FICTIONAL SAMPLE - NO REAL COMPANY, PROJECT OR EVIDENCE

Managed Evidence Review

Fictional example of an evidence-status and customer-decision pack

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. Review boundary

Item	Fictional value
Customer decision owner	Morgan Hale, Commercial Director - fictional
Evidence subject	Apex Roofing Ltd - fictional
Document	Public Liability Policy Schedule v1 - fictional
Requirement set	Riverside Insurance Requirements v3 - fictional
Review question	What does the submitted evidence support before the customer decides on mobilisation?
Taltru boundary	Evidence findings and recommendation only; customer retains final decision

2. Evidence inventory

Evidence ID	Document	Date/expiry	Quality note
EV-001	Policy schedule v1	Issued 01 Jul 2026; expires 30 Jun 2027	Legible fictional schedule
EV-002	Broker email	02 Sep 2026	Mentions endorsement but does not attach it
EV-003	Project requirement register v3	Effective 15 Aug 2026	Customer-approved fictional source

This sample does not establish authenticity. A live service would apply the agreed verification process and record any limitations.

3. Findings

Rule question	Evidence finding	Status	Source
Named insured matches subcontractor	Apex Roofing Ltd appears as named insured.	SUPPORTED	EV-001, page 1
Public liability limit at least GBP 5m	Schedule shows GBP 5m.	SUPPORTED	EV-001, page 1
Policy current on review date	Expiry is after 7 Sep 2026.	SUPPORTED	EV-001, page 1
Hot works permitted for project activity	Schedule contains a hot-works exclusion relevant to roofing activity.	NOT SUPPORTED	EV-001, page 2
Endorsement removes or modifies exclusion	Broker email refers to an endorsement; endorsement not supplied.	UNKNOWN	EV-002
Exception authorised by customer	No exception decision was included in the review population.	UNKNOWN	Inventory reconciliation

Result summary

Supported	Not supported	Unknown	Human review
3	1	2	Required before customer decision

Taltru recommendation

Hold the evidence review open. Request the referenced endorsement or written clarification from an authorised source. If the exclusion remains, escalate to the customer decision owner under the approved exception process. Taltru does not decide whether Apex Roofing may mobilise.

4. Corrective actions

ID	Action	Owner	Due	Closure evidence
CA-01	Provide the referenced endorsement.	Fictional subcontractor	10 Sep 2026	Endorsement document
CA-02	Confirm approved hot-works requirement and activity scope.	Customer requirement owner	10 Sep 2026	Signed requirement clarification
CA-03	If still conflicting, record customer exception/hold/reject decision and reason.	Customer decision owner	12 Sep 2026	Signed decision record

5. Human review and customer decision

Record	Fictional entry
Taltru reviewer	Jordan Vale - fictional reviewer
Reviewer position	Evidence is insufficient to establish that the project hot-works requirement is supported.
Second review	Required because the issue affects a material insurance condition.
Customer decision	HOLD - pending CA-01 and CA-02
Customer decision owner	Morgan Hale - fictional
Reason	The policy exclusion is relevant and the referenced endorsement is absent.
Effective date	7 September 2026
Re-review trigger	Receipt of endorsement or approved requirement clarification

6. Decision history

Time	Actor	Event	Preserved reference
09:10	Taltru intake	Three fictional records reconciled.	Inventory v1
09:35	Extraction review	Limit, expiry and exclusion cited.	EV-001 extraction v1
10:05	Rule evaluation	Three supported, one not supported, two unknown.	Requirement set v3
10:30	Taltru reviewer	Hold recommendation recorded.	Review note v1
11:15	Customer owner	HOLD decision recorded.	Customer decision v1

Integrity statement

In this fictional sample the history is illustrative. A production service must use a verified server-authoritative record, controlled access, correction history and independent security review before claiming tamper-evidence.

7. Closure status

Control	Status
Population reconciled	Yes - fictional
Unknowns disclosed	Yes
Customer decision separated from Taltru recommendation	Yes
Corrective owners assigned	Yes
Source evidence deletion/retention	Pending customer schedule
Review closed	No - re-review trigger outstanding