oak CONSULT

Getting Product Right

Retire, Rejuvenate, Rescue or Roadmap

A practical guide to in-life product management and development



Mark Conway
Oak Consult
November 2026



Foreword

Much of the attention in product management goes to the beginning, from developing a new product to getting it to market. Some of the hardest decisions come years later, when customers depend on what you have already built and the economics of keeping it running. This guide is about in-life product management and development, and the decisions leaders face once a product is in service.

I wrote it because I have sat in too many boardroom meetings and portfolio reviews where mature, revenue-generating products were trapped in limbo. The pattern is familiar. An ageing platform becomes harder to support while still making a healthy margin. A replacement is commissioned with optimism. Timelines slip, and the same small group of engineers ends up split between keeping the lights on and building a successor that still cannot do everything customers rely on today. Meanwhile, sales requests, technical debt and the pressure to justify money already spent all compete for space on the roadmap.

When the board is asked to fund another piece of work, I want to know why we started, what has changed and what else we could do. What would it take to improve the existing product, buy or partner for a successor, or help customers move? Who depends on the product today, how will the cash flows change under each option, and what work will have to wait? What will the customer experience?

That is why I wrote *Getting Product Right*. Customers rely on these systems to run their businesses, and changing or withdrawing a product can disrupt their work and put hard-earned trust at risk. The paper gives leaders a practical way to compare their options on the same basis, test the assumptions that could change the decision, and make clear what each commitment would displace.

Whether you lead a product team, manage a software portfolio or sit on a board asked to approve the next quarter's engineering budget, I hope you'll take one live product decision into your next review. Bring the credible alternatives, the evidence behind them and a clear view of what would change your mind. The roadmap can then show what you've chosen to fund and what you expect it to achieve.

I would love to discuss your in-life product challenges, where you are struggling to get traction in your market and possibly internally with business change. Get in touch directly.

Mark Conway,

Oak Consult



Executive Summary

This paper is about in-life product management and development. It starts with a product already in service, customers who depend on it and a decision about what the business should do next. Before committing more engineering time, leaders need to agree what customers and the business need from the product, which options are credible and what work would have to wait. A roadmap should record the decisions that follow.

This paper sets out four choices: **Retire** an offer and manage the transition for customers. **Rejuvenate** it where there is evidence that a revised offer can earn its place. **Rescue** the service customers rely on, with a defined budget, timescale and test of stability. Put further work on the **Roadmap** when the customer outcome and expected contribution justify the commitment. These choices can be made in stages. A business may need to stabilise a service while it tests a successor or prepares to withdraw it.

The worked case follows a fictional UK field-service software supplier. Its board is asked for another quarter to finish an in-house replacement, even though eight customers still depend on an emergency scheduling rule the new platform cannot handle. The board compares finishing the build, buying or partnering for a successor, improving the live platform, retiring it in phases and continuing with minimum support. Minimum support produces the highest first-year cash contribution in the run-off comparison, but phased retirement moves ahead over two years as renewals weaken and a major support cost falls due. The partner route has the strongest two-year estimate overall, subject to proving the workflow, confirming costs and establishing that customers can move.

The board stops the in-house build, funds six weeks of stabilisation and authorises a limited partner test. It keeps the next feature build slot open while it checks whether a £180,000 renewal depends on a bespoke change and measures the value of an improvement requested by twelve other customers.

For your next portfolio review, take one product competing for time or money. Record the outcome you need, the credible alternatives, the customers and contracts affected, and what work each option would displace. Agree what you can authorise now, who owns the next step, and what evidence would change your decision. Give that review a date.



1. The decision before the roadmap

The board of a UK field-service software supplier is being asked to commit another quarter of engineering time to an in-house replacement. It commissioned the work because the live scheduling platform was becoming harder to support. Overnight failures sometimes leave planners without a usable schedule at the start of the day, and changes to customers' assignment rules increasingly need an engineer. The business wanted more dependable scheduling and a cheaper way to accommodate changes that recur across customers.

The replacement can handle routine jobs. It still cannot reproduce a rule that eight customers use during emergency call-outs. They use it to identify an engineer who is qualified, available and permitted to attend a particular site. The engineers building the replacement are also the people fixing the live service. Meanwhile, a £180,000 annual renewal is approaching, and twelve other accounts have reported that reassigning jobs takes too long when the day's schedule changes.

This is a fictional supplier. Its 32 customers and £1.2 million annual product revenue give us a starting point for a worked decision. The aim is to determine how the business should serve those customers from here and whether it should stay in the scheduling market. The original reasons for commissioning the replacement set the criteria for judging every route.

The options in the board paper

- **Finish the in-house replacement.** Close the gap in emergency assignments, prove the replacement under real operating conditions and migrate customers. The board needs a credible estimate of the remaining work, including the time it would take away from live support and other commitments.
- **Buy or partner for a successor.** License a scheduling platform or work with a partner that can provide the missing capability. Test the eight customers' real rules, then price integration, migration, ongoing licences and support. Establish what the supplier would still own and what would depend on the partner.
- **Stabilise and selectively improve the live platform.** Fix the failures and make repeatable customer rules easier to configure. Test whether the existing architecture can support those changes at an acceptable cost and for how long.
- **Retire the scheduling offer in phases.** Keep the service dependable during the run-off and help customers move. Confirm what each contract requires, who can move when and where the team would be redeployed. This route could include helping a customer move to another supplier.
- **Continue with minimum support.** Use this as the comparison for further investment or exit. Make the consequences of carrying the existing technology, renewal exposure and future support costs visible. If minimum support cannot protect customers and meet existing commitments, it ceases to be a viable course.

These are choices about how to meet a business need. Some can be tested in parallel, and some can be combined over time. Stopping one build, maintaining the live service and exploring a partner route are three decisions the board can take in the same meeting. Each needs a reason and an owner.



2. What evidence would change the decision?

Start by agreeing the result the business needs from any route it remains willing to fund. In this case, planners must receive usable schedules by their agreed start time, the emergency assignment rules must work, and routine changes should be possible at a support cost the business can sustain. The board can then ask what each proposed route achieves and which assumptions could change the ranking.

Question	Evidence to bring to the board
Which customers depend on the product?	Critical workflows by account, frequency and consequence of failure, contract timing, and whether a customer can perform its work on an alternative.
What changes financially?	Future revenue and avoidable cash costs, implementation or migration costs, and any impact on related renewals, credits or concessions.
What capacity does the option use?	The people and skills required, when they are needed, and the named work that will wait or stop.
Which claims can we rely on?	Separate observed use and service performance, confirmed buyer commitments, supplier estimates and the assumptions Finance has modelled.
What evidence would change the decision?	A specific test, its owner and deadline, and the result that would justify proceeding, delaying or stopping.

The GOV.UK Service Manual describes how to investigate what users are trying to do and what the problem costs them today [1]. The scheduling supplier can use that approach to observe planners handling urgent assignments. Existing product data can tell it how often the workflow is used. Only a test using representative customer rules and exceptions can establish whether a particular successor handles it.

ACCA's relevant cash-flow guidance offers a second discipline. Appraise the future cash flows that change with the decision, including the financial consequences of diverting a resource from another use [2]. Engineering time released by an exit belongs in the capacity comparison. It becomes a cash saving if paid spend falls, or a financial benefit if the redeployment produces identifiable contribution. Count either effect where it arises. A common cost can be shown in every option for transparency, with the difference between the options driving the decision.

The same approach applies to reputation. Ask which customers might reconsider another contract, which commitments could slip and which references or partnerships are exposed. Note who is affected and what would trigger a review. Price the effects that can be traced to a specific cash flow. A damaged reference, for example, may matter to the board even when there is too little evidence to attach a reliable figure to it.



3. Retire an offer and plan the run-off

Why the business would exit

In June 2025, Applied Systems announced that it would withdraw its Epic broker management system from the UK following a strategic review. It cited losses, complex requirements, strong incumbents and difficulty agreeing commercial lines distribution with insurers. It decided to redirect investment to other products and markets. Epic remained a leading product in North America, and Applied committed to continued support and investment in other UK products, including Applied TAM, Rating Hub and RiskHandler [3].

The UK withdrawal also covered Applied Mobile and CSR24, which brokers used alongside Epic. Applied committed to supporting customers through a multi-year transition [3, 4]. Insurance Age reported that NFP planned to move to Acturis in the UK [5]. That is one reported customer decision. The published material establishes Applied's stated rationale and transition commitment. It gives limited visibility into exit costs and the results of migration across the customer base.

This is a decision about an offer in a market. The leadership team can withdraw one offer while continuing to invest in other services that some of the same customers buy. Its exit plan therefore has two jobs. It has to remove the costs and commitments attached to the offer, and it has to handle the transition in a way that protects the customer relationships the business still wants.

What must work before customers move

Start with the accounts whose work is hardest to move. Establish what they use, what their contracts require, who approves a change, and what has to work on the day they switch. Cost data export, testing, training, overlapping service and any temporary support. Allocate an owner to each account and budget for exceptions. Set the closure date against the last material dependency and confirm what happens if it cannot be cleared on time.

The move from analogue to digital phone lines exposed this problem for telecare providers. The UK Government's action plan documents incidents involving missed users or equipment that failed after migration. It calls for confirmation that affected users have a compatible, functioning solution in place [6]. The lesson for a B2B supplier is to identify the dependency and prove the replacement under the conditions in which the customer uses it.

For the scheduling supplier, a migration test means using actual emergency assignment rules and representative exceptions, with the customer's operations lead signing off the result. A phased exit assumes every dependent account has a workable destination by month nine. A six-month exit needs the same evidence sooner, plus enough customer and supplier capacity to complete the moves.

What it costs to stay and what it costs to leave

The figures in this whitepaper are illustrative, rounded and undiscounted. The initial six-week rescue has an expected £40,000 cash cost in every route, with approval capped at £60,000. The £40,000 is shown explicitly. Direct delivery costs include cash costs that change with the level of business. Retained engineering salaries sit outside the cash comparison, with capacity shown separately.

Year 1 cash contribution, £000	Continue with minimum support	Phased exit at month nine	Faster exit at month six
Revenue retained	1,200	900	600
Direct delivery cash costs	(680)	(510)	(340)
Legacy cash costs until closure	(300)	(225)	(150)
Migration and parallel running	0	(100)	(160)
Initial rescue	(40)	(40)	(40)
Net cash contribution	**180**	**25**	**(90)**

Revenue and direct delivery costs are assumed to fall in proportion to the months of trading in Year 1. Legacy costs run at £25,000 per month until closure. The faster route saves £75,000 in legacy costs, gives up £130,000 of contribution after direct delivery costs, and adds £60,000 in migration costs. It is £115,000 behind phased exit. Keeping the product earns £155,000 more than phased exit in the first year.

The picture changes if the business has to carry the product into the next contract cycle. Assume only £600,000 of revenue is likely to renew in Year 2 under minimum support. At £340,000 of direct delivery costs, it leaves £260,000 before the same £300,000 of legacy cash costs. A separate £140,000 support agreement also falls due and would have to be renewed. If the phased exit closes the legacy service on time, neither legacy cost continues into Year 2. The case assumes the migration budget covers the transition and no remaining liabilities produce Year 2 cash costs.

Cash contribution, £000	Continue with minimum support	Phased exit
Year 1 net contribution	180	25
Year 2 contribution after direct delivery costs	260	0
Year 2 legacy costs and support renewal	(440)	0
Year 2 net contribution	**(180)**	**0**
Two-year net contribution	**0**	**25**

Phased exit is £25,000 ahead over two years. A further £25,000 of Year 2 contribution from trading, or £25,000 of extra cost specific to the exit, would bring the options level, all else equal. Even a modest concession on another contract could matter. ACCA's discussion of sensitivity analysis explains how changing a material assumption can identify the threshold at which a financial decision changes [7].

Closing the legacy service would also free the engineers who maintain it. The board can assign some of that capacity to the broader scheduling improvement if it can be used on a successor, or to work elsewhere in the portfolio. Assign the capacity explicitly and put any financial benefit into the receiving initiative's case.



4. Rejuvenate where the product still earns its place

The eight customers' reliance on a specialist rule tells the supplier it has an obligation to manage. It also gives it a hypothesis to test. Perhaps a narrower group of operators will pay for emergency scheduling that handles those rules reliably, and the supplier can deliver it without carrying the costs of a broad legacy offer.

Find buyers with a recurring problem

Observe planners trying to fill urgent jobs when a qualified engineer is unavailable. Record how often the problem occurs, how long it takes to resolve and what the operator does when the software cannot help. Then speak to the budget holder. Ask what they would replace or stop paying for, what a workable service would be worth, and how they would approve a purchase. Include prospects who have no current contract with the supplier. An existing customer may renew because migration is difficult. A comparable prospect gives a separate test of demand.

Sage 50c offers a UK B2B example of changing an established offer. It kept desktop accounting and added cloud access and Office 365 integration, sold on subscription with support and upgrades [8]. Garmin provides a brief example of narrowing around a distinct workflow. It reported pressure on mass-market navigation from phones and factory-installed systems, while continuing to offer devices for professional truck drivers [9, 10]. Those devices can use vehicle profiles to account for route restrictions [11]. The public examples show how an offer can change. They supply no basis for assuming the scheduling supplier's narrower offer will be profitable.

Test price, repeatability and cost together

The supplier could offer urgent field-service scheduling with a standard set of assignment rules, defined onboarding and a clear support commitment. Start by configuring the workflow with one existing customer and one comparable prospect. Look for rules that recur across accounts and record the work needed to implement them. Quote an actual price and ask for a paid pilot with an agreed measure of the outcome. GOV.UK's alpha guidance supports testing the riskiest assumptions with focused prototypes before committing to further delivery [12].

A paid pilot can reveal whether buyers will commit, how much work it takes to deliver, and whether the customer gets an operational benefit. The case for repeating it needs evidence from comparable buyers and a realistic cost to serve. If the offer requires the same legacy platform and annual support agreement, include them. If a partner can deliver the specialist workflow, include the partner's commercial terms and the work the supplier would retain. A narrower customer segment only improves the business case when the economics narrow with it.



5. Rescue the service customers need today

Stabilisation is worth funding when the cost of protecting customers is proportionate to what the business would otherwise lose. In this case every credible route depends on keeping schedules usable while the board establishes what comes next. That gives the rescue a clear purpose and a limit.

Authorise six weeks and a cap of £60,000 against an expected £40,000 cash cost. Give the service lead ownership of the work. For the affected accounts, require 20 consecutive working days of usable schedules delivered by their agreed start time under normal operating demand. Check the emergency assignment workflow as part of the live service review. Technical monitoring can help identify a failed run, and the customer measure tells the board what the failure meant. The GOV.UK Service Manual gives examples of monitoring whether people can complete the task a service exists to support [13].

Give existing customers a clear support plan for the six-week rescue. The account lead should tell affected customers what the supplier is fixing, when they will hear from the team, and who to contact if a usable schedule is missing at their agreed start time. Agree a fallback with each affected customer, including how planners will handle emergency assignments. The Service Manual recommends using support feedback to find out where users are struggling [14]. In this case, the service lead should check with planners whether they could start work on time and how much manual effort it took to get there. A successful overnight run can still leave a planner rebuilding part of the schedule by hand.

Capture those consequences in the week-six review. If customers are still reassigning jobs manually, record how often it happens, the time it takes and any missed appointments. Account and Finance should establish whether continued disruption triggers service credits under the relevant contracts, puts renewals at risk or weakens confidence in a future migration. Include the staff time and support costs of keeping the fallback available. The board can then judge whether the rescue has made the service dependable in day-to-day use, and what customers would need from the supplier if it extends the rescue or moves them to an alternative.

Reserve the shared engineers for stabilisation. Account and Product can verify buyer requirements, observe the broader workflow and prepare tests using capacity they already have. Any test requiring engineering time beyond that allocation needs an explicit decision about what work moves.

At week six, end the rescue if the service meets the threshold and the service lead can sustain it within the support budget. If it falls short, require a credible fix, a revised cost and an assessment of the customer consequences before extending it. If durable stability looks unlikely, accelerate work on a customer-approved alternative and maintain the necessary support during the transition. Oak Consult's The Programme Recovery Imperative covers recovery delivery. Managing the Unmanageable discusses the ability to intervene where a supplier controls critical expertise or systems [15].



6. Decide what earns a place on the roadmap

Once the live service is stable, the supplier has enough engineering time for one piece of work. The account team wants to add a dispatch approval control in time for a £180,000 renewal. The product team wants to make it quicker for planners to reassign jobs, a problem reported by twelve customers. If the board puts the approval work first, the reassignment improvement waits. If it puts reassignment first, it needs to understand what that means for the renewal.

Steve Nuttall, then Global Head of Product Development at Mintel, describes comparing what sales and product teams heard in customer conversations with what people actually did in the product. He also suggests using the roadmap in discussions with sales to show which planned work would have to move to make room for a new request [15]. In the scheduling case, that means checking the two claims separately. Sales needs to establish whether the approval control could decide the renewal. Product needs to show how often planners run into the reassignment problem and how much time it costs them. mindtheproduct.com

Check what the customer needs to renew

Ask the customer's operations lead to show the team where dispatch approval breaks down and what a satisfactory control would have to do. Run a typical job through the software using the settings already available. If that works, take it back to the person at the customer organisation who can authorise the renewal and ask whether it meets their condition. If it falls short, establish whether the customer would renew without the change, the latest date they could accept it, and whether it would meet their needs on a successor platform.

Find out what the wider improvement is worth

Watch planners in two customer organisations reassign jobs and record how often they do it and how long it takes. Then test whether a prototype cuts the median time from 20 minutes to 10. At 15 reassignments a week, a ten-minute saving would give each planner back 32.5 hours over a 13-week quarter. A five-minute saving would give them back just over 16 hours. To put a figure on what the supplier gains, look for evidence that a customer would pay to extend its use, that the improvement would help retain an account, or that it would reduce the time the support team spends on these cases.

If the account team confirms that the renewal is at risk, bring the choice to the board with the customer's deadline and the work that would have to wait. The twelve reports give the product team a reason to investigate how widely the problem is felt. The two trials help it estimate what fixing it would achieve. Before counting the cost of a quarter's delay, say which customer benefit, additional sale or support saving would be pushed back and how that figure was estimated.

Compare the two uses of the same slot

The major contract is worth £180,000 in revenue and is assumed to contribute £110,000 over a full renewal year before the feature costs. Assume £45,000 to build the feature, £10,000 in additional first-year support and £15,000 of supplier contribution forgone if the broader improvement slips a quarter. The £15,000 needs a specific basis, such as deferring paid expansion or prolonging measurable support costs. The £70,000 broader build cost is common to both schedules if it still goes ahead in either case.

Illustrative assumption	Renewal chance without build	With build	Expected contribution protected	After £70k build, support and delay
Feature likely to determine renewal	20%	90%	£77k	**£7k**
Feature matters alongside other factors	45%	85%	£44k	**(£26k)**

The feature needs to increase the chance of renewal by about 64 percentage points to cover the £45,000 build cost, £10,000 of additional support and £15,000 cost of delaying the wider improvement. In the stronger scenario, the expected gain is £7,000. If the delay costs £22,000 instead of £15,000, that gain disappears.

A separate £60,000 contribution stream whose renewal probability improved by 20 percentage points would add £12,000, if the relationship effect can be evidenced and sits outside the original £110,000. These probabilities are scenarios. Sensitivity analysis shows where the decision changes, and buyer evidence informs the likelihood of getting there [7].

If the customer confirms that the existing settings meet its renewal condition, pursue the renewal on that basis and keep the engineering time available for the reassignment improvement. If the customer confirms that it will only renew with the new control, the board can consider putting that work first. It should do so only if the team can deliver by the customer's deadline and the expected contribution still covers the cost of building and supporting the control and delaying the other work. If the customer is still weighing several factors, agree when the account team must bring back an answer. Set that date early enough for the board to act on it.

The retirement decision limits the return from both feature options. If only six months of the renewal contribution could be earned on the legacy service, the full-year £110,000 falls to an illustrative £55,000 before any revised feature costs. Even a 70-point uplift would then protect just £38,500. Rework the costs and benefits over the same life if the change cannot be reused. If a successor can carry the contract, test that with the buyer and cost the migration and support needed. Treat the broader improvement the same way. If delaying it means the build will be cancelled, compare the two complete options with their own costs and returns.

The same checks apply when an existing product needs a new capability and there is no usage data for it yet. An in-life product decision may lead to the development of a successor. When it does, start with the work customers rely on today and the reason the current product is becoming harder to sustain. Test whether the successor can handle critical workflows, what customers would need to move and what it would cost to run both products during the transition. Agree what evidence would justify further investment before committing the team to a build.



7. Make the decision and set the review

Compare the routes on the same basis

The board starts with the two-year minimum-support baseline of zero after the common rescue, and phased exit at £25,000. It then looks at what each available improvement or replacement route could add to the baseline. The figures below are illustrative working estimates, not supplier quotes or approved spend. Incremental benefits are retained or new contribution and avoidable operating costs, net of any recurring charges above the baseline. Incremental costs include the implementation and transition cash required by the route, including the partner test where applicable. The bespoke feature and broader improvement require their own approval and are excluded from these totals.

Route over two years, £000	Additional benefit vs baseline	Additional cost vs baseline	Net cash contribution	Evidence or constraint
Finish in-house replacement	340	(420)	**(80)**	Still missing the emergency rule. Uses the shared engineering team for another quarter before the remaining workflow and migration work can be confirmed.
Buy or partner	285	(240)	**45**	Depends on a working emergency assignment test, a firm implementation and support offer and a credible migration plan. Uses engineering time for integration.
Stabilise and selectively improve	115	(100)	**15**	Depends on engineering finding a repeatable way to configure rules and lower the ongoing support burden.
Phased exit	—	—	**25**	Derived from the run-off calculation. Requires a destination and plan for all eight dependent accounts.
Continue with minimum support	—	—	**0**	Exposes the business to weaker renewals and the Year 2 support extension.

In the partner estimate, £225,000 of the benefit is contribution retained or won across the two years and £60,000 is a net reduction in operating cash costs. The £240,000 comprises £10,000 for discovery, £150,000 for implementation and integration and £80,000 for migration and parallel running. The board needs to validate the customer contribution as well as the supplier quote.

The model gives the partner route a £20,000 lead over phased exit before allowing for differences in unresolved risk. An additional £20,000 of cost or lost contribution specific to that route would eliminate that lead. Partnering is worth testing because it could retain the service with less demand on the shared engineers than finishing the in-house build. It earns approval only if the workflow, commercial terms and available capacity support it. The faster exit remains a contingency to compare if the facts change. In the worked figures, it uses more migration resource and delivers less cash than phased exit.

Record what is approved and what is conditional

The board stops the in-house build. The remaining investment case is the weakest of the modelled routes, and the missing emergency workflow makes committing another quarter particularly hard to defend. It authorises the bounded live-service rescue and a partner discovery test capped at £10,000, included in the partner route estimate. If the test fails and the board chooses phased exit, that £10,000 also reduces the realised £25,000 exit contribution to £15,000, all else equal. At the next review, Finance treats any test spend already incurred as common to the remaining choices and compares the costs and benefits still ahead. The board keeps selective improvement and phased exit open while it gathers that evidence.

Decision record	Scheduling supplier
Authority today	Stop the in-house build. Approve six weeks of stabilisation, capped at £60,000. Approve up to £10,000 for a partner test. Hold the feature build slot.
People and displaced work	Service lead assigns the shared engineers to stabilisation. Product leads partner and offer discovery within available capacity. Any request for the rescue engineers comes back with the work it would displace.
Customer commitments	Maintain support during testing. Agree acceptance criteria with the eight dependent accounts. Account lead checks related contracts, promises and concessions, and verifies the £180,000 renewal condition before its decision deadline.
Evidence for the next meeting	Product brings the partner's test results, commercial terms and a costed integration plan. Engineering assesses whether the live platform can support repeatable rules. Finance reworks the comparison using actual rescue spend, likely renewals and costs linked to each route.
Review and triggers	Review the rescue and portfolio options at week six. Bring the renewal forward if its deadline requires it. A failed workflow test, revised partner quote, missed stability threshold or material change to related contract exposure can change the preferred route.
Next authority	Approve a partner commitment if the workflow passes, the contract and migration costs stack up and delivery capacity is available. Otherwise compare selective improvement with phased exit on the updated evidence. Confirm an exit date once customers can move and the full run-off cost is known.

Conclusion

The board started with a request for another quarter on a replacement build. Once it returned to the reason the work began, it had meaningful choices. It could see which route protected live customers, how much each would cost from here, and what the shared engineers would have to put aside. It stopped one build, funded a defined piece of stabilisation and authorised a test that could change its next decision.

At your next portfolio review, choose a product competing for time or money and ask five questions.

1. **What outcome are we trying to achieve, and which credible options are on the table?**
2. **Which customers depend on the product today, and what must work before we change or withdraw it?**
3. **What changes financially, including the effect on other contracts and commitments?**
4. **Who will do the work, and what will wait or stop to make room?**
5. **What are we authorising now, who owns it, and what evidence will make us review the decision?**

Put the answers in the decision record and give the review a date. Product and transformation leadership brings customer evidence, commercial judgement and delivery capacity into that decision. The roadmap then shows the work the business has chosen to resource and what it expects that work to achieve.



Appendix A — References

[1] Government Digital Service. *How the discovery phase works*. See “What to find out in discovery”. Read the GOV.UK Service Manual.

[2] ACCA. *Relevant cash flows*. See the sections on future and incremental cash flows and opportunity cost. Read the ACCA guidance.

[3] Applied Systems (10 June 2025). *Applied Systems Announces Plan to Withdraw Applied Epic from the UK Broker Management System Market*. Read the announcement.

[4] Applied Systems. *Applied Epic UK Announcement*. Read the customer information.

[5] Kenning, E. (27 June 2025). *NFP moving from Applied to Acturis in UK*. Insurance Age. The public opening identifies NFP’s planned move. Read the trade coverage.

[6] Department of Health and Social Care and Department for Science, Innovation and Technology (2025). *Telecare National Action Plan*. See “Outcome 1” and the discussion of incidents after migration. Read the action plan.

[7] ACCA (June 2015). *Financial Management F9 examiner’s report*, p. 8. See the discussion of sensitivity analysis and its treatment of uncertainty. Read the ACCA report.

[8] Xperience Group (23 January 2017). *Sage 50c Takes Sage 50 to the Cloud*. Read the UK launch account.

[9] Garmin Ltd. *2017 Annual Report*, Form 10-K, Item 1A. See the discussion of demand for personal navigation devices. Read the 2017 annual report.

[10] Garmin Ltd. *2024 Annual Report*, Form 10-K, Item 1, “Outdoor”. See the dēzl range for professional truck drivers. Read the 2024 annual report.

[11] Garmin. *dēzl 560 Owner’s Manual*, p. 60. See “Adding Truck or RV Profiles”. Read the manual.

[12] Government Digital Service. *How the alpha phase works*. See “Focus on testing your riskiest assumptions”. Read the GOV.UK Service Manual.

[13] Government Digital Service. *Monitoring the status of your service*. See “Writing monitoring checks”. Read the GOV.UK Service Manual.

[14] GOV.UK Service Manual. *Set up and manage user support*. See “Why user support is important” and “Planning for user support”. GOV.UK guidance.

[15] Oak Consult. *Execution and Recovery*. See The Programme Recovery Imperative and Managing the Unmanageable. Read about the two Oak papers.

[16] Mind the Product. *Secrets to successful B2B product management: Part 2*. See the interview with Steve Nuttall, then Global Head of Product Development at Mintel. Read the interview.