

Check the supplier claim against cash

What you will make

A traceable campaign comparison that survives corrected records and a repeated update.

What you need

Use one approved AI chat and a calculator. Paste the green prompt. No connectors, installed skills or independent agents are required.

Follow this route

1. Define the metric before comparing campaigns.
2. Use the supplied fictional records and show source references.
3. Apply each correction once. Reconcile the total across campaigns.
4. Keep the budget decision pending human approval.

This is a dated companion to the original session. The teaching method is preserved; the setup instructions and checks are expanded.

Copy the prompt, then inspect the result

Where it goes

Paste the green block into a new approved chat. Keep this guide open separately. Do not upload the full guide for an independent test.

COPY AND PASTE / EXACT PROMPT

Use one assistant for this fictional analysis. Do not claim independent agents. Define net collected cash as deposits minus refunds, BEFORE campaign spend. Initially: Beacon cash \$60,000 and spend \$50,000; Harbor cash \$100,000 and spend \$25,000; Partner cash \$40,000 and spend \$10,000. Beacon also has \$150,000 booked contracts, which are not cash. Supplier claims 3x return and requests a \$30,000 move into Beacon. No budget approval exists. E01 reassigns a \$25,000 Harbor deposit to Partner. E02 refunds \$20,000 of Harbor cash. Spend stays unchanged. Show before and after cash, after cash/spend, and the company total. Explain why booked contracts do not prove the cash claim. Then replay E01 and E02 and prove totals remain unchanged because those event IDs already applied. Keep the funding decision pending. Do not send messages or move money.

If the response goes wrong

If cash is reduced by campaign spend, restate the metric. If updates apply twice, ask for an event-ID ledger and a replay that changes nothing.

These are teaching prompts, not recorded live-test results. The supplied examples use fictional data. Account permissions and behavior require separate verification.

Check the result before using it

Expected evidence

- 1. Before cash totals \$200,000. After: Beacon \$60,000; Harbor \$55,000; Partner \$65,000. Total \$180,000.
- 2. After cash/spend: Beacon 1.2x, Harbor 2.2x, Partner 6.5x. These are cash-to-spend ratios, not profit ROI.
- 3. Replaying E01 and E02 changes no totals. No spending approval is invented.

The supplier's 3x figure divides booked contracts by spend. The stated policy uses collected cash, producing 1.2x for Beacon.

Record your own result

Metric definition / source packet

Before / after / reconciliation total

Event IDs already applied

Unsupported claim / missing evidence

Human decision owner / approval state

Observed result / correction / retest

This is a new self-contained companion to the September exercise. Multiple labeled role passes do not establish independent evaluation.

[Read the original session Field Notes and source references](#)