solution. One is to build using in-house infrastructure (a build *"in-house"* variant), the other is to build using a public code execution environment that provides charging at the functional level based upon consumption of resource (a build *"public"* variant).

The net effect of this is the build *"public"* option has higher but more variable costs whereas the build *"in-house"* variant has significant stepwise increases in investment once the service exceeds 100,000 users per month. These stepwise increase are due to additional development (requires a more distributed architecture), the infrastructure itself and hosting. Legal points out that once we sign up to the contract, we're responsible for providing and funding the service for one year and hence if we get this wrong, we have to fund the investment regardless of whether we see a corresponding revenue increase. Given the uncertainties, the CFO has modelled both the "*in-house*" and "*public*" variants of the scenario with each examining four possible outcomes. The outcomes vary according to:

- the number of *direct* visitors to the testing application

- the number of microsite visitors

- the rate of conversion of microsite visitors to use the testing application (*indirect* visitors)

The CFO is unconvinced by marketing's conversion rate from total visitors (i.e. both direct and indirect) of the testing application to leads. Given we're being paid by the lead, the CFO views this as