Competitor Disagreement Resolution Ledger

A75 V1.0.1

Cross-functional competitive intelligence is common, so disagreement is normal. The analytical task is not to manufacture alignment: lock the object, identify the dispute authority, preserve both claims, and name what evidence would change each claim.

Fast rule

Do not average people. Align the object, then test the evidence.

2026 operating context

Current CI research shows compete ownership spans marketing, strategy/executive and product teams, while functional silos and poor sales/product-marketing alignment weaken decision use. Cross-functional disagreement is an operating condition, not evidence.

Governance upgrade

Each material claim now carries a Claim ID, controlled Source Role, participant-supplied evidence/source labels and a falsifier - the evidence that would make the claim change.

1. Scope lock before comparison

Field	Lock
Candidate	Same company, domain or business unit.
Buyer	Same decision maker, segment or account type.
Offer	Same product, service, workflow or bundle.
Geography	Same serviceable market or jurisdiction.
Time window	Same current/as-of evidence period.
Named decision	Same decision the competitor relationship is meant to inform.

Stop condition

If one reviewer is answering for enterprise software replacement and another for consulting referral traffic, there is no meaningful average. Align or split the decision object.

2. Route the dispute to the right authority

Disagreement	Authority	Next move
Scope	Decision contract / scope owner	Align or split candidate, buyer, offer, geography, time window and decision.
Fact / evidence	Source provenance + resolving evidence	Reconcile source roles; preserve contradiction or MORE EVIDENCE REQUIRED.
Relationship / rule	Protected CFC lens definition	Apply the governed lens rule to common evidence; no seventh confidence dimension.
Decision standard / judgment	Authorized decision owner	Set consequence, risk tolerance and action threshold within governed Evidence Readiness; facts stay fixed.

Owner boundary

The owner cannot lower or redefine evidence states, source-role limits or critical sufficiency gates, convert inference into observation, suppress contradiction, or use seniority as evidence.

3. Structured claim record

Field	Purpose	Boundary
Claim ID	Stable participant-supplied identifier for a material proposition.	The browser tool does not validate uniqueness outside this record.
Source Role	Controlled label for the claimed authority of the supporting source.	Role selection records provenance intent; it does not prove the source exists or is accurate.
Evidence ID / notes	Participant-supplied locator or source note.	Do not upgrade participant-supplied evidence to OBSERVED without governed provenance.
Falsifier	Evidence that would make the claimant abandon or materially revise the claim.	If no possible falsifier can be named, treat the position as a preference/identity claim, not a testable fact claim.
Material dissent	Credible minority claim still capable of changing treatment.	Preserve it until resolved or no longer decision-relevant.

4. Controlled Source Roles

Source Role	Can help establish	Cannot establish alone
Product / service page	Offer, packaging, fulfilment claims, published geography	Private buyer comparison or win/loss behaviour
Search / AI visibility	Retrieval overlap, visible role clues, demand surfaces	Commercial substitution or same-buyer choice
CRM / sales notes	Participant-supplied objections, mentions, shortlist signals	Independent buyer truth without traceable provenance
Win/loss / RFP record	Specific comparison behaviour inside the recorded scope	Market-wide substitution outside that scope
Buyer interview / review	Attributable buyer-side alternatives and decision criteria	Every segment, geography or time period
Internal product judgment	Expert interpretation of use cases/substitution	Observed buyer behaviour without supporting evidence

5. Resolver + reopening discipline

State	When	Permitted use
SCOPE MISMATCH	Reviewers are not judging the same object.	Align or split; do not compare answers.
EVIDENCE CONFLICT	Material proof is missing, contradictory or unresolved.	MORE EVIDENCE REQUIRED; preserve claims and falsifiers.
RECONCILE EVIDENCE ROLES	Reviewers rely on different source authorities.	Compare provenance and legitimate source role; do not vote.
RULE INTERPRETATION	Common sufficient evidence, different CFC treatment.	Apply governed lens definition; preserve material dissent.
DECISION STANDARD	Facts aligned; threshold/risk/action preference differs.	Owner sets policy boundary inside governed Evidence Readiness.

Future reopening trigger

This field is future-facing only. Disagreement does not reopen a run by itself. Keep closed with no material change; reopen on a material decision/scope change or new material evidence capable of changing the prior result.

6. Portable claim ledger

Field	Record
Decision object	Candidate + buyer + offer + geography + time window + named decision.
Claim ID A / B	Stable participant-supplied labels for the two material claims.
Source Role A / B	Controlled source-role labels; provenance intent, not automatic verification.
Evidence ID(s) / notes	Participant-supplied locators or source notes for each claim.
Falsifier A / B	What evidence would make each side abandon or materially revise the claim.
Routing state	Scope mismatch / evidence conflict / source-role reconciliation / rule review / decision standard / immaterial.
Material dissent	Credible minority claim still capable of changing the treatment.
Future reopening trigger	Named future material change required before recheck/rerun.

PORTABLE-HANDOFF GATE

Do not export the claim ledger until both Claim IDs, both Source Roles, both claims, evidence/source notes and both falsifiers are complete. The routing diagnosis may be available earlier; the portable record may not.