FICTIONAL SAMPLE - NO REAL COMPANY, PROJECT OR EVIDENCE

Evidence Workflow Diagnostic

Fictional example of the customer deliverable

This sample demonstrates the intended report structure only. Names, figures, documents, findings, dates and requirements are invented. It is not a compliance audit, certification, legal opinion or live mobilisation decision.

Sample control	Value
Client	Northbridge Construction Ltd - fictional
Project	Riverside Civic Renewal - fictional
Date	7 September 2026
Status	Illustrative sample only

1. Management summary

The fictional review examined how subcontractor insurance evidence moves from submission to a mobilisation recommendation. The observed process contains committed staff and several useful controls, but requirement ownership, exclusion review and exception reasoning are inconsistent. The sample therefore recommends a limited pilot rather than a broad platform deployment.

Finding position	Count	Interpretation
High-priority workflow findings	3	Ownership, exclusions and exceptions need defined controls.
Medium-priority findings	2	Expiry and naming create avoidable rework.
Unknowns	2	Current evidence could not establish the answer.
Supported controls	6	Existing practices can be retained in the pilot.

Illustrative baseline - not an industry benchmark

Measure	Fictional baseline	Evidence quality
Median review time	42 minutes per document set	Estimated from five reconstructed examples
Follow-up messages	3.1 per document set	Measured in fictional sample
Exception reasons retrievable	2 of 6	Observed
Point-in-time decision reproducible	1 of 5	Observed
Expiry alerts	Monthly spreadsheet review	Interview-confirmed

2. Current-state workflow

Stage	Owner	Input/system	Observed control	Issue
Request	Package manager	Email checklist	Standard request template	Project variations added informally
Receive	Project administrator	Shared mailbox	Files saved to project folder	Naming inconsistent
Review	Compliance coordinator	PDF plus spreadsheet	Dates and limits checked	Exclusions depend on reviewer experience
Exception	Contracts manager	Email/telephone	Senior involvement	Reason not consistently recorded
Decision	Project lead	Spreadsheet status	Named approver	Evidence/rule snapshot not preserved
Monitor	Administrator	Monthly tracker	Expiry column	No event-linked re-review

Control boundary

The Diagnostic describes the workflow observed within the fictional sample. It does not determine whether Northbridge Construction Ltd complies with law, contract or insurance requirements.

3. Findings register

ID	Finding	Status	Priority	Evidence
D-01	Project-specific insurance requirements are not captured in one approved source.	PARTIAL	High	Workshop plus three sample requests
D-02	Exclusions are reviewed, but escalation depends on individual experience.	PARTIAL	High	Interviews and sample notes
D-03	Exception approval exists without a mandatory structured reason.	NOT OBSERVED	High	Six fictional exception records
D-04	Expiry is monitored monthly rather than by event.	SUPPORTED with limitation	Medium	Tracker and interview
D-05	File naming does not consistently identify version.	PARTIAL	Medium	Fictional folder sample
D-06	Who owns requirement updates could not be established.	UNKNOWN	Medium	Conflicting interviews
D-07	Decision history can be reconstructed for older cases.	UNKNOWN	High	Only one complete case located

4. Recommended corrective actions

Action	Owner	Timing	Closure evidence
Create one project requirement register with owner and version.	Customer commercial/compliance owner	Before pilot intake	Approved register
Define exclusion review and escalation triggers.	Customer insurance specialist	Before pilot rules	Approved decision table
Require reason, authority and conditions for every exception.	Customer decision owner	Pilot configuration	Exception template
Introduce evidence ID and version naming.	Project administrator	Immediate	Naming standard plus sample
Assign requirement-change owner and notification route.	Customer governance owner	Before monitoring	Role assignment

5. Proposed founding pilot

Element	Fictional proposal
Boundary	One project; public-liability insurance schedules only
Population	10-25 subcontractors
Duration	6 weeks after approved requirements and secure environment
Method	Cited extraction, versioned rules, explicit unknowns and customer-owned decisions
Measures	Review time, follow-up rate, unknown resolution, decision reconstruction and reviewer agreement
Stop conditions	Unapproved requirement, uncontrolled evidence transfer, unsupported reviewer role or tenant/security failure
Decision	Proceed only after customer approves scope, security and requirement sources

Customer decision

Fictional management decision: consider a bounded pilot after D-01 to D-03 have approved owners. This is not an approval to mobilise any subcontractor.