



Critical Path Partners

Forensic schedule analysis

# Expert report - Ontario Community College - B2 (Demo Data)



CRITICAL PATH PARTNERS

Forensic Schedule Analysis

Narrative expert report

# Ontario Community College - B2 (Demo Data)

Project

Ontario Community College - B2 (Demo Data)

Report date

2026-09-01

Claimant (Contractor)

Northgate Constructors

Respondent (Owner)

Ontario Community College Owner Group

Prepared by

Dana Fitkowski, Principal, Critical Path Partners

Slip quantified

## 21 wd

working days, windows analysis

Standard

AACE 29R-03

Protocol

SCL

Units

working days

R-01

## Instructions received

what the analyst was asked to do

Critical Path Partners was retained by Northgate Constructors to quantify the movement of project completion between the baseline schedule of record and the schedule update at data date 01-Jul-2025, to attribute that movement by cause, and to prepare an extension-of-time submission under the contract for the owner-attributable portion. This is a demonstration engagement on synthetic data, prepared so a prospective client can see the complete work product.

Dana Fitkowski is the principal of Critical Path Partners. He has 24 years of construction planning and scheduling experience, including 20 years on Canadian nuclear projects, and currently leads planning and scheduling for major industrial and commercial construction programs. His practice is built on Primavera P6 and the methods of AACE International Recommended Practice 29R-03 and the SCL Delay and Disruption Protocol. The analysis engine used in this report is cross-validated against Primavera P6; the validation record, including its scope and limits, is published at [criticalpathpartners.ca/validation.html](https://criticalpathpartners.ca/validation.html).

The demonstration project is a college building expansion of 404 activities, baseline completion 31-Aug-2026. At data date 01-Jul-2025 the update forecasts completion on 30-Sep-2026, 21 working days later than the baseline.

The windows analysis attributes the 21 working days as follows: 9 working days to the Owner, principally the staged-witnessing restriction on fire-spray application (event DE-01), with related owner-attributed slips at the existing facade tie-in and a directed roofing resubmittal; and 12 working days to the Contractor, on remobilization crew availability, trade stacking through the interior chain, and deficiency re-work. No concurrent delay window was identified.

This submission claims the owner-attributable 9 working days pursuant to GC 6.5.1 and claims nothing for the contractor-attributable 12 working days, which are stated in the analysis so the record is complete.

Method selected: AACE 29R-03 MIP 3.3 (observational, dynamic, contemporaneous as-is).

AACE 29R-03 Section 5 identifies eleven factors bearing on method selection (Sections 5.1 to 5.11). The RP prescribes no ranking among them, permits more than one method on a single matter, and places the selection decision with the analyst. Each factor is addressed below; none is omitted.

11 factors — all eleven listed

[Export CSV](#)

| Section | Factor                                   | Application to this matter                                                                                                                                                                         |
|---------|------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5.1     | Contractual requirements                 | The demonstration contract (CCDC 2 form) prescribes no analysis method; GC 6.5 requires notice and substantiation, which the contemporaneous updates provide.                                      |
| 5.2     | Purpose of the analysis                  | The purpose is an extension-of-time submission during the project, quantified from the contemporaneous schedule record.                                                                            |
| 5.3     | Source data availability and reliability | Two P6 exports of one continuously stasured schedule exist: the baseline of record and the update at data date 01-Jul-2025. Both pass the stored-date intake screen with zero forecast violations. |
| 5.4     | Size of the dispute                      | The claim is 9 working days on a single event; a proportionate observational method is appropriate.                                                                                                |
| 5.5     | Complexity of the dispute                | One delay event, one continuous critical chain; complexity is low and does not warrant a modeled method.                                                                                           |
| 5.6     | Budget                                   | A single-window observational study fits the engagement budget; the collapsed as-built cross-check bounds the added cost of a second method.                                                       |
| 5.7     | Time allowed                             | The submission follows the update cycle; the observational method reports within it.                                                                                                               |
| 5.8     | Expertise and resources                  | The analyst maintains the P6 record and the cross-validated analysis engine used here.                                                                                                             |
| 5.9     | Forum for resolution and audience        | The audience is the owner and its consultant in the first instance; the documents are prepared so an independent expert can rerun them from the data pack.                                         |
|         |                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

| Section | Factor                                                 | Application to this matter                                                                                                                    |
|---------|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5.10    | Legal or procedural requirements                       | No procedural rules constrain the method at this stage; Ontario Form 53 duties are acknowledged in the declaration should the matter proceed. |
| 5.11    | Custom and usage of methods on the project or the case | Observational update-to-update comparison is the method already used on the project in monthly reporting.                                     |

R-05

## Assumptions and exclusions

register, seeded by the pipeline

AACE 29R-03 §2.4.A.5 requires assumptions to be stated in the final analysis product together with their basis. The standing rows below are seeded by the analysis pipeline on every build; matter-specific rows follow them.

R-05

### Assumptions and exclusions log

6 rows — all listed

Export CSV

| Topic     | Assumption                                                                                                                           | Basis                                                                    |
|-----------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Data date | All computed dates and float in this report are calculated from the data date 2025-07-01; no progress is measured to the left of it. | XER PROJECT table (last_recalc_date); AACE 29R-03 §1.5.B.2 and §4.3.D.6. |
| Calendars | 1 calendars were decoded from the XER and used for working-day arithmetic: Standard.                                                 | XER CALENDAR table (clndr_data decode), verified at intake.              |
|           |                                                                                                                                      |                                                                          |
|           |                                                                                                                                      |                                                                          |
|           |                                                                                                                                      |                                                                          |
|           |                                                                                                                                      |                                                                          |

| Topic                                | Assumption                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | Basis                                                                                                                                               |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Finish-boundary convention           | The analysis engine reports early-finish dates as the exclusive boundary: the morning after the last worked day. P6-facing dates are therefore compared start to start (ES to ES); raw engine finish against P6 finish is not compared, because the boundary offset would read as false slip.                                       | CPP engine convention, stated so every date comparison in this report can be reproduced.                                                            |
| Activity constraints                 | Activity constraints were mapped from the XER cstr_type and cstr_date fields, including secondary constraints (cstr_type2, cstr_date2). 7 activities carry a constraint into the model.                                                                                                                                             | XER TASK table; AACE 29R-03 §2.1.C.3 (document the basis of all constraints).                                                                       |
| Stored-date logic screen             | 607 finish-to-start relationships were screened against the stored dates: 0 forecast violations (successor starting before predecessor finish, both unstarted) and 24 out-of-sequence actuals were found.                                                                                                                           | Relationship screen over XER TASKPRED against stored TASK dates.                                                                                    |
| Engine scope on progressed schedules | CPM recomputation on progressed schedules simplifies P6 retained logic: remaining work is anchored at the later of actual start and the data date and is not pushed behind incomplete predecessors. Stored P6 dates therefore govern the dates published in this report, and any recomputation delta is disclosed where it appears. | CPP engine scope note; validation record at <a href="https://criticalpathpartners.ca/validation.html">criticalpathpartners.ca/validation.html</a> . |

The Contractor claims 21 working days, per the windows analysis summarized below. Sign convention: positive values are working days lost, negative values are working days recovered. Attribution is the analyst's assignment carried in the forensic result; this report renders it and does not recompute it.

|                           |                           |                        |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Total slip                | Windows analysed          | Attribution buckets    |
| 21 wd                     | 1                         | 5                      |
| working days, all windows | every window listed below | parties in the summary |

R-06

Window register: per-window completion slip

1 windows — all listed (plus total row)

Export CSV

| Window             | Baseline completion | Completion at window end | Slip (wd) |
|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| Baseline → Current | 2026-08-31          | 2026-09-30               | 21        |
| Total              |                     |                          | 21        |

R-06a

Attribution summary: working days by party

5 parties — all listed; buckets sum to 21 wd

Export CSV

| Party         | Working days |
|---------------|--------------|
| Owner         | 9 wd         |
| Contractor    | 12 wd        |
| Concurrent    | 0 wd         |
| Force Majeure | 0 wd         |
|               |              |

| Party        | Working days |
|--------------|--------------|
| Unattributed | 0 wd         |

R-07

## Appendix map

every exhibit, never truncated

R-07

### Appendix map: register of exhibits

10 exhibits — all listed

Export CSV

| Exhibit | Document                                   | Format     | SHA-256 |
|---------|--------------------------------------------|------------|---------|
| A-1     | Cover letter, extension-of-time submission | DOCX / PDF |         |
| B-DE-01 | Delay event analysis DE-01                 | DOCX / PDF |         |
| C-1     | Supporting documents index                 | DOCX / PDF |         |
| W-1     | Forensic schedule workbook                 | XLSX       |         |
| S-1     | Forensic windows analysis dashboard        | HTML / PDF |         |
| S-2     | Collapsed as-built cross-check dashboard   | HTML / PDF |         |
| S-3     | Schedule health dashboard                  | HTML / PDF |         |
| S-4     | Claim evidence workbench                   | HTML / PDF |         |
| S-5     | Monte Carlo schedule risk analysis         | HTML / PDF |         |
|         |                                            |            |         |

| Exhibit | Document                                                           | Format | SHA-256 |
|---------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| P-1     | Opposing-expert data pack (native XER files and schedule settings) | ZIP    |         |

R-08

## Declaration

independence, wired from declarations.py

Declaration of Analyst Independence (AACE RP 29R-03 §2.3.D.3 / SCL Delay & Disruption Protocol Annex A).

The signed acknowledgment of this duty is a forum requirement: Ontario Form 53 under rule 53.03 (the duty is stated at rule 4.1.01) in an Ontario civil proceeding, or FRCP 26(a)(2)(B) in a United States federal matter. AACE 29R-03 §2.3.D.3 states the analyst's duty of independence and objectivity in correcting schedule updates.

I, Dana Fitkowski, Principal, Critical Path Partners, of Critical Path Partners, declare that I have prepared this analysis independently. My professional obligation is to present an objective assessment of the schedule facts, irrespective of which party retained me.

I confirm that I have no financial or contingent interest in the outcome of this claim. My fee for preparing this analysis is a fixed professional engagement fee; it does not vary based on the amount awarded, settled, or denied.

I have no prior or present business, family, or consulting relationship with any party to this claim other than the engagement that produced this analysis.

I have had no prior expert engagements adverse to or in favour of any party to this dispute within the past five years.

All data used in this analysis was provided by the retaining party or obtained from the project record (XER exports, RFI/CO logs, meeting minutes, etc). Every derived figure in this report traces to a documented input as identified in the audit manifest.

My opinions are based on the information available as of the date of issue (2026-09-01). New information may result in updated opinions; I reserve the right to amend.

Signature

Dana Fitkowski, Principal, Critical Path Partners

Date

Ontario\_Community\_College\_baseline.xer

sha256 37a454edfda707d797f2dab200919c1da729a17454e53b46084b6a17bc4819db

Ontario\_Community\_College\_current.xer

sha256 7ed1cd8309b1752af74ec9c8d2fa11fbc9a58d4e065630a2589809ed3780ca10

Generated 2026-09-01T09:56:07 · Matter Ontario Community College - B2 (Demo Data) · Engine cpm-engine v2.9.42

Reproducible · standards-based