Customer Experience & Business Impact Review™

Focused Review | All 30 questions answered

Fictional example: Harbourview Supplies, an owner-led Caribbean trade and retail supplier. All 30 questions have been answered for this demonstration. These are illustrative self-reported conditions, not evidence about a real business.

SAMPLE - FICTIONAL BUSINESS - NOT CLIENT ADVICE

Generated from the accepted product report engine. Sample edition v40.7.1 | 27 October 2026. Product report version: CS-HOSTED-REPORT-C1-2026-10-20

1. Result

50 /100

Significant gaps

Higher means stronger operating control in this area. Findings reflect your answers; causes and effects still need verification against current records.

2. Priorities & actions

Priority 1

Identified issue

Priority selected: Complaints. Main issue areas: Complaints, Returns / refunds. Where it appears: Sales / enquiry stage. Reported frequency: Several times a week. Duration: 6–12 months. Seriousness: Regularly affects work. People affected: Customers. Repeat delay, cost or lost-opportunity frequency: Several times a week. Desired 90-day outcome: Fewer repeat complaints.

Action to take

Make “Complaints” the first 90-day priority. Verify one current example using the most relevant records, identify the operating cause rather than only the symptom, assign one accountable owner, set a starting measure, trial the smallest supported correction, and review the result weekly.

Priority 2

Identified issue

Reported control gaps or partial controls: clear ownership, clear rules / limits, simple written steps, clear escalation, controls actually used, control checking, root-cause correction after failure. Existing controls selected in Question 18: One customer-signal log. Current control effectiveness confidence: Mixed.

SAMPLE – FICTIONAL BUSINESS

Action to take

Keep controls that are already working. For the highest-risk verified gap, name the owner, clarify the rule or step, make the required information available, and check one exception from detection through correction before expanding the change.

Priority 3

Identified issue

Records available to verify the position: Customer messages. Confidence that the information is accurate enough to act on: Mixed.

Action to take

Before making a material decision, reconcile the selected issue to the most relevant current records and record what remains uncertain.

3. Follow-up

Priority 1: Suggested owner: the manager responsible for the selected issue. Record a starting measure, review weekly for four weeks, and preserve required protective controls while making changes.

Priority 2: Suggested owner: responsible manager or control owner. Measure exceptions, overdue actions and repeat failures; escalate material safety, legal, fraud, financial or continuity risks immediately.

Priority 3: Suggested owner: person maintaining the relevant operating or financial information. Measure data age, unresolved differences and repeat evidence gaps.

Why this result?

All 30 questions have been answered. The review result is available; reported conditions, causes and effects still need checking against current records before stronger conclusions are drawn. Some findings also require evidence validation before stronger claims are made.

Customer signal control indicator

50 /100

Significant gaps

Higher scores indicate stronger control in this area.

Directional self-reported indicator: 20 of 20 scorable responses included in this calculation. No scorable responses excluded. Context questions guide the diagnosis but do not receive a numeric score. The score bands are inherited from the approved 30-question Focused Review and are not an audit opinion, benchmark or proof of a root cause.

Section indicators

Signal 50%

7 of 7 scorable responses included

Issue frequency & severity 33%

3 of 3 scorable responses included

Evidence confidence 50%

1 of 1 scorable responses included

SAMPLE - FICTIONAL BUSINESS

Control design & use 56%

9 of 9 scorable responses included

Primary issue and first priority

• Priority selected: Complaints. Main issue areas: Complaints, Returns / refunds. Where it appears: Sales / enquiry stage. Reported frequency: Several times a week. Duration: 6–12 months. Seriousness: Regularly affects work. People affected: Customers. Repeat delay, cost or lost-opportunity frequency: Several times a week. Desired 90-day outcome: Fewer repeat complaints.

• Guardrail: Customer behaviour measures must fit the business model. Do not infer root cause from a score alone.

Check: Check at least one current dated example or record that matches the selected priority before treating the explanation as established.

Control design and follow-through

• Reported control gaps or partial controls: clear ownership, clear rules / limits, simple written steps, clear escalation, controls actually used, control checking, root-cause correction after failure. Existing controls selected in Question 18: One customer-signal log. Current control effectiveness confidence: Mixed.

• Guardrail: Customer behaviour measures must fit the business model. Do not infer root cause from a score alone.

Check: Check one recent exception or missed control and confirm who noticed it, who corrected it and whether the correction prevented a repeat.

Evidence quality and decision confidence

• Records available to verify the position: Customer messages. Confidence that the information is accurate enough to act on: Mixed.

• Guardrail: Customer behaviour measures must fit the business model. Do not infer root cause from a score alone.

Check: Do not convert an uncertain estimate into a fact. Verify the current records and date used for the decision.

Control effectiveness still uncertain

• Confidence that current controls are reducing the issue: Mixed. What has already been tried: Changed the process.

• Guardrail: Customer behaviour measures must fit the business model. Do not infer root cause from a score alone.

Check: Compare the selected starting measure with the same measure after the controlled trial.

Guardrail: Customer behaviour measures must fit the business model. Do not infer root cause from a score alone.

Illustrative report output only. The full questionnaire, scoring mechanics, editable assessment and restorable data remain private. No customer licence, personal data or live order is included.

SAMPLE - FICTIONAL BUSINESS