PROTOTYPE DELIVERABLE

Vendor Invoice Audit

Public contract terms + synthetic invoice + evidence-backed findings

DEMO ONLY: This packet does not allege that any real vendor or customer was overcharged.

$58.44	$42.59	$2,214.78
Potential discrepancy	High-confidence price variance	Recurring annual exposure

Prepared for product validation

Amgolo - Know before you pay.

July 2026

1. Executive summary

The invoice in this demo is synthetic. The contract rates are drawn from a publicly posted facilities agreement.

Amgolo reviewed a mock weekly invoice against publicly available contract pricing and terms. The demonstration identified price mismatches, an unlisted service charge, and event-based charges that require supporting documentation before payment.

$179.22	$120.78	$58.44
Invoice billed	Contract-aligned amount	Potential difference

What Amgolo would tell accounts payable

PAY	$120.78 is supported by the extracted contract rates.
HOLD	$42.59 in unit-price variance should be corrected.
REQUEST EVIDENCE	$15.85 requires contract support or delivery/replacement documentation.

Audit conclusion

Recommended disposition: Do not approve the full invoice as presented. Pay the supported amount only after confirming the customer's accounts-payable rules, and send the vendor an itemized request for correction and documentation.

What this proves for the prototype

- A contract-versus-invoice audit can produce a clear dollar result without a full software integration.
- The result is more useful when it gives a Pay / Hold / Request Evidence decision rather than a generic anomaly score.
- The first version can be human-reviewed while the extraction and calculations are gradually automated.

2. Contract terms extracted

Public source used for demonstration: a facilities agreement and pricing quote posted by Willoughby-Eastlake Schools. The agreement lists the following unit prices and selected terms.

Contract field	Extracted rule	Source section
Cotton work shirt	$0.210 per unit	Pricing table
Cotton work pant	$0.290 per unit	Pricing table
Jacket	$0.380 per unit	Pricing table
Uniform Advantage	$0.060 per unit	Pricing table
Shop towel	$0.100 weekly per unit	Facility services pricing
Shop towel lost/replace	$0.250 per unit	Uniform quote
Make-up charge	$1.545 per garment	Agreement terms
Minimum charge	$35.00 per delivery	Agreement terms
Annual price change	4% in year 2 and 4% in year 3	Addendum note
Terminating employees	Weekly rental stops after notice and return of issued garments	General service terms

Controls that Amgolo should capture

- Effective date and contract year, because price caps can change by year.
- Every amendment and location-specific addendum.
- Unit prices, fees, minimums, automatic replacement rules, and service frequency.
- Notification requirements for terminated or inactive employees.
- Dispute deadlines and documentation requirements.

Important: contract extraction is not legal interpretation. Ambiguous terms require human review.

3. Synthetic invoice used for the audit

This invoice is fictional and was created only to test the Amgolo workflow.

Vendor	Uniform Vendor Co.	**Invoice #**	DEMO-10017
Customer	Northstar Service Group	**Service week**	07/06/2026
Location	Brentwood, CA	**Terms**	Net 30

Description	Qty	Unit price	Extended
Cotton work shirt	160	$0.259	$41.44
Cotton work pant	160	$0.351	$56.16
Jacket	20	$0.412	$8.24
Uniform Advantage	320	$0.134	$42.88
Shop towel	48	$0.114	$5.47
Service charge	1	$9.950	$9.95
Shop towel lost/replace	12	$0.423	$5.08
Make-up charge	4	$2.500	$10.00
INVOICE TOTAL			**$179.22**

Supporting assumptions for this demo

- The public contract pricing is treated as effective for the service week.
- No approved amendment authorizing the higher invoice prices was provided.
- No documentation was supplied for the service charge, lost/replacement items, or make-up charges.
- Tax is excluded from the demonstration.

4. Audit findings

$42.59	$15.85	$58.44
High confidence	Needs evidence	Total potential

Line	Billed	Expected	Potential	Confidence	Action
Cotton work shirt	160 × $0.259	160 × $0.210	$7.84	High	Correct unit price
Cotton work pant	160 × $0.351	160 × $0.290	$9.76	High	Correct unit price
Jacket	20 × $0.412	20 × $0.380	$0.64	High	Correct unit price
Uniform Advantage	320 × $0.134	320 × $0.060	$23.68	High	Correct unit price
Shop towel	48 × $0.114	48 × $0.100	$0.67	High	Correct unit price
Service charge	$9.95	Not listed	$9.95	Medium	Request contract basis
Lost/replace	12 × $0.423	12 × $0.250	$2.08	Medium	Request item evidence
Make-up charge	4 × $2.500	4 × $1.545	$3.82	High	Correct unit price

Recurring exposure

The recurring unit-price mismatches total $42.59 per weekly invoice, or approximately **$2,214.78 per year** if quantities and rates remain unchanged. The unlisted service charge could add another $517.40 annually if it repeats weekly, but it is classified as “needs evidence” rather than confirmed.

Why this is stronger than anomaly detection

- Every flagged amount is tied to a specific contract rate.
- The report separates confirmed arithmetic differences from missing-document questions.
- The customer can act immediately without deciphering a score or dashboard.

5. Issue detail and evidence trail

Price variance - Uniform Advantage — $23.68

Finding: The invoice uses $0.134 per unit, while the public quote lists $0.060.

Evidence: Invoice line: 320 units × $0.134. Contract/quote: Uniform Advantage $0.060.

Recommended action: Correct the rate and request a $23.68 credit.

Price variance - Shirts and pants — $17.60

Finding: Shirts and pants are billed above the quoted rates.

Evidence: Shirts: $0.259 vs $0.210. Pants: $0.351 vs $0.290.

Recommended action: Correct both unit prices and request a $17.60 credit.

Unlisted service charge — $9.95

Finding: No service-charge amount appears in the public pricing table used for this demo.

Evidence: Invoice line: Service charge $9.95. Contract pricing field: no listed amount.

Recommended action: Request the contractual basis and approval history before payment.

Lost/replacement and make-up charges — $5.90

Finding: The billed unit prices exceed the rates shown in the public quote/agreement. Lost-item charges also require item-level support.

Evidence: Lost/replace: $0.423 vs $0.250. Make-up: $2.500 vs $1.545.

Recommended action: Request affected item IDs, dates, and delivery/replacement records; correct the unit rates.

Amgolo should preserve a screenshot or extracted text snippet for every invoice line and contract clause used in a finding.

6. Ready-to-send vendor review request

A human should approve this message before it is sent.

Subject: Request for review and correction - Invoice DEMO-10017

Hello Billing Team,

We reviewed Invoice DEMO-10017 against the applicable pricing schedule and identified several items that require correction or supporting documentation before approval.

1. Cotton work shirts were billed at $0.259 per unit; the pricing schedule lists $0.210. Potential difference: $7.84.
2. Cotton work pants were billed at $0.351 per unit; the pricing schedule lists $0.290. Potential difference: $9.76.
3. Uniform Advantage was billed at $0.134 per unit; the pricing schedule lists $0.060. Potential difference: $23.68.
4. Please provide the contractual basis for the $9.95 service charge.
5. Please provide item-level support for the lost/replacement charges and correct the unit price to the agreed rate if applicable.
6. Make-up charges were billed at $2.500 per garment; the agreement lists $1.545. Potential difference: $3.82.

Please send a corrected invoice or the supporting documents for these line items. Based on the records available, the amount currently supported is $120.78.

Thank you,
Accounts Payable

Recovery tracker

Issue	Amount	Sent	Vendor response	Recovered
Price corrections	$42.59	Pending	Pending	$0.00
Service charge	$9.95	Pending	Pending	$0.00
Replacement/make-up	$5.90	Pending	Pending	$0.00

7. The Amgolo audit method

1	**Collect**	Contract, amendments, invoices, delivery tickets, employee roster, and vendor correspondence.
2	**Extract**	Capture effective dates, item codes, unit prices, fees, minimums, caps, and documentation requirements.
3	**Normalize**	Match vendor invoice descriptions and item codes to the contract's terminology.
4	**Recalculate**	Recompute every line and compare billed totals to contract-aligned totals.
5	**Verify**	Check employee status, deliveries, replacements, and approvals for exception charges.
6	**Classify**	High confidence, needs evidence, or informational - never label a charge "fraud" from documents alone.
7	**Recover**	Generate the vendor request, attach evidence, track credits, and confirm the charge does not reappear.

Human-review rules for the MVP

- No finding is released unless the invoice line, contract term, calculation, and source document are visible together.
- An unlisted fee is labeled "request evidence," not automatically "overcharge."
- Any legal interpretation, renewal dispute, or termination claim is referred to qualified counsel.
- The customer approves all vendor communications.
- Recovered savings are recorded only after a credit memo, corrected invoice, refund, or documented rate reduction is received.

Minimum data fields for a real pilot

Vendor name, Contract effective date, Contract year, **Location,** Employee/item ID, Invoice date, **Invoice number,** Item code, Description, **Quantity,** Billed rate, Expected rate, **Delivery evidence,** Issue category, Confidence, **Potential amount,** Vendor response, Recovered amount.

8. Source notes and next action

Public source used

Willoughby-Eastlake Schools - Cintas Agreement and pricing quote. Open public PDF

The public document shows quoted prices for work shirts, work pants, jackets, Uniform Advantage, shop towels, replacement pricing, make-up charges, minimum charges, and selected service terms. This packet uses those terms only to demonstrate an audit workflow. The invoice, customer, invoice number, quantities, and discrepancies are synthetic.

What we have now

- A clear audit methodology.
- A realistic sample invoice.
- An evidence-backed report format.
- A vendor dispute template.
- A defined Pay / Hold / Request Evidence workflow.

Next action

Use this packet to test whether a business owner understands the value in under five minutes.

Pilot readiness test: Show the report to three owners, controllers, or accounts-payable managers. Ask only: “Would you send us your own contract and invoices for a free review?”

Do not build the full application until: at least one real customer provides documents, the audit finds a legitimate discrepancy, and the customer confirms they would pay for continued monitoring or successful recovery.

Prototype limitation

This packet demonstrates product logic and presentation. It does not establish that the cited public customer was overcharged, does not evaluate the full master agreement or every amendment, and is not legal, tax, or accounting advice.