



FIELD NOTES / CUSTOMER ANALYTICS

Give the Analytics Trial Its Own Spending Decision

Record two authorisations: what you may spend to learn, and what still needs approval before the larger purchase.

WHAT YOU WILL DO

Approve a limited analytics trial separately from the larger purchase, and give both decisions a clear owner and end point.



SOURCE



INSIGHT



APPLICATION

ARTICLE / FILLABLE WORKSHEET / SOURCE NOTES



Create two spending authorisations

GTMA proposal: give an analytics evaluation its own spending decision. Record the trial fee, staff time, permitted access, end date and cancellation terms. Then create a separate, initially unapproved decision for the subscription or rollout. State its full commitment and decision owner. This makes it explicit which work can start and which purchase still needs a business case.

What the study can contribute

A paper in *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* reports a positive association between customer big data analytics and firm performance in a survey of 120 senior managers across multiple industries in Pakistan.

The authors describe a cross-sectional design: data were collected at one point in time. They say this restricts causal inference and prevents a full assessment of longer-term effects.

Our application: that association can motivate a question to investigate. It supplies neither your project's financial return nor evidence that these proposed authorisations improve purchasing decisions.

A fictional trial approval with a clear boundary

Fictional example: Priya is considering a customer-analytics subscription. The supplier offers a two-week evaluation for £600, with no automatic extension; internal staff time is budgeted at £300. The proposed annual subscription costs £12,000 before implementation. These are invented amounts, not benchmarks.

In this fictional example, Priya approves only the £900 evaluation. Its question is whether account managers can use the proposed output to choose a follow-up action more reliably than with their current records. The account lead will record disagreements, missing information and preparation time. Priya records the trial end date, assigns cancellation responsibility and schedules the separate purchase decision. The annual subscription remains unapproved.

Close the trial before opening the commitment

GTMA proposal: at the trial review, record what was learned, what remains uncertain and the total delivery cost. Useful output alone does not establish financial return. The purchase owner can approve the defined next commitment, decline it, or propose another explicitly funded evaluation. Reconcile the original trial fee and staff time, close or cancel its access as agreed, and record the second decision separately. Do not let an unfinished trial silently become an ongoing subscription.



Worksheet: record the two spending decisions

Complete one buying case. This is a GTMA proposal for structuring a decision. Keep customer and sensitive business information in your approved systems.

Type into the fields, or print. Save a copy to retain your answers.

01 / Authorisation A: evaluation only

Record the evaluation fee, staff-time budget, permitted work/access, approval owner, end date and cancellation responsibility. State the maximum commitment authorised now.

02 / Question and evidence for the trial

Name the customer decision, the uncertainty to resolve, the current-process comparison and the observations to collect. State what the trial cannot establish.

03 / Authorisation B: purchase still pending

Record the proposed subscription or rollout commitment, implementation and staff costs, decision owner/date, remaining business-case evidence and explicit approval status.

04 / Close A and decide B

Record actual evaluation cost, findings, remaining uncertainty and access closure/cancellation. Separately record the purchase decision, authorised commitment and owner - or an explicitly funded further evaluation.



Read further. Know the limits.

Source findings, GTMA proposals and fictional examples have different roles. Use the original research to examine its methods and context.

[1] Linking customer big data analytics to firm performance: evidence from B2B organizations in an emerging market context

Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence / Published: 2026-05-05

Reported positive association in a survey of 120 senior managers across multiple industries in Pakistan. Cross-sectional design; causal inference and longer-term effects are limited. The evaluation and worksheet are GTMA proposals, not methods validated by this study.

<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/artificial-intelligence/articles/10.3389/frai.2026.1757750/full>

What is attributed to the study

The paper reports a positive association between customer big data analytics and firm performance in a survey of 120 senior managers across multiple industries in Pakistan.

The authors describe the data as cross-sectional, collected at one point in time. They state that this restricts causal inference and that longer-term effects cannot be fully assessed.

What this does not establish

The finding does not supply the return on investment for your proposed project, prove that analytics caused an improvement, or establish that the results transfer to a particular SaaS team. No coefficient is converted into a percentage revenue increase.

The data-collection period is not established in the selected findings. Publication date is not a substitute for the observation period.

What GTMA proposes

The two spending authorisations, the trial closure process and the four worksheet prompts are GTMA proposals. They have not been validated by this paper.

Priya, the supplier terms and all amounts are fictional. The example approves a GBP900 evaluation while leaving a GBP12000 annual subscription unapproved. These are not benchmarks, and no customer or sales outcome is reported.

The worksheet is a GTMA proposal, not a research-validated instrument. Fictional examples are illustrations, not evidence of results.