ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE — FICTIONAL CLIENT AND FIGURES, SHOWN FOR FORMAT ONLY



DECISION BRIEF — DAY 5 READOUT

# Azure Cost & Reliability Audit
# Northwind Analytics B.V.

| | |
|---|---|
| CLIENT<br>**Northwind Analytics B.V. (fictional)** | ENVIRONMENT<br>**2 subscriptions, 14 resource groups** |
| AGREED BASELINE<br>**EUR 32,400 / month** | AUDIT WINDOW<br>**Five business days** |
| ACCESS USED<br>**Reader + Cost Management Reader** | PREPARED BY<br>**Asif Bhat, Accepire** |

**How to read this brief.** Every finding is tied to a safe action, an owner, a risk note, and an annualised value estimate. Findings we could not evidence to that standard are listed separately and do not count toward the guarantee. The report ends with what we would leave alone, and why.

**About this sample.** Northwind Analytics is not a real company. The resources, figures, and findings on the following pages are invented to show the structure and depth of the deliverable. A real brief runs longer and is specific to your environment.

ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE — FICTIONAL CLIENT AND FIGURES, SHOWN FOR FORMAT ONLY

1 — SPEND BASELINE

## Where the EUR 32,400 goes each month.

| COST AREA | MAIN SERVICES | MONTHLY (EUR) | SHARE |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Compute** | Virtual machines, VM scale sets | 9,850 | 30% |
| **App hosting** | App Service Plans (3 production, 2 non-production) | 5,620 | 17% |
| **Databases** | Azure SQL (elastic pool + 4 single DBs), Cosmos DB | 6,140 | 19% |
| **AKS** | One production cluster, one staging cluster | 4,480 | 14% |
| **Storage** | Blob storage, managed disks, backup vault | 2,910 | 9% |
| **Observability** | Log Analytics, Application Insights | 2,190 | 7% |
| **Networking & other** | Egress, gateways, Fabric capacity, misc. | 1,210 | 4% |
| **Agreed monthly baseline (3-invoice average, Mar–May)** | | **32,400** | **100%** |

2 — DECISION SUMMARY

## EUR 3,750/month identified as safe to change. EUR 45,000 annualised.

Nine findings met the evidence standard. Ranked by value against risk, the first five are implementable inside two weeks by your own team from the register on the next page. Two further opportunities are listed as *needs more evidence* — they are plausible but were not verifiable with read-only access in five days, so they are excluded from the guarantee assessment.

> **Guarantee assessment.** Identified annualised savings of **EUR 45,000** against the threshold of **EUR 13,500** (three times the EUR 4,500 fee). The guarantee is met at 3.3× the threshold. Figures verified jointly at this readout against the evidence column of the register.

ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE — FICTIONAL CLIENT AND FIGURES, SHOWN FOR FORMAT ONLY

3 — RANKED SAFE-CHANGE REGISTER

## Nine findings, in the order we would action them.

| # | SAFE ACTION | OWNER | RISK NOTE | ANNUALISED (EUR) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Right-size the production App Service Plan from P3v3 to P1v3 (2 instances)**<br>Evidence: 30-day CPU average 11%, memory 34%; scale-out never triggered above 2 instances. | Platform team | LOW Scale rule retained; rollback is a tier change, minutes. | 10,900 |
| 2 | **Delete 14 unattached premium disks and 3 orphaned public IPs**<br>Evidence: unattached >120 days; source VMs deleted; no locks or references found. | Platform team | LOW Snapshot before delete; disks retained 14 days in soft-delete. | 7,600 |
| 3 | **1-year reserved instances for the 6 steady-state production VMs**<br>Evidence: flat 24/7 utilisation across 90 days; sized correctly after finding #4. | Finance + platform | LOW Commit only after right-sizing lands; instance-size-flexible RIs. | 8,700 |
| 4 | **Downsize 4 over-provisioned D8s_v5 VMs to D4s_v5**<br>Evidence: peak CPU under 25% over 90 days including month-end; no memory pressure. | Platform team | MEDIUM One VM hosts a legacy batch job; resize in a maintenance window, test the job, rollback is a resize. | 6,300 |
| 5 | **Move 8.2 TB of blob data untouched >90 days from Hot to Cool tier**<br>Evidence: last-access-time tracking enabled during audit; access log confirms archive pattern. | Data team | LOW Lifecycle rule, not manual move; read cost modelled and negligible. | 4,100 |
| 6 | **Reduce Log Analytics ingestion: drop verbose container logs, add table-level retention**<br>Evidence: 61% of ingested GB is debug-level AKS stdout never queried in 90 days of query history. | Platform team | MEDIUM Agree the drop list with on-call first; keep error/warn streams untouched. | 3,800 |
| 7 | **Scale the staging AKS cluster to zero outside working hours**<br>Evidence: no deployments or traffic 20:00–07:00 or weekends in 60 days of activity logs. | Platform team | LOW Automation runbook; first morning start monitored. | 2,200 |
| 8 | **Consolidate 4 single SQL databases into the existing elastic pool**<br>Evidence: combined peak DTU fits pool headroom with 40% margin; no cross-region dependency. | Data team | MEDIUM Move one DB per change window; performance baseline checked after each. | 1,000 |
| 9 | **Delete the idle VPN gateway in the decommissioned pilot resource group**<br>Evidence: zero tunnel connections since January; peered network removed. | Platform team | LOW Confirm with the team that owned the pilot before delete. | 400 |
| **Identified annualised value (guarantee basis)** | | | | **45,000** |

4 — NEEDS MORE EVIDENCE

## Plausible, but not verifiable in five days. Excluded from the guarantee.

### Cosmos DB provisioned throughput (~EUR 6,000/yr possible)

Utilisation metrics suggest autoscale would halve RU cost, but two collections are written by a third-party integration whose burst behaviour we could not observe with read-only access. Needs a two-week metric capture before a responsible call.

### Microsoft Fabric capacity pause schedule (~EUR 3,500/yr possible)

The F32 capacity idles overnight, but one scheduled refresh at 03:00 was added recently and its owner was unavailable during the audit window. Confirm the refresh is still needed, then pause on schedule.

5 — WHAT WE WOULD LEAVE ALONE

## Expensive, and correct.

### The production SQL elastic pool tier

It looks over-sized against average DTU, but month-end reporting genuinely uses the headroom. Downsizing would save ~EUR 4,800/yr and put the month-end close at risk. Not worth it.

### Zone-redundant deployment of the API tier

Halving the instance count would save money and remove your zone failover. The uptime commitment in your enterprise contracts depends on it. Keep it.

### Backup retention on customer-data stores

Retention is above the Azure default and costs more. It matches your stated contractual obligation to customers. Correct as configured.

### The second (staging) AKS cluster itself

Merging staging into the production cluster would save ~EUR 7,000/yr and couple the failure domains of test and production workloads. Scale it to zero off-hours (finding #7) instead.

6 — RELIABILITY AND OWNERSHIP NOTES

## Two risks found on the way. Neither costs money to leave — both cost money to hit.

### Single-region backup vault

Backups are healthy but live in the primary region only. A regional event takes the workload and its restore path together. Recommendation: enable geo-redundant vault storage (~EUR 60/month, not a saving — flagged as risk spend worth adding).

### No owner for cost drift

Nobody is accountable for the monthly bill. That is how the environment got here. Recommendation: name an operating owner and a 30-minute monthly review, or scope Managed Governance.

ILLUSTRATIVE SAMPLE — FICTIONAL CLIENT AND FIGURES, SHOWN FOR FORMAT ONLY

7 — GUARANTEE ASSESSMENT

## How the three-times promise is settled.

| TEST | BASIS | VALUE (EUR) |
|---|---|---|
| **Identified annualised savings** | Findings 1–9, evidence verified jointly at readout | 45,000 |
| **Guarantee threshold** | Three times the fixed fee of EUR 4,500 | 13,500 |
| **Result: guarantee met at 3.3× the threshold. Fee payable as agreed.** | | — |

The guarantee is assessed on identified savings, not implemented ones. Whether Northwind implements with its own team, with Accepire, or not at all is Northwind's call and does not change the assessment. Findings in section 4 are excluded from the figure above.

8 — RECOMMENDED ROUTE

## The order of work, whoever does it.

1. **Week 1:** findings 2, 5, 7, 9 — deletions, lifecycle rule, staging schedule. No production behaviour change.
2. **Week 2:** findings 1 and 4 in a maintenance window, then finding 3 (commit reservations only after sizes settle).
3. **Week 3:** findings 6 and 8 with the on-call and data teams respectively.
4. **Then:** the two needs-evidence items once the metric capture and refresh-owner questions close.
5. **Ongoing:** name a cost owner. A saved bill drifts back within quarters if nobody owns it.

> **If you want implementation done for you:** Azure Remediation scopes each approved finding as a fixed-price piece of work with a written rollback path. If your team implements, this register is the order and the risk notes are the guardrails. Either way, the decision is now yours to make on evidence.

CONTACT

**Asif Bhat** · Accepire Techsol Pvt. Ltd. · asif@accepire.com · accepire.com/book/ · Microsoft Partner ID 6771527