

A new offer that earns its place.

Which service should an established owner commit the team to delivering?

Fictional company, people, bookings and financial inputs. Real public sources, checked 12 October 2026. This demonstrates the work; it is not a client result or a forecast.

One question. Three paths. A recommendation to proceed.

Proceed with the defined service.

Commit to four carefully scoped migration jobs. The defined offer fits the team's available hours and reaches the first-month contribution target before an advisory fee. Paying for this brief changes that result, as section 05 shows. The bespoke alternative does neither reliably enough to justify its larger headline price.

The decision is between a bespoke technology service, a defined migration package and postponing the launch. The owner wants additional work that makes a worthwhile contribution while preserving existing client commitments. The relevant question is not simply whether people will buy. It is whether the team can deliver the right work at an acceptable cost in attention and time.

The source check changes the product itself. The original idea was a fixed-price upgrade for any customer's existing computer. Published system requirements do not support that promise. The revised offer begins with eligibility and compatibility checks, then covers an agreed migration. Replacement hardware, licensing and unusual applications are priced or referred separately.

The comparison then favours the defined service. Four bespoke jobs produce more revenue, but take 44 technician hours against 40 available. Four defined jobs take 32 hours. After the stated labour and other direct costs, each route contributes \$4,400 before owner pay, overhead and tax.

Two separate decisions: proceed with the defined service if the bookings and estimates hold. Do not commission a \$1,500 brief for this launch alone if \$4,000 of first-month contribution after that fee is a firm requirement. The free analysis is enough to identify that conflict.

Growth within the available week.

The fictional owner operates a small technology service business. Existing delivery is already scheduled. The new offer has to fit the remaining capacity rather than borrow unacknowledged time from current customers or the owner's other commitments.

Supplied facts for this example

- There are 40 technician hours and 10 owner hours available for the launch month, after existing work.
- Four business customers have indicated in writing that they would book the defined service at \$2,200, subject to eligibility and final scope. These are assumed bookings for the example, not verified demand.
- The owner wants at least \$4,000 of first-month contribution after the specified direct costs and any advisory fee. This is the owner's chosen hurdle, not a universal benchmark.
- The technician's fully loaded direct hourly cost is \$100. Hardware and licensing are paid separately by the customer and are outside the service prices shown here.
- Both routes require eight technician hours and four owner hours of launch preparation. Delivery estimates are nine technician hours per bespoke job and six per defined job.

What remains an assumption

The bookings will hold, the work will qualify and the team can honour the delivery estimates. Customer systems, application compatibility and backup arrangements have not been inspected in this advisory example. The delivery specialist must establish them before confirming a job.

All money in this example is Canadian dollars. Owner pay, ongoing overhead, taxes, hardware, licensing and unlisted acquisition costs are outside the operating contribution calculation. Section 05 then subtracts the advisory fee. This is a planning comparison, not a profit forecast or a measure of value created by advice.

Replace the blanket promise.

Three public checks matter to the service scope. Each is distinct from the fictional commercial inputs.

The support context

Microsoft's lifecycle guidance says ordinary Windows 10 version 22H2 support ended on 14 October 2025. That establishes a reason for affected business customers to review their position. It does not establish this company's demand or mean that every Windows edition has the same lifecycle.

Source: Microsoft, Windows lifecycle FAQ.

The hardware assumption

Microsoft lists a compatible processor, UEFI capability and TPM 2.0 among Windows 11 requirements. An existing computer's ability to run Windows 10 does not by itself establish eligibility. The service therefore cannot promise the same upgrade for every device. Individual hardware and application checks belong before a confirmed scope.

Source: Microsoft, Windows 11 specifications and system requirements.

The alternative to immediate migration

Eligible commercial devices can receive Extended Security Updates for up to three years. The programme supplies specified security updates, with limits on support and features. That gives some customers a temporary alternative. "Everyone must replace immediately" would be an inaccurate sales premise.

Source: Microsoft, commercial Extended Security Updates programme.

Resulting change: sell an eligibility check and a defined supported migration, with exceptions agreed separately. This is a change in what the business promises, not merely a source list attached to an unchanged recommendation.

Revenue is only one line.

The same four-job volume and launch allowance are used for both active routes. Each option is tested against the owner's contribution target and remaining capacity.

First-month planning comparison. All inputs are fictional.

Measure	Bespoke offer	Defined service	Defer
Service revenue	4 × \$2,600 \$10,400	4 × \$2,200 \$8,800	\$0
Technician hours, including launch	4 × 9 + 8 44 hours	4 × 6 + 8 32 hours	0
Owner hours, including launch	4 × 2 + 4 12 hours	4 × 1 + 4 8 hours	0
Technician cost	\$4,400	\$3,200	\$0
Other direct costs	4 × \$400 \$1,600	4 × \$300 \$1,200	\$0
Contribution before owner pay, overhead and tax	\$4,400	\$4,400	\$0
Fits both time limits?	No	Yes	Yes

Calculation: revenue minus technician cost minus other direct costs. Launch labour is included once in technician hours, so it is not subtracted a second time.

The bespoke route asks for four more technician hours and two more owner hours than are available. Its extra \$1,600 in revenue is entirely absorbed by extra direct costs. The defined route preserves eight technician hours and two owner hours while achieving the same operating contribution. A separate advisory fee has not yet been deducted here.

Deferring preserves all available capacity. It becomes the stronger choice if the owner's true priority is recovery time or completing another obligation. On the stated objective, however, it gives up a feasible source of contribution.

The decision includes the cost of advice.

Would we commission this brief?

A CAD 1,500 advisory fee reduces the first-month contribution from \$4,400 to \$2,900, before any applicable tax on the fee. The \$4,000 hurdle is missed. If this month is the entire decision, use the free analysis and have the delivery lead check the estimates. Paying for a brief would work against the stated objective.

A repeatable offer could justify a longer horizon, but future bookings are not established here. The test is whether an independent examination could change a consequential commitment enough to warrant its cost. The offer's total revenue is not the value created by the brief.

The package must stay a package.

A fixed price does not create a fixed scope. Each job may reveal unusual applications, difficult data or expectations of open-ended support. Check eligibility, migration tasks and acceptance criteria before confirming the booking. Price or refer exceptions separately.

Where the operating economics change

At seven technician hours per job, operating contribution is exactly \$4,000: \$8,800 revenue minus \$3,600 technician cost, including launch, minus \$1,200 other direct costs. A commissioned brief would reduce that to \$2,500 before tax on the fee.

Above seven hours, the offer misses the contribution hurdle even without advice. At nine hours it contributes \$3,200 before an advisory fee and needs 44 hours, exceeding capacity. With only three jobs at six hours each, it contributes \$3,100 before that fee.

Resolve the decisive unknowns first.

The delivery lead must check scope and timing; the owner must confirm qualifying bookings. Public sources establish technical constraints, not demand or actual delivery hours. Those operating checks have priority over collecting more general market information.

Make the commitment concrete.

Before confirming the four jobs

The owner and delivery lead agree a one-page service boundary. The delivery lead checks each proposed job against it, including device eligibility, applications and the customer's backup arrangements. The owner confirms the four prices and start dates in writing only after that check.

Reserve what delivery needs

Allocate the eight launch hours, 24 estimated delivery hours and eight remaining technician hours as a reserve. Keep the reserve visible rather than selling it twice. Set aside the eight owner hours and retain the remaining two for exceptions. Pause the bespoke launch for this month.

Watch the assumption that matters

After the first completed job, compare the actual technician and owner hours with the estimate. Include clarification and rework. Update the expected average for the remaining jobs. If it exceeds seven technician hours, revise future scope or price before making another promise. Already agreed customer commitments still need to be honoured.

What would change this recommendation

- Fewer than four jobs qualify and remain booked.
- Expected delivery exceeds seven technician hours per job before any advisory fee, or added costs lower the contribution below the owner's hurdle.
- Owner work rises beyond the 10-hour allowance or draws time from existing obligations.
- Eligibility checks reveal work the team cannot competently deliver within the agreed package.

The first useful action is the service-boundary conversation with the delivery lead. It determines whether the attractive offer exists in practice. If it does, book the work and deliver it.

Scope of this example: business direction and resource allocation. It does not certify a technical migration, establish tax treatment or substitute for specialist review of a customer's systems.

The commitment at a glance.

Question

Which new service should the owner commit to this month without disrupting existing work?

Recommendation

Proceed with four defined jobs after eligibility and scope checks. Pause the bespoke launch. If the \$4,000 first-month hurdle is firm, use the free analysis rather than commission a brief for this launch alone.

Reason

The defined service contributes \$4,400 before an advisory fee, using 32 technician hours and eight owner hours. A \$1,500 fee leaves \$2,900 before tax on that fee. The bespoke route exceeds both time limits.

Evidence that changed the offer

Published requirements rule out a blanket upgrade promise. Commercial extended updates also provide a temporary alternative for eligible customers.

Critical assumptions

Four qualifying bookings hold. Delivery averages six technician hours per job. Costs and available time match the fictional supplied inputs.

First action

Agree the service boundary with the delivery lead, then confirm qualifying jobs and reserve the hours.

Reconsider when

Fewer than four jobs qualify, added costs erode the hurdle, delivery exceeds seven hours per job, owner time exceeds 10 hours or specialist checks undermine the scope.

What to retain

The agreed scope, calculation, source checks and actual hours. These make the next decision easier to examine.

Original Congaso worked example. Prepared 12 October 2026. All commercial inputs and outcomes are fictional. Public-source facts are linked in section 03 and may change. No affiliation with Microsoft is implied.