FICTIONAL ASSESSMENT / PRINT EDITION

BUSINESS INTELLIGENCE / ASSESSMENT 10 NOVEMBER 2026 · FICTIONAL SAMPLE

Cedar & Spoke Cycle Works

A strong local offer. A clearer path to trust.

Cedar & Spoke has a recognizable local identity, clearly described mechanical services and useful staff and repair stories. That foundation is weakened by service promises that conflict with the shop's policy, outdated contact details and trust claims without inspectable support. The priority is to make the existing offer consistent and verifiable, so customers can understand the right fit before they book.

Explore your priorities ↗ | Browse the assessment ↓

THE CENTRAL FINDING

Strengthen the signal. Keep the substance.

The offer has useful detail. Its most important claims need to agree across every place customers encounter them.

See the business implications →

PRESERVE

A specific service offer

Mechanical work, named staff and practical repair stories give readers substance.

Explore the strengths ↗

ALIGN

Promises with policy

Clarify e-bike exclusions and timing before a customer makes a booking.

See the first change sheet ↗

SUBSTANTIATE

The claims that build trust

Make review and credential support inspectable, and correct stale contact details.

Follow the evidence ↗

Fictional business and evidence. No live model observations. Scope and limitations

Fictional demonstration. Every company, place, quote, page, review, technical field and answer illustration in this report is invented. No live business research, measured business outcome or AI-product observation is presented.

Contents

Use this contents page, PDF bookmarks, or the navigation in every page footer. All evidence IDs and finding IDs link to their full records.

Four different questions. One clear next step. . . . 3

The Top 3 priorities. . . . 6

Three implementation change sheets . . . 8

How a cross-model comparison can help . . . 11

The first 90 days. . . . 15

Next in line. . . . 16

Every finding stays visible. . . . 17

Executive clarity. Specialist depth. . . . 19

- Executive Intelligence . . . 19
- Entity Resolution . . . 22
- Entity Understanding . . . 35
- Trust Signal . . . 47
- Recommendation Readiness . . . 61
- Technical Evidence . . . 73
- Cross Model Observation . . . 76

The synthetic evidence library. . . . 79

What the labels mean. . . . 93

What this sample demonstrates. . . . 94

01 / Owner overview

Four different questions. One clear next step.

Each core lens has equal space and a different job. The sentences below summarize the fictional findings; they are not a new low-to-high scale.

From evidence to useful action

Three shared issues connect the specialist findings. These are workstreams, not scores.

01

Service promise

Broad claim → conflicting policy

Align scope and timing

02

Contact record

Current pages → stale fields

Publish one verified record

03

Trust claims

Positive headline → missing proof

Make the source inspectable

For every workstream: confirm facts → approve the change → publish → inspect the result. A separately collected model check is needed to establish any change in AI answers.

What this means for the business

The decision: make the existing offer consistent and verifiable before expanding promotional claims. The fictional packet supports a recognizable local bicycle retailer and mechanical workshop. Its main risks come from conflicting service promises, an old contact record and trust claims whose proof cannot be inspected.

Strengths to preserve

- Keep the specific commuter and gravel-bike offer, mechanical service detail and inspection-based policy. E03 · Services and E05 · Service policy.
- Keep named staff and concrete mechanical case stories, without turning first-party descriptions into independently verified credentials. E06 · Staff biographies and E10 · Case stories.

Three risks to address first

1. **Wrong service expectations:** broad e-bike and same-day wording can attract a request the policy excludes. See change sheet 1.
2. **Wrong contact details:** visible pages and structured data disagree about address and phone. See change sheet 2.
3. **Uncheckable proof:** a review aggregate and certification headline exceed the evidence supplied. See change sheet 3.

What is still unknown

No real business, customer outcome, credential, review population or AI-product behavior was verified. Every business record in this report is constructed. Missing proof is not proof of poor service or absent qualifications. There is no measured visibility, revenue effect or recommendation rate.

Read in this order: the Top 3, their implementation change sheets, and the client roadmap. Use the full specialist record and source library when checking the reasoning.

Label guide: severity is potential consequence; confidence is certainty about a specific conclusion, not business quality. Evidence strength is support for that conclusion. Priority is the order of work. See the full reading guide.

The intended result

Expected outcome for Cedar & Spoke

Completing these recommendations should give customers and AI systems a clearer, more consistent and better-supported picture of Cedar & Spoke: a local bicycle retailer and mechanical repair workshop with explicit e-bike service limits, realistic repair timing, one current contact record and claims readers can check. The intended improvement is to reduce ambiguity about where to find the shop, what work it accepts and which customer needs it can reasonably serve, while preserving the specific service detail and repair stories that already support its offer.

How to check the improvement

- Service promises: compare the homepage, booking copy and services with the approved mechanical-only policy and conditional timing. Confirm that exclusions appear before a booking request.
- Contact consistency: compare the visible contact details, exact structured-data fields and directory record with the owner-confirmed address and phone. Keep third-party corrections pending until the changed listing is visible.
- Inspectable proof: trace material review and credential claims to attributable sources with the right business match and scope, or visibly qualify or remove unsupported wording.

These checks establish whether the underlying business information was corrected. They do not establish that AI answers changed. A separately scoped, comparable observation would be needed to evaluate that. No inclusion, recommendation, traffic or sales outcome is guaranteed. This fictional sample records no completed corrections or live AI observations.

Entity Resolution

Can systems identify the right business?

The target is recognizable; the contact record conflicts.

The name, domain and current footer agree. One old directory and the JSON-LD still point to the former address and phone.

Read the complete Entity Resolution audit →

Entity Understanding

Do they understand what the business actually does?

Everyday services are clear; e-bike and timing limits are uneven.

Commuter/gravel retail and mechanical repairs are specific. Broad banners are less precise than the detailed service policy.

Read the complete Entity Understanding audit →

Trust Signal

Can readers check the claims?

There is useful detail, but key proof is hard to inspect.

Named staff and concrete repair stories help. The review aggregate and certification claim lack sufficient original-source support in the packet.

Read the complete Trust Signal audit →

Recommendation Readiness

For which customer needs is the business a defensible fit?

Local mechanical scenarios have support within limits.

A routine tune-up is different from same-day battery repair. The readiness audit keeps those scenarios separate and does not infer observed recommendations.

Read the complete Recommendation Readiness audit →

Main limitation. Every source is constructed. The audits show the reasoning and evidence route a report can contain, not an actual business assessment. No numerical scores are assigned; an unassigned field is not zero. Existing qualitative specialist labels below are illustrated only within the synthetic packet. The technical appendix uses authored fields, and the Cross-Model appendix records that no observation was performed.

How to read the labels. Severity describes consequence, evidence strength describes the support, confidence describes certainty about the stated conclusion, and priority describes what to tackle first. Read the plain-English guide.

02 / What matters first

The Top 3 priorities.

Fix the contradictions that change customer decisions. Keep the useful service detail and supporting stories.

Make repair promises match the work the shop accepts

A customer seeking an e-bike battery repair or guaranteed same-day turnaround could follow the broad banner and booking language, despite the narrower service policy. The fix starts with a clear promise, not more promotional copy.

Do next. Align the homepage, booking introduction and service descriptions around mechanical-only e-bike work. Make same-day adjustments conditional and show when estimates and completion dates are confirmed.

Done when. The same repair and timing limits appear before a booking request. Staff approve the wording and a reviewer checks every relevant surface against the policy.

E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | EU-02 | EU-03 | TS-02 | TS-03 | RR-01 | RR-02

Why now	Direct effect on customer fit and expectations
Owner	Suggested: owner and service manager, with site editor
Expected benefit	Clearer evidence and customer fit. No visibility or sales guarantee.

Publish one current location and phone record

Visible pages use 18 Mill Lane while structured data and one directory use the former contact. This creates an avoidable reconciliation problem even though the name and domain remain recognizable.

Do next. Confirm the canonical contact record. Correct the named JSON-LD fields and request the stale directory correction, retaining dated before-and-after evidence.

Done when. The visible contact pages, exact schema fields and original directory record agree. A submitted correction is not treated as a published correction.

E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-04 | TS-01 | RR-03 | TE-01

Why now	Shared dependency for identity and local customer use
Owner	Suggested: owner or administrator, with site editor
Expected benefit	Clearer evidence and customer fit. No visibility or sales guarantee.

Source agreement

One contact record. Two conflicting surfaces.

Compared with the scenario’s designated current record in E01. Agreement is not independent verification.

Surface	Address	Phone
Homepage footer	Matches record	Matches record
Business Circle listing	Matches record	Matches record
Local directory	Former record	Former record
Website structured data	Former record	Former record

Correct the specific conflicting fields. A requested directory update is not a published correction. Open the contact change sheet →

Let readers inspect the proof behind trust claims

A review total and a certification headline are easy to repeat, but the packet does not establish their original sources or scope. Positive selected comments and specific staff stories are useful; neither validates an aggregate or credential.

Do next. Link attributable original review profiles and identify the source/date of any aggregate. Name the issuer and scope of any genuine certification, or replace the claim with precise, supportable experience wording.

Done when. A reviewer can follow every material aggregate or credential claim to the original source, confirm the entity match and scope, and see any unresolved limit.

E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | EU-03 | EU-04 | TS-03 | TS-04 | RR-04

Why now	Strengthens support without inventing new services
Owner	Suggested: owner and staff credential holder
Expected benefit	Clearer evidence and customer fit. No visibility or sales guarantee.

Action tools

Three implementation change sheets

Draft guidance grounded in the fictional packet. Proposed wording and canonical fields require owner approval before use. No change has been implemented.

1 Make service and timing promises precise

Why it matters: a rider seeking same-day battery repair has a different need from someone booking a mechanical tune-up. A broad banner can create the wrong expectation before the detailed policy is read.

Surfaces to change: homepage e-bike banner, service descriptions and booking introduction. Check their visible text together with the linked policy.

What conflicts: “Certified e-bike experts. Get back on the road fast.” (E02 · Homepage) sits alongside the mechanical-only exclusions and conditional timing in E05 · Service policy. The booking promise is recorded in E04 · Booking.

Proposed replacement copy for owner review

Mechanical service for bicycles and eligible e-bikes. We do not repair e-bike batteries, motors, electrical systems or firmware. Most mechanical jobs are planned for 3-5 business days after inspection, parts availability and estimate approval. We confirm timing before work begins. Same-day adjustments may be possible when capacity allows, but completion is not guaranteed.

Before publishing: the owner/service manager confirms eligibility, exceptions and current timing. The site editor uses the approved conditions next to the booking action, rather than relying only on a footer link. This is proposed copy, not a new business commitment.

How to verify completion

- Compare the homepage, service page, booking introduction and policy side by side. They must agree on mechanical-only scope and conditional turnaround.
- Test a battery-repair request and a routine tune-up request as reading scenarios. The former must encounter the exclusion; the latter must not imply guaranteed same-day completion.
- Save dated before-and-after text or screenshots and the owner’s approved policy. Record any remaining conflicting surface.

Suggested owner: owner/service manager, supported by site editor. **Follow-up:** check the published pages; do not claim that an AI answer changed without a separately collected observation.

Return to priority 1 · Timing finding · E-bike scope finding

2 Reconcile the contact record field by field

Why it matters: an old address or telephone can be repeated even when the business name is correct. A syntactically valid schema can still carry the wrong facts.

Fictional contact reconciliation, proposed target requires owner confirmation

Field	Current visible record	Conflicting record	Proposed target
Street address	18 Mill Lane	6 Foundry Street	18 Mill Lane
Telephone	503-555-0148	503-555-0119	503-555-0148
City, region, postal code	Alder Quay, OR 97000	Same in supplied fixtures	Confirm, then retain

Source of the comparison: E01 · Scenario identity, E02 · Visible footer, E08 · Old directory and E12 · Structured data.

Exact work to hand off

- After owner confirmation, edit **address.streetAddress** and **telephone** in the JSON-LD script identified as **bike-store**. Retain the existing identity reference unless a separately justified correction is needed.
- Request correction of the named directory record. Keep its request date, submitted fields, confirmation and current status.
- Compare the published visible contact, emitted JSON-LD and actual directory record. Checking only the editor or a submission receipt is insufficient.

Completion evidence: dated captures of the exact published fields; a parsed schema check; and directory status marked published, pending or declined. Syntax validation does not establish ownership, search visibility or AI entity merging.

Suggested owner: business administrator with site editor. **Dependency:** owner confirms the canonical record first. Return to priority 2 · Technical finding.

3 Build a proof register for material claims

Why it matters: readers need a route to the original evidence, not just a positive headline. The supplied packet does not prove that a genuine credential is absent or that reviews are false.

Review aggregate

The displayed “4.9 from 87 reviews” in E07 · Review widget lacks an attributable original profile/export. Ask for original profile URLs, matching business/location, capture date, source-specific totals and calculation rules. Keep different sources distinguishable; do not average or combine them without a defensible method.

Certification

For “Certified e-bike experts” in E02 · Homepage and footer, request issuer, credential holder, covered work, issue/expiry dates where applicable, and an issuer verification record or other inspectable documentation. E06 · Staff biographies supplies experience claims but no named credential record.

Decision before publication

- If the claim can be substantiated, link its original support and qualify its exact scope.
- If support cannot be supplied, remove or narrow the claim. Proposed alternative for owner review: “Bicycle mechanical repairs, with estimates agreed before work begins.” This avoids inventing a credential or broader electrical capability.
- Keep individual review excerpts clearly attributed and selected. Do not call the six invented sample comments representative of a real population.

Completion evidence: a register pairing every material claim with source, entity match, date, scope, caveat and owner decision. Test each link and retain the supporting capture.

Suggested owner: owner and credential holder, supported by site editor. Return to priority 3 · Certification finding · Review provenance finding.

Constructed teaching demonstration

How a cross-model comparison can help

No AI products were tested. Every answer below is invented by the report author to demonstrate evaluation, not a model output or forecast.

Illustrative systems A, B and C are anonymous teaching labels. They do not represent OpenAI, Google, Anthropic or any other provider. There are no capture dates, model versions or actual citations because no execution occurred. These examples must not be counted as observations, accuracy rates, visibility or improvement.

The useful question is not simply “Did the business appear?” It is whether the answer matches the customer’s need, identifies the right business and keeps its claims inside the available evidence. Compare the following constructed answers with the same fictional sources.

Prompt 1 at a glance · constructed answers

The same question can produce very different guidance.

ILLUSTRATIVE A

Overbroad recommendation

Repeats the promotion and misses the battery-repair exclusion.

ILLUSTRATIVE B

Policy-aligned answer

Explains the exclusion and avoids inventing an alternative.

ILLUSTRATIVE C

Cautious, less specific

Avoids a false claim but does not explain the known exclusion.

These are authored examples, not observed AI outputs or rankings. Read the exact prompt, full answers and source checks below.

Prompt 1 A need the business does not serve

Illustrative unbranded discovery prompt: “Where could I take an e-bike in Alder Quay for a same-day battery repair?”

Constructed answer A: “Cedar & Spoke Cycle Works may be an option; it advertises certified e-bike experts and same-day repairs.”

Constructed answer B: “Cedar & Spoke’s stated policy excludes battery, motor, electrical-system and firmware repairs. It is not a supported match for this request. I cannot name a verified alternative from the available material.”

Constructed answer C: “I do not have enough verified information to recommend a same-day battery-repair provider in Alder Quay. Confirm battery-service capability and turnaround directly before booking.”

What the comparison teaches

- **A is overbroad:** it repeats promotional wording while omitting explicit exclusions. It would create a poor customer fit if actually observed.
- **B respects the supplied policy:** the exclusion is supported by E03/E05. Its refusal to invent an alternative avoids a second unsupported recommendation.
- **C is cautious but less specific:** it makes no false service claim, yet does not use the available exclusion to explain why this named shop is unsuitable.

Source check: E02 · Banner, E03 · Services, E04 · Booking, E05 · Policy. These are report references, not model-generated citations. **Business action:** apply change sheet 1. A real discovery baseline must not be supplied these corrective findings as hidden context.

Prompt 2 Recognizing the right place

Illustrative named-recognition prompt: “Where is Cedar & Spoke Cycle Works in Alder Quay, and what number should I call?”

Constructed answer A: “It is at 6 Foundry Street. Call 503-555-0119.”

Constructed answer B: “The supplied current record lists 18 Mill Lane and 503-555-0148. An old directory and structured-data fields conflict with that record, so confirm the current details before traveling.”

Constructed answer C: “The available records disagree between 18 Mill Lane / 503-555-0148 and 6 Foundry Street / 503-555-0119. I cannot independently confirm which is current.”

What the comparison teaches

- **A matches the stale fixture:** the business name alone does not make the contact answer correct.
- **B uses the scenario’s designated current contact:** that is correct within the fictional packet, not independent real-world verification.
- **C exposes the conflict:** this is less decisive, but preferable to presenting an unresolved contact as certain without source reasoning.

Source check: E01 · Target identity, E02 · Footer, E08 · Directory, E12 · JSON-LD. **Business action:** reconcile the exact fields in change sheet 2.

Prompt 3 Separating evidence from praise

Illustrative source-informed diagnostic prompt: “Using the supplied review widget and staff biography excerpts only, what can you support about Cedar & Spoke’s reputation and certification, and what remains unverified?”

Constructed answer A: “The business is a top-rated, certified e-bike specialist with 87 verified reviews.”

Constructed answer B: “The widget displays 4.9 from 87 reviews, but the original profiles and calculation are not supplied. Staff experience is described, but no certification issuer or scope is documented. Neither a top-rated comparison nor verified certification is established.”

Constructed answer C: “Some selected comments describe useful service, but the packet cannot establish representative sentiment or the displayed aggregate. Credential evidence is missing; that does not prove the staff are unqualified.”

What the comparison teaches

- **A adds unsupported claims:** “top-rated,” “verified” and certification exceed the supplied evidence.
- **B separates a displayed claim from proof:** it states the limits without converting missing support into a negative judgment.
- **C preserves the selected-review limitation:** favorable examples and missing credential records cannot settle broader quality claims.

Source check: E06 · Staff, E07 · Reviews. **Business action:** build the proof register in change sheet 3. This source-informed arm is distinct from discovery; its answers must never be counted as independent discovery outcomes.

What a real observation record would need

This demonstration does not promise an identical live collection scope for every offer. An agreed real assessment protocol would define its products, questions, repetition plan, access methods, cost limits and exclusions before collection.

- Exact prompt, full unedited answer, attempt status and collection timestamp; retain failures and exclusions rather than only favorable answers.
- Product/interface and model/version where known; account tier, search settings, location context, personalization and other relevant conditions. Unknown backend identity stays unknown.
- Displayed citations, retrieved source captures and claim-by-claim factual review. A citation’s presence does not establish that it supports the answer.
- Separate discovery, named recognition and source-informed diagnostics. Keep prompts comparable without hiding corrective findings in a discovery baseline.
- Repetitions and comparable prior observations when commissioned. Counts describe only the captured sample, never market share or a probability of recommendation.
- Independent analytical review and human release, with uncertainty and changes in business evidence, model environment and methodology distinguished.

Read the unchanged actual not-performed coverage record · Read the original zero-call execution record · Other illustrative customer questions.

03 / Proposed sequence

The first 90 days.

A practical sequence for the fictional shop. Suggested roles and timing are planning guidance, not commitments or an automated service.

Use dependencies, not the calendar, to decide when to move. These are planning ranges, not required waiting periods. Work can overlap once the owner confirms the underlying facts. Track each action as not started, in progress, corrected and checked, or waiting on a third party. Do not label a directory update complete until the changed listing is visible.

A repeatable improvement sequence

Move when the evidence is ready.

1. **Confirm** Owner verifies the facts and service limits.
2. **Align** Correct the affected pages and records.
3. **Substantiate** Make material claims inspectable.
4. **Recheck** Verify changes and retain unresolved items.

Suggested order, not a completion tracker or measured progress. Work may overlap when its dependencies are met.

Days 1-30

Resolve the conflicts

1. Owner confirms repair scope, timing and the canonical contact record.

2. Site editor aligns homepage, booking, visible contact and exact schema fields.

3. Administrator requests the named directory correction and preserves the request/status.

Completion check. Ready for the next phase when the changed first-party sources agree and unresolved external updates remain explicitly tracked.

P1 | P2

Days 31-60

Make proof inspectable

1. Owner traces the review aggregate to attributable original profiles, or removes/qualifies the unsupported total.

2. Credential holder supplies any genuine issuer/scope record; unsupported “certified” wording is replaced.

3. Connect the existing mechanical case stories to the services they actually describe.

Completion check. Ready when material claims have inspectable sources or visible qualifications, without implying stronger expertise or representative reviews.

P3

Days 61-90

Recheck and decide

1. Reviewer compares the exact changed surfaces with the original packet and retains both versions.

2. Confirm whether the directory correction is published, still pending or declined.

3. Review unresolved priorities and decide whether a separately scoped reassessment or live model observation would answer a useful business question.

Completion check. Complete when changed claims and remaining limits are documented. A later commissioned model observation or reassessment requires its own plan and evidence.

P1 | P2 | P3

No implementation, directory request, client contact or live model collection has been performed by this sample. Rechecking business evidence does not demonstrate that an AI product has changed its answers.

04 / Retained, not forgotten

Next in line.

These supporting actions remain visible. They do not displace the stronger, more immediate conflicts above.

Clarify case scope

Keep the three mechanical repair stories specific about work performed, limits and evidence. Do not turn a story into a guaranteed result or electrical qualification.

E10 · Three repair case stories

Improve policy access

Place a concise timing and scope summary near booking, linked to the full policy. The current footer link exists; this is a prominence improvement, not an absence finding.

E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E11 · Technical response and discovery fixture

Document staff experience

Retain useful named biographies, and attach inspectable proof where a material qualification is claimed. Do not infer that a missing credential record means no credential exists.

E06 · Staff biographies

05 / Complete inventory

Every finding stays visible.

All positive, limiting and informational findings are retained in their owning audit. “High” in one column does not turn the other columns into the same judgment.

Read the 18 findings as connected issues, not 18 independent failures. Service wording connects EU-02/EU-03, TS-02/TS-03 and RR-01/RR-02. Contact consistency connects ER-02/ER-04, TS-01, RR-03 and TE-01. Proof connects EU-04, TS-04 and RR-04. The specialist IDs preserve different reasoning; repeated references to the same evidence do not create independent corroboration or a new score.

Source-owned findings in the fictional packet. Follow the ID to its full reasoning and evidence.

Finding	Condition	Severity	Confidence
ER-01 Entity Resolution	Current public identity is consistently anchored in name, domain and visible contact details	Positive within the synthetic packet	High within the synthetic packet
ER-02 Entity Resolution	The stale directory presents a competing address and phone	High within the synthetic packet	High within the synthetic packet
ER-03 Entity Resolution	Validation sources have narrow claim scope and do not establish every entity relationship	Medium within the synthetic packet	High within the synthetic packet
ER-04 Entity Resolution	Structured business data repeats stale contact information despite a stable canonical identifier	High within the synthetic packet	High within the synthetic packet
EU-01 Entity Under standing	The core bicycle retail and mechanical workshop model is understandable	Not applicable: positive finding within the synthetic packet	High within the synthetic packet
EU-02 Entity Under standing	The same-day booking promise conflicts with the workshop policy	High within the synthetic packet	High within the synthetic packet
EU-03 Entity Under standing	Broad e-bike certification language overstates the evidenced service boundary	High within the synthetic packet	High within the synthetic packet
EU-04 Entity Under standing	Practical experience is understandable, but superiority and rating-led positioning are not established	Moderate within the synthetic packet	High within the synthetic packet
TS-01 Trust Signal	Visible accountability is weakened by conflicting location and contact details	High · within synthetic packet	High · within synthetic packet
TS-02 Trust Signal	An unconditional same-day promise conflicts with the service policy	High · within synthetic packet	High · within synthetic packet

Finding	Condition	Severity	Confidence
TS-03 Trust Signal	Ordinary mechanical expertise is supported, but the e-bike certification claim is not substantiated	High · within synthetic packet	High · within synthetic packet
TS-04 Trust Signal	A displayed review aggregate cannot be traced to an original review source	Medium · within synthetic packet	High · within synthetic packet
RR-01 Recommendation Readiness	Routine mechanical repair is a defensible scenario; guaranteed same-day completion is not	High · within synthetic packet	High · within synthetic packet
RR-02 Recommendation Readiness	E-bike recommendations must stop at clearly bounded mechanical work	High · within synthetic packet	High · within synthetic packet
RR-03 Recommendation Readiness	Local relevance is established inside the packet, but the destination needs reconciliation	High · within synthetic packet	High · within synthetic packet
RR-04 Recommendation Readiness	Service fit has support; “best” or “top-rated” comparison does not	Moderate · within synthetic packet	High · within synthetic packet
TE-01 Technical Evidence	Structured data repeats the former contact details	Moderate	High within the synthetic packet
CO-01 Cross Model Observation	Actual model behavior is not assessed in this demonstration	Informational	High about the sample boundary; Inconclusive about actual model behavior

06 / Full analytical record

Executive clarity. Specialist depth.

All required audit sections remain available, including scorecard fields marked unassigned and every bounded evidence limitation.

Executive Intelligence

8 sections · 0 findings

Synthesis of the current fictional specialist outputs only. Source findings remain separate from this synthesis; no historical baseline or comparison is included.

1 Executive Intelligence Thesis

The fictional shop is understandable as a local bicycle retailer and mechanical workshop. Its main constraint is disagreement between useful detailed service limits and broad promotional promises. Repairing that mismatch, reconciling contact details and making trust claims inspectable would improve several evidence paths at once.

This conclusion synthesizes the specialist findings below. It does not assert measured AI visibility or new findings beyond the synthetic audits.

Support | EU-02 | EU-03 | TS-02 | TS-03 | RR-01 | RR-02 | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-04 | TS-01 | RR-03 | TE-01 | EU-03 | EU-04 | TS-03 | TS-04 | RR-04

2 Current AI Position

No visibility category, aggregate score or observed AI position is assigned. The synthetic evidence supports a clear business meaning and bounded everyday repair contexts, while live discovery and recommendations remain unassessed. Source-defined specialist metrics are shown as unassigned, not zero.

A clear identity is not the same as validated expertise. Useful service descriptions are not final recommendation readiness. The four core lenses retain their separate roles.

Support | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record | CO-01

3 Visibility Constraint Analysis

First, the same-day and e-bike wording changes which customers may see the shop as a fit. Second, former contact details persist in two specific authored representations. Third, review and credential claims are harder to check than the detailed service content.

These are evidence and interpretation constraints in the constructed case. No report claim establishes that a provider encountered them, repeated them or changed an answer because of them.

Support | EU-02 | EU-03 | TS-02 | TS-03 | RR-01 | RR-02 | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-04 | TS-01 | RR-03 | TE-01 | EU-04 | TS-04 | RR-04

4 Visibility Opportunity Analysis

Preserve the clear commuter/gravel positioning, practical price ranges, named staff and mechanical case stories. They give readers a concrete account of what the shop does. Make those strengths easier to use by connecting them to precise service conditions and verifiable proof.

The opportunity is not an invented expansion into battery repair, statewide service, emergency availability or guaranteed outcomes. The evidence supports a narrower offer, stated more consistently.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E06 · Staff biographies | E10 · Three repair case stories | EU-01 | EU-03 | RR-01 | RR-02 | RR-03 | RR-04

5 Visibility Multiplier Analysis

One service-policy alignment benefits Understanding by clarifying scope, Trust by narrowing unsupported claims and Readiness by setting honest scenario limits. One contact reconciliation benefits Resolution and local-use readiness. Better source attribution benefits Trust and the evidence used to justify recommendations.

These are cross-lane benefits from the same underlying records, not independent corroboration multiplied by the number of analysts. None guarantees more citations, rankings, recommendations or sales.

Support | EU-02 | EU-03 | TS-02 | TS-03 | RR-01 | RR-02 | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-04 | TS-01 | RR-03 | TE-01 | EU-04 | TS-04 | RR-04

6 Strategic Priority Matrix

The order below reflects practical customer consequence, strength of the authored conflict and dependency across lanes. It is not a numerical formula or new rating scale. No critical issue is identified in this bounded fictional packet; that is not a safety certification of a real shop.

Priority	Reason for order	Completion basis
1. Repair promises	Direct service-fit and expectation conflict, including excluded battery work.	Approved limits consistent across the service and booking surfaces.
2. Current contact record	Specific contradictory machine-readable and directory fields.	Published source-level agreement, not just a requested update.
3. Inspectable proof	Unverified review aggregate and certification scope constrain trust claims.	Original-source attribution and claim scope checked by a reviewer.

Support | EU-02 | EU-03 | TS-02 | TS-03 | RR-01 | RR-02 | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-04 | TS-01 | RR-03 | TE-01 | EU-04 | TS-04 | RR-04

7 AI Visibility Roadmap

The proposed 90-day sequence resolves contradictions first, develops supporting evidence second, and rechecks the exact changed surfaces last. Owners are suggested roles for the fictional business, not accepted assignments. Timing is a planning sequence, not a delivery promise or recurrence.

Reassessment must preserve the original packet and distinguish corrections in business evidence from any later observed product change. No new model collection is authorized or implied by this sample.

Support | EU-02 | EU-03 | TS-02 | TS-03 | RR-01 | RR-02 | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-04 | TS-01 | RR-03 | TE-01 | EU-04 | TS-04 | RR-04

8 Executive Determination

Keep the clear everyday bicycle offer. Before broadening promotion, make repair scope, timing, contact details and trust claims mutually consistent and inspectable. The synthetic specialist audits support that sequence; the observation appendix does not supply real-product evidence.

This is a complete presentation demonstration, not a qualified native assessment, client release, certification, benchmark or measured result. A real engagement requires actual preserved sources, appropriate collection, independent analytical review and joint human review before release.

Support | EU-02 | EU-03 | TS-02 | TS-03 | RR-01 | RR-02 | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-04 | TS-01 | RR-03 | TE-01 | EU-04 | TS-04 | RR-04 | CO-01

↑ All audits | Finding index | Evidence library →

Entity Resolution

25 sections · 4 findings

A synthetic specialist audit of the authored evidence packet. Findings describe the constructed case, not measured real-world business or model performance. No numeric score is assigned. Any source-defined qualitative labels are illustrative judgments within the synthetic packet.

1 Executive Summary

Cedar & Spoke Cycle Works is resolvable as one intended fictional bicycle shop and workshop within the synthetic packet. Its public name, canonical domain and current visible contact details form a clear anchor. The principal limitation is not a lack of schema: both the synthetic directory and existing BikeStore markup carry an old address and phone.

Correct the first-party markup and stale directory before expanding technical enrichment. Treat Business Circle membership as contact/listing corroboration, selected testimonials as selected testimonials, and staff ownership/experience claims according to their actual evidence. No real-world identity verification, model test or final trust/readiness decision is asserted.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-03 | ER-04

2 Entity Identity Score™

Not assigned in this fictional demonstration. The active methodology does not supply an approved numeric mapping for this field. Qualitatively, the public business identity is clear within the synthetic packet, but statutory identity and complete relationship validation remain outside its evidence coverage. This is neither a zero nor an estimate.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E06 · Staff biographies | E09 · Business Circle member listing | ER-01 | ER-03

3 Entity Confidence Score™

Not assigned in this fictional demonstration. The source-defined component maxima remain 25/25/20/15/15; no component points or total are invented. The retained component records describe identity support, contact conflict, relationship limits, evidence coverage and contradiction burden within the synthetic packet. No aggregate band is assigned.

Component	Source maximum	Allocation	Rationale
Identity Consistency	25	Not assigned in this fictional demonstration	The public name and canonical domain are aligned; the stable structured identifier names the same intended business. This is a qualitative component description within the synthetic packet.

Component	Source maximum	Allocation	Rationale
Contact Consistency	25	Not assigned in this fictional demonstration	Current visible details compete with a stale directory tuple and the same stale tuple in first-party structured data. This is a qualitative component description within the synthetic packet.
Relationship Clarity	20	Not assigned in this fictional demonstration	The Business Circle reference is explicit; owner and review-source relationships are only partly evidenced. This is a qualitative component description within the synthetic packet.
Evidence Completeness	15	Not assigned in this fictional demonstration	The packet covers several identity surfaces but intentionally lacks independent record verification. This is a qualitative component description within the synthetic packet.
Contradiction Severity	15	Not assigned in this fictional demonstration	Two competing address/phone tuples remain, including a first-party visible/structured conflict. This is a qualitative component description within the synthetic packet.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-03 | ER-04

4 AI Resolution Confidence Assessment™

Not assigned in this fictional demonstration. Qualitative assessment: the intended public entity can be identified within the synthetic packet, but current-location reconciliation remains conditional because two contact tuples compete. This is an analyst interpretation of constructed evidence, not observed AI behavior or a success probability.

Supporting evidence is the shared name/domain/current visible record and Business Circle contact listing. Primary resolution risks are the stale external directory, contradictory first-party structured contact fields, and unverified legal/review-source relationships. E13 is a constructed cross-model fixture, not a test, and is not used as empirical support.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-03 | ER-04

5 Knowledge Graph Readiness Score™

Not assigned in this fictional demonstration. The original explicit/implicit structure is retained: explicit signals 40%, implicit signals 60%; no calculation is performed. Explicit signals include a canonical BikeStore @id, correct name/URL and a Business Circle sameAs reference, but address and phone are stale. Implicit signals include current visible contact details, a Business Circle listing and concrete service descriptions, alongside the conflicting directory and unverified review aggregate.

Within the synthetic packet, the primary improvement is consistency between existing signals. Adding more schema cannot repair contradictory identity facts. Neither existing markup nor a corrected fixture would prove knowledge-graph inclusion, ownership, indexation or AI visibility.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-03 | ER-04

6 Ambiguity Risk Score™

Not assigned in this fictional demonstration. Qualitative ambiguity risk: Moderate within the synthetic packet. The public name and domain are coherent, but different address/phone tuples could be mistaken for two branches. A namesake search was not performed, so external name uniqueness is unknown rather than confirmed.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E08 · Old directory listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-04

7 Contradiction Risk Score™

Not assigned in this fictional demonstration. Qualitative contradiction risk: High within the synthetic packet because the first-party site itself presents current visible contacts and stale embedded contacts. This risk describes unresolved identity conflict and is not the inverse of a made-up confidence score. Service-time and e-bike-scope contradictions are handled in Understanding rather than imported into this numeric field.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E08 · Old directory listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-02 | ER-04

8 Entity Identification Strength™

The public-facing name, controlled example-domain URL, visible address and phone supply a strong identification anchor within the synthetic packet. The Business Circle contact record supports the same intended local entity. Email, social profiles, government registration and a Google Business Profile are not supplied for this exercise; their absence from the packet is not proof they do not exist. Mara Ellis’s owner relationship remains attributed to the staff biography.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E06 · Staff biographies | E09 · Business Circle member listing | ER-01 | ER-03

9 Entity Consistency™

Name and canonical domain are consistent within the synthetic packet. Address and phone are inconsistent: E01/E02/E09 use 18 Mill Lane and 503-555-0148, while E08/E12 use 6 Foundry Street and 503-555-0119. The matching stale tuple does not constitute independent corroboration because copied data could explain the repetition, and no data-lineage evidence is supplied. The category remains bicycle retail/workshop rather than a separate electrical-service entity.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-04

10 Entity Distinctiveness™

The compound business name and canonical domain distinguish the intended entity inside this closed packet. A bicycle category label alone would be generic; adding the location and current contacts makes the reference specific. No competitor, near-name business, parent brand or additional domain is evidenced. External uniqueness was not assessed, so this conclusion cannot be exported as a real-world namesake clearance.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E09 · Business Circle member listing | ER-01

11 Entity Ambiguity Analysis™

The demonstrated ambiguity is principally a location/contact conflict, not a supported finding of multiple businesses. Keep one intended single-location entity and retain the stale references as conflicts pending correction. Do not create a second branch, assert a move date, or infer a legal relationship merely to make the records agree. Qualitative ambiguity risk is Moderate within the synthetic packet.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E08 · Old directory listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-02 | ER-04

12 Entity Validation Strength™

Validation support is Moderate within the synthetic packet. The business-controlled content establishes what the fictional business publishes, and the Business Circle record supports its listing/contact fields. Neither proves professional licensing, electrical competency, legal ownership, superior workmanship or a review-platform aggregate. Repeating six selected review excerpts or a sameAs URL does not provide independent confirmation of those claims.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-03

13 Geographic Entity Clarity™

The defined current operating address is 18 Mill Lane, Alder Quay, Oregon 97000 within the synthetic packet. The shop has one location; the old directory/markup tuple is not evidence of another active branch. Local workshop relevance is supported by the packet, but a service radius, shipping area, collection service, walk-in availability and mobile repair coverage are not defined. Do not infer those operational promises from a street address.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-04

14 Entity Reconciliation Analysis™

Reconcile E01, E02 and E09 to the current public business. Associate E12 with that intended entity through its exact name, URL and @id, while explicitly rejecting its stale contact properties as current data. Retain E08 as a stale reference requiring correction; the supplied scenario identifies it as stale, but no move chronology is invented. The name match alone would not be sufficient outside the controlled packet.

Do not merge an unspecified legal entity or original review profile into the map. Resolve those relationships only with an attributable record, matching identifiers and claim-specific reasoning.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-03 | ER-04

15 Entity Structure Analysis™

The supported structure within the synthetic packet is one public-facing business, one canonical example domain and one current shop/workshop. Mara Ellis is the claimed owner in E06; legal ownership is not independently established. No DBA, parent company, subsidiary, related legal entity, product brand ownership or additional branch is supplied. Those relationships remain unassessed, not denied.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E06 · Staff biographies | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-01 | ER-03

16 Entity Map™

The following relationships are a constructed entity map within the synthetic packet, not externally verified legal or platform links.

- Public business → Cedar & Spoke Cycle Works. Supported Evidence; High confidence within the synthetic packet. E01/E02/E09.
- Public business → canonical domain https://cedarandspoke.example and identifier https://cedarandspoke.example/#shop. Supported Evidence; High confidence within the synthetic packet. E01/E12.
- Public business → current operating contact: 18 Mill Lane, Alder Quay, Oregon 97000; 503-555-0148. Supported Evidence with competing contact fields retained; High confidence in the exercise-defined current record. E01/E02/E09.
- Public business → E08 directory and E12 stale contact tuple: 6 Foundry Street; 503-555-0119. Conflicting Evidence; High confidence that the packet contains this conflict. Not a second branch.
- Public business → Mara Ellis, claimed owner. Supported first-party relationship, not independently verified legal ownership; Moderate confidence. E06.
- Public business → Business Circle member/listing reference. Supported for membership/contact only; High confidence in that limited packet relationship. E09/E12. sameAs is not proof of ownership or endorsement.
- Public business → original review aggregate/profile. Unverified Evidence; Low confidence in source attribution. E07. Do not fabricate the missing original profile.
- Legal name, DBA, social profiles, related brands/legal entities, product-brand ownership: Missing Evidence within the reviewed packet; relationship confidence not assigned. No nonexistence claim.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-03 | ER-04

17 Entity Evidence Inventory™

This inventory classifies the particular identity claim rather than treating every source as equally authoritative. No source is independently verified outside the synthetic packet.

- E01 canonical business record: Supported Evidence for exercise-defined name/domain/current contacts; not a government record.

- E02 visible homepage/footer: Supported Evidence for current first-party identity publication; underlying credential claims remain unverified.
- E03 service/prices and E05 policy: Supported Evidence for published business category and offer boundaries, not proof of completed outcomes.
- E06 biographies: Supported Evidence for attributed staff description; independent owner/credential verification is not supplied.
- E07 review widget/excerpts: Unverified Evidence for the 4.9/87 aggregate and source relationship; selected testimonials are present, so “no reviews” is unsupported.
- E08 directory: Conflicting Evidence for current address/phone; its stale status is part of the authored scenario.
- E09 Business Circle: Supported Evidence for membership/listing and contact; not a professional license or quality validation.
- E11 technical fixture: Supported Evidence only that the authored fields describe six accessible-format pages and their discoverability properties; no live access, crawl or indexation verified.
- E12 BikeStore fixture: Supported Evidence for the intended @id/name/URL; Conflicting Evidence for address/phone; sameAs remains a claimed reference.
- E13 constructed cross-model fixture: Not an empirical observation; excluded from measured identity-success conclusions.
- Email, original review profile, government/legal record, license record, social profiles and unrelated entities: Missing Evidence in the packet only.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E11 · Technical response and discovery fixture | E12 · Structured data | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record | E05 · Service policy | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-03 | ER-04

18 Entity Strength Analysis™

Top Entity Strengths are represented by ER-01. The coherent current visible identity is the substantive positive finding; the canonical @id also offers continuity but is not counted as a separate strength that conceals ER-04. These support identification within the synthetic packet, not universal correctness or independent verification.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-01

19 Entity Weakness Analysis™

ER-02 and ER-04 identify linked but distinct correction surfaces for the same contact inconsistency: an external directory and first-party structured data. ER-03 identifies the narrower validation/relationship limitation. They are not independent penalties to be summed. Full evidence, reasoning, severity, impact, action and completion criteria appear in the stable finding records.

Support | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-02 | ER-03 | ER-04

20 Entity Contradiction Analysis™

Contradiction A (ER-02): E08 conflicts with the exercise-defined current record and matching visible/Business Circle contacts. For current address/phone, E01 defines the scenario and E02/E09 support its intended current publication; the stale directory has lower claim relevance. Severity High, contradiction risk High and confidence High within the synthetic packet. Correct E08 and document the result without inventing a move history.

Contradiction B (ER-04): E12 conflicts with E02 inside the first-party site. The current exercise record and visible current details determine the intended correction; structured markup has no inherent right to override visible text. Severity High, contradiction risk High and confidence High within the synthetic packet. Preserve @id, correct the contact fields and validate all template instances.

The packet provides no actual legal-name, legal-status or ownership contradiction. Missing legal records and an unverified owner claim must not be recast as adverse contradictory evidence.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E06 · Staff biographies | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-02 | ER-03 | ER-04

21 AI Resolution Impact Analysis™

The causal concern is conditional: a system selecting the stale tuple could route a local answer incorrectly or split one shop into apparent branches. A system selecting the current visible/Business Circle records could identify the intended shop, while still lacking proof for legal/review relationships. No response frequency, error rate, model preference or search visibility is measured.

The full seven-part impact analysis for each ER finding separately addresses identification, reconciliation, ambiguity, resolution-specific knowledge-graph support, downstream understanding, trust and recommendation analysis. Those downstream effects do not establish final scores or decisions owned by other analysts.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-03 | ER-04

22 Recommendation Prioritization™

Priority 1: Correct the first-party structured contact tuple (ER-04) and stale directory (ER-02), using the approved record and a dated verification of each change. First-party correction is directly controllable; directory correction may require the listing publisher.

Priority 2: Preserve the coherent identity anchor (ER-01) and establish claim-specific provenance for material legal/owner/review relationships (ER-03).

Priority 3: Consider additional sameAs or technical enrichment only for verified relevant profiles after the contact inconsistency is resolved. Do not add guessed profiles or treat schema volume as evidence quality.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-03 | ER-04

23 Action Confidence™

High Confidence Actions within the synthetic packet: preserve the canonical record (ER-01), correct E08 to that record (ER-02), and align E12 with visible current contacts (ER-04). Each directly addresses a demonstrated field difference.

Moderate Confidence Action within the synthetic packet: obtain additional claim-specific legal/ownership/review provenance for ER-03, because the actual availability and public relevance of those records are unknown. This is a request for evidence, not a presumption of noncompliance. Completion is defined by the finding-level checks, not by an assumed score increase.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-03 | ER-04

24 Entity Resolution Maturity Level™

Qualitative demonstration placement: Level 2: Emerging Entity within the synthetic packet. Basic public identity consistency exists, while contact conflicts and limited independent relationship validation prevent a fully resolved characterization. This uses the source maturity vocabulary only; it is not a numerical score, empirical certification or classification of a real company.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-03 | ER-04

25 Final Resolution Determination™

One intended public business is identifiable within the synthetic packet, but current contact resolution is conditional until the old directory and first-party markup are aligned. Retain unverified legal/owner/review relationships without asserting they are false or absent. The immediate resolution work is to reconcile facts already present, not accumulate more technical markup.

This concludes the synthetic identity/reconciliation analysis only. It does not establish observed AI behavior, statutory identity verification, trustworthiness, recommendation readiness or an overall Entitylytics score.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-03 | ER-04

Finding records and completion checks

Each record below belongs to this specialist lane. Classifications and confidence apply only to the stated claim within the synthetic packet, never to a real business or model performance.

ER-01 · Synthetic finding

ER-01 Current public identity is consistently anchored in name, domain and visible contact details

What the packet shows. Current public identity is consistently anchored in name, domain and visible contact details within the synthetic packet.

Reasoning. The public name, controlled domain and matched current contact fields supply a coherent identity anchor within the synthetic packet. E01 is an exercise specification, not a government registry; E02 is first-party publication; E09 is a constructed third-party listing. These have different evidential roles and are not three independent real-world confirmations.

AI and business consequence.

- visibility: The correct name and current location can be represented when the current visible records are used.
- actual visibility is not measured.
- identification: A specific business name, domain and contact tuple supports one local-business identity.
- reconciliation: E01, E02 and E09 can be associated without creating an additional branch.
- ambiguity: The shared current contact tuple helps distinguish the intended entity inside the packet.
- name uniqueness outside it was not tested.
- knowledge graph: The visible identity anchor is usable, but ER-04 identifies a competing structured contact tuple.
- downstream understanding: The entity can be described as one local bicycle retailer and workshop, subject to the service limits in E05.
- downstream trust: Listing alignment supports identity attribution only, not service quality.
- downstream recommendation: Later scenario analysis may use this identity anchor but must resolve the conflicting contact routes.

Recommended action. Preserve one approved current business record and use it as the controlled reference when correcting E08 and E12. Retain the Business Circle relationship only with its actual membership/listing scope.

Completion check.

- The approved current record lists exactly 18 Mill Lane and 503-555-0148.
- Visible homepage and contact details agree with that record.
- The report describes Business Circle membership as listing corroboration, not certification.

Severity	Positive within the synthetic packet
Evidence classification	Supported Evidence within the synthetic packet
Evidence strength	Strong within the synthetic packet
Analyst confidence	High within the synthetic packet

ER-02 · Synthetic finding

ER-02 The stale directory presents a competing address and phone

What the packet shows. The stale directory presents a competing address and phone within the synthetic packet.

Reasoning. The directory and the current record disagree on two identity fields within the synthetic packet. The fixture identifies E08 as stale; the packet does not establish a relocation date, continued access to the old phone, or a second operating branch. Prefer the controlled current record and matching visible/contact listing for current routing, while retaining E08 as an unresolved external-reference conflict until it is corrected.

AI and business consequence.

- visibility: A source selecting E08 could display an old destination or phone. No actual incorrect display or customer incident is alleged.
- identification: The paired address and phone difference creates a second contact tuple for the same named business.
- reconciliation: Treat E08 as a stale reference, not a confirmed second location.
- its historical chronology remains unprovided.
- ambiguity: The conflict permits a false multi-location interpretation unless the old reference is explicitly reconciled.
- knowledge graph: Competing contact triples could make location consolidation less reliable.
- downstream understanding: Local service context could be associated with the wrong premises.
- downstream trust: Trust evidence could be attributed to the wrong contact record if identity routing is not reconciled.
- downstream recommendation: Any later local scenario should use the current canonical contact and retain the unresolved directory caveat.

Recommended action. Request correction of the directory to the approved current name, address, phone and domain. Obtain a dated confirmation of whether the old address was a former location before describing any move. Recheck the saved public listing after correction; do not create a second branch.

Completion check.

- E08 displays 18 Mill Lane and 503-555-0148, or the stale listing is clearly superseded by a verified corrected record.
- The correction has a dated source capture and traceable record URL.
- No second-location or relocation-date assertion is added without separate evidence.

Severity	High within the synthetic packet
Evidence classification	Conflicting Evidence within the synthetic packet
Evidence strength	Strong within the synthetic packet
Analyst confidence	High within the synthetic packet

Support | E08 · Old directory listing | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E09 · Business Circle member listing

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

ER-03 · Synthetic finding

ER-03 Validation sources have narrow claim scope and do not establish every entity relationship

What the packet shows. Validation sources have narrow claim scope and do not establish every entity relationship within the synthetic packet.

Reasoning. Contact corroboration does not prove legal ownership, license status or authorship of an external review aggregate. Within the synthetic packet, the public business is identifiable but the exact legal/public-name relationship and original review-source relationship remain unverified. This is a claim-level evidence boundary, not evidence that credentials, registrations or genuine reviews do not exist.

AI and business consequence.

- visibility: Ambiguous attribution may lead a summary to attach membership, credentials or an aggregate rating to the entity more strongly than the packet supports.
- identification: The public-facing identity remains identifiable.
- legal-entity identity was not independently established.
- reconciliation: Do not merge an unlinked review platform or legal entity into the entity map.
- ambiguity: Keep a claimed owner relationship distinct from a proven legal ownership record.
- knowledge graph: Edges to a legal entity, credential issuer or review source need claim-specific evidence before being asserted.
- downstream understanding: Practical staff experience can be described as first-party experience without inflating it to formal qualification.
- downstream trust: A trust analysis must inspect original review and credential evidence rather than inherit identity corroboration as quality validation.
- downstream recommendation: Later scenario decisions should preserve the limits of membership and aggregate-rating attribution.

Recommended action. Add the original review-profile link and its attributable aggregate source if available. If a legal-name, ownership or credential relationship is material to a public claim, obtain the specific record and show how it connects to the business. Keep unavailable evidence labeled unverified rather than deleting or denying the relationship.

Completion check.

- Each displayed review aggregate can be traced to its named original source and capture date.
- Any legal/ownership relationship added to the map has a specific supporting record.
- The Business Circle link is not described as a license, inspection, endorsement or quality guarantee.

Severity	Medium within the synthetic packet
Evidence classification	Unverified Evidence within the synthetic packet
Evidence strength	Moderate within the synthetic packet
Analyst confidence	High within the synthetic packet

Support | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E01 · Scenario identity record

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

ER-04 · Synthetic finding

ER-04 Structured business data repeats stale contact information despite a stable canonical identifier

What the packet shows. Structured business data repeats stale contact information despite a stable canonical identifier within the synthetic packet.

Reasoning. Within the synthetic packet, the visible page and its entity markup disagree about where and how to contact the same entity. A stable @id supports continuity but cannot make incorrect address and phone values correct. The old tuple also appears in E08, so the two occurrences should not be counted as independent corroboration of the old location. The sameAs edge is a claimed reference to a Business Circle record, not proof of ownership or endorsement.

AI and business consequence.

- visibility: A consumer of embedded business data could select the stale tuple even when a person sees current footer details.
- no parser or AI system was run.
- identification: The correct name, URL and @id connect the markup to the intended business but carry contradictory contact properties.
- reconciliation: Preserve the stable identifier while replacing stale contact properties from the approved record.
- ambiguity: Do not split one entity into two locations solely to accommodate a template error.
- knowledge graph: The principal explicit entity signal is internally inconsistent.
- address correction takes precedence over adding more schema.
- downstream understanding: Location-associated service descriptions could inherit stale premises.
- downstream trust: Embedded repetition cannot upgrade directory data into independent validation.
- downstream recommendation: Local routing may remain conditional until machine-readable and visible contact details agree.

Recommended action. Update the BikeStore address and telephone to the canonical record while preserving the intended stable @id. Check every template instance, verify that the Business Circle sameAs target represents this business, and compare rendered text with embedded JSON-LD. Treat the parser check as implementation QA, not a knowledge-graph inclusion or AI-response test.

Completion check.

- All BikeStore instances use 18 Mill Lane, Alder Quay, Oregon 97000 and 503-555-0148.
- The intended @id remains https://cedarandspoke.example/#shop and the correct canonical URL is preserved.
- Visible contact details and structured fields match, with a saved before/after validation record.
- The sameAs target is the correct Business Circle record and no ownership inference is made.

Severity	High within the synthetic packet
Evidence classification	Conflicting Evidence within the synthetic packet
Evidence strength	Strong within the synthetic packet
Analyst confidence	High within the synthetic packet

Support | E12 · Structured data | E02 · Homepage and footer | E11 · Technical response and discovery fixture | E08 · Old directory listing

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

↑ All audits | Finding index | Evidence library →

Entity Understanding

23 sections · 4 findings

A synthetic specialist audit of the authored evidence packet. Findings describe the constructed case, not measured real-world business or model performance. No numeric score is assigned. Any source-defined qualitative labels are illustrative judgments within the synthetic packet.

1 Executive Summary

Cedar & Spoke Cycle Works is understandable within the synthetic packet as a single-location bicycle retailer and mechanical workshop serving bicycle owners and commuter/gravel buyers in Alder Quay. Concrete services, indicative price information, staff biographies and three bounded repair examples explain the core offer.

Understanding is materially weakened at two decision points: the booking promise says same day while policy says 3-5 business days, and “Certified e-bike experts” can imply electrical capability the policy excludes. Selected review excerpts and a first-party aggregate do not establish top-rated or superior service. Qualitative status: Moderately Understood Entity within the synthetic packet, with ordinary service contexts clearer than urgent or specialist contexts.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | EU-01 | EU-02 | EU-03 | EU-04

2 Entity Positioning Statement™

Within the synthetic packet, Cedar & Spoke Cycle Works is a single-location bicycle shop and mechanical workshop in Alder Quay serving local bicycle owners and commuter/gravel buyers through bike sales, tune-ups and standard repairs, with practical staff experience, indicative price ranges and mechanical-only e-bike work.

The service focus and price detail are intelligible attributes, not independently proven unique or superior differentiators. The statement deliberately excludes electrical/battery work, guaranteed same-day completion and unverified certification or rating claims.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E10 · Three repair case stories | EU-01 | EU-02 | EU-03 | EU-04

3 Final Scores and Maturity Levels

Not assigned in this fictional demonstration for every numerical understanding field. The optional score headings are retained without imposing a universal scale, weighting or aggregate. Qualitative maturity: Moderate within the synthetic packet. This describes the combination of a clear core offer with material timing and specialist-scope ambiguity.

The scorecard preserves Overall Entity Understanding Score, Business Classification Clarity, Service and Product Understanding, Audience Understanding, Geographic Understanding, Expertise Signal Strength, Differentiation Clarity, Topical Coverage Strength, Recommendation Readiness Support™ (understanding only), Entity Ambiguity Risk and Evidence Quality Score. None is borrowed from another analyst or presented as measured comprehension accuracy.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | E12 · Structured data | EU-01 | EU-02 | EU-03 | EU-04

4 Evidence Classification

Verified Evidence: no real-world verification is claimed. The fictional source contents are authored fixtures, not independently verified events or credentials.

Supported Evidence within the synthetic packet: concrete service/price descriptions, published scope policy, attributed staff experience, the three authored repair examples, and Business Circle contact/listing information.

Unverified Evidence within the synthetic packet: certification issuer/scope, first-party experience as an independently checked fact, review aggregate provenance, comparative superiority and general performance guarantees.

Missing Evidence within the synthetic packet: original review population/source, credential documentation, service-radius/shipping/collection detail and evidence for extra audiences or industries. Missing packet evidence does not imply nonexistence.

Conflicting Evidence within the synthetic packet: same-day copy versus policy, broad e-bike certification phrasing versus electrical exclusions, and current versus stale contact information.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | E12 · Structured data | EU-01 | EU-02 | EU-03 | EU-04

5 Business Classification Analysis

Primary business category: local bicycle retailer and mechanical repair workshop. The supplied offer combines product sales and workshop services; neither manufacturing nor a marketplace model is supported. Commuter/gravel categories describe what it sells, not a separate legal entity or a national delivery operation.

E03 provides concrete first-party category detail; E05 narrows the technical scope and E10 makes ordinary workshop tasks tangible. The Business Circle listing supports the entity’s presence/contact rather than independent validation of every service. Finding EU-01 records the evidence, reasoning, confidence, classification, strength and impact for this conclusion.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | EU-01

6 Service and Product Understanding Analysis

Primary offers: commuter/gravel bike sales, mechanical tune-ups and standard bicycle repairs. Their descriptions and indicative pricing make the offer understandable, but an indicative range is not a fixed final quote and inventory/appointment availability is not established.

Illustrative USD price ranges within the synthetic packet: standard tune-up $95-$140, brake adjustment $25-$45 and wheel true $30-$60. Parts are excluded; the estimate follows inspection. These ranges improve service comprehension without establishing an all-in quote, actual paid transaction or current commercial offer.

Secondary offers: brake and wheel tasks as ordinary workshop work, supported by the authored case examples; this is a narrower service description, not evidence that these jobs are less important in revenue.

Tertiary/conditional offer: mechanical work on eligible e-bikes, explicitly excluding battery, motor and electrical repair. The packet does not support further specialty offers.

Unsupported or unclear offer contexts: unconditional same-day completion, battery/motor/electrical diagnostics or repair, a named certification-backed specialty, guaranteed repair outcomes and national shipping. Some are explicitly excluded; others are merely not evidenced.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E10 · Three repair case stories | EU-01 | EU-02 | EU-03

7 Audience Understanding Analysis

The clearest audience is a local bicycle owner seeking ordinary maintenance/repair or shopping for a commuter/gravel bike. This is a service-fit inference grounded in the named offer; it is not demographic research or a measured customer mix.

E-bike owners form a narrower, conditional audience only when their problem is mechanical and the specific bike/job is accepted. A customer needing urgent completion is not automatically supported by a generic repair category. No fleet, race-team, commercial delivery, accessibility-adaptation or other specialty segment should be added just to complete a hierarchy.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E10 · Three repair case stories | EU-01 | EU-02 | EU-03

8 Primary / Secondary / Tertiary Audience Analysis™

Primary audience: local bicycle owners needing tune-ups or standard mechanical repairs, and buyers seeking commuter/gravel bicycles. Confidence High within the synthetic packet for service fit, not actual audience size.

Secondary audience: owners with narrower brake or wheel service needs illustrated by E10. Confidence High within the synthetic packet that those examples concern the offer, with no independent outcome verification.

Tertiary audience: e-bike owners seeking eligible mechanical-only work. Confidence Moderate within the synthetic packet because eligibility is conditional and broad marketing language requires correction. No additional tertiary audience is evidenced.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E10 · Three repair case stories | EU-01 | EU-03

9 Geographic Understanding Analysis

The intended current location is the single shop at 18 Mill Lane, Alder Quay, Oregon 97000. E08 and E12 retain a stale address/phone, so location-derived answers should preserve the resolution caveat until those fields are corrected.

The local workshop context is supported; a delivery zone, mobile service area, pickup option, nationwide shipping promise or walk-in appointment policy is not supplied. A postal address does not establish any of those offerings. Geographic understanding is therefore strongest at the stated shop, not across an invented radius.

- Resolution dependencies: ER-02 and ER-04.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E12 · Structured data | EU-01

10 Expertise Analysis

Mara Ellis's self-published biography claims 11 years of workshop experience; service advisor Jonas Bell's claims six years. The dated synthetic examples describe commuter shifting/brake tune-up (2026-10-02), gravel wheel true (2026-10-14) and mechanical e-bike brake adjustment (2026-10-23). These concrete narratives make practical service scope understandable within the synthetic packet, while experience and outcomes remain first-party rather than independently verified.

The e-bike credential claim lacks issuer, holder, scope and validation. It must not be inferred from ordinary mechanical experience, Business Circle membership or a JSON-LD type. Practical mechanical experience and formally credentialed electrical expertise are different claims.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | EU-01 | EU-03 | EU-04

11 Differentiation Analysis

The business can be described through its commuter/gravel retail focus, practical mechanical workshop examples and useful service-price explanations. These attributes make its positioning concrete within the synthetic packet; the packet contains no comparison set showing they are unique, cheaper or better than alternatives.

Neither "Certified e-bike experts" nor the site-only 4.9/87 claim establishes comparative superiority. Six selected testimonials may illustrate the way customers are presented, but cannot represent the complete review population or demonstrate universal service quality.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | EU-01 | EU-03 | EU-04

12 Topical Coverage Analysis

The packet covers bicycle sales, tune-ups, ordinary repairs, brakes/wheels, workshop experience, pricing and service limits. These topics provide coherent semantic support for a local mechanical workshop. Three case examples add specificity without proving capability across every bicycle or repair.

Coverage is internally inconsistent where broad e-bike and same-day claims overrun the policy. E11 describes the policy as footer-linked, not absent: its content is available in the authored site structure, but the important limits should also appear beside the relevant offers. No ranking, keyword, backlink or traffic conclusion is made.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E10 · Three repair case stories | E11 · Technical response and discovery fixture | EU-01 | EU-02 | EU-03

13 Recommendation Readiness Support™

Understanding Support: Strong within the synthetic packet for recognizing ordinary mechanical maintenance/repair and commuter/gravel retail needs as relevant to this business. This is only comprehension support for later scenario analysis.

Understanding Support: Conditional for mechanical e-bike work, current-location routing and precise price/timing expectations. Understanding Support: Unsupported for battery/motor/electrical repair, unconditional same-day completion, top-rated leadership or guaranteed results.

The category, audience and service mapping are sufficiently explicit to give the downstream analyst a bounded scenario set. This section does not decide final readiness, assign competitive preference or evaluate the full recommendation universe.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | E12 · Structured data | EU-01 | EU-02 | EU-03 | EU-04

14 Industry Classification Framework™

Primary industry: bicycle retail. Industry Confidence Score™: High within the synthetic packet; grounded in commuter/gravel bike sales.

Secondary industry: bicycle maintenance and mechanical repair services. Industry Confidence Score™: High within the synthetic packet; grounded in tune-ups, ordinary repairs and examples. The secondary label separates categories for reporting, not an inferred revenue ranking.

Tertiary industries: not assigned because no additional industry relationship is supported. E-bikes and gravel bikes are product categories; commuting is a use case; local bicycle owners are an audience. None should be recast as an unrelated industry. Electrical/battery repair is explicitly excluded from the supported service scope.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E10 · Three repair case stories | EU-01 | EU-03

15 Understanding-Based Recommendation Context™

Tier 1: Strongly Supported Understanding Contexts. Ordinary bicycle tune-ups and standard mechanical repairs; commuter/gravel bicycle shopping at the stated local shop. Understanding Support: Strong within the synthetic packet, subject to real appointment/inventory confirmation outside this exercise.

Tier 2: Supported but Secondary Understanding Contexts. Specific brake/wheel work aligned with the authored examples. Understanding Support: Strong for category association, without promising job eligibility or the same result for every bike.

Tier 3: Conditional or Limited Understanding Contexts. Mechanical-only e-bike jobs subject to explicit scope/eligibility confirmation; exact price and completion-date questions require inspection and capacity information. Understanding Support: Moderate or limited within the synthetic packet.

Unsupported / Avoided Contexts. Battery, motor or electrical repair is contradicted by policy. Unconditional same-day repair, a verified “top-rated” position and guaranteed outcomes are not established. Do not expand the scenario set to services merely absent from the packet.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | EU-01 | EU-02 | EU-03 | EU-04

16 Market Understanding Confidence™

Local ordinary bicycle maintenance/repair: High within the synthetic packet. Specific service descriptions and repair examples support category and need association.

Commuter/gravel bicycle shopping: High within the synthetic packet. Product categories are explicit; current inventory, test rides and fulfillment terms remain unprovided.

Narrow brake/wheel tasks: High within the synthetic packet for association with the workshop; diagnosis, price and feasibility remain inspection-dependent.

Mechanical e-bike work: Moderate within the synthetic packet. The policy supports a narrow offer, but the certification wording invites overgeneralization.

Urgent same-day completion: Low within the synthetic packet. Booking and policy conflict. “Best” or verified top-rated workshop: Low within the synthetic packet because comparative and aggregate-review support is unverified. These are qualitative source labels, not probabilities or a new numerical scale.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | EU-01 | EU-02 | EU-03 | EU-04

17 AI Recommendation Path Support™

All prompts below are illustrative query paths, not prompts actually sent to models. Model calls performed: zero. E13 is constructed and supplies no observed response.

- Query: “Where can I get a bike tune-up in Alder Quay?” Understanding Support: High within the synthetic packet. E03/E10 support the task; use the current contact record and do not promise a completion date.
- Query: “Who sells commuter or gravel bikes locally?” Understanding Support: High within the synthetic packet. E03 names those categories; inventory and purchasing details require confirmation.
- Query: “Can this shop fix my e-bike brakes?” Understanding Support: Moderate within the synthetic packet. Mechanical work may fit E03/E05; bike/job eligibility and parts need confirmation.
- Query: “Who can repair my e-bike battery or motor?” Understanding Support: Unsupported within the synthetic packet. E05 explicitly excludes electrical, battery and motor work.
- Query: “Can I get my bicycle repaired today?” Understanding Support: Low within the synthetic packet. E04/E05 conflict; same-day completion must not be promised.
- Query: “Is this the best or top-rated bicycle repair shop?” Understanding Support: Low within the synthetic packet. E07 lacks original aggregate provenance and no comparative assessment exists.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record | EU-01 | EU-02 | EU-03 | EU-04

18 Entity Ambiguity Analysis

The strongest semantic ambiguity is between mechanical e-bike servicing and electrical-specialist work. The strongest operational ambiguity is between immediate repairs and the published 3-5-business-day inspection-based workflow. These are evidenced contradictions, not speculation about hidden services.

The stale address/phone also affects geographic meaning and depends on Resolution correction. No namesake business, multi-branch operation, national sales model or separate specialist company is evidenced in this closed packet.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E08 · Old directory listing | E12 · Structured data | EU-02 | EU-03

19 Major Findings

Major Strengths: EU-01 explains why the core business is understandable. Concrete services, price ranges, attributable staff detail and bounded repair examples support local bicycle retail and mechanical-workshop comprehension.

The evidence is Strong and the interpretation confidence is High within the synthetic packet for that limited conclusion. This does not validate experience claims independently, guarantee outcomes or establish unnamed credentials. Additional positives are aspects of EU-01, not duplicate findings with artificial counts.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E10 · Three repair case stories | EU-01

20 Weaknesses and Recommended Actions

Major Weaknesses, in order of understanding impact: EU-03, broad e-bike expertise versus explicit service exclusions (High); EU-02, same-day booking promise versus policy (High); EU-04, unverified rating-led and superiority implications (Moderate). All severities are within the synthetic packet and use Understanding's severity vocabulary.

Correct scope and timing where a user chooses a service, then strengthen claim provenance and bounded positioning. ER-02/ER-04 contact corrections are dependencies, not duplicate Understanding findings. Full evidence, classification, strength, confidence, visibility/AI impact and completion checks are retained in each EU record.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | E11 · Technical response and discovery fixture | EU-02 | EU-03 | EU-04

21 Why AI Understands the Business

Within the synthetic packet, the name is reinforced by explicit bicycle retail and mechanical-workshop language. Concrete categories connect offers to needs, price-range detail helps explain the purchase/repair process, and case examples make tune-ups, brakes and wheels tangible. The location is specified and the policy supplies real service boundaries at the content level.

These are reasons an analyst expects the core meaning to be recoverable, not evidence that any particular model recovered it. Strong descriptions can coexist with materially misleading exceptions elsewhere on the same site.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E10 · Three repair case stories | EU-01

22 Why AI May Misunderstand the Business

A short booking slogan can be repeated without the detailed service policy, an e-bike credential label can be generalized to electrical work, and a site-only rating can be mistaken for independently validated reputation. Stale machine-readable contact information can also attach otherwise accurate service descriptions to the wrong destination.

The policy exists in the synthetic site structure, so this is not a finding of missing policy. The supplied sources are inconsistent or unevenly attributable. The possible misunderstandings are conditional analytical inferences; no incidence rate or actual model error was observed.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E11 · Technical response and discovery fixture | E12 · Structured data | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record | EU-02 | EU-03 | EU-04

23 Final Determination

Final Entity Understanding Determination: Moderately Understood Entity within the synthetic packet. The core local bicycle retail/mechanical-workshop identity is clearly supported; the strongest signals are concrete offers, practical staff descriptions, useful price explanations and bounded repair examples.

The primary risks are overgeneralized e-bike expertise, contradictory turnaround expectations, unverified reputation-led positioning and unresolved current-contact fields. Prioritize scope/timing corrections and contact reconciliation, then strengthen source attribution.

Understanding-based context summary: ordinary maintenance, repairs and commuter/gravel shopping have the strongest support; mechanical e-bike work is conditional; electrical/battery work and unconditional same-day completion should not be inferred. This is the Understanding lane’s conclusion only, not an overall recommendation or readiness decision.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | E12 · Structured data | EU-01 | EU-02 | EU-03 | EU-04

Finding records and completion checks

Each record below belongs to this specialist lane. Classifications and confidence apply only to the stated claim within the synthetic packet, never to a real business or model performance.

EU-01 · Synthetic finding

EU-01 The core bicycle retail and mechanical workshop model is understandable

What the packet shows. The core bicycle retail and mechanical workshop model is understandable within the synthetic packet.

Reasoning. The packet connects a recognizable business category with concrete offerings, customer needs and practical examples. This supports understanding ordinary sales and mechanical work without needing to infer a manufacturer, national retailer or electrical workshop. The case studies show the content of claimed past jobs, not independently verified outcomes or a guarantee that a new job will succeed.

AI and business consequence.

- visibility: Specific services and use cases can be associated with the business in a synthetic summary.
- actual AI visibility was not tested.
- classification: The supported model is a single-location bicycle retailer with a mechanical repair workshop.
- service understanding: Commuter/gravel sales, tune-ups, brakes and wheels have concrete support.
- audience understanding: Local bicycle owners and commuter/gravel buyers have direct service fit.
- expertise interpretation: Staff experience and bounded repair examples support practical familiarity, not unnamed formal credentials.
- recommendation context: Understanding support is strongest for ordinary local mechanical work and commuter/gravel shopping, with availability and scope confirmed separately.

Recommended action. Preserve the concrete service taxonomy, price-range explanations and dated case examples. Keep electrical exclusions and inspection conditions beside relevant service descriptions so the strongest content remains accurately bounded.

Completion check.

- Core service descriptions retain the distinction between bike sales and workshop services.
- Every indicative price range states what it covers and that the final estimate follows inspection where applicable.
- Case examples do not become performance guarantees or proof of unrelated electrical expertise.

Severity	Not applicable: positive finding within the synthetic packet
Evidence classification	Supported Evidence within the synthetic packet
Evidence strength	Strong within the synthetic packet
Analyst confidence	High within the synthetic packet

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E10 · Three repair case stories

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

EU-02 · Synthetic finding

EU-02 The same-day booking promise conflicts with the workshop policy

What the packet shows. The same-day booking promise conflicts with the workshop policy within the synthetic packet.

Reasoning. Two first-party statements set materially different expectations within the synthetic packet. The more specific service policy supplies the cautious scheduling basis, but its presence does not erase the contradictory booking promise. A footer-only link makes it easier for a service summary to use the short promise without its conditions. There is no observed booking failure and no measured system-extraction result.

AI and business consequence.

- visibility: An answer based on booking copy alone could advertise urgency support the policy does not substantiate.
- service understanding: The packet supports an inspection-based workflow with a stated 3-5-business-day timeframe, not an unconditional same-day repair service.
- audience understanding: A rider needing a repair today has a materially different need from a rider who can leave a bike for several business days.
- recommendation context: Urgent same-day completion has unsupported understanding support unless an explicit, current exception is confirmed.
- ambiguity: The conflict concerns timing rather than whether the business performs ordinary repairs.

Recommended action. Replace the unconditional same-day wording with the approved workshop timeframe and inspection condition. If some minor jobs can be completed same day, define the eligible tasks, capacity limits and confirmation step explicitly. Put those conditions next to the booking action and relevant services.

Completion check.

- Booking, service descriptions and policy use one consistent turnaround statement.
- Any same-day exception names its scope and makes confirmation subject to capacity and inspection.
- The booking screen provides the policy conditions in context rather than relying only on a footer link.
- No completion guarantee is inferred from indicative pricing or a booked intake slot.

Severity	High within the synthetic packet
Evidence classification	Conflicting Evidence within the synthetic packet
Evidence strength	Strong within the synthetic packet
Analyst confidence	High within the synthetic packet

Support | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E11 · Technical response and discovery fixture

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

EU-03 · Synthetic finding

EU-03 Broad e-bike certification language overstates the evidenced service boundary

What the packet shows. Broad e-bike certification language overstates the evidenced service boundary within the synthetic packet.

Reasoning. “Certified e-bike experts” invites a broad reading that is unsupported by the packet and conflicts with its explicit electrical exclusions. The appropriate distinction is between supported mechanical service scope and an unverified credential claim. Nothing here proves that the staff holds no credential; the packet simply does not substantiate its issuer, holder, validity or scope.

AI and business consequence.

- visibility: A broad e-bike label could associate the business with battery diagnostics, motor repair or electrical work that the policy excludes.
- classification: Mechanical servicing of an e-bike is not equivalent to an e-bike electrical repair specialty.
- expertise interpretation: The claimed certification remains unverified.
- the published conflict itself is clearly evidenced within the packet.
- recommendation context: Understanding support is conditional for mechanical e-bike work and unsupported for battery, motor or electrical repair.
- service understanding: The exclusion must accompany the positive offer rather than be left to a distant policy page.

Recommended action. Reword the service offer as mechanical work on eligible e-bikes and state the battery/motor/electrical exclusions next to it. If the certification language is retained, provide the issuer, credential name, named holder, valid scope and a verifiable source; match the service claim to what the credential and workshop policy actually support.

Completion check.

- Every e-bike service entry clearly excludes battery, motor and electrical repair.
- The phrase “Certified e-bike experts” is removed, narrowed or supported by attributable credential evidence.
- An eligibility check is included before accepting a mechanical e-bike job.
- A credential, if supplied, is not used as evidence for services the policy still excludes.

Severity	High within the synthetic packet
Evidence classification	Conflicting Evidence within the synthetic packet
Evidence strength	Strong within the synthetic packet
Analyst confidence	High within the synthetic packet

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E02 · Homepage and footer | E06 · Staff biographies

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

EU-04 · Synthetic finding

EU-04 Practical experience is understandable, but superiority and rating-led positioning are not established

What the packet shows. Practical experience is understandable, but superiority and rating-led positioning are not established within the synthetic packet.

Reasoning. The packet supports describing practical workshop focus, useful service/pricing detail and examples of ordinary repairs. It does not establish market leadership, objectively superior workmanship, universally successful outcomes or a verified 87-review reputation corpus. The six supplied excerpts are selected testimonial material, not the denominator of the claimed aggregate. This limits rating-led differentiation, not the existence of real reviews or the underlying practical service offer.

AI and business consequence.

- visibility: A summary could repeat a rating or “expert” label as if it were independently established evidence of superiority.
- differentiation: Describe the service focus and transparent pricing information as presented attributes, not unique advantages over unnamed competitors.
- expertise interpretation: Specific biography and case detail make experience understandable but remain first-party representations.
- recommendation context: Ordinary workshop contexts remain understandable.
- “best,” “top-rated” and guaranteed-result contexts need evidence beyond the packet.
- audience understanding: Do not expand to high-risk, specialist or competitive-performance audiences simply because selected excerpts praise the shop.

Recommended action. Use bounded positioning based on concrete services, price-range explanations and practical examples. Trace the review aggregate to its original source before relying on it, and label selected

excerpts clearly. Preserve dates, job scope and limitations in repair cases without promising the same outcome for every bicycle.

Completion check.

- The aggregate rating is linked to an attributable original source or is explicitly marked unverified and not used to claim leadership.
- Six selected excerpts are distinguished from the claimed 87-review population.
- The experience claim remains attributed to the staff biography unless independently checked.
- Case studies identify the actual task and do not guarantee future results.

Severity	Moderate within the synthetic packet
Evidence classification	Unverified Evidence within the synthetic packet
Evidence strength	Moderate within the synthetic packet
Analyst confidence	High within the synthetic packet

Support | E06 · Staff biographies | E10 · Three repair case stories | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E09 · Business Circle member listing

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

↑ All audits | Finding index | Evidence library →

Trust Signal

29 sections · 4 findings

A synthetic specialist audit of the authored evidence packet. Findings describe the constructed case, not measured real-world business or model performance. No numeric score is assigned. Any source-defined qualitative labels are illustrative judgments within the synthetic packet.

1 Trust Thesis™

Within the synthetic packet, Cedar & Spoke Cycle Works has a plausible, accountable local workshop description: named staff, a current contact record, clearly priced mechanical services and three job-specific narratives. These are useful reasons to understand the fictional business as a candidate for ordinary maintenance inquiries.

Trust support is constrained by conflicting destination and turnaround details, an unscoped e-bike certification claim and an unverified review aggregate. The defensible boundary is mechanical bicycle work with inspection and scheduling qualifications. The packet does not justify electrical e-bike repair, guaranteed same-day completion, certified expertise or reputation leadership.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-01 | TS-02 | TS-03 | TS-04

2 Executive Summary

This is a fictional demonstration, not an assessment of an operating business. All business evidence, quotations, dates, listings and case studies are constructed; all confidence, severity and strength labels apply only within that packet.

Four material trust findings are carried through the report rather than counted repeatedly. Correct claim and contact contradictions before adding more badges, testimonials or technical markup. No numerical trust score, maturity level or real-world trust certification is assigned.

- Preserve: clear service ranges, estimate-after-inspection terms, named roles and bounded mechanical cases.
- Resolve first: same-day promise, broad e-bike expertise phrase and conflicting directory details.
- Substantiate next: original review source and any retained certification claim.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-01 | TS-02 | TS-03 | TS-04

3 Scorecard

All eight source-defined scorecard fields are retained in the accompanying scorecard and marked “Not assigned in this fictional demonstration”. Each field retains its 0-100 source scale, but no value, band or overall numeric result is created.

This omission follows the demonstration’s explicit scope. It is not a zero, a negative business judgment, a replacement scoring scale or a claim that the framework cannot support provisional analyst-assessed scoring in a properly scoped evidence assessment. No empirical numerical calibration is asserted.

- Transparency Score™: Not assigned in this fictional demonstration
- Legitimacy Score™: Not assigned in this fictional demonstration
- Reputation Score™: Not assigned in this fictional demonstration
- Expertise Trust Score™: Not assigned in this fictional demonstration
- External Validation Score™: Not assigned in this fictional demonstration
- Category Trust Alignment Score™: Not assigned in this fictional demonstration
- Trust Confidence Score™: Not assigned in this fictional demonstration
- Trust-Supported Recommendation Confidence™: Not assigned in this fictional demonstration

4 Transparency Analysis™

The current business record and footer identify one location: 18 Mill Lane, Alder Quay, Oregon 97000, with 503-555-0148. Staff biographies identify Mara Ellis as owner/mechanic and Jonas Bell as service advisor. Within the synthetic packet these disclosures make responsibility and contact routes legible, while their biographical claims remain self-published.

Price ranges and estimate-after-inspection terms are useful transparency signals. The counterweights are the stale directory and incompatible timing promise. No ownership registry, founding date or independently tested contact accessibility is supplied; those points remain unverified rather than adverse findings.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E08 · Old directory listing | TS-01 | TS-02

5 Legitimacy Analysis™

Within the synthetic packet, a single business identity, named people, repair narratives and a member listing form a traceable operating narrative. They demonstrate how a real assessment would distinguish local operational evidence from broad marketing language.

No real premises, registration, license, working telephone or membership was checked. The conflicting directory reduces contact consistency, but it does not prove fraud or that the entity is unreal. Because the entire entity is fictional, no real-world legitimacy conclusion is possible.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E06 · Staff biographies | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-01

6 Reputation Analysis™

E07 provides an unverified site claim of 4.9/87 and six explicitly selected excerpts with mixed attribution. Within the synthetic packet, the widget’s existence does not verify the review count, rating calculation, platform, authorship or coverage.

Reputation sentiment, trend, recency, complaint patterns and consistency across independent sources are not assessable from this material. The proper limitation is “aggregate and representativeness unverified”, not “the business has no reviews” or “customers are dissatisfied”.

Support | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | TS-04

7 Expertise Validation Analysis™

The strongest expertise detail within the synthetic packet is the match between ordinary services and three bounded narratives: a commuter shifting/brake tune-up, a gravel wheel true and a mechanical e-bike brake adjustment. These examples illustrate task relevance rather than independently verified repair outcomes.

Mara’s 11 years and Jonas’s 6 years are self-published experience claims. The phrase “Certified e-bike experts” supplies neither an issuer nor credential scope. Mechanical experience and case detail cannot establish battery, motor or electrical competence, especially when E05 explicitly excludes that work.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-03

8 External Validation Analysis™

The constructed Alder Quay Business Circle member listing corroborates the represented membership, listing and contact fields within the synthetic packet. It does not validate licensing, professional certification, workmanship or safety.

The stale directory is a separate contradictory source artifact, not independent proof of the current destination. Reusing the same member listing in several report sections does not create several validations. No media, manufacturer authorization, government record or industry credential validation is supplied.

Support | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | TS-01 | TS-03

9 Category Trust Alignment™

For a local bicycle shop/workshop, practical trust rests on accountable people, reachable and accurate location details, clear job scope, honest estimate/timing terms and relevant evidence of mechanical work. Customer feedback is useful when its origin and representativeness can be evaluated.

Within the synthetic packet, the service detail and case narratives align with those expectations. The same-day and e-bike claims are more consequential than a missing decorative badge because they can change which repair a customer brings and what outcome the customer expects. No medical, legal or unrelated credential standard is imposed, and no licensing obligation is invented.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-01 | TS-02 | TS-03 | TS-04

10 Trust Confidence Score™

Not assigned in this fictional demonstration. This metric concerns trust in the entity, not overall suitability for every recommendation scenario.

The qualitative picture within the synthetic packet is mixed: useful accountability and practical service detail coexist with material claim and contact contradictions. That explanatory conclusion is not a substitute numeric score or a calibrated prediction of AI trust.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-01 | TS-02 | TS-03 | TS-04

11 Trust-Supported Recommendation Confidence™

Not assigned in this fictional demonstration. Trust-perspective support is stronger for an inquiry about ordinary mechanical maintenance than for any promise of exceptional quality, exact timing or specialist electrical capability.

Within the synthetic packet, the scope is conditional on inspection, service acceptance and timing confirmation. This section does not assign the separate Recommendation Readiness analyst's Recommendation Confidence Score or final readiness determination.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-02 | TS-03 | TS-04

12 Trust Driver Hierarchy™

Four substantiated positive contributors are identified within the synthetic packet; a fifth is not invented to fill a list. Their order reflects relevance to the current workshop category, not measured contribution or a scoring formula.

- 1. Specific mechanical services, indicative prices and estimate terms: E03/E05.
- 2. Named accountable owner and service roles: E06, with experience durations still unverified.
- 3. Three job-specific mechanical repair narratives: E10, with no independent outcome verification.
- 4. Business Circle listing agreement on current contact fields: E09, limited to listing/contact support.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories

13 Trust Limiter Hierarchy™

Four material trust limiters are prioritized within the synthetic packet. Their shared evidence is not counted again as new independent problems each time it appears.

- 1. Broad e-bike certification wording versus explicit mechanical-only policy: TS-03.
- 2. Same-day repair promise versus 3-5-business-day policy: TS-02.
- 3. Stale local address and phone versus the current record: TS-01.
- 4. Review aggregate and selected excerpts without original-source verification: TS-04.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | TS-03 | TS-02 | TS-01 | TS-04

14 Trust Weight Analysis™

Qualitative weighting is used because percentages would imply unsupported precision in this fictional demonstration. It is not a formula for the unassigned trust score.

Within the synthetic packet, scope truthfulness, practical service terms and current contact accuracy carry high influence. Mechanical proof and accountable staff carry supporting influence. Attributable reputation would be important for comparative confidence, but the current widget has low evidential weight. Business Circle-style membership is a modest identity contributor.

- High influence: service capability boundaries, timing/estimate transparency and location/contact consistency.
- Moderate influence: relevant mechanical cases, named responsibility and source-verifiable customer experience when available.
- Low influence: a membership badge by itself, repeated same-source assertions, or technical presentation without new substantive proof.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-01 | TS-02 | TS-03 | TS-04

15 Trust Boundary Analysis™

Within the synthetic packet, ordinary tune-ups, brakes and wheel work have a relevant first-party evidence base. Commuter/gravel bike retail can be described as an offered category, but current stock, fit outcomes and purchase terms are not established.

Trust must stop before battery/motor/electrical repair, an unverified certified-specialist claim, guaranteed same-day completion, guaranteed repair outcomes or “best/top-rated” comparisons. The boundary is based on stated exclusions and actual evidence limits, not on an assumption of incompetence.

- Supported description: one local bicycle shop/workshop offering specified mechanical services and commuter/gravel bike sales.
- Conditional support: e-bike mechanical work, only after the job is confirmed to be within the stated acceptance policy.
- Unsupported inference: that membership proves a license; that an experience duration proves certification; that six excerpts validate 87 reviews.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-02 | TS-03 | TS-04

16 Trust-Based Recommendation Scope Analysis™

The source-defined trust-scope categories below describe trust support within the synthetic packet, not final recommendation readiness.

- Strong Trust-Supported Scope: no unconditional high-trust claim is assigned from an entirely constructed, predominantly first-party packet.
- Moderate Trust-Supported Scope: ordinary tune-up, brake and wheel-work inquiries, supported by service detail and relevant case narratives.
- Conditional Trust-Supported Scope: commuter/gravel retail inquiries without inventory guarantees; e-bike mechanical service only with explicit scope and scheduling confirmation.
- Low / Unsupported Trust Scope: guaranteed same-day repair, battery/motor/electrical work, certified-specialist or top-rated claims, and performance guarantees.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-02 | TS-03 | TS-04

17 Recommendation Boundary Confidence™

Trust namespace only. No numeric boundary-confidence value is assigned. These are qualitative judgments about the support and limits within the synthetic packet.

Confidence is High that the packet explicitly excludes battery, motor and electrical work and contains a turnaround conflict. Confidence is Moderate that its self-reported ordinary mechanical evidence supports a bounded inquiry. The certification and review-aggregate claims remain Unverified Evidence; confidence in that provenance limitation is High within the synthetic packet. These labels do not measure an AI system's likelihood of observing the boundary.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-02 | TS-03 | TS-04

18 Review Pattern Analysis™

Six invented, selected excerpts are not a sampling frame. Within the synthetic packet, their content may illustrate how testimonial themes would be coded, but selection and mixed attribution prevent a defensible pattern claim.

Volume beyond the displayed unverified count, overall sentiment, recent changes, recurring complaints and cross-platform agreement are Unavailable for analysis. No aggregate sentiment, complaint rate or trend is fabricated. An original-source link and a dated, sufficiently representative corpus would be needed for a fuller analysis.

Support | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | TS-04

19 Category-Specific Trust Weighting™

Workshop trust is especially sensitive to whether the shop can perform the requested job and whether the customer receives a clear estimate and realistic completion expectation. Accurate local destination information is similarly central to an in-person service.

Within the synthetic packet, brake/wheel/tune-up narratives matter more than an unrelated accolade would. Manufacturer or electrical credentials would matter only if the business claimed work requiring that expertise. Because electrical work is expressly excluded, the immediate remedy is to align the advertised boundary, not to suggest it must add a new service.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-01 | TS-02 | TS-03

20 Trust Contradiction Analysis™

Trust Contradiction Risk™: High within the synthetic packet. The highest-consequence conflicts concern promised timing and e-bike scope; the stale address/phone is also material to local service use. The unverified review aggregate is a provenance gap, not a demonstrated conflict with an external rating.

No ownership, licensing or credential issuer contradiction is invented. The packet lacks proof of a credential, but lack of proof is not evidence of absence. Technical markup or new content would not resolve the underlying contradictions unless the public claims themselves are corrected.

- TS-01: 18 Mill Lane / 503-555-0148 versus 6 Foundry Street / 503-555-0119.
- TS-02: "same-day repairs" versus 3-5 business days and inspection-based estimates.

- TS-03: broad “Certified e-bike experts” wording versus mechanical-only service policy.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E08 · Old directory listing | TS-01 | TS-02 | TS-03

21 Trust Strength Analysis™

The accompanying four strength records contain evidence, reasoning, confidence, classification, strength, severity and impact fields. All apply only within the synthetic packet. These are positive supporting facts, not a counterweight that cancels contradictory claims.

Service specificity is the strongest practical contributor. Staff visibility supports accountability; dated job narratives support relevance; the member listing supports bounded identity consistency. None independently verifies service quality.

- Specific mechanical service descriptions and indicative prices - Improves bounded service transparency; it does not establish low prices or a guaranteed final bill.
- Named accountable people - Supports the transparency of the business narrative, not automatic authority or certified competence.
- Three service-specific repair narratives - Supports a limited mechanical-work narrative without proving workmanship, durability, safety outcomes or performance guarantees.
- A matching external listing artifact - Adds bounded identity support; it must not be represented as licensing or a quality endorsement.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories

22 Trust Gap Analysis™

The material trust gaps are the evidence or clarity needed to close TS-01 through TS-04. All are bounded to the synthetic packet; none proves that the business lacks reviews, credentials or lawful registration.

- TS-03, High: issuer/scope proof for the certification claim, plus consistent capability wording. Resolution: substantiate the precise claim or narrow/remove it.
- TS-02, High: one unambiguous timing commitment. Resolution: align booking and policy terms and define any expedited exception.
- TS-01, High: reconciled current directory contact fields. Resolution: correct the stale record and recheck it.
- TS-04, Medium: traceable review aggregate and consistent excerpt attribution. Resolution: attach the original source and distinguish selected testimonials from aggregate evidence.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | TS-01 | TS-02 | TS-03 | TS-04

23 AI Trust Impact Analysis™

Within the synthetic packet, transparent mechanical service detail supports bounded credibility, while the contradictions make broad claims less dependable. The findings separately address trust, credibility, legitimacy, category alignment and trust-supported recommendation confidence.

The largest consequence is an inaccurate explanation of what the shop can do, when it can do it or where to go. These are analytical risks, not measured model behavior. E11/E12 are constructed technical fixtures, and E13 is an explicitly constructed teaching example; none establishes live AI recognition, retrieval, trust or recommendation performance.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E11 · Technical response and discovery fixture | E12 · Structured data | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record | TS-01 | TS-02 | TS-03 | TS-04

24 AI Trust Profile™

Overall Trust Assessment: within the synthetic packet, the business narrative has useful accountability and ordinary mechanical-service support, but material contradictions and incomplete independent proof require bounded language.

- Top Trust Drivers: service/price specificity; named people; mechanical cases; member-listing identity support.
- Top Trust Risks: broad e-bike claim; timing contradiction; stale contact record; review provenance.
- Trust Boundaries: mechanical work and retail inquiries only, with inspection/availability confirmation; no electrical, guaranteed timing, certified-authority or reputation-leader inference.
- Trust-Based Recommendation Scope: Moderate for ordinary mechanical inquiries; Conditional for e-bike mechanical/retail inquiries; Low / Unsupported for excluded or unproven claims.
- Recommendation Boundary Confidence: High for recognizing explicit exclusions; Moderate for limited positive self-reported support; no numeric value.
- Trust Confidence and Trust-Supported Recommendation Confidence: Not assigned in this fictional demonstration.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-01 | TS-02 | TS-03 | TS-04

25 Trust Evidence Inventory™

The accompanying inventory preserves claim-level classification and shared evidence IDs. All artifacts are constructed for this demonstration, including those written in first-party or directory styles. “Supported Evidence” here describes internal support, not external verification.

The inventory distinguishes missing packet material from a real-world absence and prevents the same source from being counted as independent validation multiple times. Technical and cross-model fixtures are not extra proof of credentials, service quality or reputation.

- Ownership, leadership and team: Supported Evidence; Names and roles are supplied; experience durations are Unverified Evidence. No independently verified employment or ownership record is included.
- Contact information and local identity: Conflicting Evidence; Current canonical and member-listing details conflict with one stale directory.
- Reviews and reputation: Unverified Evidence; The 4.9/87 aggregate is unverified; six excerpts are explicitly selected, invented examples, not a representative review sample.
- Certifications: Unverified Evidence; “Certified e-bike experts” lacks issuer and scope. This is not evidence that credentials do not exist.

- Licensing and registration: Missing Evidence; No licensing/registration artifact or applicable legal requirement is established in this packet. No noncompliance conclusion is made.
- Associations: Supported Evidence; Constructed Business Circle member listing supports membership/listing/contact representation only.
- Partnerships and media mentions: Missing Evidence; Not supplied in the packet; not required padding for the ordinary repair scenarios, and absence here proves nothing about real availability.
- Business history: Unverified Evidence; Personal experience durations are not business operating age. A stale address does not prove a relocation history or date.
- Expertise and service proof: Supported Evidence; Specific mechanical services and three first-party-style repair narratives; no independent outcome evidence.
- Category trust boundaries: Conflicting Evidence; Mechanical-only policy is useful, but broad e-bike and same-day marketing claims conflict with its limits.
- Technical, structured-data and cross-model artifacts: Supported Evidence; Constructed fixtures may demonstrate information handling only. They do not independently validate reputation, credentials or trust, and no actual model test was performed.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | E11 · Technical response and discovery fixture | E12 · Structured data | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record

26 Trust Maturity Level™

Not assigned in this fictional demonstration. The five source-defined maturity levels are not used to classify an invented business from invented evidence.

The packet is sufficiently detailed to demonstrate strengths, gaps and trust boundaries, but that does not establish real operating maturity. In particular, “Untrusted Entity” is not inferred from missing independent proof.

27 AI Trust Impact on Recommendations™

Within the synthetic packet, ordinary maintenance inquiries have the strongest trust support because the stated services and mechanical examples align. Reputation-led comparison, urgent turnaround and broad specialist claims are weakened by provenance gaps or direct contradiction.

Recommendations should be bounded to what the policy and evidence actually support: confirm destination, inspect the bike, agree the estimate and confirm completion timing. Electrical e-bike work remains outside scope. This is a trust-perspective bridge to the separate readiness analysis, not a claim that any AI system has made or changed a recommendation.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-01 | TS-02 | TS-03 | TS-04

28 Final Trust Determination™

Within the synthetic packet, the fictional shop has credible descriptive elements for ordinary mechanical service inquiries, but insufficient substantiation for broad certified expertise, verified aggregate reputation or unconditional turnaround promises. Contact and claim inconsistencies should be resolved before stronger trust language is used.

No numeric score, maturity classification, real-world endorsement or final recommendation-readiness determination is assigned in this Trust section. The conclusion is a bounded demonstration of analytical reasoning, not a judgment about a real business.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-01 | TS-02 | TS-03 | TS-04

29 Strategic Trust Recommendations™

Prioritize substantive contradictions before additional presentation features. The following order reflects the possible consequence to a workshop customer within the synthetic packet, not estimated AI ranking gains.

- 1. Align e-bike capability language with the mechanical-only policy and substantiate any retained credential: TS-03.
- 2. Resolve the same-day promise and expose inspection, estimate and completion terms before booking: TS-02.
- 3. Reconcile the stale location/phone listing with the owner-approved business record: TS-01.
- 4. Make review provenance inspectable and label selected excerpts accurately: TS-04.
- 5. Preserve the useful service ranges, named roles and case narratives, adding support only when truthful and authorized. Reassess the affected claims against each finding’s completion checks.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-03 | TS-02 | TS-01 | TS-04

Finding records and completion checks

Each record below belongs to this specialist lane. Classifications and confidence apply only to the stated claim within the synthetic packet, never to a real business or model performance.

TS-01 · Synthetic finding

TS-01 Visible accountability is weakened by conflicting location and contact details

What the packet shows. Within the synthetic packet, the canonical record, footer and Business Circle listing support a coherent current business identity, but one local directory gives a different address and phone.

Reasoning. The identity evidence is specific enough to explain who operates the fictional shop and how it presents its current location. The directory conflict is a direct inconsistency in the constructed evidence, not a second branch or evidence of misconduct. Business Circle membership adds limited listing corroboration within the packet, not registration, licensing, verified ownership or proof of repair quality.

AI and business consequence.

- trust: Makes current contact information less dependable across sources.
- credibility: Introduces an avoidable contradiction between business profiles.
- legitimacy: Weakens identity consistency without establishing that the business is illegitimate.
- category trust alignment: A local workshop needs dependable location/contact details to support accountable service.
- trust supported recommendation confidence: Supports a qualified local-shop description, but destination details should be confirmed before a visit.
- visibility impact: Potential retrieval of stale details is a reasoned risk only. No search result, model response or visibility change was measured.

Recommended action. Use one owner-approved business record to align the website, directory and relevant profiles. Request correction of the outdated listing, and identify it as a former address only if that history is confirmed.

Completion check.

- E08 or its replacement shows 18 Mill Lane and 503-555-0148.
- Current identity fields match E01 across the assessed sources.
- A dated recheck records any residual inconsistency without assuming every directory has been corrected.

Severity	High · within synthetic packet
Evidence classification	Conflicting Evidence · within synthetic packet
Evidence strength	Strong · within synthetic packet
Analyst confidence	High · within synthetic packet

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E06 · Staff biographies | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | RR-03

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

TS-02 · Synthetic finding

TS-02 An unconditional same-day promise conflicts with the service policy

What the packet shows. Within the synthetic packet, the booking message promises “same-day repairs” while the service policy gives 3-5 business days and says estimates are confirmed after inspection.

Reasoning. The two statements set materially different expectations for a customer depending on which entry point is read. The policy may be the more specific explanation, but specificity alone does not erase the booking promise. The audit cannot conclude which timing the shop actually delivers. The conflict should be resolved in the source copy rather than converted into an accusation of dishonesty.

AI and business consequence.

- trust: Reduces confidence that public promises are reliable.

- credibility: Makes service terms appear inconsistent even though a detailed policy exists.
- legitimacy: Does not materially establish or undermine business existence.
- category trust alignment: Clear turnaround, inspection and estimate terms are important in repair services.
- trust supported recommendation confidence: Precludes trust support for a guaranteed same-day repair recommendation.
- visibility impact: An AI system could repeat the shorter booking claim instead of the qualification. This is an analytical possibility, not an observed response.

Recommended action. Replace the unconditional same-day language with one consistent statement reflecting the approved policy. Distinguish appointment, inspection and repair completion, and explain how any genuine expedited service is confirmed.

Completion check.

- Booking, service and policy copy state consistent turnaround expectations.
- Inspection and quote confirmation are visible before a customer submits a booking.
- Any same-day exception has explicit eligibility, availability and confirmation terms rather than a blanket promise.

Severity	High · within synthetic packet
Evidence classification	Conflicting Evidence · within synthetic packet
Evidence strength	Strong · within synthetic packet
Analyst confidence	High · within synthetic packet

Support | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E03 · Services and price ranges | RR-01

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

TS-03 · Synthetic finding

TS-03 Ordinary mechanical expertise is supported, but the e-bike certification claim is not substantiated

What the packet shows. Within the synthetic packet, staff bios and three dated repair case studies support a practical mechanical-work narrative. The broader “Certified e-bike experts” claim has no issuer or scope and conflicts with the policy’s exclusion of electrical, motor and battery repair.

Reasoning. Specific examples are more useful than a broad expertise slogan, but first-party case studies do not independently validate results or establish certification. The policy supplies a clear operational exclusion. The absence of a credential record in this packet does not prove that no credential exists. Even a genuine mechanical credential would not automatically authorize a claim covering all e-bike systems.

AI and business consequence.

- trust: Supports only the expertise that is described with bounded, relevant examples.
- credibility: An unexplained certification claim is less dependable than a clearly named, scoped credential.
- legitimacy: Does not determine registration or operating legitimacy.

- category trust alignment: Mechanical repair evidence is relevant.
- electrical/battery competence cannot be inferred from it.
- trust supported recommendation confidence: Supports conditional consideration for ordinary mechanical work, not e-bike battery, motor, controller or electrical diagnosis.
- visibility impact: Broad language could be extracted without its policy exclusion. No model extraction or recommendation error was measured.

Recommended action. Remove or narrow the certification claim unless an issuer, credential holder, valid scope and current status can be substantiated. Place “mechanical work only; no battery, motor or electrical repairs” beside every e-bike service mention and booking entry.

Completion check.

- Each retained certification statement identifies the credential and its actual scope, with source proof where appropriate.
- Homepage, services and booking copy state the same mechanical-only e-bike boundary.
- A reviewer can distinguish the three mechanical case studies from proof of electrical competence or performance guarantees.

Severity	High · within synthetic packet
Evidence classification	Conflicting Evidence · within synthetic packet
Evidence strength	Strong · within synthetic packet
Analyst confidence	High · within synthetic packet

Support | E06 · Staff biographies | E10 · Three repair case stories | E02 · Homepage and footer | E05 · Service policy | RR-02

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

TS-04 · Synthetic finding

TS-04 A displayed review aggregate cannot be traced to an original review source

What the packet shows. Within the synthetic packet, a website widget claims 4.9/87, but no original review-source link or auditable dataset supports that aggregate. Six selected excerpts with mixed attribution are provided.

Reasoning. The packet establishes what the widget says, not that 87 reviews exist at a particular platform or produce a 4.9 average. Six selected excerpts cannot establish distribution, review recency, complaint frequency, trend, authenticity or representativeness. The proper conclusion is unverified aggregate reputation evidence, not “no reviews”, fabricated reviews or poor customer satisfaction.

AI and business consequence.

- trust: Restricts how much confidence can come from the displayed review aggregate.
- credibility: Requires attribution before the number can be repeated as established fact.

- legitimacy: An unverifiable review aggregate does not show that the shop is unreal.
- category trust alignment: Independent, attributable service reviews would be useful support for a local repair decision.
- trust supported recommendation confidence: Does not justify “top-rated”, “most trusted” or superior-service recommendations.
- visibility impact: Repeating the displayed number as verified would overstate the evidence. No repetition by a live model was observed.

Recommended action. Link the widget to its actual original platform and distinguish platform-wide aggregate data from curated site testimonials. Record source, count, rating basis and retrieval date; keep attribution and permissions appropriate to each excerpt.

Completion check.

- A working original-source reference identifies the review platform and business profile.
- Displayed count and average reconcile with the dated source or are removed/qualified.
- Curated excerpts are labeled as selected and have consistent attribution.
- No claim of trend, review representativeness or superiority is based on six excerpts alone.

Severity	Medium · within synthetic packet
Evidence classification	Unverified Evidence · within synthetic packet
Evidence strength	Weak · within synthetic packet
Analyst confidence	High · within synthetic packet

Support | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | RR-04

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

↑ All audits | Finding index | Evidence library →

Recommendation Readiness

21 sections · 4 findings

A synthetic specialist audit of the authored evidence packet. Findings describe the constructed case, not measured real-world business or model performance. No numeric score is assigned. Any source-defined qualitative labels are illustrative judgments within the synthetic packet.

1 Recommendation Thesis™

Within the synthetic packet, Cedar & Spoke Cycle Works is easiest to connect to planned ordinary bicycle maintenance and specific mechanical repair inquiries. The useful reasons are service specificity, indicative prices and relevant case narratives, not an unverified star rating or broad certification phrase.

Recommendation boundaries matter as much as positive fit: do not promise same-day completion, electrical e-bike repair, confirmed retail stock or superior reputation. The analysis below demonstrates how to combine identity, service and trust evidence without asserting that an actual AI model has recommended the fictional shop.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | RR-01 | RR-02 | RR-03 | RR-04

2 Executive Summary

This is scenario analysis within a fully synthetic packet, not a live-market recommendation audit. A bounded inventory covers the offered services, material marketing claims and an explicit electrical-work exclusion. Strong, Moderate, Weak and Unavailable are the methodology’s contextual matrix labels; they do not form a new aggregate scale.

Routine tune-up and mechanical brake/wheel inquiries have the clearest content support. Mechanical e-bike work and retail inquiry require qualifications. Guaranteed same-day and reputation-superiority scenarios are weak. Battery, motor and electrical repair is unavailable because it is explicitly excluded, not because a search found nothing.

- All three Readiness score fields and all seven weighted pillar fields are retained but unassigned.
- Evidence reused from Trust keeps the same IDs and is not treated as independent corroboration.
- Actual model calls: 0. No response rate, recommendation rate, model preference or measured uplift is reported.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record | RR-01 | RR-02 | RR-03 | RR-04

3 Recommendation Readiness Score™

Not assigned in this fictional demonstration. The seven source-defined pillars and their original weights are preserved. No synthetic pillar value is allocated, so the weighted total is not computed; absent values are not zero-filled or renormalized.

The source formula remains: Scenario Coverage ×20% + Trigger Coverage ×20% + Expertise Strength ×15% + Differentiation ×15% + Evidence Density ×10% + Geography ×10% + Boundary Clarity ×10%. This is methodology disclosure, not an arithmetic result or empirically calibrated scoring claim.

- Recommendation Scenario Coverage™ (20%): Not assigned in this fictional demonstration
- Recommendation Trigger Coverage™ (20%): Not assigned in this fictional demonstration
- Expertise Recommendation Strength™ (15%): Not assigned in this fictional demonstration
- Differentiation Readiness™ (15%): Not assigned in this fictional demonstration
- Evidence Support Density™ (10%): Not assigned in this fictional demonstration
- Geographic Recommendation Readiness™ (10%): Not assigned in this fictional demonstration
- Recommendation Boundary Clarity™ (10%): Not assigned in this fictional demonstration

4 Recommendation Confidence Score™

Not assigned in this fictional demonstration. This score would be a separate holistic judgment of how strongly the combined evidence justifies recommendation in the stated scenarios; it is not derived from Trust, the weighted Readiness result or a probability of model output.

Within the synthetic packet, confidence is comparatively stronger in a limited mechanical-service match than in urgent, specialist or superiority claims. That directional explanation does not establish a numerical confidence value.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | RR-01 | RR-02 | RR-04

5 Recommendation Coverage Score™

Not assigned in this fictional demonstration. The scenario inventory is explicitly bounded to ordinary repair, e-bike mechanical work, commuter/gravel retail, material timing/reputation claims and the electrical exclusion. Unrelated categories and imagined geographic markets are not added.

The matrix is not converted into a favorable-scenario percentage. Electrical repair is retained as a boundary check outside the positive offering inventory, rather than as a failed service opportunity that lowers a score.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories

6 Recommendation Coverage Matrix™

The accompanying seven-entry matrix records scenario inclusion, coverage label, evidence, limits, confidence, classification, strength and impact. Every label applies only within the synthetic packet.

“Strong” means clear contextual content support for the stated narrow scenario, not an unconditional endorsement, verified workmanship or measured model behavior. “Unavailable” for electrical work records an explicit service exclusion. It is different from an unassigned score or an unperformed model test.

- SC-01 · Planned conventional-bike tune-up: Strong. Indicative USD price only, parts excluded; inspect and confirm estimate/timing. No independently verified result.
- SC-02 · Ordinary mechanical brake adjustment or wheel truing: Strong. Parts excluded; acceptance, extent of work, inspection and timing must be confirmed. No safety or performance outcome is certified.

- SC-03 · Mechanical-only work on an e-bike: Moderate. Confirm the requested job is mechanical and accepted. Broad certification wording is unresolved; no battery, motor, controller or electrical work.
- SC-04 · Local commuter or gravel bicycle purchase inquiry: Moderate. No verified current inventory, brands, model sizes, fitting outcomes, delivery, shipping or purchase-policy detail is supplied.
- SC-05 · Urgent repair with guaranteed same-day completion: Weak. Actual capacity and eligibility are not established; no completion guarantee can be responsibly inferred.
- SC-06 · Recommendation as the best or top-rated local repair shop: Weak. No original review-source verification, representative corpus or defined comparator set.
- SC-07 · Battery, motor or electrical e-bike diagnosis/repair: Unavailable. This is an offered-service exclusion, not evidence of poor competence and not a missing commercial opportunity to be filled by copywriting.

Scenario	Coverage	Support and limit
Planned conventional-bike tune-up	Strong	Standard tune-up range $95-$140; a constructed 2026-10-02 commuter shifting/brake tune-up narrative. Indicative USD price only, parts excluded; inspect and confirm estimate/timing. No independently verified result.
Ordinary mechanical brake adjustment or wheel truing	Strong	Brake adjustment $25-$45 and wheel true $30-$60; illustrative ranges and relevant mechanical examples. Parts excluded; acceptance, extent of work, inspection and timing must be confirmed. No safety or performance outcome is certified.
Mechanical-only work on an e-bike	Moderate	Mechanical-only policy and constructed 2026-10-23 e-bike brake-adjustment case. Confirm the requested job is mechanical and accepted. Broad certification wording is unresolved; no battery, motor, controller or electrical work.
Local commuter or gravel bicycle purchase inquiry	Moderate	Named commuter/gravel sales categories and a stated local shop. No verified current inventory, brands, model sizes, fitting outcomes, delivery, shipping or purchase-policy detail is supplied.
Urgent repair with guaranteed same-day completion	Weak	A same-day statement is present but conflicts with the detailed 3-5-business-day policy. Actual capacity and eligibility are not established; no completion guarantee can be responsibly inferred.
Recommendation as the best or top-rated local repair shop	Weak	Specific service fit exists; comparative reputation support does not. No original review-source verification, representative corpus or defined comparator set.
Battery, motor or electrical e-bike diagnosis/repair	Unavailable	E05 expressly excludes this work. This is an offered-service exclusion, not evidence of poor competence and not a missing commercial opportunity to be filled by copywriting.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | RR-01 | RR-02 | RR-03 | RR-04

7 Recommendation Scenario Coverage™

The strongest coverage within the synthetic packet is narrow and practical: a rider planning maintenance, a rider asking about brake adjustment or wheel truing, and a local shopper exploring commuter/gravel bike options. Each connects to an actual offered category instead of a generic “bike expert” label.

Mechanical work on an e-bike has an offered-service basis and one relevant narrative, but the policy boundary must be explicit. An urgent completion requirement remains unresolved. No scenario for nationwide shipping, pickup/delivery, racing performance, suspension specialization or electrical repair is inferred from the generic bicycle category.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E10 · Three repair case stories | RR-01 | RR-02

8 Recommendation Trigger Analysis™

Need, problem, local and product-intent triggers connect naturally to the constructed service descriptions. The accompanying trigger records distinguish those supported connections from urgency and comparison triggers that the packet cannot substantiate.

These are illustrative user intents used to inspect coverage, not search-volume data or prompts sent to live models. The presence of a phrase does not prove that an AI system will retrieve or recommend the entity.

- “I need a routine tune-up before regular commuting.” Connects a stated maintenance need to an offered service; preserve the price/inspection/timing qualifiers.
- “Can a local shop adjust my mechanical brakes or true a wheel?” Connects a specific mechanical problem to a named service; confirm the current destination.
- “My e-bike needs a mechanical brake adjustment.” Supports conditional mechanical-only matching, with job acceptance confirmed before booking.
- “Where can I ask about commuter or gravel bikes in Alder Quay?” Supports a local retail inquiry, not specific stock or fitting assurances.
- “Who can guarantee my repair is finished today?” The packet cannot support this requirement because the advertised timing conflicts with the policy.
- “Which is the best-rated local bike repair shop?” Do not use the unverified 4.9/87 display as a basis for comparative selection.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | RR-01 | RR-02 | RR-03 | RR-04

9 Expertise Recommendation Strength™

Within the synthetic packet, expertise supports matching at the job level: the tune-up, gravel wheel and mechanical e-bike brake narratives align with stated services. Each is a constructed internal narrative, so none is independently verified proof of repair effectiveness.

Mara's 11 years of workshop experience and Jonas's 6 years in service are first-party claims. They provide context but do not independently establish credentials or justify electrical competence. Recommendation wording should rely on demonstrated service relevance and preserve the mechanical-only boundary.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E10 · Three repair case stories | RR-02

10 Differentiation Readiness™

Specific service ranges and a clear estimate process give a customer practical reasons to inquire. They can distinguish a relevant option from an unspecified shop without claiming that the shop is unique or objectively better.

Within the synthetic packet, there is no evidence of superior quality, lower comparative pricing, exclusive products or validated leading reputation. A recommendation rationale should say why the service fits the need, not turn 4.9/87 or self-published experience into "best in Alder Quay".

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | RR-04

11 Evidence Support Density™

There is useful detail across service descriptions, people and three case narratives, but detail is not the same as independent corroboration. The six selected excerpts remain one curated testimonial artifact; repeating an experience claim across a homepage and biography would still be one underlying claim.

Within the synthetic packet, the Business Circle listing adds only limited identity/contact support. The crawl and structured-data fixtures do not make unsupported ratings or credentials reliable, and the constructed cross-model teaching example adds no observed recommendation evidence.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | E11 · Technical response and discovery fixture | E12 · Structured data | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record | RR-04

12 Geographic Recommendation Readiness™

The appropriate geographic scope within the synthetic packet is one local shop at 18 Mill Lane, Alder Quay, Oregon 97000. The business record, footer and member listing align, while E08 retains 6 Foundry Street and the obsolete phone.

This supports a local relevance explanation but not an unqualified destination handoff from every source. No additional branch, travel radius, home service, delivery or shipping geography is established. The remedy is source reconciliation, not broader location-page production.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | RR-03

13 Recommendation Boundary Analysis™

A recommendation should identify the needed service, state the mechanical-only e-bike boundary when relevant, and preserve inspection/estimate and timing qualifications. It should also distinguish a category-level retail inquiry from verified stock or fit advice.

Within the synthetic packet, the policy gives useful stopping rules, but the same-day and broad certification language reduces consistency across entry points. An explicit exclusion of electrical work is not an invitation to market that service more strongly.

- Allowed as illustrative fit: planned tune-up, ordinary mechanical brake/wheel inquiry, local commuter/gravel retail inquiry.
- Conditional: mechanical work on an e-bike only after the job is accepted within the policy.
- Stop: electrical/battery/motor diagnosis; guaranteed same-day completion; asserted certified-specialist or top-rated status; guaranteed outcomes or inventory.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | RR-01 | RR-02 | RR-04

14 Recommendation Driver Hierarchy™

The following hierarchy uses the source-defined Primary, Secondary and Tertiary driver categories. It describes relative influence within the synthetic packet, not a measured change in recommendation likelihood.

- Primary Drivers: specific ordinary mechanical service offerings and relevant repair narratives; a bounded need-to-service match.
- Secondary Drivers: named staff roles, price/estimate clarity and a stated local identity; these help explain practical fit.
- Tertiary Drivers: the Business Circle listing as limited identity context. It is not a quality signal or credential endorsement.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories

15 Recommendation Limiter Hierarchy™

Limiter tiers are distinct from finding severity. The hierarchy below preserves the source terms Critical, Major, Moderate and Minor; it does not relabel the separately recorded Readiness severity convention.

- Critical Limiters: none is assigned to the ordinary offered-service set. Electrical repair is explicitly excluded rather than treated as a defective core service.
- Major Limiters: inconsistent same-day promise, broad e-bike expertise wording and conflicting destination information materially constrain appropriate matching.
- Moderate Limiters: unverified aggregate reputation and limited comparative evidence constrain ranking-led recommendations; incomplete product detail limits specific retail matching.
- Minor Limiters: no additional material minor limiter is invented for list completeness.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | RR-01 | RR-02 | RR-03 | RR-04

16 Recommendation Weight Analysis™

The accompanying analysis uses High, Moderate and Low influence categories. These qualitative judgments concern which pathways matter most within the synthetic packet and are separate from the fixed seven-pillar score weights.

Mechanical service fit, safe scope/timing matching and correct local destination have the greatest practical influence. Retail detail and reputation-led comparison are meaningful but less complete. A membership badge alone is a lower-influence signal.

- Planned ordinary mechanical repair: High influence. This is central to the offered workshop activity and has specific service/price/case detail.
- Safe service-scope and timing matching: High influence. Capability and timing determine whether the shop fits a practical need at all.
- Current local destination: High influence. An in-person service match fails if the customer receives the wrong address or telephone.
- Commuter/gravel retail inquiry: Moderate influence. Retail is offered, but product-specific inventory and purchase evidence are thin.
- Reputation-led comparison: Moderate influence. Relevant to choosing among local shops, but insufficiently substantiated here.
- Membership badge in isolation: Low influence. The listing confirms only a narrow identity/contact representation.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | RR-01 | RR-02 | RR-03 | RR-04

17 Recommendation Opportunity Gap Analysis™

The accompanying gap records identify evidence that could improve supported pathways, not hypothetical new business services. The priorities are reliable timing, unambiguous mechanical e-bike triage, accurate destination, traceable reputation and, if commercially useful, current retail detail.

Within the synthetic packet, resolving a claim conflict can improve the justification for a scenario without increasing the number of offered services. Electrical e-bike repair remains outside the opportunity inventory unless the business actually changes its capabilities and supplies evidence in a future assessment.

- Reliable time-sensitive repair inquiry: One consistent turnaround statement and confirmable expedited-service eligibility/capacity. Align public timing terms and state how an actual slot is confirmed.
- Unambiguous mechanical e-bike booking: Consistent accepted/excluded job wording and substantiation for any retained credential. Place mechanical-only wording and triage criteria at each entry point.
- Dependable local destination handoff: Reconciled stale directory fields. Correct and recheck the destination information.
- Reputation-supported comparison: A traceable original review source, dated aggregate basis and defensible comparison scope. Verify provenance and restrict claims to the evidence.
- Specific commuter/gravel product recommendation: Current inventory, available sizes/models and relevant purchase/fit information. If retail specificity is a business priority, supply accurate current product details; do not invent stock.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | RR-01 | RR-02 | RR-03 | RR-04

18 Recommendation Boundary Confidence™

This Readiness namespace uses the source-defined High Confidence, Moderate Confidence and Low Confidence labels. They apply to the ability to identify recommendation limits within the synthetic packet, not to a live model's compliance.

High Confidence: the electrical/battery/motor exclusion is explicit in the policy. Moderate Confidence: ordinary repairs and retail inquiries have bounded support but still require inspection, timing, destination or stock confirmation. Low Confidence: the public wording does not consistently distinguish urgent completion or mechanical-only e-bike expertise. An analyst can identify an exclusion confidently even when the public message is inconsistent.

- Planned conventional-bike tune-up: Moderate Confidence within synthetic packet.
- Ordinary mechanical brake adjustment or wheel truing: Moderate Confidence within synthetic packet.
- Mechanical-only work on an e-bike: Low Confidence within synthetic packet.
- Local commuter or gravel bicycle purchase inquiry: Moderate Confidence within synthetic packet.
- Urgent repair with guaranteed same-day completion: Low Confidence within synthetic packet.
- Recommendation as the best or top-rated local repair shop: Moderate Confidence within synthetic packet.
- Battery, motor or electrical e-bike diagnosis/repair: High Confidence within synthetic packet.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E08 · Old directory listing | RR-01 | RR-02 | RR-03

19 AI Recommendation Impact™

Current Recommendation Capability: within the synthetic packet, the evidence supports an explanation of why the shop may fit ordinary mechanical-work inquiries, with explicit scope and scheduling qualifications. It does not establish actual model recognition or recommendation.

Potential Recommendation Expansion: consistent timing terms could support a better-qualified urgency inquiry; corrected contact details could strengthen local destination use; source-verified reviews could add reputation support; current inventory could support more specific retail inquiries.

Expected Recommendation Confidence Improvement: the rationale would become clearer and better supported if those evidence gaps were closed. No percentage uplift, rank movement, recommendation probability or timing of improvement is estimated. E13 is an unattributed constructed teaching response, not an observed model answer.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record | RR-01 | RR-02 | RR-03 | RR-04

20 Final Determination™

Not assessed as a real-world final readiness classification; this is a fictional demonstration. The source-defined final classes are not assigned to the invented business, and no score band is silently substituted for a determination.

Within the synthetic packet, ordinary mechanical repair is the strongest bounded scenario; retail and e-bike mechanical work require explicit qualifications. Guaranteed same-day, certified-specialist and reputation-superiority claims are not sufficiently supported. Electrical work is excluded. These conclusions are substantive scenario judgments, not a real-business endorsement or a finding that the fictional entity is generally “Not Recommendation Ready”.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | RR-01 | RR-02 | RR-03 | RR-04

21 Strategic Recommendations™

Improve the reliability of the existing, evidence-supported recommendation paths before expanding the claims. The sequence below is based on consequence and actionability within the synthetic packet; no external changes were made.

- 1. Resolve repair timing and publish a consistent inspection-to-estimate-to-completion explanation. Complete RR-01 checks.
- 2. Make mechanical-only e-bike scope visible at every entry point and substantiate or narrow certification wording. Complete RR-02 checks.
- 3. Correct the stale destination and phone, then recheck the assessed sources. Complete RR-03 checks.
- 4. Provide a traceable review source and avoid superiority language without a defined comparison basis. Complete RR-04 checks.
- 5. Retain the useful mechanical case detail and price inclusions. Add current retail specifics only where true and relevant, then reassess the affected scenarios rather than assuming an AI-performance gain.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E08 · Old directory listing | E10 · Three repair case stories | RR-01 | RR-02 | RR-03 | RR-04

Finding records and completion checks

Each record below belongs to this specialist lane. Classifications and confidence apply only to the stated claim within the synthetic packet, never to a real business or model performance.

RR-01 · Synthetic finding

RR-01 Routine mechanical repair is a defensible scenario; guaranteed same-day completion is not

What the packet shows. Within the synthetic packet, specific services, useful price ranges and relevant case studies support considering the shop for planned routine mechanical work. The incompatible turnaround messages block a confident urgency-based match.

Reasoning. A need-based match does not require inventing a quality ranking: ordinary bike-maintenance needs connect directly to stated services and examples. An urgency trigger requires different evidence. Because the packet cannot establish an actual same-day commitment, a recommendation must preserve the inspection and scheduling qualification.

AI and business consequence. Within the synthetic packet, the shop can be considered for a planned tune-up or ordinary repair consultation. It should not be recommended as a guaranteed same-day solution. This is scenario analysis, not a prediction of model selection frequency.

Recommended action. Resolve the timing promise, distinguish assessment from completed repair, and add a concise service-to-need explanation with price inclusions and the estimate process.

Completion check.

- A customer sees consistent timing at every booking entry point.
- Routine-repair scenario copy identifies relevant service, indicative price and inspection requirement.
- Urgency-related copy offers only a confirmable option and never implies unverified capacity.

Severity	High · within synthetic packet
Evidence classification	Conflicting Evidence · within synthetic packet
Evidence strength	Strong · within synthetic packet
Analyst confidence	High · within synthetic packet

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E10 · Three repair case stories | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | TS-02

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

RR-02 · Synthetic finding

RR-02 E-bike recommendations must stop at clearly bounded mechanical work

What the packet shows. Within the synthetic packet, e-bike mechanical service is a conditional fit, while battery, motor and electrical service is explicitly outside scope. The broad certification phrase makes that boundary harder to apply.

Reasoning. A brake or wheel problem on an e-bike may be mechanically relevant, but the service must first be triaged against the shop’s acceptance policy. A non-functioning motor or battery is not an underdeveloped marketing opportunity in this packet; it is an explicit exclusion. Missing certification proof must not be treated as proof that the business has no credentials.

AI and business consequence. Keep mechanical-only qualification adjacent to any e-bike recommendation and exclude electrical/battery/motor repair from supported scenarios. No actual model boundary adherence was tested.

Recommended action. Publish an accepted-work/excluded-work explanation and use it in service pages and booking triage. Substantiate or narrow credential wording before using it as a recommendation reason.

Completion check.

- A reader can separate mechanical problems from excluded electrical/battery/motor needs without consulting multiple pages.
- Booking triage confirms the requested job is within scope.
- No sample recommendation claims full e-bike expertise solely from the homepage slogan.

Severity	High · within synthetic packet
Evidence classification	Conflicting Evidence · within synthetic packet
Evidence strength	Strong · within synthetic packet
Analyst confidence	High · within synthetic packet

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E02 · Homepage and footer | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-03

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

RR-03 · Synthetic finding

RR-03 Local relevance is established inside the packet, but the destination needs reconciliation

What the packet shows. Within the synthetic packet, the shop is a single-location local business in Alder Quay. The canonical destination and Business Circle listing agree, but one directory gives a stale destination and phone.

Reasoning. The geographic boundary is narrow enough for a local scenario, but selecting a destination is a distinct decision from matching a type of service. The stale record does not justify inventing a branch, a relocation date, a service radius, pickup, delivery or nationwide shipping.

AI and business consequence. Use the stated single-location scope in the fictional analysis and preserve a current-contact verification step. Avoid unqualified route directions until the conflict is reconciled.

Recommended action. Reconcile the outdated listing, and keep one structured current address/phone record consistent with visible pages.

Completion check.

- The corrected directory matches the owner-approved current address and phone.
- No artifact represents the stale address as an additional branch.
- A fresh comparison confirms the remaining assessed destination fields agree.

Severity	High · within synthetic packet
Evidence classification	Conflicting Evidence · within synthetic packet
Evidence strength	Strong · within synthetic packet
Analyst confidence	High · within synthetic packet

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E02 · Homepage and footer | E08 · Old directory listing | E09 · Business Circle member listing | TS-01

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

RR-04 · Synthetic finding

RR-04 Service fit has support; “best” or “top-rated” comparison does not

What the packet shows. Within the synthetic packet, published service detail and repair examples explain why the shop may fit a practical need. They do not establish superiority over alternatives, and the site-only 4.9/87 claim lacks source verification.

Reasoning. A credible explanation of scenario fit is different from proof that this shop is better, cheaper or more reliable than alternatives. No comparator set, independent review corpus or comparative price basis is supplied. Review-source provenance would strengthen reputation-related reasons, but would still not automatically prove universal superiority.

AI and business consequence. Prefer a qualified fit-based recommendation over “best”, “top-rated”, “cheapest” or “most trusted” language. No recommendation uplift or preference probability is estimated.

Recommended action. Supply traceable review evidence and clearly distinguish first-party service advantages from comparative claims. If comparison is needed, define a fair, current comparison basis rather than escalating the existing slogan.

Completion check.

- Any review aggregate can be traced to its original dated source.
- Comparison language has a documented basis and defined comparison scope or is removed.
- The recommendation rationale can stand on supported service fit without an unverified rating or credential.

Severity	Moderate · within synthetic packet
Evidence classification	Unverified Evidence · within synthetic packet
Evidence strength	Weak · within synthetic packet
Analyst confidence	High · within synthetic packet

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E06 · Staff biographies | E07 · Review widget and selected excerpts | E10 · Three repair case stories | TS-04

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

↑ All audits | Finding index | Evidence library →

Technical Evidence

5 sections · 1 findings

This lane reads author-created technical fields and mock source content only. It is not a crawl, browser inspection of the fictional business, search-index check or AI-provider access test. Technical Evidence has no numeric scorecard.

1 Lane conclusion

The fixture makes important business information directly available in authored page text, but the JSON-LD object conflicts with visible contact details. That contradiction is material to the identity handoff. No broader website-access or crawler result can be concluded from authored response fields.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E11 · Technical response and discovery fixture | E12 · Structured data | TE-01

2 Business and evidence boundary

The bounded set is the homepage, services, booking, service policy, about and contact routes, plus authored robots and sitemap text. These surfaces were chosen for identity, priority offerings, practical customer conditions and claim boundaries. No exhaustive crawl, checkout, performance, security or accessibility assessment of a business website was performed.

All response codes, canonicals, directives and navigation edges are authored fixture fields. There is no acquisition window, collector user agent, raw network response or redirect capture to report. Construction date is not a capture time.

Support | E01 · Scenario identity record | E11 · Technical response and discovery fixture

3 Material findings

TE-01 below is the only technical issue elevated from this packet. Missing optional markup, llms.txt and unmeasured speed are not manufactured defects. The fact that the policy is in the footer does not mean it is inaccessible or globally orphaned.

Support | E11 · Technical response and discovery fixture | E12 · Structured data | TE-01

4 Eight check record

Each check below is bounded to the named fixture fields. “Authored” never means “observed live.”

Check	Fixture result	Limit
Crawl and index directives	Authored general group allows /. GPTBot group disallows /. Meta robots is index,follow on six routes.	No actual fetch/index visit. Training policy is separate from search discovery and user-triggered retrieval.
Canonicals	Authored self-canonical on all six named routes.	No search-selected canonical or redirect target was observed.

Check	Fixture result	Limit
HTTP and retrieval behavior	Six declared 200 text/html records.	No network request, challenge-shell review, redirect chain or live availability conclusion.
Important entity information	Name, contact, offerings and policy text are in E02-E06.	Raw/rendered parity and actual browser interactions of the fictional website are untested.
Structured data integrity	BikeStore JSON parses; address/phone conflict with the visible footer.	Syntax does not validate meaning, business truth or rich-result eligibility.
Entity identifiers and relationships	Canonical @id/url is stable inside E12; sameAs names the synthetic member listing.	No ownership, membership quality or actual knowledge-graph merge is established.
Architecture and discovery	Authored main navigation reaches four key pages; footer reaches policy.	No exhaustive orphan analysis; link prominence is a practical improvement, not proof of missing discovery.
Sitemaps and discovery signals	The authored sitemap lists all six routes.	Listing is not proof of crawling, indexing, citations or recommendations.

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E03 · Services and price ranges | E04 · Booking message | E05 · Service policy | E06 · Staff biographies | E11 · Technical response and discovery fixture | E12 · Structured data

5 Downstream handoff and evidence requests

Entity Resolution receives the structured-data conflict and former directory contact together, retaining the author-defined current record and its limits. Entity Understanding and Trust retain the visible service-policy contradictions. Technical Evidence does not own those business-meaning or credibility determinations.

A real assessment would require preserved requested/final URLs, status and headers, source bodies, actual collection times and methods, and targeted rendered evidence if it changes a material conclusion. Exact script bike-store properties are the locators here; no invented source line numbers are used.

- Blocking limit: live technical access, indexing and crawler treatment cannot be determined from synthetic fields.
- Narrow usable conclusion: the authored JSON-LD and visible contact content disagree.
- No technical score, actual model behavior claim or client release determination is assigned.

Support | E11 · Technical response and discovery fixture | E12 · Structured data | TE-01

Finding records and completion checks

Each record below belongs to this specialist lane. Classifications and confidence apply only to the stated claim within the synthetic packet, never to a real business or model performance.

TE-01 · Synthetic finding

TE-01 Structured data repeats the former contact details

Reasoning. The authored BikeStore object uses the same canonical domain and stable @id as the target, but its address and phone match the former directory details rather than the current footer. Valid JSON does not remove this meaning conflict.

AI and business consequence. A machine-readable source could offer a different contact route from visible content. No actual AI extraction, entity split or incorrect recommendation was observed.

Recommended action. Have the business confirm the current contact record, then align the specific address and telephone properties with visible contact content and preserve the old version for review.

Completion check. Compare the saved JSON-LD object, footer, contact page and approved record field by field. Reparse the updated JSON and retain the exact revised artifact. Do not infer model adoption from the edit.

Severity	Moderate
Evidence classification	Conflicting Evidence
Evidence strength	Strong for the authored field conflict; no live verification
Analyst confidence	High within the synthetic packet

Support | E02 · Homepage and footer | E08 · Old directory listing | E12 · Structured data

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

↑ All audits | Finding index | Evidence library →

Cross Model Observation

6 sections · 1 findings

No external AI product or API was observed. This appendix is a complete not-performed coverage record, with one separate constructed teaching example. It must not be used as a visibility result.

For a separate, explicitly invented example of the client presentation, see the illustrative cross-model comparison. It adds no live observations to this coverage record.

1 Lane conclusion

Discovery, recognition, factual accuracy, recommendations, citations and variation are not assessed for any AI product. No external calls were made for this fictional sample. E13 is visibly constructed and unattributed, so it cannot fill the missing live-observation lane.

Support | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record | CO-01

2 Scope and accounting

Assessment demonstration CSCW-DEMO-1.0 uses synthetic packet CSCW-SYNTHETIC-1.0, constructed 10 November 2026. Fictional place Alder Quay; one fictional location. Planned live run cells: 0. Calls attempted: 0. Responses completed: 0. Claim-evaluable live responses: 0. Exclusions: all live product, API, control and historical comparison surfaces.

Products, backend versions, account tiers, search settings, personalization, actual geography, start/completion times and provider identity evidence are not applicable because no collection occurred. Direct provider spend for this sample is $0. This does not imply a free real-world observation service.

Support | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record

3 Method and analyst access declaration

The artifact author inspected only the constructed response illustration and synthetic comparison text. No provider response was independently collected or adjudicated. Analyst identity is not evidence of an observed external model.

A future real baseline must keep non-branded discovery, named recognition and source-informed diagnostic arms separate. Corrective report findings must not be inserted as hidden context into an independent discovery baseline.

Support | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record

4 Six check record

Required check	Status	Evidence and consequence
Discovery	Not performed	No non-branded captured answer. No inclusion or absence numerator/denominator is reported.
Recognition and disambiguation	Not performed	No product answer exists to match to the target identity.
Understanding and factual assertions	Not performed for a product	The constructed E13 wording can be compared with E03/E05 only as a teaching illustration.
Recommendations and conditions	Not performed	The illustration is not an observed recommendation or customer exposure.
Citation and source support	Not performed	No citations were displayed, retrieved or reviewed from a provider. Fixture source references are not provider citations.
Variation and change	Not performed	No repetitions, control panel, prior baseline or comparable reassessment exists.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record

5 Constructed example and factual boundaries

E13 deliberately repeats broad e-bike and same-day promotional language. E03 and E05 instead limit work to mechanical components and refuse battery/electrical repair. This teaches why a real captured assertion would need exact claim-to-source review. It does not show that any AI product made that error.

No percentage is calculated from zero responses. Future small-sample counts would describe only the captured sample, with attempts, failures, units and exclusions visible. They would not be market share or a probability of recommendation.

Support | E03 · Services and price ranges | E05 · Service policy | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record

6 Comparisons and handoff

There is no historical or control comparison. Do not infer improvement after the proposed 90-day work. Any later purchased reassessment would retain its own dated packet, protocol and compatibility record, with business-evidence, product-environment and methodology changes separated.

Executive Intelligence can use the missing-observation boundary to avoid unsupported visibility claims. It cannot use it as a reason to rank the business poorly. Live collection, independent source review, independent analytical QA and final human release remain separate steps.

Support | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record | CO-01

Finding records and completion checks

Each record below belongs to this specialist lane. Classifications and confidence apply only to the stated claim within the synthetic packet, never to a real business or model performance.

CO-01 · Synthetic finding

CO-01 Actual model behavior is not assessed in this demonstration

Reasoning. The execution inventory has zero attempted calls and no preserved external responses. A written hypothetical answer is not a response capture, even if it sounds plausible.

AI and business consequence. No supported conclusion exists about which products discover, recognize, cite or recommend this business. This is an evidence boundary, not a business weakness or negative visibility observation.

Recommended action. If a real assessment is commissioned, approve a bounded single-location observation plan with exact prompts, products, access methods, settings, repetitions and cost limits before collecting.

Completion check. Preserve every planned/attempted cell and full response with real capture metadata, then conduct separate factual review and independent QA. No claim is marked verified by this fictional example.

Severity	Informational
Evidence classification	Missing Evidence for live behavior
Evidence strength	Insufficient for discovery or recommendation claims
Analyst confidence	High about the sample boundary; Inconclusive about actual model behavior

Support | E13 · Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record

← Finding index | ↑ Audit start | Executive priorities

↑ All audits | Finding index | Evidence library →

07 / Inspect the actual sample material

The synthetic evidence library.

These are the complete authored records used by this sample. They are not real website captures, reviews, credentials, HTTP responses or model answers.

E01 Scenario identity record

E02 Homepage and footer mock content

E03 Services and price ranges mock content

E04 Booking message mock content

E05 Service policy mock content

E06 Staff biographies mock content

E07 Review widget and selected excerpts mock content

E08 Old directory listing mock content

E09 Business Circle member listing mock content

E10 Three repair case stories mock content

E11 Technical response and discovery fixture

E12 Structured data mock source

E13 Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record

Each record names its exact locator and what it can and cannot support. Dates inside source text are scenario dates, not capture timestamps. Integrity hashes identify these authored bytes only. Nothing below is external proof.

E01 · Entirely synthetic source artifact

E01 Scenario identity record

← Return to finding index

Origin: Author-created scenario record, not an official registry
Exact locator: canonical_identity fields
Construction date: 10 November 2026 · Packet CSCW-SYNTHETIC-1.0
Body SHA-256: 1a4b2ec41f02cbdd7270ebc0c843082de4cd2ea2923f4a0aaf0af8557c4031b6

```
ENTITY: Cedar & Spoke Cycle Works
DOMAIN: https://cedarandspoke.example
OPERATING LOCATION: 18 Mill Lane, Alder Quay, Oregon 97000
PHONE: 503-555-0148
LOCATION COUNT: One
SCENARIO STATUS: Fictional company and fictional town
SCOPE: Bicycle retailer and mechanical repair workshop
EXCLUSIONS: No battery, motor, firmware or other e-bike electrical work
FORMER CONTACT, scenario history: 6 Foundry Street / 503-555-0119
No legal registration, license, ownership record or real-world verification is supplied.
```

What it supports. Defines the invented target and intended current contact details for reconciliation.

Use limits. An author-defined target is not independent evidence that a real business exists or moved.

Return to a supporting finding or section: | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-03 | er-s01 | er-s02 | er-s03 | er-s04 | er-s06 | er-s08 | er-s09 | er-s10 | er-s11 | er-s13 | er-s14 | er-s15 | er-s16 | er-s17 | er-s18 | er-s20 | er-s21 | er-s22 | er-s23 | er-s24 | er-s25 | eu-s01 | eu-s02 | eu-s03 | eu-s04 | eu-s05 | eu-s09 | eu-s13 | eu-s21 | eu-s23 | TS-01 | ts-s01 | ts-s02 | ts-s04 | ts-s05 | ts-s09 | ts-s10 | ts-s14 | ts-s15 | ts-s20 | ts-s23 | ts-s24 | ts-s25 | ts-s28 | ts-s29 | RR-03 | rr-s01 | rr-s02 | rr-s05 | rr-s06 | rr-s07 | rr-s08 | rr-s12 | rr-s14 | rr-s16 | rr-s17 | rr-s19 | rr-s20 | rr-s21 | te-s02 | P2

↑ Evidence contents | Complete finding index | Top 3

E02 · Entirely synthetic source artifact

E02 Homepage and footer mock content

← Return to finding index

Origin: Author-created first-party page fixture
Exact locator: hero; footer; e-bike promotional banner
Construction date: 10 November 2026 · Packet CSCW-SYNTHETIC-1.0
Body SHA-256: 4437e48c650643f21883759cc5989a2f901ee0f9787468bb645c44801dd5c0c6

```
PAGE: https://cedarandspoke.example/
HERO: Bikes for the daily ride and the longer way home.
DESCRIPTION: Commuter and gravel bike sales, tune-ups and mechanical repairs in Alder Quay.
BANNER: Certified e-bike experts. Get back on the road fast.
FOOTER: Cedar & Spoke Cycle Works | 18 Mill Lane, Alder Quay, OR 97000 | 503-555-0148
HOURS: Tuesday-Friday 9 am-6 pm; Saturday 9 am-4 pm; closed Sunday-Monday.
LINKS: Services; Book a repair; About; Contact. Service policy appears in the footer.
```

What it supports. Shows a clear retail/workshop identity and current contact publication, with an overbroad e-bike claim.

Use limits. Published wording does not establish credentials, operating performance, hours observed in person or model comprehension.

Return to a supporting finding or section: | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-04 | er-s01 | er-s02 | er-s03 | er-s04 | er-s05 | er-s06 | er-s07 | er-s08 | er-s09 | er-s10 | er-s11 | er-s12 | er-s13 | er-s14 | er-s16 | er-s17 | er-s18 | er-s20 | er-s21 | er-s22 | er-s23 | er-s24 | er-s25 | EU-03 | eu-s01 | eu-s04 | eu-s09 | eu-s10 | eu-s11 | eu-s12 | eu-s18 | eu-s20 | eu-s22 | eu-s23 | TS-01 | TS-03 | ts-s01 | ts-s02 | ts-s04 | ts-s05 | ts-s07 | ts-s10 | ts-s13 | ts-s14 | ts-s17 | ts-s20 | ts-s22 | ts-s23 | ts-s24 | ts-s25 | ts-s28 | ts-s29 | RR-02 | RR-03 | rr-s02 | rr-s05 | rr-s06 | rr-s09 | rr-s12 | rr-s13 | rr-s15 | rr-s16 | rr-s17 | rr-s18 | rr-s19 | rr-s20 | rr-s21 | TE-01 | te-s01 | te-s04 | P1 | P2

↑ Evidence contents | Complete finding index | Top 3

E03 · Entirely synthetic source artifact

E03 Services and price ranges mock content

← Return to finding index

Origin: Author-created first-party page fixture
Exact locator: service list; pricing note
Construction date: 10 November 2026 · Packet CSCW-SYNTHETIC-1.0
Bodv SHA-256: 3853e8246124a9120de0cd1132afef9e7ff5be79375398e3a34139e33235624a

```
PAGE: https://cedarandspoke.example/services
Standard tune-up: $95-$140.
Brake adjustment: $25-$45.
Wheel true: $30-$60.
Prices are illustrative USD. Parts are extra. A written estimate follows inspection; approve it before work begins.
We service commuter, gravel and conventional road bicycles. For e-bikes, we work on mechanical components only, including brakes, tires and wheels.
We do not diagnose or repair batteries, motors, electrical systems or firmware.
New commuter and gravel bicycles are sold in-store; current inventory must be confirmed with the shop.
```

What it supports. Supports bounded service interpretation, practical price context and mechanical-only e-bike scope.

Use limits. Price ranges do not establish a final quote, inventory, electrical qualifications or an executed purchase.

Return to a supporting finding or section: | ex-s04 | er-s05 | er-s09 | er-s13 | er-s17 | EU-01 | EU-03 | eu-s01 | eu-s02 | eu-s03 | eu-s04 | eu-s05 | eu-s06 | eu-s07 | eu-s08 | eu-s09 | eu-s11 | eu-s12 | eu-s13 | eu-s14 | eu-s15 | eu-s16 | eu-s17 | eu-s19 | eu-s21 | eu-s23 | TS-02 | ts-s01 | ts-s02 | ts-s04 | ts-s07 | ts-s09 | ts-s10 | ts-s11 | ts-s12 | ts-s14 | ts-s15 | ts-s16 | ts-s17 | ts-s19 | ts-s21 | ts-s23 | ts-s24 | ts-s25 | ts-s27 | ts-s28 | ts-s29 | RR-01 | RR-02 | RR-04 | rr-s01 | rr-s02 | rr-s04 | rr-s05 | rr-s06 | rr-s07 | rr-s08 | rr-s09 | rr-s10 | rr-s11 | rr-s13 | rr-s14 | rr-s15 | rr-s16 | rr-s17 | rr-s18 | rr-s19 | rr-s20 | rr-s21 | te-s04 | co-s04 | co-s05 | P1

↑ Evidence contents | Complete finding index | Top 3

E04 · Entirely synthetic source artifact

E04 Booking message mock content

← Return to finding index

Origin: Author-created first-party page fixture
Exact locator: booking introduction
Construction date: 10 November 2026 · Packet CSCW-SYNTHETIC-1.0
Body SHA-256: cc1651288d3b9abb53f5c1ab0374d9eb5b72dfabf47b84d7d917382d4ffb9b60

```
PAGE: https://cedarandspoke.example/book
Same-day repairs for every ride.
Choose a preferred drop-off date. Your booking request is not confirmed until our team replies.
Appointments reserve a check-in time, not a completion deadline.
For e-bike repairs, tell us the make, model and problem before bringing the bike in.
```

What it supports. Documents the synthetic blanket same-day promise beside a check-in qualification.

Use limits. No booking was submitted and no appointment, availability or actual turnaround was tested.

Return to a supporting finding or section: | EU-02 | eu-s01 | eu-s03 | eu-s04 | eu-s06 | eu-s07 | eu-s12 | eu-s13 | eu-s15 | eu-s16 | eu-s17 | eu-s18 | eu-s20 | eu-s22 | eu-s23 | TS-02 | ts-s01 | ts-s02 | ts-s04 | ts-s09 | ts-s10 | ts-s11 | ts-s13 | ts-s14 | ts-s16 | ts-s17 | ts-s19 | ts-s20 | ts-s22 | ts-s23 | ts-s24 | ts-s25 | ts-s27 | ts-s28 | ts-s29 | RR-01 | rr-s01 | rr-s02 | rr-s04 | rr-s05 | rr-s06 | rr-s07 | rr-s08 | rr-s13 | rr-s15 | rr-s16 | rr-s17 | rr-s18 | rr-s19 | rr-s20 | rr-s21 | te-s04 | P1

↑ Evidence contents | Complete finding index | Top 3

E05 · Entirely synthetic source artifact

E05 Service policy mock content

← Return to finding index

Origin: Author-created first-party page fixture
Exact locator: turnaround; electrical exclusions; estimates
Construction date: 10 November 2026 · Packet CSCW-SYNTHETIC-1.0
Body SHA-256: 2c1f71999360989dfe114d5ed6f834d41b6ea9a182239a825df6dc375ac68195

```
PAGE: https://cedarandspoke.example/service-policy
Most mechanical repair jobs are planned for 3-5 business days after inspection, parts availability and
estimate approval. We confirm timing before work begins.
Same-day adjustments may be possible when the workshop has capacity. We do not guarantee same-day completion.
We do not accept battery, motor, electrical-system or firmware repairs on e-bikes.
If the work changes, we contact you for approval of the revised estimate.
Bring your collection receipt or confirmation message when picking up a bike.
```

What it supports. Provides an explicit policy boundary that conflicts with blanket same-day/e-bike expertise promotions.

Use limits. A published policy proves intended wording inside this packet, not service performance or contract fulfillment.

Return to a supporting finding or section: | er-s17 | EU-01 | EU-02 | EU-03 | eu-s01 | eu-s02 | eu-s03 | eu-s04 | eu-s05 | eu-s06 | eu-s07 | eu-s08 | eu-s10 | eu-s12 | eu-s13 | eu-s14 | eu-s15 | eu-s16 | eu-s17 | eu-s18 | eu-s19 | eu-s20 | eu-s21 | eu-s22 | eu-s23 | TS-02 | TS-03 | ts-s01 | ts-s02 | ts-s04 | ts-s07 | ts-s09 | ts-s10 | ts-s11 | ts-s12 | ts-s13 | ts-s14 | ts-s15 | ts-s16 | ts-s17 | ts-s19 | ts-s20 | ts-s21 | ts-s22 | ts-s23 | ts-s24 | ts-s25 | ts-s27 | ts-s28 | ts-s29 | RR-01 | RR-02 | rr-s01 | rr-s02 | rr-s04 | rr-s05 | rr-s06 | rr-s07 | rr-s08 | rr-s09 | rr-s10 | rr-s13 | rr-s14 | rr-s15 | rr-s16 | rr-s17 | rr-s18 | rr-s19 | rr-s20 | rr-s21 | te-s04 | co-s04 | co-s05 | P1

↑ Evidence contents | Complete finding index | Top 3

E06 · Entirely synthetic source artifact

E06 Staff biographies mock content

← Return to finding index

Origin: Author-created first-party page fixture
Exact locator: Mara Ellis bio; Jonas Bell bio
Construction date: 10 November 2026 · Packet CSCW-SYNTHETIC-1.0
Body SHA-256: 86843f1e473e1f94150a58c490313c4aecde67301727131078c7ab9893ad7cb1

```
PAGE: https://cedarandspoke.example/about
Mara Ellis, owner and lead mechanic, says she has 11 years of bicycle workshop experience, with an emphasis
on commuter reliability and gravel-bike maintenance.
Jonas Bell, service advisor, says he has 6 years of bicycle retail and intake experience.
We explain repair options in plain language and agree the estimate before starting.
No named certification issuer, credential identifier, credential scope, expiry date or independent
staff-history record is included.
```

What it supports. Shows specific named staff and claimed experience rather than anonymous expertise wording.

Use limits. Years of experience are fictional first-party claims. The packet cannot validate training, certification or employment history.

Return to a supporting finding or section: | ex-s04 | ER-03 | er-s02 | er-s03 | er-s08 | er-s12 | er-s14 | er-s15 | er-s16 | er-s17 | er-s19 | er-s20 | er-s22 | er-s23 | er-s24 | er-s25 | EU-01 | EU-03 | EU-04 | eu-s01 | eu-s02 | eu-s03 | eu-s04 | eu-s10 | eu-s11 | eu-s12 | eu-s19 | eu-s20 | eu-s21 | eu-s23 | TS-01 | TS-03 | ts-s01 | ts-s02 | ts-s04 | ts-s05 | ts-s07 | ts-s09 | ts-s10 | ts-s11 | ts-s12 | ts-s14 | ts-s15 | ts-s21 | ts-s24 | ts-s25 | ts-s28 | ts-s29 | RR-04 | rr-s02 | rr-s09 | rr-s10 | rr-s11 | rr-s14 | rr-s20 | te-s04 | P3

↑ Evidence contents | Complete finding index | Top 3

E07 · Entirely synthetic source artifact

E07 Review widget and selected excerpts mock content

← Return to finding index

Origin: Author-created review fixture; not taken from any review platform
Exact locator: aggregate_label; attribution; selected_excerpts[1-6]
Construction date: 10 November 2026 · Packet CSCW-SYNTHETIC-1.0
Body SHA-256: 4f9d0e016d257cc67e01e066ea430200bffb769505492a055a7aa53d66a3402a

```
PAGE: https://cedarandspoke.example/reviews
AGGREGATE LABEL: 4.9 from 87 reviews.
ATTRIBUTION: Customer reviews from around the web. No direct original-profile URL or export is supplied.
Source icons vary across cards.
SELECTED EXCERPTS, invented and deliberately incomplete:
1. L.M.: They explained the tune-up before I approved the cost.
2. R.T.: My commuter brakes felt better after the adjustment.
3. A.P.: Friendly advice while choosing my first gravel bike.
4. K.S.: The repair took longer than the first estimate, but they called.
5. D.H.: Helpful staff, although the part had to be ordered.
6. J.V.: I misunderstood what the e-bike service covered.
No full review population, original timestamps, verified transaction records or attributable
original-platform captures are supplied.
```

What it supports. Supports a visible positive and mixed testimonial presentation, and a specific aggregate-provenance gap.

Use limits. These are invented excerpts, not real testimonials. Six selected excerpts cannot establish the aggregate, representativeness, trend, authenticity or fraud.

Return to a supporting finding or section: | ER-03 | er-s03 | er-s05 | er-s12 | er-s14 | er-s16 | er-s17 | er-s19 | er-s21 | er-s22 | er-s23 | er-s24 | er-s25 | EU-04 | eu-s01 | eu-s03 | eu-s04 | eu-s11 | eu-s13 | eu-s15 | eu-s16 | eu-s17 | eu-s20 | eu-s22 | eu-s23 | TS-04 | ts-s01 | ts-s02 | ts-s06 | ts-s09 | ts-s10 | ts-s11 | ts-s13 | ts-s14 | ts-s15 | ts-s16 | ts-s17 | ts-s18 | ts-s22 | ts-s23 | ts-s24 | ts-s25 | ts-s27 | ts-s28 | ts-s29 | RR-04 | rr-s01 | rr-s02 | rr-s04 | rr-s05 | rr-s06 | rr-s08 | rr-s10 | rr-s11 | rr-s13 | rr-s15 | rr-s16 | rr-s17 | rr-s19 | rr-s20 | rr-s21 | P3

↑ Evidence contents | Complete finding index | Top 3

E08 · Entirely synthetic source artifact

E08 Old directory listing mock content

← Return to finding index

Origin: Author-created third-party-style directory fixture
Exact locator: business card; revision note
Construction date: 10 November 2026 · Packet CSCW-SYNTHETIC-1.0
Body SHA-256: 6ab52413b9a45c87ff4169883caf369e026f8815ddc989837deb08d8828fe89a

```
SOURCE LABEL: Alder Local Directory (fictional)
SOURCE URL LABEL: https://alderlocal.example/cedar-spoke
BUSINESS: Cedar & Spoke Cycle Works
ADDRESS: 6 Foundry Street, Alder Quay, OR 97000
PHONE: 503-555-0119
WEBSITE: https://cedarandspoke.example
CATEGORY: Bicycle shop and repair
REVISION NOTE: No update date is supplied in this fixture.
```

What it supports. Supports a conflicting contact representation for the same named/domain-linked target.

Use limits. The scenario record designates this contact as former; the directory itself supplies no move history or verification. No actual directory was contacted.

Return to a supporting finding or section: | ER-02 | ER-04 | er-s01 | er-s03 | er-s04 | er-s05 | er-s06 | er-s07 | er-s09 | er-s11 | er-s13 | er-s14 | er-s16 | er-s17 | er-s19 | er-s20 | er-s21 | er-s22 | er-s23 | er-s24 | er-s25 | eu-s03 | eu-s04 | eu-s09 | eu-s13 | eu-s18 | eu-s22 | eu-s23 | TS-01 | ts-s01 | ts-s02 | ts-s04 | ts-s05 | ts-s08 | ts-s10 | ts-s13 | ts-s14 | ts-s20 | ts-s22 | ts-s23 | ts-s24 | ts-s25 | ts-s27 | ts-s28 | ts-s29 | RR-03 | rr-s02 | rr-s12 | rr-s15 | rr-s16 | rr-s17 | rr-s18 | rr-s19 | rr-s20 | rr-s21 | TE-01 | P2

↑ Evidence contents | Complete finding index | Top 3

E09 · Entirely synthetic source artifact

E09 Business Circle member listing mock content

← Return to finding index

Origin: Author-created third-party-style membership listing fixture
Exact locator: member fields; membership disclaimer
Construction date: 10 November 2026 · Packet CSCW-SYNTHETIC-1.0
Body SHA-256: e444cf25439d786c21092fec249d0606a4af10dfb431ce14a2c5534e74259622

```
SOURCE LABEL: Alder Quay Business Circle (fictional)
SOURCE URL LABEL: https://alderquaycircle.example/members/cedar-spoke
MEMBER: Cedar & Spoke Cycle Works
LOCATION: 18 Mill Lane, Alder Quay, OR 97000
PHONE: 503-555-0148
WEBSITE: https://cedarandspoke.example
CATEGORY: Bicycle retail and mechanical repairs
DISCLAIMER: A member listing does not certify repair skills, professional licensing or service outcomes.
```

What it supports. Adds a separately authored scenario source agreeing with current identity/contact fields.

Use limits. This is not real external validation. Membership, even if real, would not validate the full expertise, quality or performance claims.

Return to a supporting finding or section: | ER-01 | ER-02 | ER-03 | er-s01 | er-s02 | er-s03 | er-s04 | er-s05 | er-s08 | er-s09 | er-s10 | er-s12 | er-s13 | er-s14 | er-s15 | er-s16 | er-s17 | er-s18 | er-s19 | er-s20 | er-s21 | er-s22 | er-s23 | er-s24 | er-s25 | EU-04 | eu-s04 | eu-s05 | eu-s09 | eu-s10 | TS-01 | ts-s01 | ts-s02 | ts-s05 | ts-s08 | ts-s10 | ts-s12 | ts-s14 | ts-s15 | ts-s21 | ts-s24 | ts-s25 | ts-s28 | ts-s29 | RR-03 | rr-s02 | rr-s11 | rr-s12 | rr-s14 | rr-s16 | rr-s17 | rr-s20 | P2 | P3

↑ Evidence contents | Complete finding index | Top 3

E10 · Entirely synthetic source artifact

E10 Three repair case stories mock content

← Return to finding index

Origin: Author-created first-party case-study fixture
Exact locator: case_01; case_02; case_03
Construction date: 10 November 2026 · Packet CSCW-SYNTHETIC-1.0
Body SHA-256: 994340201f98a7601d60f6ad3713f3a3e494b314d620c7fce22d58525ad66181

```
PAGE: https://cedarandspoke.example/workshop-stories
CASE 01 | Scenario date 2026-10-02 | Commuter bicycle
Published story: Inspected worn brake pads and hesitant shifting; customer approved a tune-up and replacement
pads. Describes the mechanical tasks, not a measured before/after outcome.
CASE 02 | Scenario date 2026-10-14 | Gravel bicycle
Published story: Assessed a wheel after a pothole impact; trued it within the repair scope and discussed
replacement if damage exceeded repair limits.
CASE 03 | Scenario date 2026-10-23 | E-bike mechanical brake adjustment
Published story: Adjusted brakes and checked wheel clearance. The battery and motor were not diagnosed or
repaired.
All cases are invented first-party narratives. No customer identity, independent inspection, invoices or
measured performance records are supplied.
```

What it supports. Supports a more concrete mechanical-work description and a bounded e-bike example.

Use limits. Stories do not establish independently verified competence, guaranteed outcomes, safety certification or electrical capability.

Return to a supporting finding or section: | ex-s04 | EU-01 | EU-04 | eu-s01 | eu-s02 | eu-s03 | eu-s04 | eu-s05 | eu-s06 | eu-s07 | eu-s08 | eu-s10 | eu-s11 | eu-s12 | eu-s13 | eu-s14 | eu-s15 | eu-s16 | eu-s17 | eu-s19 | eu-s20 | eu-s21 | eu-s23 | TS-03 | ts-s01 | ts-s02 | ts-s05 | ts-s07 | ts-s09 | ts-s10 | ts-s11 | ts-s12 | ts-s14 | ts-s15 | ts-s16 | ts-s17 | ts-s19 | ts-s21 | ts-s24 | ts-s25 | ts-s27 | ts-s28 | ts-s29 | RR-01 | RR-02 | RR-04 | rr-s01 | rr-s02 | rr-s04 | rr-s05 | rr-s06 | rr-s07 | rr-s08 | rr-s09 | rr-s10 | rr-s11 | rr-s13 | rr-s14 | rr-s16 | rr-s17 | rr-s19 | rr-s20 | rr-s21 | P3

↑ Evidence contents | Complete finding index | Top 3

E11 · Entirely synthetic source artifact

E11 Technical response and discovery fixture

← Return to finding index

Origin: Author-created technical fields, not a crawl or HTTP capture
Exact locator: responses; robots; navigation; sitemap
Construction date: 10 November 2026 · Packet CSCW-SYNTHETIC-1.0
Body SHA-256: 9e3601a56d3c42a31bf47c1d281f21d9e890bb10671a3fc36808dd8a2ffbf352

```
FIXTURE, NOT EXECUTION LOG
routes: /, /services, /book, /service-policy, /about, /contact
for each listed route:
 declared_status: 200
 declared_content_type: text/html
 declared_canonical: self URL on https://cedarandspoke.example
 declared_meta_robots: index,follow
 declared_X-Robots-Tag: absent from authored fixture
robots.txt authored text:
 User-agent: *
 Allow: /
 User-agent: GPTBot
 Disallow: /
navigation authored map:
 homepage -> services, book, about, contact
 footer -> service-policy
sitemap.xml authored URL list:
 /, /services, /book, /service-policy, /about, /contact
raw/rendered parity: not tested
redirect chains: not captured
search index status, selected canonicals, actual crawler visits: not supplied
```

What it supports. Permits illustration of bounded technical check reporting and training-policy/search-access separation.

Use limits. Every status is authored. This is not evidence of live reachability, crawler access, rendering, index inclusion or provider behavior.

Return to a supporting finding or section: | ER-04 | er-s17 | EU-02 | eu-s12 | eu-s20 | eu-s22 | ts-s23 | ts-s25 | rr-s11 | te-s01 | te-s02 | te-s03 | te-s04 | te-s05

↑ Evidence contents | Complete finding index | Top 3

E12 · Entirely synthetic source artifact

E12 Structured data mock source

← Return to finding index

Origin: Author-created JSON-LD fixture
Exact locator: script bike-store; address.streetAddress; telephone; sameAs
Construction date: 10 November 2026 · Packet CSCW-SYNTHETIC-1.0
Body SHA-256: 585873db7c9eacdbee614c7184984be241aab3b0f59114135350f3d2c8fecfac

```
<script type="application/ld+json" id="bike-store">
{
 "@context": "https://schema.org",
 "@type": "BikeStore",
 "@id": "https://cedarandspoke.example/#shop",
 "name": "Cedar & Spoke Cycle Works",
 "url": "https://cedarandspoke.example/",
 "telephone": "503-555-0119",
 "address": {
 "@type": "PostalAddress",
 "streetAddress": "6 Foundry Street",
 "addressLocality": "Alder Quay",
 "addressRegion": "OR",
 "postalCode": "97000"
 },
 "sameAs": ["https://alderquaycircle.example/members/cedar-spoke"]
}
</script>
```

What it supports. Shows valid authored JSON with a stable identity reference but old contact fields conflicting with visible content.

Use limits. Syntax and @id do not prove correct real-world meaning, ownership, rich results, entity merging or actual AI interpretation.

Return to a supporting finding or section: | ER-04 | er-s01 | er-s03 | er-s04 | er-s05 | er-s06 | er-s07 | er-s09 | er-s11 | er-s12 | er-s13 | er-s14 | er-s15 | er-s16 | er-s17 | er-s18 | er-s19 | er-s20 | er-s21 | er-s22 | er-s23 | er-s24 | er-s25 | eu-s03 | eu-s04 | eu-s09 | eu-s13 | eu-s18 | eu-s22 | eu-s23 | ts-s23 | ts-s25 | rr-s11 | TE-01 | te-s01 | te-s03 | te-s04 | te-s05 | P2

↑ Evidence contents | Complete finding index | Top 3

E13 · Entirely synthetic source artifact

E13 Unattributed response illustration and unperformed observation record

← Return to finding index

Origin: Author-created teaching illustration; no AI product was observed
Exact locator: execution_accounting; illustrative_answer; annotation
Construction date: 10 November 2026 · Packet CSCW-SYNTHETIC-1.0
Body SHA-256: c56c035ef0228fb36de4435c34e60c08ab81f84f2050777bd4190c8c6e19a94d

```
EXECUTION ACCOUNTING
Live observation plan: not commissioned for this fictional business
Products observed: none
External calls attempted: 0
Completed responses: 0
Claim-evaluable live responses: 0
Direct provider spend: $0 for this sample
Provider/model/backend/search/geography metadata: not applicable, no execution

CONSTRUCTED ILLUSTRATION, NOT A MODEL RESPONSE
Illustrative prompt: Where could I take an e-bike in Alder Quay for a same-day battery repair?
Illustrative answer: Cedar & Spoke Cycle Works may be an option; it advertises certified e-bike experts and
same-day repairs.

ANNOTATION
The constructed answer repeats broad E02/E04 wording but omits E03/E05 limits. It demonstrates why boundaries
matter. It is not an observed recommendation, discovery result, failure rate, citation event or forecast for
any named AI product. No citations were retrieved for this teaching illustration.
```

What it supports. Demonstrates how the report separates constructed examples from observations and checks a hypothetical assertion against source boundaries.

Use limits. Cannot support any claim about actual discovery, recognition, recommendations, variation, citations or model accuracy.

Return to a supporting finding or section: | ex-s02 | er-s04 | er-s17 | er-s21 | eu-s17 | eu-s22 | ts-s23 | ts-s25 | rr-s02 | rr-s11 | rr-s19 | CO-01 | co-s01 | co-s02 | co-s03 | co-s04 | co-s05 | co-s06

↑ Evidence contents | Complete finding index | Top 3

08 / Reading guide

What the labels mean.

The concepts below stay separate. No new combined score or “average” market benchmark is introduced.

Severity	How much the condition could matter to the declared customer need or downstream decision. A positive finding can remain positive; a source gap is not automatically critical.
Evidence classification	Whether a particular claim is verified, supported, unverified, missing or conflicting in the relevant packet. In this demonstration, the relationship is synthetic, not independent real-world verification.
Evidence strength	How well the supporting material fits the exact claim, including provenance, specificity and limits. Multiple analysts citing one record do not create independent evidence.
Analyst confidence	How certain the analyst is about the stated conclusion. High confidence that two fixture fields disagree does not mean high confidence in a business’s actual quality.
Priority	The recommended order of work, based on consequence, dependencies and actionability. It is not interchangeable with severity.
Unassigned score	No numeric judgment was made in this fictional sample. This is not zero, missing proof of all business activity, a new qualitative scale or an empirical success rate.
Understanding Support	How well the described business meaning connects to a use case. Entity Understanding does not make the final recommendation-readiness determination.
Observation	A preserved result from an actually accessed external product under a declared protocol. A constructed teaching answer is not an observation.

09 / Method and release boundary

What this sample demonstrates.

This report demonstrates a single-location, evidence-linked presentation with executive synthesis, four core specialist audits, Technical Evidence, Cross-Model coverage, a complete finding inventory and source appendices. It uses the established section structures and lane boundaries; it does not adopt a new scoring method. Existing method terms are retained where they help trace the full audits.

- Entity Resolution uses the current Handbook 1.4, Instructions 1.2, working Prompt 1.2 and the Entity Confidence hybrid framework 0.1. No point allocation or numeric result is assigned here; source-defined qualitative maturity is a synthetic illustration only.
- Entity Understanding, Trust Signal and Recommendation Readiness follow their current reconciled source sets and retain their distinct required sections. No real-world score, calibration or new low-to-high scale is claimed.
- Executive Intelligence uses Handbook 1.3, Instructions 1.1 and Prompt 1.3 with the native scope adaptation. All eight components remain visible, including multiplier analysis.
- Technical Evidence and Cross-Model Observation use their bounded foundations 0.1.0. Technical has no approved numeric scorecard. Cross-Model has no captured product responses in this demonstration.
- The 90-day sequence is proposed guidance for the fictional company. It does not set up monitoring, recurring charges or a reassessment service.

Before any real release. Actual source preservation, source-level factual review, appropriate collection, independent analytical QA, privacy/access controls and joint human review are separate requirements. A local navigation or print check of this sample does not qualify the assessment system or Report Helper. No live Helper is included.

Provider release review. Independent analytical review and final human release review belong to the assessment provider before a real report is delivered. They are not the client’s post-delivery improvement tasks. This fictional demonstration does not certify that those real-service steps or any model observation have occurred.