

FICTIONAL / TEACHING EXAMPLE

See the client output and the work behind it

Prepared teaching draft · CV07 excerpt, 5 October 2026. Larch, the participants and the case are fictional. This extract illustrates an advisory evidence-to-decision method. The original report derives from a dated model drafting run; the reviewer return and revision are separately scripted teaching material. It is not an installed system, professional approval or a client outcome.

The decision the client pays to make

Should a components business test a local replacement-part offer for non-critical processing components, and what buyer conditions should a pilot require?

The teaching case uses eight invented interview notes. It compares no launch, a broad speed-led launch and a bounded compatibility-led pilot. It does not establish market size or population-level demand.

The completed report excerpt

Finding 1 — Trial depends on approval and the current alternative. A maintenance manager would consider a trial only with engineering compatibility sign-off. A procurement lead reports that the incumbent delivered nine of ten orders within the agreed window. These accounts support examining approval conditions and incumbent performance; they do not establish a general unmet need. Sources: N01 and N02.

Finding 2 — Willingness differs by use case. A workshop lead would trial a documented substitute for low-risk fittings while retaining approved suppliers for safety-critical parts. Another operations manager reports no recent stockout. Trial interest is conditional, and urgency cannot be assumed across the market. Sources: N03 and N07.

Finding 3 — One premium purchase does not establish general willingness to pay. One repair buyer reports a single urgent purchase at a higher price. A distributor has no record linking faster delivery to switching, and another buyer has committed neither an order nor a premium. Sources: N06, N04 and N08.

Conditional recommendation: Consider a pilot of one non-critical component with willing sites, engineering compatibility review and a separate supplier-capability check. Do not justify it through a general switching or price-premium claim. No launch remains reasonable if qualification effort or capability makes a trial unattractive.

The notes are not transcripts or verified purchase records. Supplier capability, costs and a representative market sample remain absent. The recommendation is a teaching draft for review, not professionally accepted advice.

How the work reaches a reviewer

Step	Prepared work	Decision a person retains
Define the job	One decision question, method, included evidence and exclusions	Approve scope and the method
Organise evidence	Preserve each note, source ID and use condition	Decide whether sources are permissible and adequate
Prepare analysis	Compare approval, urgency, alternatives and pricing evidence	Challenge interpretation and missing evidence
Prepare the output	Findings, options, conditional recommendation and limits	Review the exact version before professional issue

Step	Prepared work	Decision a person retains
Handle a return	Keep the reason and revise the affected claims	Decide whether the revision addresses the return

In the separately scripted review example, a reviewer rejects an introduced general-switching claim and narrows the price interpretation. That return was authored for teaching; it is not an actual reviewer accepting this output, nor evidence that the original model draft made that error.

What this helps you examine

If your firm repeatedly turns qualitative evidence into client decisions, this is a specimen of the work an AI implementation could help prepare and check. It lets you inspect the output, trace its basis and consider the judgement you would retain before deciding whether to investigate your own service.

The method structure and checking questions are possible reusable components. Each new case still needs its own sources, use rights, interpretation and review. This example does not include a completed second engagement or measure reduced effort.

The accompanying reply supplies the single buyer question.

Source edition: Original CV07 teaching packet, Parts B and C; source IDs identify the fictional records. The separate interactive browser demonstration uses authored deterministic rules and current-session states. It does not run live AI or demonstrate client integration. The source edition's scenario fees and finance records are omitted; they are not Build n Bloom pricing.

This is a generic excerpt. No version of your firm's actual method, operating environment or client engagement has been designed here.

Prepared teaching draft · fictional case · not a client result, professional approval or price. Source edition:
<https://www.buildnbloom.io/downloads/firm-capacity/cv07-complete-engagement.md>