

# Appendix: Illustrative Cost Model

Companion to: [From Telemetry Inflation to Decisive Observability](#) (main strategic paper)

This appendix is a **sensitivity exercise, not a forecast**. It expands the condensed economics note in the main paper with editable placeholders, tables, and meeting prompts. **All monetary amounts are USD.**

*Terminology:* In the main paper, *high-fidelity proof*, *decisive evidence*, and *richer evidence* refer to the same outcome: trusted explanatory proof delivered on operational time. This appendix uses **proof** and **evidence** in that same sense.

---

## Illustrative Cost Model (Sensitivity Exercise, Not a Forecast)

Leadership conversations stall when observability remains only qualitative. The figures below are a **deliberately simple calculator**: they exist to show **which levers move the budget**—bridge duration, headcount on a bridge, and incremental “insurance-shaped” infrastructure—not to assert audited savings.

**Replace every input with your own** (region, labor mix, incident taxonomy, and risk appetite).

### Shared assumptions (editable)

Input	Example value	What it stands for
Blended fully loaded cost per incident hour	\$200 / hr	Mixed L2/L3, duty managers, vendor time (order-of-magnitude)
Average concurrency on a major bridge	8 people	Parallel streams (NOC, app, network, storage, security, leadership)
Major “ambiguous transient” incidents per year	12	Severity-1/2 events where causality is disputed for hours

These inputs are not recommendations. They are **placeholders** so finance can run a one-page sanity check.

### OPEX: bridge time dominates

Bridge labor cost per incident is roughly:

█ **concurrency × blended hourly cost × hours to trusted explanatory story**

Using the placeholders:

Scenario	Hours to trusted story (example)	Labor-only bridge cost (example)
<b>A — Late proof</b> (re-capture, widen windows, debate artifacts)	6 hr	$8 \times \$200 \times 6 =$ <b>\$9,600</b>
<b>B — Earlier decisive proof</b> (same staffing, shorter ambiguity window)	2 hr	$8 \times \$200 \times 2 =$ <b>\$3,200</b>

Illustrative **delta per incident: \$6,400** in bridge labor alone—before customer credits, SLA penalties, opportunity cost, or vendor charges.

At **12** such incidents per year, that single line item is on the order of **~\$77k/year** of *bridge-time difference* in this toy model. Change concurrency to **12** people or hourly cost to **\$350**, and the same math scales linearly.

The point is not the exact dollars. The point is that the function is multiplicative: **people × time × incident rate**.

All figures in this appendix are **USD**. The same formula scales linearly with whatever burdened hourly rate finance accepts (for example **\$250/hr** or **\$350/hr** instead of **\$200/hr**).

### CAPEX: “insurance-shaped” observability stacks compound

A separate line—often buried in refresh cycles—is incremental capital spent to reduce uncertainty: more capture, hotter retention, wider analytics clusters. A three-year program might add **single-digit to low tens of millions** of USD in large environments, depending on scope; amortization and refresh rules determine how it hits the P&L.

### Illustrative 3-year TCO shell (always-on capture / wide observability path)

The table below is an **order-of-magnitude TCO skeleton** for a “widen the net” program—not a quote. Ranges intentionally wide; finance should substitute vendor pricing and internal run costs.

Line item	Illustrative 3-year TCO band (USD, large enterprise)	What typically drives the spread
Tap / SPAN / packet broker fabric + optics	<b>\$3M–\$8M</b>	Port count, speeds (100G–800G), redundancy
Capture appliances / probes	<b>\$1M–\$4M</b>	Sustained throughput, buffering, form factor

Line item	Illustrative 3-year TCO band (USD, large enterprise)	What typically drives the spread
Storage + hot retention for flow / metadata / PCAP-adjacent data	\$2M–\$6M	TB/day ingest, retention policy, replication
Analytics / SIEM / datastore ingest uplift	\$1M–\$4M	EPS, licensing, compute cluster
Implementation + 3-year run (FTE + contractors + training)	\$1M–\$3M	Often under-modeled

**Rough combined band:** about \$8M–\$25M over three years for a heavy “insurance-shaped” posture in a large footprint—**before** you can show a modeled reduction in **hours of ambiguity** per incident.

**TCO is not the enemy.** The question is whether the next dollar reduces **forensic time** enough to justify itself, or mainly expands **capacity to store uncertainty**.

An evidence-activation posture does not magically eliminate that baseline. It targets a different failure mode: **spending for universal high fidelity and still paying long bridges** because proof arrives on forensic time.

A useful internal question is therefore:

**If we spend the next tranche of CAPEX on wider always-on capture, what is our modeled reduction in *hours of ambiguity*—and who owns that assumption?**

### SLA credits and contractual exposure (illustrative add-on)

Bridge labor is only one line. Many organizations also carry **contractual** exposure: service credits, rebates, or penalties tied to **minutes** of outage or sustained degradation. This is **not legal advice**; it is a reminder to put **revenue-at-risk** next to **hours on bridge**.

Input	Example (placeholder)
Monthly recurring revenue (MRR) under an affected contract	\$500,000
SLA: cumulative <b>30 minutes</b> of violation triggers a <b>10%</b> monthly service credit (cap varies)	Policy-dependent
One incident drives <b>45 minutes</b> of billable violation time	Simplified

If the credit applies as **10% of MRR** for that month, **one** qualifying month exposes on the order of **\$50,000** in credits—**before** vendor overtime, customer churn risk, or regulatory reporting costs.

A single material SLA month can swamp the bridge-OPEX line. That is why “faster proof” is not only efficiency—it can be **revenue and relationship protection**.

## How to use this appendix in a meeting

- Treat the tables as a **spreadsheet shell**, not a claim.
- Force alignment across networking, operations, and finance on **hours to trusted story** for one historical incident; the argument becomes empirical quickly.
- If the organization cannot estimate **hours to trusted story**, that is already a signal: **the cost model is missing the variable that actually invoices**.

---

[← Back to main paper](#)

---

## License Notice

---

Copyright (c) 2026 Alain Degreffe.

Except where otherwise noted, this document is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-ND 4.0).

License deed:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/>

Full legal code:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/legalcode>

Patent notice:

No patent rights are granted under this license or by this publication.