

A \$5,000 difference. No additional tracking defect.

Closed · Reporting definition clarified · Same 1,000–order cohort as the audit, after removing the separately identified duplicate rows.

SAMPLE STORE · SUBSCRIPTION NUTRITION · USD

Reported concern

The purchase report shows \$120,000 while finance shows \$115,000 for the same orders. Is tracking still overstating revenue?

Investigation	Result
Matched the population	Both reports contain the same 1,000 eligible paid orders, with the same UTC window and USD currency.
Checked repetition and amounts	The corrected purchase view has one row per order; product values total \$120,000.
Inspected the refund basis	Finance deducts \$5,000 of monetary refunds against these orders through 10 August. The purchase view shows revenue before refunds.
Recalculated on the same definition	$\$120,000 - \$5,000 = \$115,000$. Unexplained difference: \$0.

\$120,000

product revenue before refunds

–\$5,000

same-cohort refunds at cutoff

\$115,000

net product revenue

Resolution

Saved separate “Product revenue” and “Net product revenue” views, displayed the refund cutoff, and updated the revenue definition record. No collector or event configuration was changed for this issue. The earlier duplicate-delivery defect is tracked independently under R-02.

Client-facing conclusion

The remaining difference is fully explained by refunds. Both reports agree when they use the same definition. The two saved views now make that distinction visible, and the reconciliation is linked to this issue.

Evidence summary: source cohort, corrected purchase export, order-linked refund extract and reconciliation. Closure: report owner accepted the definition. All actions and results in this sample are fictional.

02 / CONFIRMED DEFECT · R-02

Repeated purchases traced to a delivery retry.

Closed after repair and validation · Linked finding A-01 · The incident affected the custom purchase dataset, not every connected advertising platform.

SAMPLE STORE · SUBSCRIPTION NUTRITION · USD

Reported concern

The receiving dataset contains 1,120 purchases, but the store created only 1,000 eligible paid orders. Revenue also appears too high.

Investigation / action	Recorded outcome
Match orders to destination rows	880 orders have one row each; 120 have two. All repeated rows match the original order value.
Trace accepted deliveries and retries	The first delivery was accepted, its response timed out, and the retry used a new sale identity.
Reproduce before changing code	The original 1,000–order fixture with 120 accepted-then-timeout cases produces 1,120 rows.
Repair and repeat the same test	Stable sale identity and repeat-delivery handling produce 1,000 rows. Different orders still create separate sales.
Release and correct reporting	Released feed 1.1 after approval. Excluded the 120 proven repeated rows from the reporting view; kept raw rows and exclusion reasons.
Verify live and close	A separate settled post-release cohort contains 250 paid orders and 250 destination rows. No unexplained product-value difference.

Client-facing conclusion

The overcount came from retries being treated as new sales. The fix passed the original failure test, and the first settled post-release cohort reconciles. The affected historical reporting view is corrected, with all excluded rows retained in the audit trail.

Follow-through

Updated the event record and release log. Keep reconciliation active for missing, repeated and mismatched orders. If the issue recurs, retain pending deliveries and reopen this ticket with the affected order references; do not delete evidence or silently reclassify records.

Evidence summary: order-to-row join, accepted-delivery trace, pre/post test output, release record, exclusion ledger and independent post-release reconciliation. Fictional example, not a past-client result.

The result, measured against the original problem.

Acceptance record · Reporting cutoff: 10 August for the original cohort; 14 August for the separate 11–12 August post-release cohort.

SAMPLE STORE · SUBSCRIPTION NUTRITION · USD

Measure	Before	After / evidence
Original cohort · paid orders	1,000	1,000 · unchanged source population
Original cohort · purchase rows	1,120	1,000 · corrected reporting view
Original cohort · product revenue	\$134,400	\$120,000 · \$14,400 repeated value excluded
Retry failure test · same fixture	1,120 rows	1,000 rows · 120 forced response timeouts
Net revenue comparison · R-01	\$120,000 vs \$115,000	\$115,000 vs \$115,000 · same refund basis
Independent post-release cohort	Separate observation	250 orders / 250 rows · \$30,000 product revenue in both systems

Acceptance checklist

Passed: one sale per eligible order in the tested cohorts; stable identity across retry paths; product values reconcile; historical exclusions are traceable; report definitions are explicit; event record and release log updated.

Open item carried forward

60 of the original 1,000 orders remain “unknown” for first / repeat classification. Customer-data owner to recover history or approve continued unknown status before these records inform customer-status-based commissions. This does not reopen the resolved duplicate-delivery issue.

What the result proves

The documented defect is resolved in the failure test and checked post-release cohort. It does not prove universal attribution, completeness in every advertising platform, or improved ROAS. Those require their own destination-specific validation.

Handover references: system register revision 1.1 · event record EVT-01 · release and rollback record · reporting exclusion ledger · issues R-01 and R-02. Illustrative records are summarized here; no raw evidence files are attached.