

CASE 04

Fragmented Information to Management Decision

Consolidating contracts, emails, spreadsheets and incident records into one evidence-based decision package.

Decision question

Should management renew, renegotiate or exit a critical service arrangement when the operational record is fragmented and different documents support different narratives?

EVIDENCE VOLUME 42 source items	TIME SPAN 24 months	DECISION Renew / renegotiate / exit
CORE CHALLENGE Contradictions + gaps	EXPOSURE Operational + commercial	OUTPUT Decision brief + evidence map

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

1 Question Define the decision	2 Evidence Structure inputs	3 Analysis Test issues	4 Priorities Rank exposure	5 Options Support action
--	---	--	--	--

Illustrative demonstration case

This case is a fictionalised scenario created to demonstrate analytical method, decision structure and deliverable design. It does not represent a named client engagement.

01 / ENGAGEMENT FRAME

The management problem behind the document problem

Management does not lack information. It lacks a reliable structure showing which facts are established, which claims are disputed, which documents control and which risks matter to the next decision.

Illustrative source set • Master service agreement and two amendment versions • Service-level schedules and monthly reports • Incident logs and support tickets • Invoices, credits and cost spreadsheets • Internal emails and meeting notes • Supplier correspondence and escalation records	Competing narratives • Operations: service failures are recurring and unresolved. • Finance: switching cost may exceed one more year of service. • Supplier: most incidents fall outside contracted service levels. • Procurement: renewal deadline creates time pressure. • Management: no single chronology links incidents, contract terms and financial impact.
---	--

DECISION RISK

Why an unstructured review is dangerous

Risk	How it appears	Consequence
Wrong governing document	Teams cite different SLA versions	Weakens negotiation / claim position
Memory bias	Recent incidents dominate discussion	Older recurring pattern is missed
Unproven causation	Operational loss is asserted without linkage	Exposure cannot be defended
Deadline asymmetry	Renewal date arrives before evidence is consolidated	Supplier gains leverage
Information leakage	Internal weaknesses are disclosed prematurely	Negotiation position erodes

Analytical objective Create one decision-grade evidence model: chronology, controlling documents, issue ownership, financial exposure, open questions and action options.

Portfolio note: all company names, figures and operating details in this demonstration case are illustrative.

02 / EVIDENCE MODEL

From 42 items to a defensible information structure

Each item is classified by source, date, authority, issue, evidentiary weight and relationship to other records. Duplicates and superseded documents are not counted as independent support.

Evidence class	Illustrative count	Treatment
Contracts / amendments	6	Identify governing version and precedence
Operational reports	9	Map to service period and metric definition
Incident / support records	11	Normalise event dates, severity and closure status
Financial records	7	Link cost / credit to specific events where possible
Emails / meeting notes	9	Separate contemporaneous fact from opinion / recollection

ILLUSTRATIVE CONTRADICTIONS FOUND

What the consolidated record reveals

- 01 Three SLA versions circulate internally; only one was incorporated by the signed amendment.
- 02 Seven incidents were labelled "resolved" in monthly reports while support records show recurring follow-on events.
- 03 Two claimed service credits were discussed by email but never formally submitted under the contractual process.
- 04 A pricing increase is supported by a change notice, but internal approval evidence is incomplete.
- 05 Management estimates downtime cost using a broad monthly average; only part of that figure can currently be linked to documented incidents.

Evidence discipline

The output distinguishes: established fact, supported inference, conflicting evidence, unsupported assertion and information gap. This prevents confidence from being mistaken for proof.

Portfolio note: all company names, figures and operating details in this demonstration case are illustrative.

03 / DECISION FINDINGS

What matters to the renewal decision

The evidence is prioritised by decision relevance rather than document volume. A long email chain may have less value than one signed amendment or one contemporaneous incident record.

Finding	Evidence strength	Exposure	Management implication
Recurring service instability	Strong	Operational continuity	Renewal should not be unconditional
Contractual credit recovery	Medium	Financial leakage	Quantify and preserve claim process
Termination mechanics	Strong	Switching / continuity	Exit is possible but requires lead time
Supplier causation for all losses	Weak-medium	Claim recoverability	Do not overstate damages position
Internal control gaps	Strong	Negotiation / governance	Fix before external disclosure where possible
Renewal deadline pressure	Strong	Leverage asymmetry	Create interim option before deadline

INFORMATION NOT TO DISCLOSE PREMATURELY

Preserve negotiation leverage

- Internal uncertainty about the final switching budget.
- The organisation's maximum tolerable extension period.
- Unverified estimates of consequential operational loss.
- Internal process failures that are not needed to establish the supplier issue.
- Alternative supplier discussions until they create concrete BATNA leverage.

Strategic point

The evidence package should improve the organisation's information position without automatically increasing the counterparty's information position.

Portfolio note: all company names, figures and operating details in this demonstration case are illustrative.

04 / OPTIONS

Renew, renegotiate or exit

The preferred path depends on continuity risk and the strength of the alternative supplier route. The key is to avoid a deadline-driven renewal that removes leverage before the evidence is used.

Option	Operational effect	Leverage	Exposure	Assessment
A - Full renewal	No migration disruption	Low after signature	Known service issues remain	Weak
B - Conditional extension + renegotiation	Buys continuity time	High if short and structured	Limits immediate switching risk	Preferred
C - Immediate exit	Maximum strategic reset	Depends on replacement readiness	Highest continuity / execution risk	BATNA if supplier refuses
D - Parallel transition	Keep service while moving critical scope	Moderate-high	Higher temporary cost	Useful if exit readiness is low

RECOMMENDED SEQUENCE

Preserve optionality before committing

- 01 Confirm governing contract / amendment set and renewal notice dates.
- 02 Quantify defensible service, credit and switching exposure using evidence-linked calculations.
- 03 Prepare a concise issue schedule for the supplier without disclosing internal uncertainty.
- 04 Seek a short conditional extension or standstill that preserves termination and claim rights.
- 05 Run replacement / transition readiness in parallel so negotiation is supported by a credible exit route.

Recommended decision

Conditional extension plus parallel exit preparation: use the consolidated evidence to renegotiate while preserving the ability to transition if the counterparty does not address the material issues.

Portfolio note: all company names, figures and operating details in this demonstration case are illustrative.

05 / DELIVERABLES

Evidence-to-decision package

The final output is designed to support management, procurement, legal and operations from the same structured fact base.

Deliverable	Function	Primary user
Evidence index	Source, authority, issue, date and relationship tracking	Analyst / legal
Canonical document set	Separate governing, superseded and duplicate versions	Legal / procurement
Chronology	Link incidents, communications, contract changes and cost	Management / operations
Contradiction & gap matrix	Show where narratives diverge or evidence is incomplete	Decision team
Exposure schedule	Quantify defensible cost, credits and transition burden	Finance / management
Executive decision brief	Options, leverage, risks, deadlines and next actions	Management

WHAT THIS CASE DEMONSTRATES

Capabilities evidenced

Evidence & review • Document review and canonicalisation • Chronology reconstruction • Contradiction detection • Evidence-strength grading • Information-gap identification	Decision & strategy • Exposure prioritisation • Counterparty leverage analysis • Deadline / notice control • Controlled disclosure strategy • Renew / renegotiate / exit option design
---	--

Portfolio value

This case demonstrates the ability to turn a large, inconsistent information set into a controlled decision record - with explicit evidence strength, exposure, leverage and next actions.

Portfolio note: all company names, figures and operating details in this demonstration case are illustrative.