A capacity decision your partners can inspect

01. The decision in one page

Fictional Northbank advisory case · 26 September 2026 · version 1.0 · prepared by Build n Bloom. Forwardable illustration, not a quote, client result or buyer approval. Currency: AUD excluding tax.

Problem: more diagnostic engagements add preparation and senior correction to the same team. The complete case uses an assumed 18 senior, 36 analyst and 4 operations hours, including allocated selling/scoping effort within W1. That manual commercial work remains unchanged. Faster drafting alone does not show more accepted and collected work.

First paid purchase: a Firm Capacity Blueprint maps one revenue path and fully designs three connected improvements. It produces the decision and usable designs; buying it creates no commitment to install. Repair evidence intake; compare a bounded report/review capability against that repaired method; use existing tools for close-out. Prepare a separate W2 installation decision only if source rights, quality, role capacity and economics hold.

Three designed outcomes: W1, usable scope and evidence brief; W2, source-linked review-ready report with a professional decision; W3, accepted completion evidence for finance and permitted learning. Each has its own inputs, owners, alternatives, permissions, return paths and proposed tests. W3 requires no custom AI agent in this case.

Conditional capacity model: 40 baseline cases; six additional comparable cases only if demand, quality, analyst capacity, operations headroom and collection hold. First-year effort is 46 × target case hours + setup + annual oversight: senior 46×15+18+8 = 716; analyst 46×30+32+12 = 1,424; operations 46×4.5+12+12 = 231. Assumed availability is 720 senior, 1,440 analyst and 240 operations hours. Operations availability is 160 current-case hours plus 80 spare hours; changing the existing 40 cases already consumes 20 of those spare hours. Operations uses spare capacity; there is no payroll saving.

Contrary case: if W2 needs 10.5 senior hours instead of nine, the binding cap falls to two added cases. A better intake method may capture the value without AI. An inconclusive comparison means defer, simplify or stop.

Decision options for a real firm: no-build method repair; paid Blueprint after fit; separate bounded installation after evidence; or defer a named check. This example asks for no purchase and grants no installation authority.

02. What each purchase actually includes

Stage	What you receive	Separate decision
Free Firm Capacity Fit Call	25-minute discussion of the constraint, owners, evidence and next useful check; no confidential files required	Whether a paid assessment fits
Paid Firm Capacity Blueprint	One important revenue-path map; baseline/economics; three complete connected designs; simpler alternatives; shared controls; ranked first installation; portable decision document	Quote-specific fee, participation, timing and acceptance
First installation	Agreed working capability, permissions, checks, human decisions, failure recovery, representative tests, training and runbook	Separate scope, price, contract and access approval
Stabilisation/continuity or handover	Agreed correction duties and operating transfer; optional continuity where justified	Written period, responsibilities and price; no automatic retainer

The Blueprint is usable with another competent implementer. It does not install the whole path, grant access, issue advice, send invoices, guarantee additional revenue or create a default support period. Installation remedies come from the applicable agreement; none is invented here. The old one-workflow cohort fee does not price this package.

Investment status: this illustration contains no Build n Bloom quote. One-time cash investment K must include the actual Blueprint, installation and incremental setup expenditure once. Licences, vendor terms, ongoing cost and client contribution must be disclosed for the actual scope.

Ownership: the actual agreement identifies the client deliverables and rights. Third-party licences and pre-existing IP remain explicit. Receive the design, calculations, schemas, permitted references, tests and operating documentation needed for another competent team. No undisclosed method is required to force continued supplier involvement.

03. Finance and data questions to settle

Synthetic financial assumptions: 18,000 collected fee minus 8,000 incremental cash cost per extra case = 10,000 contribution before system costs and fixed overhead. Annual incremental non-labour system cost: 6,000. K is the unknown actual one-time cash investment.

Accepted and collected additional cases	First-year cash effect before tax
0	-6,000 minus K
3	24,000 minus K
6, central conditional model	54,000 minus K
2, higher-review-effort contrary case	14,000 minus K

These are teaching calculations, not predicted results or prices. The central scenario leaves 54,000 before actual one-time investment K; positive cash effect requires K below that amount. This is not a recommended purchase budget. It compares the proposed package with the unrepaired baseline. Incremental AI value against the repaired-method comparison is unmeasured and cannot be priced from this illustration. First-year required cases are ceiling((6,000+K)/10,000), constrained by actual capacity and demand. Do not add a value for the same released hours. Hourly-billed firms must check whether fewer hours reduce fees.

Client participation assumption: 18 senior + 32 analyst + 12 operations setup/adoption hours; annual oversight 8 + 12 + 12 hours. Per-case operations effort is already included in W2's target. Actual participation must be agreed, and ramp/timing can reduce the full-year case.

Data boundary to verify: approved sources, client/case permissions, exact provider/region/data-use terms, logs/backup retention and deletion, export rights, incident ownership and revocation. The sample specifies requirements; it does not certify an operating environment. No confidential production files are needed for the Fit Call.

Managing partner owns commercial scope; qualified reviewer owns advice and issue; operations owns handoffs and recovery; finance owns billing/collection and contribution evidence; practice lead owns reuse rights; client administrator owns access and revocation. A model cannot approve its own authority. Missing rights or approval blocks the relevant action.

04. The decision gates and acceptance specimen

Before a paid Blueprint: confirm repeated paid work, an accountable owner, permitted evidence and the ability to examine a complete case. Agree quote-specific scope, fee, client effort, schedule and document acceptance.

Before a separate installation: compare the repaired existing method; verify sources/provider terms and tools; agree eligible cases, professional rubric, role-specific baseline, permissions, human gates, cost, schedule, change control, correction duties and stop conditions.

Proposed functional acceptance specimen - not run: ordinary finding traces to a source; unsupported conclusion returns to reviewer; changed source invalidates finding; cross-case request is denied without leaked content; outage/replay creates no duplicate accepted record; revocation prevents new actions; source/action/retry/time-limit breaches stop further actions, retain draft output and record escalation; authorised human records the actual decision. Require traces and receiving receipts. A professionally approved deliverable, customer acceptance, functional acceptance and realised business value are separate events.

After use: measure preparation, review, correction, exceptions, operation and adoption by role; compare equivalent accepted cases; reconcile quality and collections. If results are negative or inconclusive, stop expansion. A working installation is not a guarantee of profit.

Handover: name the ongoing operator, reviewer, administrator and incident owner; provide configuration, tests, logs, cost register, known limits, recovery and source-refresh instructions. Continuity is separately scoped if needed. Revoke supplier access at agreed exit.

Questions each partner should answer:

- Is this the binding constraint, and can a simpler method solve it?
- Can our reviewers and operations team support the proposed work?
- Do we have permissible evidence and authority to use it?
- What happens to the investment case at two or zero added collected cases?
- Are scope, acceptance, ownership and stopping point clear enough to commission elsewhere?

Use approval-cover.html to record your firm’s constraint, investment, conditions and decision owners. Open the complete sample Blueprint and working records before deciding. The next conversation can be a free 25-minute Firm Capacity Fit Call at cal.com/buildnbloom/workflow-fit-call. No confidential client files required. An actual quote and agreement are separate decisions.