.
<b>⊖</b> Security posture		Varies by vendor; generic web tools can expose data.	Closed-loop, Straker-hosted Al stack for sensitive content.
<b> </b>		Throughput constrained by human capacity/time zones.	100–120+ language pairs and batch uploads designed for volume.
☐ Governance & repeatability		SOPs live in docs; hard to enforce.	Reusable, auditable workflows and usage reporting.

Traditional multilingual-content workflows depend on people for every step, which creates delays, variability, and hidden coordination costs – from timezone waits to quote negotiations and re-reviews.

Verify blends Al speed with human oversight and, crucially, tells you how good the output is before you publish.

That addresses two of the biggest objections to Al that teams raise internally: "Can we trust the quality?" and "Will we still be in control?"



