



INDEPENDENT EVIDENCE ASSURANCE | WORKED FICTIONAL EXAMPLE

Construction Change-Order Evidence Reconstruction

Illustrative matter: Tidewater Commercial Build LLC

Review subject: Riverton Mechanical Services

THE BUYER DECISION

What do the dated instructions, site logs, labour records and payment certificates establish about each claimed change?

ILLUSTRATIVE EVIDENCE POSITION

Segregate instructed, measured and unapproved work; send causation and legal entitlement to qualified specialists

DEMO REFERENCE	EVIDENCE DATE	STATUS
DEMO-09-2026-001	11 OCT 2026	ILLUSTRATIVE ONLY

Prepared for prospective US clients. No real client, counterparty or evidence packet.



Document control and limits of reliance

Aperture Research Works | Construction Change-Order Evidence Reconstruction | Demonstration Edition, 11 October 2026.

Control	Record
Matter reference	DEMO-09-2026-001
Scenario	Wholly fictional; invented organisations, documents, persons, dates and figures
Prepared for	General contractors, subcontractors and construction counsel
Evidence cut-off	11 October 2026 for public methodological references only; no target-specific sources retrieved
Approval status	Demonstration document. Human approval required before public release.
Professional boundary	No engineering certification, quantity surveyor opinion, delay expert determination or legal claims advice.

READ THIS FIRST: All MOCK exhibit labels and findings describe invented records created to show the investigation method. They are not allegations about, or findings concerning, any real person or entity.

The decision this work supports

A fictitious subcontractor demands change-order payment after an eight-week re-sequencing of HVAC installation. The general contractor argues that scope was already included and written approvals were not issued.

Central evidence question: What do the dated instructions, site logs, labour records and payment certificates establish about each claimed change?

Commercial moment: When changed work, approvals, time extensions or project payments are disputed

Economic context in the fictional case: \$186,000 claimed change-order adjustments



Executive position: what should change now?

Segregate instructed, measured and unapproved work; send causation and legal entitlement to qualified specialists.

The scenario illustrates why a clean-looking presentation is not a complete evidence basis. The purpose is to identify source-attributed decision issues early, distinguish conflicting explanations and direct additional work only where it changes the decision.

Three practical buyer benefits

- Match each cost to an instruction, date and work package.
- Expose duplicate items and weak approvals before negotiations.
- Deliver counsel and schedulers an organised event trail.

From a claim to decision-ready evidence



The evidence trail is part of the deliverable, not an invisible step.

Each claim is matched to an invented source object and tested for entity attribution, date, origin, contrary evidence, plausible alternatives and the specific document that would close the gap.

Finding classification used in this example

SUPPORTED means adequate evidence for the narrow stated point. QUALIFIED means partial support with a material limitation. MATERIAL CONFLICT or CONTRADICTED means the invented record contains an explicit inconsistency. UNRESOLVED and NOT ESTABLISHED are evidence insufficiency classifications, not findings of misconduct.



MATERIAL CONFLICT		3
QUALIFIED		3
UNRESOLVED		2
NOT ESTABLISHED		2

Claim-to-evidence matrix

All rows below are constructed data, not actual research results. Exhibit references identify simulated document objects, not attachments or verified public records.

# / claim	Illustrative record outcome	Evidence state
1. Every extra was formally approved	Three of seven items have signatures; the rest are requests.	MATERIAL CONFLICT
2. The change was outside original scope	Two disputed tasks appear in original drawings but quantities changed.	QUALIFIED
3. The owner ordered eight weeks of delay	Contemporaneous critical-path records are incomplete.	NOT ESTABLISHED
4. All additional labour was productive	Some labour hours lack work-package attribution.	UNRESOLVED
5. Unit rates follow the agreement	One rate uses post-contract supplier pricing.	QUALIFIED
6. Delay costs were not previously compensated	A prior approved adjustment overlaps a claimed period.	MATERIAL CONFLICT
7. All changes were noticed on time	Two notices were issued after the stipulated window.	QUALIFIED
8. Material deliveries were delayed by instruction	Carrier receipts establish later arrival, not cause.	NOT ESTABLISHED
9. No change was verbally withdrawn	Minutes flag one item as deferred, not cancelled.	UNRESOLVED



# / claim	Illustrative record outcome	Evidence state
10. The claimed amount is fully supported	One claim duplicates previously approved overhead allocation.	MATERIAL CONFLICT

Material findings with original-document tests

01. Every extra was formally approved

Constructed record: MOCK-01 change-order tracker. State: MATERIAL CONFLICT.

Worked observation: Three of seven items have signatures; the rest are requests.

Counter-evidence test: look for independently attributable, contemporaneous records, confirm the relevant entity and effective dates, and actively search for a reasonable alternative before describing the discrepancy as adverse.

Release gate for the buyer: Link each item to signed authority and contract mechanism.

02. The change was outside original scope

Constructed record: MOCK-02 scope matrix. State: QUALIFIED.

Worked observation: Two disputed tasks appear in original drawings but quantities changed.

Counter-evidence test: look for independently attributable, contemporaneous records, confirm the relevant entity and effective dates, and actively search for a reasonable alternative before describing the discrepancy as adverse.

Release gate for the buyer: Map drawing revisions to measured additional work.

03. The owner ordered eight weeks of delay

Constructed record: MOCK-03 look-ahead schedules. State: NOT ESTABLISHED.

Worked observation: Contemporaneous critical-path records are incomplete.

Alternative explanations to test: the stated discrepancy could reflect a recording delay, a superseded document, an affiliated entity or a legitimately scoped exception. These are candidate explanations only; none is proven by this illustration.

Release gate for the buyer: Request native schedules and project-controls analysis.

04. All additional labour was productive

Constructed record: MOCK-04 time sheets. State: UNRESOLVED.



Worked observation: Some labour hours lack work-package attribution.

Counter-evidence test: look for independently attributable, contemporaneous records, confirm the relevant entity and effective dates, and actively search for a reasonable alternative before describing the discrepancy as adverse.

Release gate for the buyer: Crosswalk worker, day, location and instruction.

05. Unit rates follow the agreement

Constructed record: MOCK-05 rate table. State: QUALIFIED.

Worked observation: One rate uses post-contract supplier pricing.

Counter-evidence test: look for independently attributable, contemporaneous records, confirm the relevant entity and effective dates, and actively search for a reasonable alternative before describing the discrepancy as adverse.

Release gate for the buyer: Recompute according to authorised rate bases.

06. Delay costs were not previously compensated

Constructed record: MOCK-06 payment applications. State: MATERIAL CONFLICT.

Worked observation: A prior approved adjustment overlaps a claimed period.

Alternative explanations to test: the stated discrepancy could reflect a recording delay, a superseded document, an affiliated entity or a legitimately scoped exception. These are candidate explanations only; none is proven by this illustration.

Release gate for the buyer: Review overlap and prior payment certificates.

07. All changes were noticed on time

Constructed record: MOCK-07 notice log. State: QUALIFIED.

Worked observation: Two notices were issued after the stipulated window.

Counter-evidence test: look for independently attributable, contemporaneous records, confirm the relevant entity and effective dates, and actively search for a reasonable alternative before describing the discrepancy as adverse.

Release gate for the buyer: Have counsel interpret contract notice and waiver.

08. Material deliveries were delayed by instruction

Constructed record: MOCK-08 shipping records. State: NOT ESTABLISHED.



Worked observation: Carrier receipts establish later arrival, not cause.

Counter-evidence test: look for independently attributable, contemporaneous records, confirm the relevant entity and effective dates, and actively search for a reasonable alternative before describing the discrepancy as adverse.

Release gate for the buyer: Obtain procurement orders and schedule logic.

09. No change was verbally withdrawn

Constructed record: MOCK-09 meeting minutes. State: UNRESOLVED.

Worked observation: Minutes flag one item as deferred, not cancelled.

Alternative explanations to test: the stated discrepancy could reflect a recording delay, a superseded document, an affiliated entity or a legitimately scoped exception. These are candidate explanations only; none is proven by this illustration.

Release gate for the buyer: Locate minutes approval and subsequent instruction.

10. The claimed amount is fully supported

Constructed record: MOCK-10 cost-to-complete ledger. State: MATERIAL CONFLICT.

Worked observation: One claim duplicates previously approved overhead allocation.

Counter-evidence test: look for independently attributable, contemporaneous records, confirm the relevant entity and effective dates, and actively search for a reasonable alternative before describing the discrepancy as adverse.

Release gate for the buyer: Create a non-duplicative line-by-line cost bridge.

Reproducible quantitative check

The following values are fictional and their arithmetic is shown so a client can understand the checking method. No valuation, legal loss, statutory liability or security rating is inferred.

Change order reconciliation example

Submitted total change-order claim	186,000
Prior approved item overlaps	-24,000
Unsupported provisional labour allowance	-18,000



Illustrative evidence-supported review base	144,000
---	---------

\$144,000 is not an entitlement. It is the portion left for scoped documentary assessment after mock exclusions.

Re-performance control: the calculations above are to be recomputed from the underlying constructed inputs. Where the third or fourth number is a derived value, test its inclusion and whether any value is already a subset of another amount. A buyer must never add an item twice merely because it appears under two risk headings.

Alternative hypotheses and challenge log

Hypothesis	What would support it	What would undermine it
Benign documentation gap	Time-stamped correction, matching independent counterparty confirmation	Conflicting identifiers or unexplained account changes
Scope or definition mismatch	Contemporaneous definitions and consistent signed annexes	Retroactive redefinition after the discrepancy was identified
Material misstatement / control weakness	Repeated exceptions, inconsistent original records, ineffective approvals	Authenticated correction, complete reconciled trail and credible independent corroboration

No adverse conclusion is reached in this hypothetical example. A real matter requires applicable fairness, right-of-reply considerations, lawful collection methods and jurisdiction-specific professional review.

Evidence provenance and chain of reliance

For every material source record, the production team should preserve: native filename and format; collector and lawful access method; capture timestamp and time zone; document hash where possible; issuing organisation; entity and period covered; reliability grading; amendments or superseded versions; contradiction trail; and reviewer approval.

Evidence object	Why it matters	Reliance boundary
MOCK-01 change-order tracker	Every extra was formally approved	Link each item to signed authority and contract mechanism.
MOCK-02 scope matrix	The change was outside original scope	Map drawing revisions to measured additional work.
MOCK-03 look-ahead schedules	The owner ordered eight weeks of delay	Request native schedules and project-controls analysis.



Evidence object	Why it matters	Reliance boundary
MOCK-04 time sheets	All additional labour was productive	Crosswalk worker, day, location and instruction.
MOCK-05 rate table	Unit rates follow the agreement	Recompute according to authorised rate bases.
MOCK-06 payment applications	Delay costs were not previously compensated	Review overlap and prior payment certificates.

What the buyer can do with the result

Stage	Decision use	Appropriate next owner
Initial screening	Do not elevate unverified representations to confirmed facts.	Buyer / internal project lead
Before irreversible payment or contract	Resolve documentary release gates and obtain written conditions.	Buyer, finance leader and counsel
Negotiation or remediation	Send a focused discrepancy schedule rather than an unstructured accusation.	Authorised counterparty contact
Specialist escalation	Separate accounting, legal, technical or regulated determinations.	Qualified professional in relevant jurisdiction
Final record	Preserve traceable limitations and a source-backed decision note.	Buyer and nominated reviewer



Priority release gates for the illustrative engagement

PRIORITY / EVIDENCE RELEASE PATH

- Link each item to signed authority and contract mechanism.
- Map drawing revisions to measured additional work.
- Request native schedules and project-controls analysis.
- Crosswalk worker, day, location and instruction.
- Recompute according to authorised rate bases.
- Review overlap and prior payment certificates.

Illustrative evidence-object index

X-01 | MOCK-01 change-order tracker | Purpose: Every extra was formally approved. Result: Three of seven items have signatures; the rest are requests. | Constructed illustration only.

X-02 | MOCK-02 scope matrix | Purpose: The change was outside original scope. Result: Two disputed tasks appear in original drawings but quantities changed. | Constructed illustration only.

X-03 | MOCK-03 look-ahead schedules | Purpose: The owner ordered eight weeks of delay. Result: Contemporaneous critical-path records are incomplete. | Constructed illustration only.

X-04 | MOCK-04 time sheets | Purpose: All additional labour was productive. Result: Some labour hours lack work-package attribution. | Constructed illustration only.

X-05 | MOCK-05 rate table | Purpose: Unit rates follow the agreement. Result: One rate uses post-contract supplier pricing. | Constructed illustration only.

X-06 | MOCK-06 payment applications | Purpose: Delay costs were not previously compensated. Result: A prior approved adjustment overlaps a claimed period. | Constructed illustration only.

X-07 | MOCK-07 notice log | Purpose: All changes were noticed on time. Result: Two notices were issued after the stipulated window. | Constructed illustration only.

X-08 | MOCK-08 shipping records | Purpose: Material deliveries were delayed by instruction. Result: Carrier receipts establish later arrival, not cause. | Constructed illustration only.

X-09 | MOCK-09 meeting minutes | Purpose: No change was verbally withdrawn. Result: Minutes flag one item as deferred, not cancelled. | Constructed illustration only.

X-10 | MOCK-10 cost-to-complete ledger | Purpose: The claimed amount is fully supported. Result: One claim duplicates previously approved overhead allocation. | Constructed illustration only.



Methodological source register

The links below identify real public reference material used to shape the methodology. They are NOT documents obtained about the fictional organisations or verification of any mock finding.

1. AIA G701 Change Order document overview
<https://help.aiacontracts.com/hc/en-us/articles/1500009384382-summary-g701-2017-change-order>
2. Federal Rules of Evidence, official US Courts
<https://www.uscourts.gov/rules-policies/current-rules-practice-procedure/federal-rules-evidence>
3. US General Services Administration, construction guidance
<https://www.gsa.gov/real-estate/design-and-construction>

Scope, professional boundaries and limitations

No engineering certification, quantity surveyor opinion, delay expert determination or legal claims advice.

The proposed fee is an indicative quotation hypothesis for a bounded service: \$3,500. It is not evidence of prior completed sales or a guaranteed price. Actual scope, geographic coverage, legal authority, source costs, timing, conflict checks and responsible-review resources must be approved in writing before work begins.

This report is intentionally a constructed demonstration, not a certified assessment. No claims of actual source retrieval, customer success, audit assurance, regulated investigative licensing or market-leading accuracy are made.

What to send for a scope review

Start with a short written account of the decision to be made, the legal entities involved, the date by which the decision is needed, the approximate geography and the single most material unresolved claim. Do not send confidential or personal documents in an initial public enquiry.

Aperture Research Works can assess whether a narrowly defined evidence review would be useful and lawful. Every engagement is separately accepted and scoped. The buyer retains decision responsibility.

Visit: apertureforensic.com | [Discuss a Matter](#) | info@apertureforensic.com