Mystery Shopping Fieldwork Case Review

Anonymised retrospective review | MS-01

The archive contains software-retail mystery-shopping project documents naming Rapid Verification Services and Edward Omondi, together with a completed visit questionnaire. This review describes recorded fieldwork and its limits without identifying the client or visited retailer.

Record status	Historical project documentation and one completed two-page visit questionnaire
Historical period	Project records dated 2013 and 2014; completed visit form undated
Review prepared	9 November 2026

What the retained material shows

The project material includes an assignment quotation, a vendor-named statement-of-work template, programme requirements, a target-outlet workbook, meeting notes and a vendor-agreement document.

The retained questionnaire records an in-person visit, the retailer identity observed, the role of the contact, the shopper scenario, product recommendations, point-of-sale observations and handwritten comments.

The form records a difference between the supplied business name and the name observed during the visit. That illustrates the value of checking outlet identity before attributing visit results.

The questionnaire marks both a genuine-software field and a counterfeit-offer field. Its handwritten comments also record an offer concern. The contradictory selections require clarification; this review does not declare an infringement or a pass/fail result.

Interpretation and limitations

What this example demonstrates

Verify the outlet identity and record what was observed rather than relying only on a target list.

Keep each visit record distinct from campaign planning and completion totals.

Resolve inconsistent checkbox selections before assigning a final result.

What it does not establish

The completed visit form has no visit date. Its printed 2012 footer is the template edition date, not evidence that the visit occurred in 2012.

The quotation, target list and meeting notes describe different proposed scope counts. A target list does not establish visits completed, final acceptance, payment or a campaign-wide result.

The vendor agreement names Rapid Verification Services and an historical effective date, but its signature blocks are blank in the supplied copy. The SOW also contains incomplete fields. They do not establish an executed agreement or current vendor status.

Historical client and retailer names, supplier identifiers, staff contacts, exact visit locations and signatures are not reproduced. No endorsement or continuing brand relationship is claimed.

Attribution and source handling

Evidence keys M01-M10 in the privately retained source register. The public account is an anonymised retrospective summary, not a reproduction of confidential programme material.

This document is a newly prepared anonymised review of historical material. It is not the original report, a fresh investigation of the subject, a client testimonial or a current licence certificate.

Discuss a current assignment

RVS Kenya | www.rvskenya.com | info@rvskenya.com

Current work is assessed and quoted separately. The written scope should identify the question, methods, deliverables, exclusions and working timeline.