BRIEFING · AUGUST 2026

ACUITYSTORE® · POINT OF USE

The cost of *not knowing.*

See it, control it, prove it — at the point of work.

`04-Sep-26 02:17:09 · ISSUE · night shift · TS-01 · Grinding disc 125mm · Qty 6 · WO 4501887332`

`04-Sep-26 06:41:12 · ISSUE · day shift · TS-01 · Torque wrench 3/4" #TW-114 · Qty 1 · CAL 11-Nov-26`

Every asset-heavy site knows precisely what it **bought**. Almost none can say what it **used** — by whom, on which job, against which piece of equipment. This paper is about the cost that lives in that gap: how it accrues without appearing on any line, why it is always recognised too late and under the wrong name, and what it takes to make it visible.

> **How to read this document.** It is not a product brochure. It sets out an argument about a class of operating cost, and answers the three questions we are asked most often before anyone buys anything — including the question of whether you need to buy anything at all. Where a simpler answer is sufficient, we say so.

Written for maintenance, reliability, supply and HSE leaders **who suspect the number is bigger than anyone can prove.**

Sierra Acuity Pty Ltd · 1/32 Horus Bend, Bibra Lake WA 6163
1300 850 563 · sierraacuity.com.au

IF YOU READ NOTHING ELSE

The argument, in seven sentences.

- **You know what you bought. You don't know what you used.** Purchase data is complete and always recoverable. Consumption data exists for one instant, at the store, and is gone if nothing records it.
- **The cost of that gap is real and continuous, and it never appears as itself.** It shows up later as a budget overrun, a slipped schedule, a write-off or an audit finding — in four different departments, none of which can see the cause.
- **It cannot be measured backwards.** You can start measuring today. You cannot decide today to have measured last year, which is why every month of delay is a month permanently missing from the evidence.
- **A spreadsheet cannot do this job**, not because people are careless, but because it is written after the event, by someone who was not there, and it cannot stop anything leaving the store.
- **Nor should one person carry it.** A storeperson is a gate that is open eight hours a day, and the system lives in their head until the day they leave. That is not a criticism of them. It is an unfair position to put them in.
- **You are not paying to collect information — you are paying for the control.** The record is what the control produces on its way past. You would want the locked door even if the record were thrown away.
- **And you can test the whole case with one division.** Annual fee divided by annual controlled spend gives the reduction it must deliver to pay for itself. Decide if that number is plausible. Nothing else in the argument needs to be believed.

> THE TEST, WORKED
>
> A site spending **$300,000** a year on the items that would sit behind the door, against an annual fee of **$30,000**, breaks even at a **10%** reduction — one item in ten. That is consumption alone. Recovered time, avoided delays, released stock and reduced compliance exposure are all above the line and unpriced.

HOW THIS PAPER IS ARRANGED

Two parts, two readers.

PART ONE · PAGES 3 TO 8

Why this is worth doing

The gap between purchase and use, a register of six costs that accrue unseen, why the timing argument runs the opposite way to instinct, and straight answers to the three questions we are asked most: the spreadsheet, the storeperson, and paying to collect.

WRITTEN FOR

Maintenance · reliability · supply · HSE

PART TWO · PAGES 9 TO 12

Whether it pays here

A worksheet you fill from your own figures, the break-even test above, both sides of the ledger, what an approver is actually signing, six questions to put to any supplier, and how to shape the ask so it survives the approval process.

WRITTEN FOR

Whoever signs the purchase order

> **No benchmarks, deliberately.** There is not one industry statistic, survey finding or claimed average anywhere in this document. Every number is either arithmetic you can check or a figure you supply. A case built on somebody else's average does not survive a budget meeting, and you should not be handed one.

WHERE THE COST LIVES

You have complete purchase data and no consumption data.

Purchase data is complete, auditable and re-derivable. It sits in the invoice and it will still be there in ten years. **Consumption data has none of those properties.** It exists for a single instant — at the store, when a person, an item and a job are momentarily in the same place. If nothing records it then, it is gone, and no audit, reconciliation or reconstruction will ever recover it.

POINT OF PURCHASE

What you bought

Quantity, price, supplier, date. Captured automatically by the transaction that pays for it. One aggregation level up from the work, and weeks removed from it. **Always available.**

POINT OF USE

What you consumed

Who took it, when, for which job, against which asset, and what remained. Captured only if something is present at the moment of issue to capture it. **Available only forward, never back.**

THE ASYMMETRY THAT MATTERS

Consumption is the only significant data class in an industrial business that **cannot be reconstructed after the fact.** Financial records can be re-derived. Maintenance history can be rebuilt from work orders. Usage evaporates at the moment it occurs. Every month a store runs uninstrumented is a month permanently absent from the evidence — not delayed, absent.

A TEST WORTH RUNNING BEFORE YOU READ FURTHER

Three questions, thirty seconds.

- **Who is holding the calibrated torque wrench right now?** Not who signed for it last month — who has it, at this moment.
- **What did we consume against equipment tag 22-P-101B last quarter?** Not what the area spent — what that asset cost to keep running.
- **How many times last month did someone come to the store for something that was not there?** Not how many purchase orders were raised — how many jobs were interrupted.

WHAT THE TEST ACTUALLY REVEALS

Most sites cannot answer any of the three, and conclude they have a reporting problem. They do not. **They have a control problem, and the missing data is its symptom.** No amount of effort applied downstream — better spreadsheets, tighter stocktakes, more diligent supervision — produces these answers, because the moment at which they could have been recorded has already passed.

WHAT CLOSING THE GAP LOOKS LIKE

One line, captured at the door.

```
04-Sep-26 02:14:51 · ISSUE · night shift · TS-01 · Torque wrench 3/4" #TW-114 · Qty 1 · WO 4501887332 ·
CAL 11-Nov-26 · EndQty 3
```

Everything in this record exists only because something was present at the moment of issue. None of it can be added later.

OUT OF SIGHT, UNTIL IT IS A PROBLEM

Six costs that accrue continuously and are recognised only as events.

Each of these accumulates every day, in small increments, against no line item. None of them is anybody's fault and none of them triggers an alarm. **Every one of them is eventually recognised under a different name** — which is precisely why they are never fixed at source.

THE LATENT COST	HOW IT ACCRUES, UNSEEN	HOW IT FINALLY SURFACES
Over-issue	A few more than needed, taken in good faith, every day. No single event, no threshold crossed, nothing to investigate.	A consumables budget overrun at year end. *Filed as "price increases" or "we did more work this year".*
Stockout	A tradesperson walks to the store, the item is not there, and they solve it themselves. **Nothing anywhere records the attempt that failed.**	A job that took two days instead of one; a schedule that slipped. *Filed as "labour productivity" or "planning".*
Shadow stock	Because nobody trusts availability, everyone holds a private buffer — in lockers, utes, crib rooms and desk drawers. The site pays for the same item several times.	A stocktake that finds the same part in six places, or an obsolescence write-off. *Filed as "inventory adjustment".*
Search time	Ten minutes here, twenty there, per person, per day, walking and looking. It is real paid time and it is recorded nowhere at all.	Persistent schedule-compliance misses that no single job explains. *Filed as "we are short-handed".*
Misattribution	Every issue is expensed to one maintenance overhead, so no consumable cost ever reaches the asset that consumed it.	Usually never. The business simply cannot justify replacing a bad asset, because it cannot show what that asset costs to keep alive. *Filed as nothing. It does not surface — it just quietly prevents decisions.*
Compliance drift	An inspection or calibration date passes while the item sits in the store, available and indistinguishable from an in-date one.	An audit finding — or an incident investigation asking who held it and when. *Filed as "human error".*

WHY THE PATTERN PERSISTS

Read the third column downward. The consumables overrun goes to procurement, the schedule miss goes to planning, the write-off goes to finance and the finding goes to HSE. **Four departments each solving a symptom, none of them looking at the cause** — because the cause has no owner, no line item and no record.

FREE, AND YOU CAN RUN THEM THIS WEEK

Three tests that size your own number.

ASK YOUR BUYER

The emergency orders

How many purchase orders were raised last month for items that should have been sitting in the store? Each one is a stockout that was never counted as one.

ASK YOUR PLANNER

The materials reschedules

How many jobs moved last month for a materials reason? Compare that with the number anyone would have guessed before you asked.

WALK THE SITE

The shadow inventory

Pick one common consumable and count how many you find in lockers, utes and crib rooms. That is stock you have already bought, twice.

THE MECHANISM

Why the largest leaks are the ones nobody sees.

The delay between a cost beginning to accrue and an organisation recognising it is not a failure of attention. It is a property of how the cost is shaped. **Three properties do all the work.**

1

Visibility runs inverse to size

A single $25,000 write-off is investigated the day it appears. One hundred dollars a day, every working day, is roughly $24,000 across a working year and is investigated by no one. The finer the grain, the larger the annual total and the lower the chance anyone looks.

2

The record cannot be backdated

Recognising the cost later does not recover the evidence. You can decide today to start measuring; you cannot decide today to have measured last year. The intervention is only ever available forward.

3

It arrives under another name

By the time it is visible it has been converted into an event, and the event belongs to a different department with a different budget. The cause is never in the room when the symptom is discussed.

THE CONSEQUENCE FOR TIMING

The most expensive month of an uninstrumented store is always **the first one** — because it is the one month you can never go back and measure. Every subsequent month compounds a loss that is real, continuous and permanently unprovable.

WHICH IS WHY THE TIMING ARGUMENT RUNS THE OTHER WAY

Instrument the store at the start, not once it is a problem.

The instinct is to establish the store first and add control later, when the value is proven. That sequence is backwards, for four reasons that have nothing to do with the price of the control.

- **The baseline is the business case.** Turn capture on in month twelve and you have spent a year guessing at stock levels and you hold no evidence of what changed. The measurement taken in the first quarter is what funds everything that follows.
- **Behaviour sets at go-live.** “Badge, state the job, take it” costs nothing to establish on day one. Imposing it on an established free-issue culture eighteen months later is a change-management project people will resist — and rightly, because it will feel like an accusation.
- **The range decision is made once.** The first months of real movement data show which items are most of the draw and which should never have been stocked. That review happens at the beginning; you want evidence in the room rather than opinion.
- **Control is cheapest before the store is full.** Bringing an uncontrolled store under control requires a reconciliation. Starting controlled requires only an install.

What waiting a year actually costs

ARITHMETIC

We are not going to tell you what a controlled store saves — we do not know your site, and neither does anyone quoting you a percentage. But whatever that figure turns out to be, note what deferral does to it. On a controlled annual spend of `$300,000`, every single point of reduction is `$3,000` a year, or `$250` a month. **Waiting twelve months does not delay that — it forfeits it**, along with the baseline that would have proved it existed. The choice is rarely between acting now and acting later. It is between having a number for this year and having none.

01

THE QUESTION WE ARE ASKED MOST

“Won't a spreadsheet do the same job?”

Sometimes, yes — and we say where, at the foot of this page. But a spreadsheet and a transaction record are not two versions of the same thing. **A spreadsheet records what someone remembered. A transaction record captures what happened.** Four structural differences follow from that, and none of them can be closed by trying harder.

DIFFERENCE ONE

It is not made at the point of work

The entry is made later, at a desk, often by someone other than the person who took the item. The gap between the event and the entry is exactly where accuracy is lost — and the entry burden falls on whoever is least motivated to be precise.

DIFFERENCE TWO

Its gaps are not random

Only the transactions someone bothered to write down appear. The ones that go unrecorded are the rushed grab at 2am, the night shift, the contractor and the emergency — **precisely the events you most need to see.** The bias runs against you.

DIFFERENCE THREE

It cannot stop anything

A spreadsheet cannot prevent an out-of-calibration wrench leaving the store. It can only tell you afterwards that one did — and then only if somebody wrote it down. **Recording is not control.** The entire compliance case rests on prevention, which a spreadsheet cannot perform.

DIFFERENCE FOUR

It is not evidence

It can be edited afterwards, by anyone, leaving no trace. In an incident investigation or an audit, an editable file is not a record of what occurred — it is a record of what the file says now. This difference costs nothing until the day it costs everything.

THE COST NOBODY COUNTS

A spreadsheet is described as free because its cost sits in someone's day rather than on an invoice — the hours spent maintaining it, and the larger cost of **not quite trusting it**: the physical check to confirm what it already says, and the decisions deferred because nobody will stake anything on the number.

NOT A REPLACEMENT — A DIVISION OF LABOUR

Nobody is asking you to abandon the spreadsheet. It is good at the things it was always good at — planning a range, modelling a budget, holding a supplier list. **What it should stop doing is recording events it did not witness.** Give it the transaction data as an input and it becomes more useful, not less.

WHERE A SPREADSHEET GENUINELY IS ENOUGH — AND WE WILL TELL YOU SO

- × **A small, low-value range** with a modest number of line items and no item whose absence stops a job.
- × **One shift, one custodian, one door.** No after-hours access, no contractor draw, no second location.
- × **Nothing under inspection or calibration.** No item whose in-date status must be proven before issue.
- × **No requirement to attribute cost** to a work order, an asset or a cost centre.

If all four hold, a spreadsheet is the right instrument and we would rather you kept it. The argument in this paper starts at the point where any one of them stops being true.

02

THE QUESTION THAT DESERVES THE MOST CARE

“Isn't this what the storeperson is for?”

This is not an argument for having fewer people in the store. A good storeperson is one of the most valuable operators on a site. **The problem is not the person. It is that the site has made one person the entire control** — and asked them to be its memory as well.

- **A person is a gate that is open eight hours a day.** Work is not confined to those hours. What happens at 2am? Either the store is locked and the job waits, or somebody holds a key and the control is gone. Every site resolves this the same way, and it is never written down.
- **Their value is judgment, not transcription.** A good storeperson knows which item actually works for the job, which supplier is reliable, and what is about to run out. Asking them to also serve as a manual data-capture device spends the expensive part of them on the cheapest part of the job.
- **The system lives in their head, and it leaves when they do.** Every site has the story of the person who retired and took the store with them. The knowledge was real — it was simply never held in a form anyone else could use.
- **Nobody can independently verify their own store.** This is not a question of trust; it is a control principle. The same arrangement would not be accepted in a cash office, and the objection there has never been about the honesty of the cashier.
- **Diligence cannot produce the answer anyway.** Ask what was consumed against a specific equipment tag last quarter and no amount of care produces it, because the link between the item and the asset was never made at the moment of issue. It is not a gap in effort. It is a gap in the record.

THE REFRAME WORTH PUTTING TO A MANAGER

The question is not whether the storeperson is doing a good job. It is whether the site should depend on **one person's memory, availability and continued employment** for a control it cannot afford to lose — and whether that is a fair position in which to place them.

What instrumenting actually changes for them

PRINCIPLE

The cabinet takes the transcription, the after-hours access and the argument about who took what. The storeperson keeps the range decisions, the supplier relationships and the judgment calls, and gets back the hours currently spent on issue paperwork and stock counts. **The role does not shrink. The part of it that no person should have been carrying alone does.**

FROM THE FLOOR 2:14am · night shift

The store has been locked since four in the afternoon. The job needs a torque wrench. There is a key in the supervisor's office because there has to be a key in the supervisor's office — no site runs any other way. The wrench is taken, the job is done, and by seven the store looks exactly as it did at four. ***Nothing that happened between those hours exists anywhere.*** *The storeperson arrives and is accountable for a night they were not present for.*

	CARRIED BY A PERSON	CARRIED BY THE SYSTEM
AT 2AM	The store is locked, or somebody holds a key.	**The store opens to a badge** — and the record is identical to the day shift.
ON LEAVE	Availability and range knowledge go with them.	**Both sit in the movement data** and stay when the person doesn't.
AFTER AN INCIDENT	Recollection, plus whatever was written down.	**A timestamped record** of who held the item, which cannot be edited afterwards.

03

THE COMMERCIAL QUESTION

“Why do I have to pay to collect this information?”

It is a fair question and it contains an assumption worth examining: that collection is a new cost. **It is not. It is an existing cost that has never been named** — and the fee replaces it rather than adding to it.

WHERE YOU ALREADY PAY FOR THIS

Five invoices you are already settling.

- **The stocktake.** People, hours and disruption, producing one number a year that is stale the week after it is taken.
- **Issue and recording time** spent by the storeperson, the supervisor and the buyer — paid at operating rates, recorded as something else.
- **The unexplained variance** that gets written off each period because there is no record capable of explaining it.
- **The reconstruction** — the Friday afternoon spent working out what was used on a job in order to close it out.
- **The duplicate purchase** made because nobody could confirm what was on hand, and the shadow stock that habit creates.

WHAT YOU ARE ACTUALLY BUYING

Not a data-collection service. **You are buying the control at the cabinet** — the fact that issue requires an identity and a job, and that an out-of-date item cannot leave. The record is what that control produces on its way past. You would want the gate even if the record were thrown away; the record is simply the part you can take to a budget meeting.

One further test: whose interest does the data serve?

PRINCIPLE

The question is sharper than it first appears, because it depends who is doing the measuring. Where the party recording your consumption is also the party selling you the stock, scepticism is warranted — the meter and the merchant should not be the same business. **Sierra Acuity does not supply the goods** and takes no margin on what passes through the cabinet, which is what makes the consumption record independent, and what leaves you free to change suppliers without touching the platform.

PUT PLAINLY, FOR WHOEVER ASKS IT NEXT

You already accept this everywhere else.

Nobody at a site argues that timekeeping is an overhead. Hours are booked against a job because otherwise the job's cost is a guess — and no one describes the timesheet as “paying to collect information”. The same is true of fuel against a vehicle, and of contractor hours against a scope. **Consumables and tooling are the last significant cost on an industrial site still handled the old way**: bought carefully, then released into the plant untracked and never reconciled to the work that used them.

WHICH BRINGS US TO THE ONLY QUESTION THAT MATTERS

None of the above tells you whether it is worth the money at **your** site. That is a different question and it deserves arithmetic rather than argument. Part Two sets out how to answer it — using figures you already have, and none that we have supplied.

II

THE INVESTMENT CASE

What is it worth here?

No benchmarks, no survey findings, no claimed averages. Every figure here is either arithmetic you can check in your head or a number you already hold. **A case built on somebody else's average does not survive a budget meeting.**

FIVE LINES — FOUR YOU CAN PRICE, ONE YOU SHOULD NOT

Fill in the numbers you already have.

LINE	WHAT YOU NEED, AND WHERE IT LIVES	YOURS	THE ARITHMETIC
A. Consumption The largest line at most sites	Annual spend on the items that would sit in the store. Your buyer or the GL has this. Include only what would actually go behind the door.	$— ANNUAL SPEND	**A × reduction%** Reduction is the one figure nobody can hand you. The next page shows how to decide it without guessing.
B. Time at the tool Usually larger than people expect	People drawing from the store × minutes per day lost walking or searching × fully-burdened hourly rate. Ask three supervisors and take the lowest.	$— PAID TIME EXPOSED	**(people × min ÷ 60) × days × rate** Then apply the share you believe is recoverable — not all of it is.
C. Delays The line that gets attention	Jobs rescheduled in the last 12 months for a materials reason, from your planner, and your own cost of a delayed job. Both exist; they are rarely put together.	$— DELAY COST EXPOSED	**jobs × cost per delayed job** Use your figure, not ours. In a shutdown the number changes character entirely.
D. Shadow stock One-off, not annual	Stock already bought and held privately — lockers, utes, crib rooms. Count one common item and extrapolate honestly.	$— WORKING CAPITAL HELD	**A release, not a saving.** Book it once, in the year it is recovered, and do not repeat it.
E. Compliance Deliberately not priced	Items that must be in date before issue — calibrated tools, gas monitors, rigging, lifting gear, fit-tested equipment.	— ITEMS, NOT DOLLARS	**We do not put a dollar figure on an audit finding or an incident.** If your organisation has one, use it. If not, carry this as risk reduction, not saving.

LINE B, WORKED ALL THE WAY THROUGH

The arithmetic, in full, with nothing hidden.

WORKED `60 people × 10 min ÷ 60 = 10 hrs/day → × 240 days = 2,400 hrs/yr → × $95 = $228,000`

Every input is yours to change. Recovering a tenth of that exposed time is $22,800 a year; a twentieth is $11,400.

THREE RULES THAT KEEP THIS DEFENSIBLE

Use the low end of every estimate — a case that survives the pessimistic input survives the meeting. **Never claim the whole of line B**; some of that time is unavoidable at any site. And **put no dollar figure against line E.** An approver who sees an invented number attached to an incident stops believing the other four lines — better four you can defend than five you cannot.

THE HONEST WAY TO TEST ANY OFFER OF THIS KIND

Don't ask what it saves. Ask what it has to save.

Every vendor in this market will quote you a percentage. You have no way to verify it and it will not hold up in your budget meeting. **So invert the question.** Divide the annual fee by your annual controlled spend. That gives the reduction the system must deliver simply to pay for itself. Then decide, from what you know of your own store, whether that number is plausible.

BREAK-EVEN REDUCTION `annual fee ÷ annual controlled spend`

ANNUAL CONTROLLED SPEND	REDUCTION NEEDED TO BREAK EVEN	READING IT PLAINLY
$100,000	30%	A demanding target. At this scale the case has to rest on time and delays, not consumption.
$200,000	15%	Plausible, but it should be tested rather than assumed.
$300,000	10%	One item in ten. Ask whether an uncontrolled store is within ten per cent of tight.
$500,000	6%	Difficult to argue this is not achievable where nothing currently records who takes what.
$750,000	4%	The question stops being whether it pays and becomes why it was not done sooner.
$1,000,000	3%	Three items in a hundred. Consumption alone; every other line is upside.

Worked at an illustrative annual fee of $30,000. Substitute the figure you have actually been quoted — the table is division, not a claim, and it re-runs in thirty seconds.

TWO THINGS THIS TABLE QUIETLY SETTLES

First, **it contains no assumption about how much control saves** — there is nothing in it to dispute. Second, break-even is reached on **line A alone**. Time at the tool, avoided delays, released working capital and reduced compliance exposure all sit above the line, unpriced. If the consumption number alone clears it, everything else is free.

BOTH SIDES OF THE LEDGER

What it costs you beyond the invoice.

- **Your time in the data build.** Somebody who knows the range has to sit with the item list. Typically hours, not weeks — but it is real and it is yours.
- **The change at go-live.** A short period where people are asked to badge and state a job before taking something they used to just take. Expect grumbling in week one.
- **Someone to read the reports.** A system that nobody looks at delivers nothing. Name the person before you start, not after.
- **Nothing else, if the commercial structure is right.** No capital, no integration project and no contract tail — but confirm each of those in writing rather than assuming them. The next page lists the questions.

FOR WHOEVER SIGNS THE PURCHASE ORDER

What you are actually approving.

An approver is not really assessing the benefit — they are assessing the **downside**. These are the five questions that get asked in the room, and the answers a well-structured offer should be able to give without hedging.

THE QUESTION	WHAT A POOR STRUCTURE ANSWERS	WHAT A SOUND STRUCTURE ANSWERS
MAXIMUM EXPOSURE	Open-ended, or a multi-year total nobody totalled.	**The value of the order and nothing beyond it.** Capped and finite on its face.
IF IT DOESN'T WORK	An asset to write off and a contract still running.	**The money spent, and that is all.** No stranded asset, no tail, nothing to unwind.
CAPITAL TREATMENT	Hardware purchased, capitalised, and now yours to depreciate and dispose of.	**Hardware on hire.** Nothing capitalised, nothing to write off, removed at the vendor's cost.
INTERNAL COST TO STAND UP	Unquantified IT, OT and cyber work discovered after approval.	**Stated up front, in writing,** including who pays for it.
GETTING OUT	Notice periods, auto-renewal, and your data in a format only they can read.	**A defined end date**, no notice required, and your transaction data returned in a standard format.

ASK THESE OF ANY SUPPLIER — INCLUDING US

Six questions worth putting in writing.

- **What is my total exposure if I stop at the end of the term?** One number, on the quote.
- **Who owns the transaction data, and in what format do I get it back?** If the answer is vague, that is the answer.
- **Does anything I have paid for become unusable if I do not continue?** Hardware, licences, configuration.
- **Do you take a margin on the goods that pass through the machine?** If yes, the consumption data has a commercial interest attached to it.
- **What do you need from my IT and OT, and who pays for it?** The most common source of unbudgeted cost in this category.
- **What baseline will you measure against, and will you agree it before day one?** Agree it in advance or the result will be arguable.

> THE ONE TO INSIST ON
>
> **Agree the baseline in writing before the first day of capture.** A result measured against a baseline chosen afterwards persuades nobody — least of all a finance reviewer who was not in the room. It costs nothing to do and it is the difference between a defensible number and a disputed one.

WHERE GOOD CASES DIE

The case is usually sound. The shape of the ask is usually wrong.

Most of these proposals are not rejected on merit. They are rejected because of **how** they were asked for — the wrong instrument, the wrong category, the wrong approver, or the right approver at the wrong time of year. Four practical moves fix nearly all of it.

MOVE ONE

Buy a term, not a commitment

A capped, fixed-term order is a decision an operations manager can make. A continuing annual service is a total-contract-value commitment that often sits two approval levels higher. **Same money, different signature.**

MOVE TWO

Get the category right

Presented as software, it attracts IT governance, vendor risk and cyber review. Presented as the managed service it actually is, it is an ordinary operational purchase. **Describe what is delivered, not what it runs on.**

MOVE THREE

Ride an existing agreement

If the supplier is already engaged under a frame or master agreement, this is a scope variation rather than a procurement event — no onboarding, no new contract, and usually inside the contract owner's delegation.

MOVE FOUR

Work backwards from the budget date

Find out when next year's submissions close, then set the review so the evidence lands **before** that date. A result delivered a month late is a result that waits a full year.

THE SEQUENCING POINT MOST PEOPLE MISS

If there is no line in next year's submission, next year is decided before it starts — and you will discover it months later, when nothing can be done. **The deadline on a decision like this is almost never the end of a quarter. It is the day submissions close.** Find that date first and plan against it.

THE NEXT STEP

Start with the three questions, then the division.

If your site answers the three questions on page three in thirty seconds, you do not need us. If it cannot, the useful next move is not a purchase — it is a short, baselined measurement on one store, agreed in advance, long enough to put a defensible number in your own submission. We will scope that without obligation.

CALL
1300 850 563

WEB
sierraacuity.com.au