

Fictional exchange. Companies, people, operational inputs, interviews and reviews are invented. Updated 15 September 2026. Listed attachments are rendered pages in this PDF, not native downloadable files.

Decision request: build, buy, partner or stop Resolution Copilot

FROM Mara Vellstrand, CEO, HalcyonTrellis Systems GmbH <mara.vellstrand@halcyontrellis.example>
TO IQ256 | iq256.com/contact
DATE 15 September 2025, 08:42 CEST

Hi IQ256,

We need a board recommendation by 3 October. Competitors claim that AI can resolve invoice exceptions automatically. Sales says we are losing deals without it; Engineering says the data and error tolerance make full autonomy unsafe.

Please choose one route: build ourselves, buy VerityRelay, co-develop with SableQuarry, or stop the autonomous project and improve our guided workflow. Do not give us four equal options. We need one recommendation, the strongest objection, reversal evidence, and a 90-day plan.

The attached evidence points in opposite directions. That is why we need the review. Thanks, Mara

ATTACHMENTS (4)

- **01_HalcyonTrellis_Board_Decision_Brief.pdf**
Resolution Copilot | Decision due 3 October 2025

01
- **02_Commercial_Evidence_Q3.xlsx**
Sales claims, customer interviews, and route economics

02
- **03_Technical_Benchmark_and_Vendor_Notes.pdf**
Fictional benchmark: 3,000 imagined cases from six customers

03
- **04_Constraints_and_Stakeholder_Notes.docx**
Simulated stakeholder positions for the fictional board review

04

Board decision brief

Resolution Copilot | Decision due 3 October 2025

Fictional inputs. Benchmarks, interviews and voices are invented.

Company and decision

<div>96</div> <div>Employees</div> <div>European B2B software</div>	<div>EUR 8.6M</div> <div>ARR</div> <div>106% net retention</div>	<div>487,000</div> <div>Exception cases</div> <div>Last 12 months</div>
---	--	---

HalcyonTrellis helps manufacturers match invoices, purchase orders, and goods receipts. When records disagree, an accounts-payable user checks policy, finds missing context, contacts colleagues or suppliers, and chooses a resolution.

Four routes

Route	What it means	Earliest use	First-year cash
Build	Proprietary autonomous decision system	14-18 months	EUR 1.35M
Buy	Embed the VerityRelay decision API	10-14 weeks	EUR 609k
Partner	Co-develop with SableQuarry Labs	8-12 months	EUR 830k
Stop autonomy	Improve the guided workflow instead	10-12 weeks	EUR 180k

BOARD QUESTION

Which route solves the customer problem without creating unacceptable safety, cash, or roadmap risk?

What success means

- Reduce median resolution time from 4.7 business days to 2.0 days or less.
- Reduce manual touches from 3.2 to 1.8 or less.
- Win paid use from at least 15% of all current customers eligible for the eight covered workflows; freeze eligibility before invitations. Or improve retention by at least 2 percentage points.
- Keep severe incorrect actions below 0.1% before unattended external action.
- Keep company gross margin at or above 75%.
- Delay committed ERP integrations by no more than six weeks.

Why it feels urgent

- Eleven of the last 18 enterprise RFPs mention AI-assisted exception handling.
- Two competitors demonstrate apparent end-to-end agents, but production behavior is unverified.
- Three renewals worth EUR 610k ARR occur within six months.
- Engineering hiring must begin in October for an internal launch next year.

Non-negotiable boundaries

- No external provider trains on customer information.
- Every recommendation shows supporting facts and policy.
- No automatic supplier communication at launch.
- Current SAP, Dynamics, and Infor integrations remain first delivery priority.
- No five-year regional exclusivity.

Assignment scope

This fictional assignment is complete when the agreed review and documents are delivered and checked. Its business recommendations and future execution are separate from that completion.

Agreement	Boundary in this example
Delegated work	Compare build, buy, partner and guided workflow using supplied scenario data; recommend a route and prepare the budget, release gates and 90-day plan.
Requested output	A product review, strongest dissent, decision record and delivery plan. The fictional benchmarks and interviews were not conducted, and no Guided Resolution software was shipped.
Completion checks	Reconcile the EUR 184k plan/EUR 220k cap; distinguish interim continuation from final release gates; trace assumptions, payback proxies and reversal thresholds.
Authority retained by customer	Mara and the board retain investment and launch decisions. In this case, users approve external actions; IQ256 is not authorized to deploy, email suppliers or fund the program.
Remaining checks	Real customer/data validation, implementation, representative tests, paid-use/retention measurement, security review and production release approval.
Fee and timing	Agree the review scope, price and deadline before paid work. Implementation could be a separately scoped assignment; it is not included merely because the plan recommends building software.
Business budget	EUR 184k expected and EUR 220k cap are the fictional customer program budget, not the IQ256 review fee or a software implementation quote.

Where human input is agreed, IQ256 selects, briefs, coordinates and pays contributors. IQ256 integrates the agreed work and performs baseline completion checks. Extra verification answers a specified additional concern. External information packets require explicit customer approval; no approval is needed for every internal step within the agreed mandate.

If scope, price, deadline, sharing or customer effort changes materially, agree the next course before exceeding the mandate. A recommendation may name one option while the customer retains the decision; permission to act or commit money is agreed separately.

Discuss a defined assignment

<https://iq256.com/contact>

Start with a short, non-confidential description. Initial human reply normally within 2-48 hours, distinct from the agreed delivery deadline.

Commercial evidence

Sales claims, customer interviews, and route economics

Fictional inputs. Benchmarks, interviews and voices are invented.

What the pipeline appears to say

Evidence	Result	Important qualification
RFPs mentioning AI	11 of 18	Six mainly ask for recommendations and approval controls
Losses partly labeled missing AI	4	Only one names it as the primary cause
Gross pipeline called at risk	EUR 3.8M	Probability-weighted value is EUR 1.1M
Incremental pipeline attributed to feature	EUR 220k	Sales estimate, not controlled evidence

Forty fictional customer interviews

Response	Customers	Interpretation
Would pay EUR 12k-18k if targets are met	7	Paid interest exists, but is narrow
Expects capability in current subscription	17	Value exists; pricing power uncertain
Prohibits unattended supplier communication	10	Full autonomy conflicts with buyer policy
Interested, but no budget this year	6	Useful for learning, not current revenue

Simulated voice: Recommend the next step, show me why, and let my team send it. I do not want software emailing suppliers in our name.

02_Commercial_Evidence_Q3.xlsx

Route estimates

Route	First 12-month cash	Continuing annual cost	Restriction
Build	EUR 1.35M	EUR 420k	Seven planned hires
Buy	EUR 609k	EUR 390k minimum + usage	24-month minimum
Partner	EUR 830k	15% revenue + team	Five-year exclusivity requested
Guided workflow	EUR 180k	EUR 60k	No autonomous-AI claim

Fictional customer language

Simulated voice: If I must verify every suggestion, the value is smaller. If I do not verify it, the risk is larger.

Simulated voice: We have an AI box in the RFP because our board expects one. The winning product still needs the best SAP integration.

COMMERCIAL REALITY

Five of seven willing-to-pay customers signed non-binding pilot letters. None committed before seeing performance on its own data.

Technical benchmark and vendor notes

Fictional benchmark: 3,000 imagined cases from six customers

Fictional inputs. Benchmarks, interviews and voices are invented.

Case distribution

Case group	Share	What it needs
Eight recurring types	73%	Known company policy
Customer-specific policy	14%	Local interpretation
Missing information	9%	Colleague or supplier input
Unusual long tail	4%	No stable historical pattern

Only 54% of cases contain all decision information inside HalcyonTrellis. Thirty-one percent of historical outcome labels are ambiguous because 'resolved' does not prove the result was correct.

Fictional benchmark inputs

System	Exact action	Severe error	Common types	Long tail
HalcyonTrellis prototype	74%	1.8%	94%	51%
VerityRelay API	57%	2.6%	79%	38%
SableQuarry proof	79%	Not measured	88%	Not tested
Deterministic workflow	71% coverage	0.3% in scope	97.4%	0%

SAFETY BOUNDARY

No evaluated route meets the below-0.1% severe-error threshold for unattended supplier communication.

Architecture requirements

- Trace every decision to a source and audit record.
- Detect missing context before making a recommendation.
- Keep model providers replaceable as quality and price change.
- Require per-customer approval, role controls, and an incident path before external action.

Stakeholder positions

Simulated stakeholder positions for the fictional board review

Fictional inputs. Benchmarks, interviews and voices are invented.

Leadership positions

Perspective	Current position	Reason
CEO	Undecided	Needs a credible answer without betting the company on a label
CTO	Build	Exception knowledge could become strategic intellectual property
Product	Guided workflow	The user problem is slow investigation, not autonomy
Sales	Partner	Waiting may cost another buying cycle
CFO	Guided or stop	Verified paid demand cannot justify a EUR 1M program
Privacy	No auto action	Context, policy, and error threshold are not ready

What the board wants

- One recommendation, not a compromise disguised as a roadmap.
- A direct answer about what not to fund.
- A quantified reason to believe the selected route is better.
- The strongest dissenting view and conditions that reopen other routes.
- A plan that produces decision-quality evidence within 90 days.