

# Recall is a proposal

Kenneth Pernyér, Reflective Labs  
Stockholm, Sweden

kenneth.pernyer@reflective.se · reflective.se · ORCID 0009-0006-4543-1156

Retrieval-augmented generation solved the wrong half of the memory problem. It made relevant text available to a model; it did not make the retrieved text accountable, and in the standard arrangement the retrieved passage is concatenated into a prompt where it is indistinguishable from instruction. This paper describes Mnemos, the memory extension of our convergence substrate, which takes the opposite position: a recalled item is a *proposal*, carrying its provenance, subject to the same promotion gate as any other proposal, and incapable of becoming a fact without passing it. Two consequences follow. The first is a security property that falls out of the architecture rather than being added to it: retrieved text cannot acquire authority, so indirect prompt injection reaches the context as an attributed proposal that policy may refuse. The second is a retrieval result. Mnemos ranks vector similarity and BM25 separately and merges the *rankings* by reciprocal rank fusion rather than merging the scores, and we show why this is not a tuning preference: the two scores live on incomparable scales, and rank fusion is invariant under any monotone rescaling of either, which score fusion is not. We close on the tension we have not resolved — an append-only substrate and a memory that must forget are not obviously compatible, and we state the problem rather than claim it solved.

## 1. Introduction

An organization's memory is not a document store. It is the set of things the organization can be held to having known, which is a stronger and more uncomfortable notion. A retrieval system that returns a relevant passage has answered a question about similarity; a memory that an institution can rely on must also answer *where did this come from*, *who may act on it*, and *what happens if it is wrong*.

The dominant pattern does not attempt this. Retrieval-augmented generation (Lewis et al., 2020) fetches passages and concatenates them into a prompt, where they sit alongside the system instruction and the user's request in one undifferentiated sequence of tokens. The model cannot tell retrieved evidence from retrieved instruction, because at that point there is no difference: everything is text in a context window. This is the mechanism behind indirect prompt injection (Greshake et al., 2023), and the reason it is hard to fix inside the pattern is that the pattern's whole idea is to erase the boundary that would have contained it.

Mnemos takes the position that recall is a proposal. A retrieved entry enters the shared context the same way any Suggestor's output enters it — as a typed proposal carrying the identity and version of its producer, the query it answered, and its provenance — and it becomes a fact only if the promotion gate of our substrate admits it (Pernyér, 2025a). Nothing that memory returns is load-bearing until the engine says so.

| Layer    | Owns                                                                             |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Converge | Context, proposals, facts, promotion, the Suggestor contract                     |
| Mnemos   | Storage, recall, ingestion, agentic memory, feedback learning, recall Suggestors |
| Product  | Which stores, tenancy, credentials, retention, deployment                        |

**Table 1** | The boundary. Mnemos never promotes and never decides; it proposes, and everything it proposes is attributed. Retention is deliberately a product concern — how long an organization may keep a fact is a legal question, not a retrieval one.

## 2. What memory owns

Converge owns governed promotion; Mnemos owns memory. The boundary is worth stating in the form the implementation enforces, because a memory layer is exactly the sort of component that accretes authority by accident.

Concretely, Mnemos contributes two Suggestors — one that retrieves and one that stores — a knowledge base with hybrid retrieval, embedding support, markdown and rich-media ingestion, a set of agentic memory modules, and a feedback and replay path. Its proposals carry a typed provenance marker, and every crossing of the Suggestor boundary is traced.

### 3. Two scales that cannot be averaged

The retrieval question Mnemos has to answer is mundane and its resolution is the most transferable thing in this paper. Semantic search finds passages that mean the same thing; lexical search finds passages that use the same words. An organizational memory needs both, because half of what an organization knows is carried in acronyms, product codes, ticket numbers and names that embeddings smooth away.

So run both and combine. The obvious combination — normalize the scores and take a weighted sum — is wrong, and it is wrong for the same reason the previous paper in this series gave for not averaging a solver’s certificate with a model’s probability. A BM25 score (Robertson and Zaragoza, 2009) is an unbounded term-weighting sum whose scale depends on the corpus statistics of the query terms. A cosine similarity is bounded in  $[-1, 1]$  and depends on the embedding model. There is no principled conversion between them, and any normalization imposes one by fiat.

Mnemos therefore fuses ranks, not scores. For a document  $d$  retrieved by systems  $R$ , with  $r_i(d)$  its one-based rank in system  $i$ ,

$$\text{RRF}(d) = \sum_{i \in R} \frac{1}{k + r_i(d)}, \quad k = 60, \quad (1)$$

following Cormack, Clarke and Buettcher (Cormack et al., 2009), from whom the constant also comes. The property that justifies this is not that it performs well, though it does; it is that it cannot be misled by the scales.

**Proposition (Scale invariance).** Let  $\varphi$  be any strictly increasing function. Replacing a retriever’s score  $s$  by  $\varphi(s)$  leaves every rank  $r_i(d)$  unchanged, and therefore leaves Eq. 1 unchanged. Score-weighted fusion has no such invariance: for a weighted sum  $\alpha s_1 + \beta s_2$ , a rescaling of  $s_1$  alone can reverse the induced order.

The proof is one line and appears in Appendix B; the content is in what it licenses. Because fusion is invariant to monotone rescaling, Mnemos can change embedding models, switch tokenizers, or re-index a corpus with different statistics without re-tuning a fusion weight. The retrieval quality changes; the combination rule does not need to.

The cost is equally clear and we do not hide it. Rank fusion discards *magnitude*: a document that is overwhelmingly the best lexical match and one that is marginally the best contribute the same  $\frac{1}{k+1}$ . Where the score gap is meaningful — a near-exact identifier match, say — RRF is throwing away information that a calibrated system could have used. We accept that trade because we do not believe our scores are calibrated, and a system that pretends otherwise is worse than one that declines to.

### 4. Recall as a proposal

A retrieval result in Mnemos is not injected anywhere. It is proposed.

The proposal carries the retrieving Suggestor’s identity and version, the query it answered, the entries it found with their fused ranks, and the provenance of each entry — which store, which ingestion, which source document. The promotion gate then applies the three checks of the substrate: is this Suggestor permitted to assert this fact type in this context, does the payload match its declared schema, and is confidence above the required threshold.

Three properties follow, and only the first is about retrieval.

**Attribution.** A fact derived from memory can always be traced to the entry it came from and the ingestion that created it. “Why did the system believe this?” terminates in a document, not in a context window.

**Refusability.** Policy can decline a recalled item for reasons that have nothing to do with relevance — tenancy, retention, jurisdiction, clearance. The gate already evaluates authority per proposal, so memory inherits authorization without implementing any.

**Injection containment.** This is the property we did not design for and value most. Suppose an ingested document contains text crafted to read as an instruction. Under the RAG pattern it arrives in the prompt with the same standing as the system’s own instructions. Under this pattern it arrives as a proposal from a memory Suggestor, attributed to a document, and it can become a fact only if a policy permits *that Suggestor to assert that fact type in that context*. The attack does not disappear — a malicious passage can still mislead a model that reads it — but it cannot escalate: text in the store has no path to authority that does not pass a gate that knows where the text came from.

**Proposition (No authority from ingestion).** For any entry  $e$  in the knowledge base and any fact  $f$  derived from  $e$ ,  $f \in K$  implies  $\gamma(p_f, K) = \text{promote}$  for the proposal  $p_f$  carrying  $e$ ’s provenance. There is no admission path for stored text that bypasses the gate, so authority over  $f$  is determined by policy over  $e$ ’s Suggestor and provenance, never by  $e$ ’s content.

The proposition is a restatement of the substrate’s promotion invariant, which is exactly the point: memory needed no new security mechanism, because the one that governs every other proposal already governs this one.

## 5. Agentic memory

Beyond the knowledge base, Mnemos carries a set of memory modules that record different things about a Formation’s history: *causal* memory, linking outcomes to what preceded them; *temporal* memory, ordering what was known when; *reflexion*, retaining what a previous attempt concluded about its own failure; *skill* memory, retaining procedures that worked; *session* memory, holding a working set; and *online* and *meta-learning* paths that adjust retrieval and weighting from feedback.

We are deliberately brief here, because this is the part of Mnemos with the weakest evaluation. The modules exist, they are exercised, and we cannot yet say which of them earns its complexity. The honest summary is that causal and temporal memory have paid for themselves in explaining why a Formation reached a conclusion, session memory is plainly useful, and we do not have evidence about the others.

### 5.1. Feedback must not become authority

Feedback collection, replay and batch learning close a loop: what was recalled, what was used, what turned out to be right. Those signals adjust retrieval priors — which stores to consult, how to weight recency, when to widen a query.

They adjust nothing else. The invariant established for the planning layer (Pernyér, 2025b) applies here unchanged and for the same reason: learning flows backward into recall, authority flows forward from policy, and the two channels never meet. A memory whose learned state could influence what is permitted would make the substrate’s fixed point a function of training history, and the determinism the whole stack rests on would quietly become conditional on what the system happened to have read.

## 6. The tension we have not resolved

The substrate is append-only: context only grows, which is what makes runs replayable and provenance total. Memory is the component for which that is least tenable. An organization’s knowledge base accumulates superseded prices, departed employees, cancelled contracts and documents it is legally obliged to delete, and a store that can only grow is not a memory but an archive with a search box.

Three mechanisms are in tension and we can state them precisely. *Monotonicity* requires that facts are never removed. *Correctness* requires that superseded knowledge stops being recalled as current. *Retention law* requires that some records are destroyed on request, entirely.

The current implementation resolves this outside the proof: retention and deletion are product concerns per Table 1, superseding is modelled as a new fact rather than an edit, and recall filters by validity interval rather than by deletion. This works and it is

not a theory. In particular, a deletion performed for legal reasons removes an object the substrate’s proofs quantify over, and we have no formal account of what a replay means afterwards.

**Open problem (Forgetting in a monotone substrate).** Give a semantics for deletion in an append-only context under which (i) replay of a run that read the deleted entry is well-defined, (ii) the ledger remains a complete record of what was decided, and (iii) the deleted content is genuinely unrecoverable. State whether the three are simultaneously satisfiable.

Our present belief, which we would like to be argued out of, is that (i) and (iii) are in genuine conflict and that the best available answer is a *tombstone with an attested hash*: replay can verify that something was read and what it was not, without being able to reconstruct what it was.

## 7. Limitations

Retrieval quality is not evaluated in this report. We give a fusion rule and an invariance argument for it; we do not give recall or precision numbers on a standard collection, and the reader should treat Section 3 as an argument about *which combination rule to use* rather than evidence about how well the system retrieves.

The default embedding path is a hash embedding, with a hosted model available. Hash embeddings are cheap, local and considerably worse; conclusions drawn on one do not transfer to the other, and the fusion argument is the only claim here that is indifferent to which is in use.

The constant  $k = 60$  in Eq. 1 is inherited from the literature (Cormack et al., 2009) and has not been tuned for organizational corpora, which are smaller and far more acronym-dense than the collections it was measured on.

Finally, the injection containment argument bounds *authority*, not *influence*. A malicious passage that reaches a language model’s input can still distort what that model proposes. What it cannot do is become a fact without an attributed proposal crossing a gate. We regard that as the containment worth having and not as a solution to the problem.

## 8. Conclusion

Memory in an agentic system is usually treated as a retrieval problem with an accountability afterthought. Inverting that — making recall a proposal, with provenance, subject to the same gate as everything else — costs very little and buys attribution, refusability and a containment property for injected content that no amount of prompt hardening provides.

The retrieval result is smaller and more portable: when two rankers disagree on scales that admit no conversion, fuse the ranks. It is invariant to every monotone rescaling of either input, which means it survives changing your embedding model on a Tuesday.

What remains open is the thing an archive never has to face and a memory always does. The substrate says nothing is ever removed. The law, and the truth, both say some things must be. We have an implementation that is defensible and a theory that is missing.

**Code and correspondence.** The work described here is implemented, not sketched. The source behind every claim in this paper — the engine, the extension, the fixtures and the tests that hold the invariants — can be shared on request, including the parts that did not work. Write to [kenneth.pernyer@reflective.se](mailto:kenneth.pernyer@reflective.se). We are equally interested in being told where the argument is wrong.

## References

- Cormack, G.V., Clarke, C.L.A., Buettcher, S., 2009. Reciprocal rank fusion outperforms Condorcet and individual rank learning methods. Proceedings of the 32nd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval 758–759.
- Greshake, K., Abdelnabi, S., Mishra, S., Endres, C., Holz, T., Fritz, M., 2023. Not what you've signed up for: Compromising real-world LLM-integrated applications with indirect prompt injection. Proceedings of the 16th ACM Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Security (AISec).
- Lewis, P., Perez, E., Piktus, A., Petroni, F., Karpukhin, V., Goyal, N., Küttler, H., Lewis, M., Yih, W.-tau, Rocktäschel, T., Riedel, S., Kiela, D., 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive NLP tasks. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS).
- Pernyer, K., 2025a. Proposal, gate, commitment: deterministic convergence as a substrate for organizational decisions. Reflective Labs technical report.
- Pernyer, K., 2025b. Institutionalized disagreement: how a plan earns the right to be run. Reflective Labs technical report.
- Robertson, S., Zaragoza, H., 2009. The probabilistic relevance framework: BM25 and beyond. Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval 3, 333–389.

## A. Retrieval, operationally

- M1 Store** KnowledgeStoreSuggestor proposes an entry for ingestion. The entry carries source, ingestion identity and time. Storing is itself a proposal and may be refused.
- M2 Retrieve** KnowledgeRetrievalSuggestor runs the vector and lexical retrievers, fuses ranks per [Eq. 1](#), and proposes the top entries with their provenance attached.
- M3 Hybrid weight** SearchOptions::hybrid( $w$ ) selects the mix; the fusion itself is rank-based regardless of  $w$ , which controls how many candidates each retriever contributes rather than how their scores are combined.
- M4 Provenance** Every proposal carries the Mnemos provenance marker, and every Suggestor-boundary crossing emits a trace span. A proposal without provenance is malformed and fails the schema check at the gate.
- M5 Feedback** Usage and outcome signals update retrieval priors only. No feedback path writes to policy or to any input of the authority computation.

## B. Two short proofs

### B.1. Scale invariance of rank fusion

Let retriever  $i$  produce scores  $s_i(d)$  and let  $\varphi$  be strictly increasing. Ranks are determined by the order of the scores, and a strictly increasing map preserves order:  $s_i(d) > s_i(d')$  if and only if  $\varphi(s_i(d)) > \varphi(s_i(d'))$ . Hence  $r_i(d)$  is unchanged for every  $d$ , and [Eq. 1](#) depends on the scores only through the ranks.

For the converse, take two documents with  $s_1 = (10, 9)$  and  $s_2 = (0, 8)$  and weights  $\alpha = \beta = 1$ . The weighted sums are 10 and 17, so the second document wins. Rescale  $s_1$  by  $\varphi(x) = 10x$ , which is strictly increasing and leaves both rankings untouched: the sums become 100 and 98, and the first document wins. The order induced by score fusion therefore depends on a choice that carries no information.

### B.2. No authority from ingestion

Let  $e$  be an entry and  $f$  a fact whose content derives from  $e$ . By the substrate's promotion invariant,  $f \in K$  only if some proposal  $p_f$  with  $f_{p_f} = f$  satisfied  $\gamma(p_f, K) = \text{promote}$  ([Pernyér, 2025a](#)). Mnemos constructs no other path into the context: its only write-side interface is the proposal, and the store is not itself part of the context. The gate evaluates  $\gamma$  on the proposal's declared Suggestor, version and provenance. Therefore the admissibility of  $f$  is a function of policy applied to  $e$ 's provenance and its proposing Suggestor, and is independent of  $e$ 's content except insofar as the schema check constrains its shape.