SERVICE REPORT LIBRARY / ONE QUESTION REVIEW

ONE QUESTION REVIEW

Do the supplied figures substantiate the vendor's promised 30% reduction in operating costs?

REPORT BXV-OQR-SAMPLE-002 | v2.0 | 2026-11-08 | EN | PUBLIC ILLUSTRATION

01 Client request and decision context

Question submitted: “Our supplier claims its automation service will reduce our current support-process operating costs by 30% annually. Do the supplied proposal, cost baseline and implementation estimate support that saving for our first 12 months, and what must we verify before approving the purchase?”

Decision: whether to authorize a one-year deployment. The client wants an evidence-bounded financial review, not a technical audit of the automation system.

02 Review boundary and assumptions

Compare the stated baseline with the vendor's model and identified deployment-related costs over the first 12 months. All amounts are USD, before tax. Assume unchanged workload, service level and staffing unless otherwise evidenced. This sample does not validate real-world performance, supplier quotations or contractual enforceability.

03 Materials provided (fictional)

E1 — Client baseline worksheet, B-01: current annual process operating cost: USD 120,000; composition not independently reconciled.

E2 — Vendor savings proposal, V-02: projected post-automation process cost: USD 84,000/year; marketing headline: “30% annual cost reduction”.

E3 — Implementation estimate, I-03: one-time setup USD 12,000; transition/training USD 6,000; additional annual platform support USD 8,000.

E4 — Vendor model notes, M-01: forecast assumes constant transaction volume and no service degradation; no completed pilot, realized savings or independent workload evidence supplied.

04 Recalculation of the claim

Cost component	Amount (USD)	Evidence / treatment
Baseline annual cost	120,000	E1; unverified client figure
Vendor modeled process cost	84,000	E2; forecast, not observed
Gross modeled reduction	36,000 (30%)	120,000 - 84,000
First-year setup + transition	18,000	E3; one-time
Additional annual support	8,000	E3; recurring
First-year total modeled cost	110,000	84,000 + 18,000 + 8,000
First-year modeled net saving	10,000 (8.3%)	120,000 - 110,000

05 Assessment finding

30% reduction in the vendor's narrowly defined process-cost line: ARITHMETICALLY SUPPORTED BY E1–E2, SUBJECT TO ASSUMPTIONS. The difference between USD 120,000 and USD 84,000 is USD 36,000, or 30% of the baseline.

30% first-year reduction in total relevant operating/deployment costs: NOT SUPPORTED BY THE SUPPLIED MODEL. Including E3 yields a modeled first-year saving of USD 10,000 (8.3%), not 30%.

Actual achieved saving: UNESTABLISHED. No pilot results, verified usage data, service-level outcomes or reconciled cost records were supplied.

06 Sensitivity and interpretation

If the additional USD 8,000 annual support recurs but the USD 18,000 setup and transition charges do not, the modeled annual cost after year one is USD 92,000 and the modeled annual saving is USD 28,000 (23.3%) against an unchanged USD 120,000 baseline.

These percentages are scenario calculations, not a forecast guarantee. They change if workload, staffing, service levels, recurring fees, contract minimums or the baseline cost classification change.

07 Material gaps affecting the decision

G1 — Baseline traceability: payroll, contractor, license and overhead components of E1 are not reconciled to records.

G2 — Savings mechanism: E2 does not demonstrate how forecast savings translate into avoidable cash expense or released capacity.

G3 — Performance evidence: no representative pilot demonstrates equivalent service quality and workload.

G4 — Commercial completeness: minimum commitments, overage charges, renewal terms and internal supervision costs are not established.

08 Practical next step

Before approval, request (i) a reconciled 12-month baseline, (ii) a line-item first-year and steady-state total-cost model, (iii) a short measured pilot with service-quality thresholds, and (iv) written confirmation of all recurring and one-time charges. Re-run the decision calculation using validated inputs.

09 Conclusion and reliance boundary

The headline 30% is a correct calculation for the vendor's selected process-cost comparison, but it is not substantiated as a first-year net saving or an achieved operating result. The reviewed evidence supports a narrower, conditional conclusion only.

This fictional sample demonstrates a limited independent review of one business question. It is not a financial audit, legal opinion, certification, assurance engagement or verification of an actual supplier. ANDEKS™ methodological principles inform evidence boundaries and traceability; no formal normative assessment status is claimed.