

Worked Example 01: Vendor Deletion Certification

A synthetic illustration of the Zemi Method, Version 1.2

Version 1.2

Kevin V. Watson

August 9, 2026

Final publication revision August 25, 2026

© 2026 Kevin V. Watson. All rights reserved.

Document information

Version: 1.2

Status: Final publication version. Synthetic worked example; not evidence of a real engagement or validation study.

Zemi Method Version 1.2 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22084060>

Prepared: August 9, 2026

Final publication revision: August 25, 2026

Canonical home: <https://zemimethod.com>

Copyright: © 2026 Kevin V. Watson. All rights reserved.

Author: Kevin V. Watson

Web: <https://kevinwatson.com>

Contact: kevinwatson@gmail.com

Material changes from the Version 1.1 worked example

Aligned to the Version 1.2 finding definition and evidence-to-finding pathway; states directly that evidence is not a finding; applies the strengthened evidentiary-lineage test for independence; clarifies the decision-support boundary; identifies Artifact-to-Finding Promotion; records why representation completeness, AI Action Provenance, and Control Provenance are or are not applicable to this fact pattern; makes the storage-metric baseline and alternative-mechanism testing explicit; and reorganizes the Defensibility Check by Version 1.2 theme. The core synthetic fact pattern and adjudicated findings remain unchanged.

Contents

Why this example	4
How to read this example.....	4
Method map	5
The situation	6
1. Administrative record	6
2. Authority and scope	6
3. The question	7
4. Explanations considered	8
5. Evidence record	8
Artifact-to-Finding Promotion Version 1.1 in this example	9
6. Corroboration record	9
7. Analysis	10
8. Findings	11
Decision-support boundary	12
9. Automation record.....	12
10. Limitations.....	13
11. Defensibility check	13
Authority and Scope	13
Evidence and Source Completeness	14
Preservation, Transfer, and Custody.....	14
Analysis and Classification	14
Automation and AI	15
Reporting and Disclosure	15
Release, Correction, and Version Discipline	16
What the method changed	16
Why this example matters.....	17

This is a synthetic example. No part of this document describes a real engagement, a real client, a real vendor, or a real investigation. The organization, the vendor, the evidence, and the findings are constructed to illustrate how the Zemi Method operates end to end. Any resemblance to an actual matter is coincidental and unintended.

Release status. This final publication version illustrates the Zemi Method, Version 1.2. It is not evidence of a real engagement or validation study.

Why this example

The most common question asked of any methodology is whether it changes the outcome. A discipline that produces the same conclusion a competent practitioner would have reached anyway is documentation, not method.

This example is chosen because the two paths diverge. A certificate-only review of the same evidence produces a clean, confident answer. The Zemi Method produces a narrower answer, a stated uncertainty, and a different decision by the client. The divergence is the point.

The example also illustrates a claim-testing engagement rather than an attribution engagement. The question is not who acted. It is whether an assertion can be relied upon.

How to read this example

This document is not a model legal opinion, a model regulatory response, or a claim that this synthetic fact pattern proves the method's validity. It is a worked illustration of how the method changes the handling of a claim.

A finding is a human-adjudicated statement of what the available evidence supports, assumes, or cannot resolve within the stated authority, scope, and limits of the engagement. The certificate, deletion log, transfer record, contract, storage metric, and automated correlation result are evidence or artifacts. None is a finding by itself.

The example makes the Version 1.2 pathway explicit:

Source material → Observation → Claim → Tested claim → Human-adjudicated finding → Decision support

Applied here:

Certificate, deletion log, transfer records, contract, and storage metrics → recorded observations → complete-deletion claim → completeness, independence, failure-mode, conflict, and alternative-explanation testing → three classified human findings → Meridian's regulatory-response decision support

The important movement is from a broad vendor assertion to bounded findings:

Starting assertion	Method result
"All customer records were permanently deleted."	A substantial deletion event occurred. Complete deletion is undetermined on the available evidence. The vendor's deleted-record count is assumed only for limited descriptive purposes.

The example should be read for the reasoning discipline: how authority and scope are checked, how the question is reframed, how evidentiary lineage and independence are tested, how conflict is handled, how assumptions are kept visible, how artifacts are promoted or refused promotion into findings, and how the final answer becomes narrower than the answer the client hoped to give.

Method map

Zemi phase	What this example shows
Authority and Scope	The examiner confirms contractual audit authority, identifies disclosure authority, identifies the decision-maker, names excluded systems, and records access limits before framing the question.
Frame	The client's request is reframed from confirmation of a certificate to testing whether the evidence supports the claim. Competing explanations are carried forward together.
Preserve	Each artifact is recorded, hashed, and tied to its source. Vendor-supplied evidence and independently sourced evidence are kept distinct.
Corroborate	The certificate and deletion log are rejected as independent corroboration because they arise through the same evidentiary pipeline and share a failure mode. Cloud-provider metrics supply a materially separate process, system layer, and observation path, and material exports are checked for completeness before reliance.
Analyze	The evidence is interpreted together: a deletion event is supported, complete deletion is not, and the deleted-record count cannot be reconciled.
Adjudicate	Findings are classified as known, undetermined, and assumed before they are relied on; known findings state support basis and undetermined findings state resolution status.
Report	The findings state evidence, reasoning, contrary evidence, limits, support basis, undetermined status, automation use, AI role classification, tool-derived metric limits, material limitations, and the decision-support boundary.
Defensibility check	The final answer is narrower, but a reviewer can trace why it holds and where it stops.

The situation

Meridian Health Collective (synthetic) terminated its contract with Northgate Data Services (synthetic), a processor that had held customer records for four years. Under the termination terms, Northgate was required to permanently delete all records and certify the deletion.

Northgate issued a signed deletion certificate stating that all customer records were permanently deleted on 14 March 2026.

A regulator has since asked Meridian to confirm that the data no longer exists. Meridian's compliance lead intends to forward Northgate's certificate as the response, and engages an examiner to confirm it is sound before doing so.

The certificate-only path. The certificate is signed by an authorized officer. The vendor supplies a deletion job log on request showing 2,431,908 records deleted, timestamped 14 March 2026, status complete. Certificate and log agree. If the review stops there, the resulting answer is clean: deletion appears confirmed, forward the certificate.

The path below is what the method produces when the claim is tested rather than accepted.

1. Administrative record

Matter: Meridian Health Collective, vendor deletion verification Report date: 12 June 2026 (synthetic)
Method: The Zemi Method, Version 1.2 Mode of work: Investigative mode Mode justification: The engagement asks what the available evidence can establish about a vendor deletion claim. It does not ask for a formal likelihood-ratio evaluation or a fully evaluative opinion between legal propositions. Standards applied: none; this is a synthetic illustration. In a real engagement, applicable acquisition, preservation, validation, and handling standards would be identified by name and version. Classification: privileged and confidential

2. Authority and scope

Client and decision-maker: Meridian Health Collective, acting through its compliance lead. The immediate decision is whether Meridian can defensibly forward Northgate's deletion certificate to a regulator as confirmation that the data no longer exists.

Authority identified: Meridian has contractual authority under the synthetic data processing addendum to request deletion evidence from Northgate and to obtain tenancy-level storage consumption metrics from the cloud provider under an audit-right mechanism. That authority permits review of vendor-supplied deletion records, Meridian's own egress records, the contract and retention schedule, and provider-issued storage metrics for the Northgate tenancy.

Disclosure authority identified: Meridian's compliance lead is authorized to receive the examiner's findings and to decide what, if anything, may be disclosed to the regulator. The examiner is not authorized to send evidence, work papers, provider metrics, or the report directly to the regulator. Any external release requires Meridian's authorization and legal/privacy review.

Authority not identified: The examiner has no authority in this synthetic scenario to access Northgate backup systems, replica systems, internal administrative consoles, unrelated customer data, or provider-side object-level records outside the audit-right mechanism.

Scope included: testing whether available evidence supports the claim that all customer records transferred to Northgate were permanently deleted on 14 March 2026.

Scope excluded: legal advice to Meridian, regulatory response drafting, direct examination of Northgate backup or replica systems, object-level content identification, and independent validation of Northgate's internal deletion tooling.

Proportionality justification: The decision is significant because it concerns a regulator-facing statement about deletion of customer records. The engagement therefore requires evidence beyond a vendor certificate and vendor log. The proportional scope is limited to records Meridian can lawfully obtain before responding: vendor artifacts, Meridian transfer records, contract terms, and independently sourced cloud-provider metrics. The limitation is not treated as harmless; it directly constrains Finding 2.

Effect on findings: The work may proceed because authority exists for the evidence obtained. The lack of authority to examine backups, replicas, and object-level records prevents a complete-deletion finding and is carried into the limitations and classification of the central claim as undetermined.

3. The question

As posed by the client: confirm that Northgate deleted all customer records on 14 March 2026.

As reframed for examination: determine whether the available evidence supports the claim that all customer records transferred to Northgate were permanently deleted, and identify the limits of what the evidence can establish.

The client's framing presupposes the conclusion. It asks for confirmation of a claim rather than a test of it. The reframed question is the one the engagement can actually answer, and the gap between the two framings is recorded here because it shaped everything downstream.

Assumptions surfaced at intake:

- That the record set Northgate deleted is the same record set Meridian transferred. Not yet evidenced.
 - That "deleted" as used in the certificate means the same thing Meridian and the regulator understand it to mean. Not yet evidenced.
-

- That Northgate's deletion covers all locations where the data came to rest, not only the primary datastore. Not yet evidenced.

4. Explanations considered

Explanation	What would have to be true	What evidence would break it
E1. All transferred records were permanently deleted across all locations.	Deletion executed against the full transferred set, in primary storage and every derivative copy.	Storage evidence inconsistent with full deletion; record counts that do not reconcile; evidence of retained replicas or backups.
E2. Primary records were deleted; copies persist in backup or replica systems.	Deletion scoped to production storage only, with backup retention operating on its own schedule.	Storage consumption returning to the pre-transfer baseline; documented backup purge covering the same period.
E3. Deletion executed against a subset of the transferred records.	A scope mismatch between what was transferred and what the deletion job targeted.	Reconciliation of Meridian's transfer records against Northgate's deletion count showing agreement.
E4. The storage reduction resulted from a mechanism other than deletion of Meridian records.	Migration, storage-class reallocation, compression, tenancy reconfiguration, or unrelated data change produced the observed reduction.	A deletion execution record aligned with the independent metric change and no contrary migration or reconfiguration evidence in the available record.

Four explanations are carried forward together. E1 is the client's working theory and is not privileged over the others.

5. Evidence record

Item	Source and acquisition	Integrity	Notes
A1	Northgate deletion certificate, provided by Northgate	Hashed on receipt	Signed attestation, one page
A2	Northgate deletion job log, provided by Northgate on request	Hashed on receipt	Reports 2,431,908 records, status complete
A3	Meridian egress records for the transfer period, acquired from Meridian systems	Hashed at acquisition	Meridian's own record of what was sent
A4	Contract, data processing addendum, and retention schedule	Hashed on receipt	Defines the production-deletion obligation; does not specify backup or replica purge timing

Item	Source and acquisition	Integrity	Notes
A5	Cloud storage consumption metrics for the Northgate tenancy, obtained under Meridian's contractual audit right, direct from the cloud provider	Hashed at acquisition	Provider-issued, not vendor-supplied; covers the pre-transfer baseline through the examination date

A5 is the item the certificate-only review does not obtain, because that review does not test whether the vendor's documents are independently corroborated. Under this method it is required because A1 and A2 arise through Northgate's same evidentiary pipeline and cannot corroborate each other.

Artifact-to-Finding Promotion Version 1.1 in this example

A1 through A5 remain source material or evidence until the proposition they are offered to support has been tested. A1 does not become a complete-deletion finding because it is signed. A2 does not become a finding because it records a successful status. A5 does not become a retained-data finding merely because it shows a storage plateau. The automated correlation does not become a finding because a model proposed the pattern.

Promotion occurs only at human adjudication, after provenance, completeness, evidentiary lineage, failure modes, competing explanations, contrary evidence, and limits have been examined. A1, A2, and A5 support the narrower Finding 1. Their conflict and limits prevent promotion of the complete-deletion claim and instead support Finding 2 as undetermined.

6. Corroboration record

Claim 1: Records were deleted on 14 March 2026.

Source asserting it: A1, the certificate. Independent source tested against: A2 is **not independent**. The certificate and the deletion log are both produced by Northgate from the same operational systems and the same reporting chain. They share a failure mode: if Northgate's deletion tooling reports success incorrectly, or if its scope was misconfigured, both artifacts could be wrong in the same direction. Their different formats do not establish independence. They arise through the same evidentiary pipeline and do not represent materially separate processes, control points, system layers, actors, or observation paths. Independent source actually tested against: A5, cloud storage consumption metrics issued by the infrastructure provider rather than by Northgate. Completeness check on A5: Before A5 is relied on, the examiner verifies that the provider export covers the relevant tenancy, the pre-transfer baseline and period through the examination date, all available storage classes reported under the audit-right mechanism, and the provider's stated timezone. The export manifest shows no failed pages or omitted metric groups. This does not prove what data remained, but it supports treating A5 as a complete metric extraction for the limited question of storage-consumption change. **Result: corroborated in part.** A5

shows a substantial drop in stored volume on 14 March 2026, consistent with a large deletion event on that date. A deletion occurred.

Alternative mechanism check: E4 is tested against the available vendor execution record, contract and provider metric timeline. No migration, storage-class reallocation, compression event, or tenancy reconfiguration is identified in the available record at the relevant time. The record does not exclude every possible infrastructure-level mechanism, but the aligned deletion record and independent volume change support deletion as the bounded explanation.

Claim 2: All customer records were permanently deleted.

Independent source: A5. **Result: sources conflict.** Following the 14 March drop, storage consumption in the Northgate tenancy plateaus materially above its pre-transfer baseline. The plateau persists through the most recent metric available. A1 asserts complete deletion. A5 is inconsistent with complete deletion, although it does not identify the retained content.

Per the method, the conflict is treated as evidence in its own right and investigated rather than averaged or resolved toward the working theory. Investigation of A4 establishes that the data processing addendum obliges deletion of production records within thirty days but is silent on backup and replica retention. This does not resolve the conflict. It supplies a plausible mechanism for E2 and leaves E2 live.

Claim 3: The deleted set is the transferred set.

Source asserting it: A2, reporting 2,431,908 records. Independent source tested against: A3, Meridian's own egress records. Completeness check on A3: The examiner verifies that A3 covers the relevant transfer period and Meridian-controlled export channel, but the source schema records batch identifiers and total transfer volume rather than per-record counts. The extraction is complete for what Meridian's source holds, but the source itself does not hold the field needed for record-count reconciliation. **Result: uncorroborated, limitation stated.** Meridian's egress records capture transfer events by batch and volume but not by record count, so no reconciliation against 2,431,908 is possible from available evidence. The figure in A2 is unverified. This is a limitation of the available record, not an indication of error.

7. Analysis

The evidence establishes one point clearly and leaves the central claim unresolved.

A1 and A2 support the existence of a deletion event, but they do not independently support each other. Both are produced by Northgate, both depend on Northgate's systems and reporting chain, and both would fail in the same direction if the deletion job was scoped incorrectly or if the reporting layer overstated what happened. Their agreement is useful as a lead but insufficient as corroboration.

A5 changes the analysis. It comes from the infrastructure provider rather than Northgate and shows a material storage reduction on 14 March 2026. That independently supports the narrower proposition that a substantial deletion event occurred on the date stated.

A5 does not support the broader proposition that all customer records were permanently deleted. The post-deletion plateau above the pre-transfer baseline is inconsistent with the strongest form of Northgate's claim, but it does not prove retained Meridian data. It could reflect retained backups or replicas, unrelated data added after the baseline, storage overhead, delayed purge behaviour, or another mechanism not visible from the available record. A4 makes backup or replica retention plausible because the data processing addendum does not require backup purging within the same deletion window, but A4 does not prove what remains.

E1 is therefore not supported. E2 remains plausible and unresolved. E3 cannot be resolved because A3 does not permit record-count reconciliation. The analysis supports a narrower finding: a deletion event occurred. It does not support the decision Meridian wanted to make: that all customer records were permanently deleted.

8. Findings

Finding 1 Classification: KNOWN A deletion event affecting a substantial volume of stored data occurred in the Northgate tenancy on 14 March 2026. **Support basis:** Inference from a bounded record with single independent corroboration, supported by the vendor execution record and independently sourced provider metrics; bounded to a deletion event rather than content-level deletion. **Evidence:** A1, A2, A5. **Reasoning:** Northgate asserts deletion on that date. Storage consumption metrics issued independently by the infrastructure provider show a corresponding volume reduction on the same date. The vendor's assertion and an independently sourced measurement agree, and they do not share a failure mode. **Tool-derived basis:** A5 is a provider-issued storage-consumption metric rather than an examiner-generated measurement. The examiner uses it only to identify a material change in stored volume on the relevant date. Automated correlation was confirmed against the raw provider metrics before reliance. **Contrary evidence:** None encountered. **Limits:** Establishes a deletion event and its approximate scale within the bounded record. It does not establish what was deleted, that deletion was complete, or exclude every infrastructure-level explanation for the corresponding storage reduction.

Finding 2 Classification: UNDETERMINED Resolution status: EXHAUSTED Whether all customer records transferred to Northgate have been permanently deleted cannot be resolved on the available evidence. **Evidence:** A1, A4, A5. **Reasoning:** The vendor's certificate asserts complete deletion. Independently sourced storage metrics show consumption plateauing materially above the pre-transfer baseline. These sources conflict. The contract's silence on backup and replica retention supplies a plausible explanation for retained copies but does not evidence their contents. Resolving this requires evidence not presently available: backup system inventories, replica configuration, or provider-side object-level records. **Contrary evidence:** Northgate's certificate directly asserts the opposite of what the storage metrics suggest, and it is a signed attestation by an authorized officer. It is reported here rather than set aside. **Limits:** The plateau is consistent with retained customer records. It is also consistent with other retained data unrelated to Meridian. The evidence does not distinguish between these. The examiner's authority does not extend to the backup, replica, or object-level records needed to resolve the question.

Finding 3 Classification: ASSUMED For the limited purpose of describing the vendor's asserted deletion scope, the record count reported in the deletion log is treated as corresponding to the record set Meridian transferred. **Evidence:** A2, A3. **Reasoning:** The assumption is necessary only to describe what Northgate claims its deletion job covered. It is classified as assumed, rather than undetermined, because the report does not attempt to resolve whether the count is correct and does not rely on it as proof of deletion. Meridian's egress records do not capture per-record counts, so the vendor's figure cannot be reconciled against an independent measure. The assumption is identified rather than absorbed into Finding 1. **Contrary evidence:** None encountered. **Limits:** If the transferred set exceeded the deleted set, a scope mismatch would not be detectable from the evidence obtained. This assumption cannot be used as evidence that the deleted set and transferred set actually match.

Decision-support boundary

The findings support Meridian's decision about whether it can defensibly rely on or forward the deletion certificate. The Zemi Method does not decide Meridian's legal obligations, draft its regulatory response, determine what the regulator should accept, or assign consequences to Northgate. Those decisions remain with the authorized decision-makers and advisers.

9. Automation record

Tool and version	Used for	Inputs preserved	Outputs preserved
Local language model, version recorded in engagement file	Timeline alignment across A2, A3, and A5; drafting of the evidence table	Preserved in engagement record	Preserved in engagement record

Statement of separability: the findings in section 8 were adjudicated by the undersigned examiner. Automated assistance was limited to correlation and drafting. The storage plateau in A5 was identified by automated correlation and then confirmed against the raw provider metrics before being relied upon. No automated system determined any classification or the content of any finding.

AI role classification: AI-assisted. The local language model supported timeline alignment and drafting. It did not select evidence sources, decide source independence, classify findings, adjudicate conclusions, determine report content, or sign off. No AI system is the subject under examination in this example.

AI Action Provenance: Not applicable to the subject matter. The assisting language model did not initiate, select, coordinate, or execute consequential actions in the Northgate environment. Its engagement contribution is preserved under the automation record. The example therefore does not require preservation of a subject agent's execution trajectory, permissions, credentials, network activity, or resulting environmental state changes.

Control Provenance: Not applicable to the finding question. The example does not attribute a consequential AI action to a person or organization. Ordinary records identifying who configured and

used the assisting language model remain part of the automation record, but no specialized control-attribution analysis is required.

This matters here. The automated correlation proposed a pattern. Had that proposal been accepted without confirmation against the underlying data, the finding would rest on a summary rather than on evidence, which is the failure the method's premise names.

10. Limitations

- Backup and replica systems within the Northgate tenancy were not within the scope of the contractual audit right and could not be examined.
- Object-level records that would identify the contents of retained storage were not obtainable.
- Meridian's egress records do not support per-record reconciliation.
- The examination relies on storage consumption as an indirect provider-issued metric. It is used to identify a volume change and a remaining plateau, not to identify retained content or prove what was deleted.
- All evidence originating from Northgate is vendor-supplied and could not be independently verified except where an independent source existed.
- The reported deletion count is treated only as Northgate's asserted scope and is not independently established.
- The mode of work is investigative. The example does not express a formal likelihood ratio, probability, or fully evaluative opinion.
- The depth of verification is proportionate to a pre-response deletion verification, but not to an unrestricted forensic examination of Northgate's full infrastructure. That proportionality choice is why the central question remains undetermined rather than known.

11. Defensibility check

Authority and Scope

Check	Result
Lawful, contractual, ethical, and professional authority identified	Yes
Scope, evidence access, and excluded material stated	Yes
Mode identified and justified	Yes, investigative mode
Proportionality, access, technical-feasibility, and scope limits justified	Yes

Check	Result
Disclosure authority identified before release	Yes; Meridian may receive the findings, while external disclosure requires Meridian authorization and legal/privacy review

Evidence and Source Completeness

Check	Result
Material extractions assessed for completeness	Yes; A5 is checked for tenancy, period, storage classes, timezone, and export completeness; A3 is complete for its source but lacks record-count fields
Human-visible, machine-readable, and transformed representations compared where material	Not applicable; no source in this synthetic record presents materially different content through those representations
Prior work treated as source material rather than inherited findings	Not applicable
Every finding traces to inspectable source material and stated reasoning	Yes
Claimed corroboration arises through a materially separate evidentiary lineage	Yes; A1 and A2 are treated as one pipeline, while A5 is materially separate in process, system layer, and observation path

Preservation, Transfer, and Custody

Check	Result
Condition, source, integrity, and custody history recorded	Yes
Transfer protections and receipt verification recorded where forensic material is transferred	Not applicable; the synthetic example releases findings only
Retained-custody boundary controls recorded where required	Not applicable
Consequential AI action trajectory preserved where material	Not applicable; no AI system initiates or executes consequential actions in the environment under examination
Control Provenance preserved separately where attribution is material	Not applicable; the example does not attribute consequential AI activity

Analysis and Classification

Check	Result
Observations, claims, tested claims, and findings kept distinct	Yes
Claims bounded to what the evidence supports	Yes

Check	Result
Known, assumed, and undetermined matters separated	Yes
Known findings state support basis	Yes
Undetermined findings state pending or exhausted status	Yes; Finding 2 is exhausted
Classification is consistent with the evidence record	Yes
Competing explanations and contrary evidence tested and reported	Yes
Candidate narrowing distinguished from unique attribution where material	Not applicable
Layered responsibility distinguished where material	Not applicable
Findings could be repeated from preserved evidence	Yes

Automation and AI

Check	Result
Automation contribution documented, preserved, and separable	Yes
AI role classified and bounded	Yes; AI-assisted
AI or orchestration records corroborated where relied on for consequential actions	Not applicable
Execution, causation, authorization, objective selection, intent, autonomy, human intervention, and accountability distinguished where material	Not applicable to the subject; the assisting AI does not perform subject activity
Tool-derived or AI-derived outputs state processing basis, validation, limits, and role	Yes; A5 and automated correlation are bounded and checked against raw metrics
Every finding human-adjudicated and signed off	Yes

Reporting and Disclosure

Check	Result
Findings state evidence, reasoning, classification, support, contrary evidence, assumptions, and limits	Yes
Standards or benchmarks mapped where a finding depends on them	Not applicable
Derivative presentations tied to source and bounded where material	Not applicable
Material limitations clear enough for a decision-maker to account for them	Yes

Check	Result
Report supports rather than makes the decision	Yes

Release, Correction, and Version Discipline

Check	Result
Method version and artifact-conformance status identified	Yes; Version 1.2
Release limited to authorized recipients	Yes
Record sufficient to support later correction	Yes

Examiner signature and date.

What the method changed

The certificate-only path ends with a confirmed deletion and a certificate forwarded to the regulator. Certificate and vendor log agree; nothing on their face suggests a problem.

The method produces three differences.

It refused to treat two vendor documents as corroboration. The certificate and deletion log agree because they arise through the same evidentiary pipeline and share material failure modes. Different document formats do not create independence. Their agreement carries no more weight than the pipeline can support. This is what forced the acquisition of an independently sourced measurement, which is the only reason anything further was learned.

It surfaced a conflict that the certificate-only review never encounters, because that review never obtains the source that conflicts. The storage plateau does not prove that customer records remain. It establishes that the vendor's claim of complete deletion is not supported by the only independent evidence available, which is a different and more useful thing to know.

It changed the client's decision. Meridian cannot tell the regulator that all data has been deleted. What Meridian can say, accurately, is that a deletion event of substantial scale occurred on the stated date, that complete deletion is unresolved on available evidence, that the contract did not oblige backup purging, and that further verification requires authority and access Meridian does not currently hold. That is a weaker answer and a defensible one. Forwarding the certificate would have been a stronger answer that Meridian could not have defended if the retained copies were later discovered.

A narrow finding that holds is worth more than a broad one that breaks. This is what that principle looks like when it costs something.

Why this example matters

The example does not show the method discovering a dramatic hidden fact. It shows the method preventing a premature conclusion. That is the more common and more important use case.

The certificate-only answer is attractive because it is complete, quick, and administratively convenient. The Zemi answer is less convenient because it separates the supported claim from the unsupported one. The method changes the decision not by making the evidence stronger, but by preventing the unsupported part of the claim from passing as proven.

That is the value of the method in practice: it does not promise certainty where the evidence does not provide it. It gives the decision-maker a finding that can be defended, and it states the remaining uncertainty clearly enough that the decision-maker can account for it.

Worked examples are illustrative and synthetic. They demonstrate the method's operation and are not evidence of its application in practice.