



ELARION SOFTWARE · SAMPLE ARTIFACT

Functional Design Document

The specification Elarion wrote for its own practice.

This is a real working document, not a sample written for show: elarionsoftware.com was built from it. It is published so you can judge the artifact before commissioning one.

Internal delivery targets and the practice's own risk register have been removed. Everything else stands exactly as written — including the assumptions, the open decisions and the list of what was deliberately left out of scope.

Elarion Software — Business-Analysis-Led Custom Development Practice

Document	FDD v0.3 — Functional design specification
Subject	elarionsoftware.com — client-services software development practice
Operating entity	Elarion Software (offering under Zied Youssfi / Next Number Global Consulting Inc.)
Prepared by	Next Number Global Consulting Inc.
Status	Ready for sign-off — all open decisions closed (§13)
Supersedes	FDD v0.2

Version history

VERSION	DATE	CHANGE
0.1	—	Initial draft. Positioning, functional decomposition, conceptual data model, open questions.
0.2	2026-09-22	Domain confirmed. Positioning restated as BA- led rather than BA- only : engagement models widened (§5) and every hard gate converted to a default with a defined alternative (§9). New §4 on the BA role in solution creation. Functional requirements given IDs and acceptance criteria (§6). Added out-of-scope list, assumptions, trust/compliance requirements, success measures, release plan, glossary.
0.3	2026-09-22	All five open decisions closed (§13). Pricing presentation fixed as enquiry-led — no figures published anywhere public (FR-1.7, FR-1.3). This FDD designated as the public sample artifact (FR-3.3). Privacy built to the stricter Canadian standard unconditionally (FR-8.1, A-5). Response commitment fixed at one business day (BR-8). Trademark clearance moved to a residual risk register (§14) as an owner action outside the build path.

Sign-off

ROLE	NAME	DATE	SIGNATURE
Owner / approver	Zied Youssfi		
Prepared by	Next Number Global Consulting Inc.		

No build work proceeds against this document until the sign-off block is complete. This mirrors the gate Elarion applies to client engagements — see BR-1.

1. Purpose

This document specifies the functional design of the Elarion Software practice: its public site, its lead-to-delivery workflow, and the supporting systems needed to run it. It is written to be built from and priced from, not merely read.

It is also a working sample of the artifact Elarion produces for clients at the Requirements stage of its method. The rigor on display — numbered requirements, acceptance criteria, explicit out-of-scope list, named assumptions — is the product being sold.

2. Positioning

2.1 The claim

Most development shops begin writing code before the business problem is fully understood. Elarion begins with the business problem: requirements, process modeling, and scope definition, and only then moves to build. Analysis is not a phase that precedes the real work; it is what makes the build predictable.

2.2 The guardrail — led, not gated

v0.1 expressed this as a set of hard gates: no proposal without a structured intake, no build without a signed FDD. Those rules protect the positioning and lose deals. A referred CTO who wants to email you hits a wall. A client with a working backlog and budget ready to spend hears "not how we work." A small fixed-scope job carries the cost of a full discovery phase it does not need.

v0.2 keeps the standard and drops the wall. The operating principle:

Elarion does not start building without an agreed written scope. The form and depth of that agreement flexes to the engagement; its existence does not.

Practically:

- Analysis **depth scales** — a two-week integration gets a scope annex, a core platform build gets a full FDD (§4.3).
- Client-supplied requirements are **accepted**, not rejected. The BA role becomes validation and gap analysis (BR-2).
- Build-only, rescue, embedded, and fractional engagements are **first-class offerings**, not exceptions (§5).
- Every inbound channel is a valid entry point (BR-3).

The differentiator holds because the analysis is genuinely better, and because the artifacts are shown rather than claimed (§6.3) — not because a form refuses to submit.

2.3 Proof-of-work assets

Used as case studies rather than built from scratch:

ASSET	WHAT IT IS	ENGAGEMENT TYPE
KriftAI	Governed AI platform — validation, compliance gate and audit around every model call	Own product
ImmiCase	Canadian immigration case management platform	Own product
CrewDispatchr	Staffing SaaS / fractional COO-CTO delivery	Fractional / client delivery

These are founder-owned rather than third-party client engagements. §6.3 addresses that honestly through labeling and through publishing the underlying artifacts, which is stronger evidence of method than outcome prose would be.

3. Scope

3.1 In scope — MVP

1. Public marketing site: home, method, services/engagement models, case studies, about, contact.
2. Multiple lead entry points feeding one Lead record: discovery call booking, structured intake form, plain email/phone.
3. Case study content for the three assets in §2.3, including downloadable redacted artifacts.
4. Transactional email: prospect confirmation and internal notification.
5. Trust and compliance baseline: privacy policy, consent capture, spam protection, email authentication, analytics.
6. Proposal/SOW templates covering each engagement model in §5 — documents, produced manually.

3.2 Out of scope — MVP

Named explicitly, because this is where a fixed fee is defended:

1. Client login, authentication, or any account system.
2. Automated proposal generation from intake data (Phase 2 — see §12).
3. E-signature integration (Phase 2).
4. Engagement tracker as software; MVP tracks in a spreadsheet or Notion base (§6.6).
5. Payment collection, invoicing, or billing on the site.
6. Blog, newsletter, or content marketing engine.
7. Multi-language content. English only at MVP.
8. Live chat or chatbot.
9. A [.dev](#) microsite. The domain redirects (§8).
10. Any KriftAI infrastructure dependency. Elarion's MVP stands alone.

3.3 Assumptions

ID	ASSUMPTION	IF FALSE
A-1	elarionsoftware.com is registered and controlled by the operating entity.	Blocks launch; re-plan domain.
A-2	Elarion operates as an offering under Next Number Global Consulting Inc.; no separate legal entity, contracting, or banking is required for MVP.	Legal and contracting workstream needed before first engagement.
A-3	Zied is sole delivery resource and sole content editor at MVP.	\$6.7 CMS requirement escalates from "not needed" to required.
A-4	The published case study assets may be published without third-party consent, being founder-owned.	Per-asset consent needed; CrewDispatchr may require client sign-off for specifics.
A-5	Prospects are primarily Canadian and US SMB/mid-market, and are assumed to include Quebec residents. Privacy is built to the stricter Canadian standard unconditionally rather than being made conditional on prospect location (D-3 in §13).	No impact — the assumption is deliberately pessimistic. Relaxing it would only reduce obligations.
A-6	elarion.dev is held or obtainable.	Drop FR-8.6; no functional impact.

4. The Business Analyst role in solution creation

This section exists because the BA role is what Elarion sells, and a practice that sells it should be able to specify it. It is also the source content for the Method page (FR-1.2).

4.1 What the BA actually does

The BA is the translation layer between a business outcome someone wants and a system that can be built, priced, and accepted. Concretely, across any engagement:

1. **Elicit** — get the real problem out of the stakeholders, which is rarely the one stated first.
Interviews, process walkthroughs, document review.
2. **Model the as-is** — document how the work is done today, including the workarounds.
Spreadsheets and email threads are requirements evidence.
3. **Define the to-be** — the target process, and explicitly which parts software changes and which parts people change. Much of what is asked for as software is a process problem, and saying so is part of the value.
4. **Specify** — functional requirements with acceptance criteria, data model, business rules, integration points, non-functional constraints.
5. **Bound** — the out-of-scope list, the assumptions, the dependencies. This is what makes a fixed price possible and what protects both sides from scope drift.
6. **Validate** — walk the specification back to the stakeholders and get agreement before anything is built.

7. **Support delivery** — answer the build's questions against the specification, manage change requests, define acceptance tests, verify what was delivered.

4.2 Stage by stage

#	STAGE	BA ACTIVITY	ARTIFACT PRODUCED	CLIENT INVOLVEMENT	COMMERCIAL STATUS
0	Qualification	Understand the ask, judge fit, identify decision-maker	Discovery call notes	30 min call	Free
1	Discovery	Stakeholder interviews, as-is process capture, constraint mapping	Problem statement, as-is process map, constraints register	Interviews, document access	Billable — Phase 1
2	Requirements	To-be process design, functional specification, acceptance criteria, scope boundary	FDD (this format) or scope annex, depending on depth	Review workshops, sign-off	Billable — Phase 1
3	Solution design	Architecture, data model, integration design, UI wireframes	Architecture summary, data model, wireframes	Architecture summary shared and explained	Phase 1 or 2 depending on model
4	Build	Requirements custodian: clarifications, change control, acceptance test definition	Change log, acceptance test set, sprint status	Status updates, demos, UAT	Billable — Phase 2
5	Handoff	As-built documentation, training, retrospective, case study write-up	As-built doc, training material, case study draft	Training sessions, sign-off	Included in Phase 2

4.3 How the BA role scales

The same discipline applies at different weights. This is the flexibility that keeps deals alive:

ENGAGEMENT SIZE	ANALYSIS DEPTH	ARTIFACT	TYPICAL DURATION
Small — single integration, defined feature, clear ask	Requirements confirmation: validate the ask, write acceptance criteria, name assumptions	Scope annex in the SOW (2-4 pages)	Days, folded into the build quote
Medium — a module, a workflow, a replacement for a spreadsheet process	Focused discovery on one process, to-be design, specification	Short-form FDD	1-2 weeks
Large — a platform, a multi-stakeholder system, a compliance-bearing process	Full discovery across stakeholders, as-is and to-be modeling, full specification	Full FDD + architecture and data model	3-6 weeks
Client arrives with requirements	Validation and gap analysis against what exists — ambiguity, missing acceptance criteria, unstated assumptions, integration gaps	Requirements review memo + gap list	2-5 days, fixed fee
Rescue — a build already in trouble	Reverse-engineer actual vs. intended scope, assess what is salvageable	Assessment + recovery options memo	1-2 weeks, fixed fee

4.4 Where BA fits in engagements that are not BA-led

Build-only, staff augmentation, and fractional engagements still carry the discipline, in reduced form. Stated plainly so the site can sell them without contradicting the positioning:

- **Build-only** — Elarion confirms the client's requirements are buildable and testable before quoting, and writes acceptance criteria if none exist. That confirmation is the BA contribution, and it takes days rather than weeks.
- **Embedded / staff augmentation** — Elarion supplies BA capability into the client's own delivery team, working to their process rather than Elarion's.
- **Fractional technical leadership** — analysis shows up as roadmap definition, build-vs-buy assessment, and vendor specification rather than as a project FDD.

5. Engagement models

All six are offered. The site presents them as a menu with a recommendation, not as a single path.

ID	MODEL	ENTRY POINT	BA DEPTH (\$4.3)	COMMERCIAL SHAPE	TYPICAL FIT
EM-1	Analysis then build (<i>flagship</i>)	Discovery call or intake	Medium-large	Phase 1 fixed fee → Phase 2 scoped from the FDD	New platform, unclear or contested scope, fixed-price needed
EM-2	Combined fixed-scope project	Any	Small	Single fixed price, analysis folded in	Well-defined ask, smaller budget, no appetite for a separate discovery phase
EM-3	Build to existing requirements	Any	Requirements validation	Fixed price after validation, or T&M	Client has a spec, a backlog, or an internal BA
EM-4	Rescue / technical audit	Direct contact, usually urgent	Rescue	Fixed-fee assessment, then options	In-flight build in trouble, inherited codebase, vendor exit
EM-5	Embedded BA / delivery capacity	Direct contact	Client's process	Monthly retainer or day rate	Client team needs analysis capability, not a vendor
EM-6	Fractional technical leadership	Direct contact	Roadmap-level	Monthly retainer	Founder or SMB needs a technical decision-maker part-time

Commercial note. EM-1 is the highest-value and most defensible model, and the site should recommend it. But EM-2 through EM-6 exist so that no qualified prospect has to hear "that is not how we work." A prospect who starts at EM-3 and has a good experience is a strong candidate for EM-1 on their next project; a prospect turned away at the door is not.

6. Functional requirements

Each requirement carries an ID, a priority (**MVP / P2 / P3**), and acceptance criteria (AC). AC are the basis of acceptance testing and of the scope boundary.

6.1 Marketing site

FR-1.1 — Home page · MVP Positioning-led landing page.

- AC-1: States the BA-led positioning above the fold, in plain language, without jargon.
- AC-2: Shows the method as a visual sequence (Discovery → Requirements → Design → Build → Handoff) linking to FR-1.2.
- AC-3: Surfaces every published case study with a one-line outcome each.
- AC-4: Presents a primary CTA (book a call) and a visible secondary path (intake form) and tertiary path (email address in plain text).
- AC-5: States that engagement models flex, with a link to FR-1.3 — a visitor who wants build-only work sees within one screen that it is offered.

FR-1.2 — Method page · MVP The differentiator is process, so this page is the sales pitch.

- AC-1: Walks all five stages from §4.2, each with: what happens, what the client receives, what is asked of the client.
- AC-2: Shows a real (redacted) artifact for at least two stages, not a stock graphic.
- AC-3: Includes the "how the BA role scales" content from §4.3, so a small-budget prospect sees a version sized for them.
- AC-4: States the client-ownership rule (BR-5) explicitly and prominently.
- AC-5: States that client-supplied requirements are welcome (BR-2).

FR-1.3 — Services / engagement models page · MVP

- AC-1: Presents all six models from §5, each with: who it is for, what it includes, its commercial shape in words (fixed fee, retainer, day rate, phased), and how to start. No figures, bands, or ranges — see FR-1.7.
- AC-2: Recommends EM-1 without disparaging the others.
- AC-3: Every model has a working CTA.
- AC-4: No language anywhere that refuses a category of work.

FR-1.4 — Case study pages · MVP · one page per asset. See §6.3.

FR-1.5 — About page · MVP

- AC-1: Founder credibility: BA and consulting background, ERP depth, delivery history.
- AC-2: References KriftAI as evidence of technical range. Superseding the v0.2 decision to name it on About only: it is now published as a case study, since a governed-AI platform is the strongest available evidence of engineering depth and withholding it cost more than the cleaner separation gained.
- AC-3: Names the operating entity and jurisdiction for contracting credibility.

FR-1.6 — Contact page · MVP

- AC-1: Offers all three entry paths (call booking, intake form, direct email).
- AC-2: Direct email address is machine-readable text, not an image or a form-only path.
- AC-3: States a one-business-day response commitment (BR-8) and holds to it.

FR-1.7 — Pricing presentation · MVP · *Enquiry-led* Resolves D-1 (§13). Elarion does not publish prices. Scope varies enough between engagements that a published figure would be wrong in both directions — anchoring large engagements low and scaring small ones off — and no qualified prospect is lost to a price they never saw.

- AC-1: No figure, band, range, starting-from, or hourly rate appears anywhere on the public site, in any engagement model, case study, or downloadable artifact.
- AC-2: Each engagement model instead carries a "Discuss scope" CTA routing to the entry points in §6.2.
- AC-3: Commercial shape is still described in words, so a prospect understands whether they are buying a fixed-fee phase, a retainer, or a day rate before they call.
- AC-4: Where a prospect asks for pricing by email, the response is a call invitation, not a rate card.

Documented trade-off. Enquiry-led pricing protects deal flow — nobody self-selects out over a number — at the cost of more unqualified calls. The mitigations are the optional budget band on

the intake (FR-2.2 AC-3) and the time-box on the free call (BR-4). If the \$11 call-to-proposal rate falls below its target, the cause to examine first is qualification, not the pricing policy.

6.2 Lead capture

FR-2.1 — Discovery call booking · MVP · *Primary CTA*

- AC-1: The scheduler is **linked, not embedded**. v0.3 as specified called for an embed; an embed loads third-party JavaScript and sets cookies on this domain, which would break NFR-5 and falsify the privacy page's plain claim that the site sets no cookies. Linking out keeps those cookies on the scheduler's own domain, where the visitor has chosen to go.
- AC-2: The scheduler collects name, email and a one-line note — no more.
- AC-3: The booking record lives in the scheduler, not here. There is no database behind this site, so no Lead record is created automatically; bookings are read from the scheduler and entered in the tracker by hand (FR-6.1).
- AC-4: The call is described as free and time-boxed (BR-4), and its length is read from one constant (`CALL_DURATION`) so the page and the booking screen cannot disagree.

FR-2.2 — Structured discovery intake · MVP · *Secondary path*

- AC-1: Captures: business goal / problem statement; current process (as-is); budget band; timeline band; existing systems and integrations; decision-maker and stakeholders; how they found Elarion.
- AC-2: Only name, email, and problem statement are required. Every other field is skippable — a half-filled intake still submits and still creates a Lead.
- AC-3: Budget and timeline are selectable bands, not free text (see §7 D-1). The budget band is optional and carries a "not sure yet" option — it is qualification signal, not a barrier, and it is the main compensating control for publishing no prices (FR-1.7).
- AC-4: The form visibly demonstrates BA thinking through the questions it asks — it is a sample of the method, not a contact form.
- AC-5: Completion is possible in under four minutes.
- AC-6: Progress is preserved if the page is refreshed mid-form.

FR-2.3 — Submission handling · MVP

- AC-1: Prospect receives a confirmation email within 60 seconds, from the `elarionsoftware.com` domain, stating what happens next and by when.
- AC-2: Internal notification is delivered on every submission.
- AC-3: A Lead record is created for every submission, including partial ones.
- AC-4: If delivery fails, the full brief is written to the server log and the visitor is routed to a recovery page carrying the direct email address and the booking link — a lead is never silently lost. The internal notification is attempted first and only its failure changes the outcome, so a bounced courtesy confirmation cannot cost a lead.
- AC-5: The API credential is read at runtime through `astro:env`, never through `import.meta.env`, which inlines at build time; it is server-context and secret, so it cannot reach the client.
- AC-5: Confirmation email offers a direct booking link as the next step.

FR-2.4 — Unified lead intake · MVP

- AC-1: All entry paths — booking, form, direct email, referral, phone — produce a Lead record in the same store with the same stage vocabulary.
- AC-2: Manual Lead creation is possible for leads that arrive by conversation.
- AC-3: [source](#) and UTM parameters are captured where available.

6.3 Case studies and evidence

FR-3.1 — Case study content type · MVP

- AC-1: Structured fields per D-2: title, engagement type, sector, problem, approach, BA artifacts, outcome, tech stack, published flag.
- AC-2: [engagement_type](#) is displayed on the page — own product, client delivery, or fractional. No ambiguity about what the evidence is.
- AC-3: Client identity can be anonymized while keeping sector and size.

FR-3.2 — Published artifacts · MVP The strongest available proof of method.

- AC-1: At least two case studies link a downloadable redacted artifact — an FDD excerpt, a process map, or a requirements sample.
- AC-2: Artifacts are reviewed for confidential content before publication.
- AC-3: Download requires no email address. Friction here defeats the purpose.

FR-3.3 — Sample FDD as a public asset · MVP Resolves D-2 (§13). The published sample is **this document** — the FDD Elarion wrote for its own practice. It is a genuine working artifact, it needs no redaction because it contains no client information, and it makes the strongest available argument: the practice specified itself to the standard it sells.

- AC-1: A cleaned presentation copy of this FDD is downloadable from the Method page.
- AC-2: Commercial figures, internal targets (§11), and the residual risk register (§14) are removed from the published copy. Everything else stands as written.
- AC-3: It is presented as evidence, not gated — no email address required.
- AC-4: A prospect can read it and conclude "I want this document for my project" without speaking to anyone first.
- AC-5: A second artifact from an own-product case study (process map or data model) accompanies it, so the evidence is not a single document.
- AC-6: The published copy is re-cut whenever this document reaches a new version.

FR-3.4 — PDF export of case studies · P2

- AC-1: Each published case study exports to a branded PDF for sales use.
- AC-2: Web and PDF render from the same source content.

6.4 Proposal and SOW

FR-4.1 — Proposal template set · MVP · *Documents, not software*

- AC-1: A template exists for each engagement model in §5.
- AC-2: Every template contains: problem statement as understood, proposed approach, explicit out-of-scope list, assumptions, deliverables, fee and payment schedule, client responsibilities, change-control clause.

- AC-3: EM-1 templates express the two-phase structure — Phase 1 (analysis, fixed fee, defined deliverables) and Phase 2 (build, scoped from Phase 1 output).
- AC-4: Every template states the client-ownership rule (BR-5).
- AC-5: Every template names a lighter scope-agreement form where a full FDD does not apply (BR-1).

FR-4.2 — Proposal tracking · MVP

- AC-1: Each proposal issued is recorded against its Lead: version, date sent, fee, status.
- AC-2: Status values are the D-4 enum.

FR-4.3 — Assisted proposal drafting · P2

- AC-1: Intake answers pre-populate problem statement, constraints, and stakeholders in a proposal draft.
- AC-2: Deferred until intake questions have demonstrably produced usable proposals across at least five real engagements.

6.5 Engagement visibility

The brand promise is that the client sees the method working, not just described. This is the mechanism that delivers it, and it is deliberately cheap.

FR-5.1 — Per-engagement status page · MVP (*manual*)

- AC-1: Each active engagement has a shared status document, created at kickoff.
- AC-2: It shows: current stage (§4.2), artifacts delivered to date with links, what is in progress, what is needed from the client, next milestone.
- AC-3: Updated at least weekly for active engagements.
- AC-4: MVP implementation is a shared document or Notion page. No build required.

FR-5.2 — Client portal · P3

- AC-1: Only considered once more than five concurrent engagements make FR-5.1 unmanageable.
- AC-2: Requires authentication, which pulls in the account system excluded at 3.2.1.

6.6 Lead and engagement tracking

FR-6.1 — Lead tracker · MVP (*non-software*)

- AC-1: Every Lead is recorded with the D-1 fields.
- AC-2: Stage uses the D-1 enum, and the same vocabulary appears in the proposal templates and the status pages.
- AC-3: Every active lead carries a next action and a date.
- AC-4: Implemented in a spreadsheet or Notion base. Resolves v0.1 open question 2.

FR-6.2 — Engagement tracker · P2

- AC-1: Built only after the success measures in §11 are met.
- AC-2: Tool choice — external versus KriftAI-native — is deferred to that point and is not an MVP dependency (A-6, 3.2.10).

6.7 Content management

FR-7.1 — Content editing · MVP

- AC-1: Case studies and page copy are editable and publishable without a deployment that requires more than a commit and an automatic build.
- AC-2: Content lives as Markdown in this repository at MVP. Per A-3 the sole editor is a developer, so a CMS is overhead — this reverses the v0.1 requirement.
- AC-3: Adding a case study requires no code changes, only a new content file.

FR-7.2 — CMS · P3

- AC-1: Triggered only if A-3 fails — a non-developer becomes a content editor.

6.8 Trust, compliance and platform

Absent from v0.1; several of these block launch rather than merely improve it.

FR-8.1 — Privacy policy · MVP · *Launch blocker*

- AC-1: Published and linked from every page footer and from the intake form.
- AC-2: States what is collected, why, retention period, and how to request deletion.
- AC-3: Addresses PIPEDA **and** Quebec's Law 25 unconditionally, rather than conditionally on prospect location. Resolves D-3 (§13): the stricter standard costs little to meet at this scale — consent, purpose limitation, retention period, deletion on request, named privacy contact — and removes the need to track where prospects reside before responding to them.

FR-8.2 — Consent capture · MVP · *Launch blocker*

- AC-1: The intake form captures affirmative consent for follow-up contact, with a timestamp stored on the Lead.
- AC-2: Consent for marketing contact is separate from consent for engagement follow-up, and is not pre-ticked.

FR-8.3 — Spam protection · MVP

- AC-1: The intake form carries bot protection — a challenge widget or honeypot plus rate limiting.
- AC-2: Protection is invisible to legitimate users. No puzzle-solving in front of a qualified lead.

FR-8.4 — Email authentication and deliverability · MVP · *Launch blocker*

- AC-1: SPF, DKIM, and DMARC are configured on the sending domain.
- AC-2: A confirmation email to a Gmail and an Outlook address lands in the inbox, and this is verified before launch.
- AC-3: Bounces and failures are visible, not silent.

Without this the capture function fails silently: confirmations go to spam, the prospect assumes no answer, and nothing anywhere reports an error.

FR-8.5 — Analytics and instrumentation · MVP

- AC-1: The events in §11 are tracked.

- AC-2: Analytics are cookieless, or a consent banner is implemented.

FR-8.6 — Search visibility · MVP Expanded from a bare baseline: v0.3 as built specified only enough to be indexable, which for a practice with no domain authority is not the same as being findable.

- AC-1: Every page carries a unique title of 62 characters or fewer and a meta description between 70 and 165, both written for a query rather than for navigation. Enforced by [scripts/verify.mjs](#).
- AC-2: Commercial pages carry the service term and, where the intent is local, the city. North America is the locked market (D-6); language expansion is deferred.
- AC-3: One Open Graph image per case study, plus a site default, generated from the site's own design tokens.
- AC-4: [sitemap.xml](#) with per-page [lastmod](#) taken from the page source's last commit, not from build time. Conversion-confirmation pages are excluded and carry [noindex](#).
- AC-5: Structured data is a single [@graph](#) per page with [@id](#)-linked nodes, so the organization, the website and the founder resolve as one entity across all pages: [Organization/ProfessionalService](#) with address and [areaServed](#), [WebSite](#), [Person](#) with credentials, [Service](#) per capability, [BreadcrumbList](#) on nested pages, and [CreativeWork](#) on case studies. Validated by [scripts/verify.mjs](#).
- AC-6: [sameAs](#) is emitted only once real profiles exist, never as an empty array, and person and organization keep separate lists ([FOUNDER_SAME_AS](#), [ORG_SAME_AS](#) in [src/site.ts](#)) — a personal profile on the Organization node would assert that the company *is* that profile. Entity corroboration is the largest single lever on a new domain and it is mostly off-site work — see §14 R-5.
- AC-7: Lighthouse SEO score of 90 or above at launch.

FR-8.9 — AI assistant visibility · MVP Assistants are a distribution channel for a practice that sells expertise, so this is specified rather than left to chance.

- AC-1: [/llms.txt](#) describes the practice, its services, its engagement models and its case studies in plain language, and is generated from the content collection so it cannot drift when a case study is added or unpublished.
- AC-2: [robots.txt](#) states an explicit per-crawler policy for the major AI agents rather than allowing them by omission, so the decision is visible and reversible.
- AC-3: The published FDD (FR-3.3) is linked from [/llms.txt](#) as a primary source document — it is the one genuinely unique artifact on the site.
- AC-4: Pages remain server-rendered static HTML with no client-side JavaScript (NFR-5), so no crawler needs to execute anything to read the content.

FR-8.7 — Site states · MVP

- AC-1: Thank-you page after intake and after booking, each with a clear next step.
- AC-2: Styled 404 routing back to the primary CTA.
- AC-3: Form errors are field-level and preserve entered data.

FR-8.8 — Domain configuration · MVP

- AC-1: [elarionsoftware.com](#) serves the site over HTTPS; [www](#) and apex resolve consistently to one canonical host.

- AC-2: [elarion.dev](#), if held, 301-redirects to the canonical [.com](#) host — resolving v0.1 open question
3. No separate microsite (3.2.9).

7. Data model

Field types are indicative. This is a conceptual model, not a schema.

D-1 — Lead

FIELD	TYPE	NOTES
id	uuid	
name	string	Required
email	string	Required
phone	string	Optional
company	string	Optional
role	string	Optional
problem_statement	text	Required
current_process	text	Optional — as-is
budget_band	enum	unknown , under_15k , 15_50k , 50_150k , over_150k
timeline_band	enum	unknown , asap , 1_3_months , 3_6_months , exploratory
existing_systems	text	Integration context
constraints_notes	text	Free text, supplements the bands
decision_maker	string	Who signs
engagement_model_interest	enum	EM-1...EM-6, unsure
source	enum	booking , intake_form , email , referral , phone , other
utm	json	Where available
consent_followup	bool + ts	FR-8.2
consent_marketing	bool + ts	Separate, not pre-ticked
stage	enum	See below
next_action	string	
next_action_date	date	
created_at	timestamp	

Lead stage enum (single vocabulary — resolves the v0.1 mismatch between the data model and the tracker): `new` → `qualifying` → `discovery_call_booked` → `proposal_drafting` → `proposal_sent` → `won` → `in_delivery` → `delivered` · terminal: `lost`, `no_fit`, `dormant`.

D-2 — CaseStudy

FIELD	TYPE	NOTES
id, title, slug		
engagement_type	enum	<code>own_product</code> , <code>client_delivery</code> , <code>fractional</code> — FR-3.1 AC-2
engagement_model	enum	EM-1...EM-6
client_type	string	Anonymizable: sector and size
problem	text	
approach	text	The BA work specifically
ba_artifacts	Artifact[]	See D-3
outcome	text	Metrics where available
tech_stack	string[]	
published	bool	

D-3 — Artifact

Introduced because publishing the artifact is the differentiator; a list of strings cannot carry a file.

FIELD	TYPE	NOTES
id, label		e.g. "As-is process map"
type	enum	<code>fdd</code> , <code>process_map</code> , <code>data_model</code> , <code>wireframe</code> , <code>requirements</code> , <code>other</code>
stage	enum	Which §4.2 stage produced it
file	file	Redacted version
public	bool	Gate on this, not on an email address

D-4 — Proposal

FIELD	TYPE	NOTES
id, lead_id		
engagement_model	enum	EM-1...EM-6
version	int	
sent_at	date	
phase1_fee, phase2_estimate	money	Phase 2 may be null pending analysis
status	enum	draft , sent , in_discussion , accepted , declined , expired
scope_agreement_form	enum	full_fdd , short_fdd , scope_annex , client_supplied — BR-1

D-5 — Engagement · P2

id, lead_id, proposal_id, engagement_model, current_stage (\$4.2), scope_agreement_status ([pending](#) / [agreed](#) / [amended](#)), status_page_url, next_milestone, owner.

8. Integrations

INTEGRATION	PURPOSE	PRIORITY	NOTES
Scheduler (Calendly or similar)	Discovery call booking	MVP	Primary CTA
Resend	Transactional email — prospect confirmation and internal notification	MVP	Sends from elarionsoftware.com, which must be verified in Resend; FR-8.4
Form backend	Intake persistence	MVP	Must not lose a submission on failure
Bot protection	Spam control	MVP	Invisible to users
Analytics	\$11 measurement	MVP	Cookieless preferred
Vercel	Hosting for elarionsoftware.com	MVP	The build must use the Vercel adapter; any other output layout 404s every route. Domain secured (A-1)
E-signature	FDD / SOW sign-off	P2	Email acceptance suffices at MVP
CRM / tracker	Lead and engagement tracking	P2	Spreadsheet or Notion at MVP

9. Business rules

Each rule states the default, the flexibility, and — where relevant — the line that does not move. This is the v0.2 rewrite of v0.1 §6.

BR-1 — Agreed written scope before build. *Default:* no build work begins without a written, client-agreed scope. *Flexes:* the form scales with the engagement — full FDD, short-form FDD, SOW scope annex, or a reviewed and confirmed client-supplied specification (§4.3). *Exception path:* where a client needs to start before analysis completes, work begins time-boxed and on time-and-materials, with a written scope agreed before any fixed-price commitment is made. *Does not move:* there is always something written and agreed. Nothing is built on a verbal scope at a fixed price.

BR-2 — Client-supplied requirements are accepted. Elarion does not require clients to redo analysis they have already done. Where a client brings a specification, backlog, or internal BA output, the BA role becomes validation and gap analysis — delivered as a short fixed-fee review (§4.3), not a full discovery phase. *Rationale:* v0.1's implied rejection of this scenario would have lost every prospect who arrived prepared.

BR-3 — Every channel is a valid entry point. Email, phone, referral, form, and booking all create a Lead and all can lead to a proposal. Qualification is governed by whether the discovery information is sufficient to write a responsible proposal — not by which channel it arrived through. *Replaces v0.1's "intake is the only path to a proposal."*

BR-4 — The first call is free. A time-boxed discovery call (30 minutes) is unbilled. Billable work starts only after a written proposal is accepted. This keeps the entry to the funnel free while keeping substantive analysis paid.

BR-5 — The client owns what they pay for. On payment, the client owns the FDD and all BA artifacts produced, including if they do not proceed to build. They may take the specification to another vendor. *This is stated publicly (FR-1.2 AC-4). It removes the single largest objection to paid analysis, and it is only safe to offer because the analysis itself is the product.*

BR-6 — Case study consent. Published only with consent or existing public context. The §2.3 assets are founder-owned (A-4). Third-party client case studies require written consent; anonymized publication is the fallback.

BR-7 — Out-of-fit leads are referred, not dropped. Where an ask falls outside what Elarion does, the response names someone who does it. Costs nothing, returns referrals.

BR-8 — Response time commitment. *Default:* every inbound lead receives a human response within **one business day**, stated publicly (FR-1.6 AC-3). Resolves D-4 (§13): same-day was considered and rejected because it cannot be held during a delivery crunch, and a missed public commitment costs more credibility than a modest one gains. *Note:* a response is an acknowledgement from a person with a next step — not necessarily an answer. The automated confirmation (FR-2.3 AC-1) does not satisfy it.

10. Non-functional requirements

ID	REQUIREMENT	ACCEPTANCE
NFR-1	Performance	Largest Contentful Paint under 2.0s on 4G mobile; Lighthouse performance ≥ 90
NFR-2	Mobile	Every page and both entry paths fully usable at 375px width; booking completable on mobile
NFR-3	Accessibility	WCAG 2.1 AA for contrast, keyboard navigation, form labels, focus states
NFR-4	Credibility	Site reads as carefully scoped, not templated — the artifact is the argument
NFR-5	Stack minimalism	Every page prerendered static with no client-side JavaScript. Exactly one server-rendered route, the lead endpoint, because an email API credential cannot ship to the browser. No database or auth at MVP
NFR-6	Security	HTTPS enforced; no secrets in the repository; form backend rate-limited
NFR-7	Data retention	Lead data retained no longer than the stated policy period; deletion on request
NFR-8	Browser support	Current and previous major versions of Chrome, Safari, Edge, Firefox

12. Release plan

RELEASE	CONTENTS	GATE
MVP	§6 items marked MVP: six pages, three entry points, the published case studies with artifacts, transactional email, trust and compliance baseline, manual proposal and tracking	Domain live, deliverability verified, privacy policy published
Phase 2	E-signature (FR-4.1 support), assisted proposal drafting (FR-4.3), engagement tracker (FR-6.2), case study PDF export (FR-3.4)	§11 measures met
Phase 3	Client portal (FR-5.2), CMS (FR-7.2)	Only on the triggers named in those requirements

13. Decisions closed

All open questions carried from v0.1 and v0.2 are now closed. Recorded here with their rationale, because a decision without a reason gets reopened every time someone new reads the document.

ID	DECISION	RATIONALE	IMPLEMENTED IN
D-1	No published pricing. Enquiry-led: commercial shape described in words, no figure anywhere public.	Scope varies too much between engagements for a published number to be right in both directions, and nobody self-selects out over a price they never saw. Trade-off documented under FR-1.7.	FR-1.7, FR-1.3 AC-1
D-2	This FDD is the public sample artifact, alongside one own-product artifact.	It is real, needs no redaction, and demonstrates the standard by being it. Avoids the delay and confidentiality review that redacting a client document would require.	FR-3.3
D-3	Privacy built to PIPEDA + Law 25 unconditionally.	The stricter standard is cheap to meet at this scale and removes the need to establish where a prospect resides before responding. Assumption A-5 is deliberately pessimistic.	FR-8.1 AC-3, A-5
D-4	One business day response commitment, not same-day.	Only commit to what holds during a delivery crunch. A missed public commitment costs more than a tighter one gains.	BR-8, FR-1.6 AC-3
D-6	North America first, English only. Flat facets (/services/ , /systems/ , /industries/), never nested; geography expressed in titles and schema rather than as a URL level. French deferred (Quebec first when it comes), Arabic deferred behind the right-to-left cost. The Estonian entity stays off the site so neither GDPR trigger — establishment nor targeting — attaches before there is EU revenue.	A nested facet tree produces hundreds of templated combination pages, which is what scaled-content-abuse policy targets and the worst possible bet for a domain with no authority.	FR-8.6 AC-2, §7 ORG.areaServed
D-5	Trademark clearance is an owner action, not a build dependency.	The domain is secured and the site can be built and launched while clearance proceeds. It is tracked as a risk (R-1) rather than a gate, so it cannot silently block delivery.	§14 R-1

Earlier decisions, closed in v0.2 and unchanged: both entry paths with booking primary (FR-2.1, FR-2.2); tracker deferred behind the §11 trigger (FR-6.2); [.dev](#) redirects to the canonical host (FR-8.8 AC-2). KriftAI visibility was reopened and re-decided — it is now a published case study rather than an About-page mention (FR-1.5 AC-2).

Glossary

TERM	MEANING
BA	Business Analysis / Business Analyst — the discipline of §4
FDD	Functional Design Document — the Requirements-stage artifact; this document is one
As-is / to-be	Current process versus target process
Scope annex	Short scope agreement attached to a SOW where a full FDD is disproportionate
EM-1...EM-6	Engagement models, §5
Phase 1 / Phase 2	Analysis engagement / build engagement under EM-1
SOW	Statement of Work — the contracting document
Acceptance criteria (AC)	Testable conditions under which a requirement is met

This FDD is an example of the artifact Elarion produces for clients at the Requirements stage of its method. It is written to be signed, scoped, and built from. Under FR-3.3 it is also the sample published on elarionsoftware.com — the practice's argument for itself is that it specified its own business to the standard it sells.