

More orders. Less repetitive work. Room to grow.

Starting with a wholesaler generating EUR 10 million in annual net revenue: customer-specific commerce, Qommerce-funded setup and a long-term route towards full order coverage.

The partnership	The economics	The ambition
Qommerce takes care of and funds initial setup. Customer effort is kept low.	Measure removed work, price released capacity and distinguish it from avoided expenditure.	Expand towards processing 100% of the order flow, including assisted and connected channels.

The decision in one paragraph

For a wholesaler with repetitive order administration, a reliable digital flow can reduce effort per order and create room for growth. Whether it pays depends on actual order mix, net handling time, adoption, price and how released capacity is used. Qommerce offers a partnership intended to remove implementation burden and improve that flow over time. The financial examples in this paper are transparent scenarios, not customer results.

English edition. Amounts exclude VAT unless a source states otherwise. No measured Qommerce customer returns or service-performance results are asserted.

Choose a better operating model, then prove its value

Our starting case is a wholesaler with EUR 10 million annual net product revenue. At the assumed EUR 125 average order, this represents 80,000 orders per year. The illustration assumes this order base is eligible for migration; an existing efficient EDI share must be removed from the savings base and the forecast recalculated. Revenue is constant over the three years; platform migration is not additional sales.

A wholesale order is more than an ERP entry. It can involve customer identification, contract pricing, units, stock checks, approvals, confirmation, changes and follow-up. When volume grows, that work can consume the capacity that the business needs for customer service and selling.

What Qommerce takes responsibility for

Qommerce prepares and funds the initial setup, coordinates agreed integration and data preparation, and leads onboarding. The customer supplies necessary access, confirms commercial rules and accepts the result. The service objective is little to negligible customer implementation effort; no measured number of customer hours is promised. The wholesaler retains its brand, customer relationship, commercial decisions and fulfilment.

What the illustrative economics say

For a EUR 10m wholesaler, an assumed EUR 125 average order implies 80,000 orders a year. With conditional eight-minute net savings on migrated orders and migration rising from 40% to 80%, three-year gross capacity value is EUR 920,746. Proposed platform fees total EUR 202,000. After fees and the indexed extra-work allowance, the case produces EUR 711,018 net capacity value. At 50% conversion to avoided expenditure, cash net is EUR 250,646. The operating assumptions remain unmeasured; costs beyond the included extra-work allowance reduce both outcomes.

Three different reasons to invest

Cost reduction requires documented avoided expenditure. Growth capacity requires a credible plan to use freed time for additional orders or better service. Resilience requires evidence that peaks and exceptions can be handled reliably. These are distinct objectives: the same released hours cannot be sold as payroll savings, extra selling time and avoided hiring simultaneously.

Read sections 06-09 for assumptions, ROI and pricing; 10-11 for alternatives; the final research and financial summaries compare all five profiles.

Use research for context, not a borrowed ROI claim

The most relevant published comparison [1]

APQC's 2016 sales-order paper reports a median channel-processing cost of USD 12.60 for traditional channels (N=755) and USD 4.00 for new digital channels (N=758). It also reports a USD 24.21 median for a separate total-order-management measure (N=608). These are different measures and samples. They must not be combined or treated as Dutch wholesale averages.

How much confidence does that support?

The paper is historical and cross-industry, with sponsor commentary from Esker. The channel groups are not a controlled before/after experiment. Their cost difference is not a promised automation saving. Values remain in original dollars: no inflation, currency or country adjustment is applied. The evidence supports measuring order administration, not copying a benchmark into a customer forecast.

Dutch labour costs provide a second reference [2]

CBS reports approximately EUR 48 labour cost per hour worked across the Dutch economy in 2025. Its trade table shows EUR 30.8 wages plus EUR 8.7 employer charges per hour, or EUR 39.5 combined; trade includes more than wholesale. Neither is an order-desk role rate. The example uses an explicitly assumed EUR 45/hour and tests EUR 48 separately. Use actual employer costs for the decision.

Demand for a digital channel is a separate question [3,4]

McKinsey B2B Pulse 2024 surveyed nearly 4,000 decision makers across 13 countries and 34 sectors. It reports 71% offering e-commerce and a 34% revenue share among organisations offering that channel. Eurostat reports 23.8% of covered EU enterprises making e-sales in 2023, including web/app and EDI orders. Different populations and definitions explain why the percentages cannot be compared directly; neither establishes Qcommerce savings.

Conclusion from the research

No recent representative Dutch wholesale average is established by these sources. Avoid claims such as "every order costs EUR 20" or "automation saves 70%". Establish the partner's process boundary, observe its work and report the weighted cost per order. Published figures provide context and challenge unrealistic assumptions.

03 / ACTIVITY-BASED ORDER COST

Count the work around the order, not just typing

Define administrative processing from receipt to administrative closure. Sum active minutes across every employee involved. A five-minute call involving two staff consumes ten staff-minutes; waiting for a reply is elapsed time, not automatically labour time. Separate warehouse handling, packaging and delivery unless a specific measured change affects them.

Activity	Illustrative minutes	What to observe
Receive and identify	2	Find customer, read request and identify order lines
Interpret and enter	4	Map SKUs, units, quantities and enter the order
Validate conditions	3	Check price, stock, credit, address and delivery
Confirm and amend	2	Confirmation and subsequent changes
Follow up	2	Status questions and exception handling
Close administration	2	Invoice checks and expected correction effort
Total example	15	Assumed activity budget, not a measured average

Convert minutes into a transparent cost

At the assumed EUR 45/hour, eight minutes costs EUR 6.00, 15 minutes EUR 11.25, 20 minutes EUR 15.00 and 30 minutes EUR 22.50 in labour. These calculations explain why a EUR 10-20 working range can be plausible for some manual workflows; they do not establish that range as a sector average. Add attributable systems and overhead separately, avoiding costs already included in the hourly rate.

Avoid two common accounting errors

Allocate exceptional work by frequency: a 20-minute correction on 5% of orders adds one minute per order, not 20. Account for unsuccessful quotes separately or allocate their costs transparently; a forecast based only on clean completed orders understates the work. In the ROI model, net time saved already includes remaining order work and must not be counted again as extra overhead.

What the financial example actually assumes

The main model conditionally applies 11 manual minutes and three digital minutes, giving eight minutes saved, as informed by the external supplier benchmark in the research section. It does not replace that narrow scenario with the 15-minute activity example above. Before proposing savings, measure comparable orders by line count, complexity, channel and exception frequency. Report weighted means for cost, with medians and ranges for operational context.

04 / CAPACITY AND THE NEXT STAGE OF GROWTH

Time released today can become capacity tomorrow

A digital order flow can change how effort scales with demand. Customer-specific prices, repeat lists and validated data can reduce repeated checks and entry. If the team handles less routine work per order, growth does not have to bring a proportional increase in administrative staffing. That is an opportunity to demonstrate, not unlimited capacity or guaranteed headcount savings.

Illustrative operating situation	Orders/year	Active minutes/order	Labour value, EUR
EUR 10m baseline at EUR 125/order	80,000	11	660,000
Twice the demand, unchanged process	160,000	11	1,320,000
Twice the demand, improved process	160,000	3	360,000

Decide where the capacity goes

Choose an explicit use: absorb forecast demand, avoid a budgeted hire, reduce overtime, improve response times or return sales staff to customer advice. Name an owner and measure the result. Eight minutes saved in fragmented periods is not automatically eight minutes of usable capacity; peaks, skill requirements and task switching can reduce realisation.

Our ambition is 100% order-flow coverage

Qcommerce is willing to invest in a long-term partnership and expand towards processing 100% of a partner's orders. Start with suitable recurring orders, then extend to additional products, accounts, configurations, channels and exceptions. The 80% adoption in the financial scenario is an input, not a ceiling on the partnership.

Full coverage is broader than self-service

Customer self-service, connected EDI/API orders and sales-desk-assisted orders can share one governed flow. Measure coverage of all orders, customer self-service adoption and straight-through processing separately. Human approval can remain appropriate for credit, unusual terms or complex configurations. Already-efficient EDI should not be disrupted merely to increase a portal metric.

Capacity must be verified at every layer

Administrative productivity does not establish database capacity, ERP throughput or warehouse capacity. Test peak order rates, synchronisation, pricing and recovery before expanding. The financial illustration uses the proposed declining marginal schedule in section 09. Confirm channel fees and capacity before expansion. The doubled-volume labour-value example is not a revenue-share forecast.

05 / A PARTNERSHIP THAT REMOVES SETUP BURDEN

Qcommerce leads delivery; the wholesaler keeps control

Work	Qcommerce takes care of	Customer contribution
Prepare	Scope, source mapping, data preparation and implementation plan	Authorise access; name a decision contact
Configure	Catalogue, price rules, accounts and agreed ERP connection	Confirm commercial rules and representative cases
Validate	Test execution, reconciliation and recovery demonstrations	Approve results and resolve policy questions
Launch	Initial onboarding, guided rollout and agreed monitoring	Approve launch and introductions where needed
Improve	Measure friction and propose agreed extensions	Confirm priorities and business outcomes

Who pays for the first setup?

Qcommerce absorbs initial setup within the agreed delivery scope as an investment in a long-term relationship. It is not added to customer setup costs in the model. The intention is little to negligible implementation time for the customer. Necessary authorisation and acceptance still belong with the wholesaler; complex commercial decisions cannot be made on its behalf without agreement.

Commercial and data ownership

The wholesaler remains seller of the goods, sets commercial conditions, accepts orders and manages fulfilment and invoicing. It retains its customer relationship and control of its business data. The agreement must specify data ownership, permitted processing, export, retention and continuity. Qcommerce operates the agreed digital service and coordinates its technical delivery.

Proposed scope versus accepted capability

Customer assortments, contract pricing, product configuration, repeat ordering and order visibility form the proposed service scope. Each partner's ERP version, units and commercial exceptions require confirmation. A capability is ready for that partner when its acceptance criteria pass; a feature description alone is insufficient.

Keep expansion deliberate

Qcommerce's willingness to grow the service should become an agreed improvement plan, not an undefined promise of unlimited bespoke work. Specify included services, later change scope and review points. A change outside agreed scope requires prior agreement; setup overruns within the funded scope are not an automatic customer surcharge.

Make the economics easy to inspect and replace

Input	Research-informed scenario	Evidence status
Annual net wholesale revenue	EUR 10,000,000; unchanged each year	Starting business size
Eligible annual orders	80,000 at assumed EUR 125/order	Full-base eligibility assumption; exclude efficient EDI
Annual-average migration	40% / 65% / 80%	Assumption, not a forecast
Manual / digital handling	11 / 3 minutes; conditional 8-minute active-time saving	External benchmark; Qcommerce transfer requires measurement
Loaded labour rate	EUR 45/hour initially; +3% yearly	Assumption; CBS context is not a role rate
Customer initial setup	EUR 0; Qcommerce-funded	Stated operating model
Additional customer costs	EUR 2,500 initially; +3% yearly	Planning allowance; no setup charge
Cost avoidance / discount	100% main cash condition; 50% sensitivity; 8% NPV hurdle	Avoided costs require validation

Core formulas

Migrated orders = eligible orders x migration share. Gross capacity value B = migrated orders x net minutes saved / 60 x loaded hourly cost. Recurring customer cost C = platform fee F + actual additional customer costs O. Capacity-based net value = B - C; cash net = $r \times B - C$, where r is the share backed by avoided expenditure. Cumulative ROI = cumulative net value / total incremental cost over the same period.

A precise base-case boundary

Qcommerce funds setup. Recurring extra customer work is budgeted at EUR 2,500 initially, rising 3% annually. The eight-minute saving is informed by the published 11/3-minute benchmark, but remains conditional on equivalent active-time savings at the customer. Full cash ROI assumes personnel expenditure is removed or planned hiring is avoided; 50% is a separate downside sensitivity. See the research section for source limitations.

Benefits and exclusions

No incremental sales, error reduction, customer-time benefit or working-capital improvement is counted. Orders are assumed invoiced on account with no incremental payment cost. Returns and credits are reflected in net revenue; there is no invoice delay. Tax, financing, terminal value and unquoted exit costs are excluded. Nominal annual values use 3% labour/cost indexation; prices and volumes are otherwise constant.

07 / THREE-YEAR CUSTOMER ECONOMICS

Savings, costs and ROI in euros

EUR 10m wholesaler; conditional eight-minute saving, EUR 2,500 initial extra annual work and declining marginal fees. Full cost avoidance and a separate 50% sensitivity are shown. EUR unless stated.

Metric	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Average migration	40%	65%	80%
Migrated orders	32,000	52,000	64,000
Net platform revenue	4,000,000	6,500,000	8,000,000
Labour saving; full cost avoidance	192,000	321,360	407,386
Platform fee	50,000	70,000	82,000
Customer setup cost	0	0	0
Extra customer work	2,500	2,575	2,652
Net saving; full cost avoidance	139,500	248,785	322,733
ROI; full cost avoidance	265.7%	342.8%	381.2%
Sensitivity: net at 50% cost avoidance	43,500	88,105	119,041

Three-year result

Gross capacity value: EUR 920,746. Fees: EUR 202,000. Net capacity value: EUR 711,018; capacity-based ROI: 339.0%. At 50% avoided-expenditure realisation, cash net is EUR 250,646 and cash ROI is 119.5%. At an 8% assumed hurdle, capacity-value NPV is EUR 598,656 and cash NPV is EUR 210,312.

Read the result correctly

Released time is not automatically a cash saving. If no expense or planned hire is avoided, it is zero and the cash net is negative and equals minus the fees and actual extra costs. A business can still choose capacity-led growth, but should document forecast demand and how the freed time will be used. Do not add avoided hiring on top of the same capacity value.

Timing and payback

Year 1 begins with operation after implementation. There is no customer setup investment to recover, so setup payback is not a useful headline. Both the full-cost-avoidance case and the 50% sensitivity are positive annually under these assumptions. Full cost avoidance requires the corresponding expenditure to be eliminated or a planned hire to be avoided. Annual-average adoption is not a monthly schedule: reforecast from actual launch and billing dates.

08 / DOWNSIDE AND DECISION THRESHOLDS

Show what changes the answer

All sensitivities below are assumptions, not probabilities. The annual fee bands are recalculated from actual scenario revenue. Other inputs follow section 06.

Net minutes saved	3-year capacity net EUR	3-year cash net EUR; 50%
3	135,552	-37,087
4	250,646	20,459
8	711,018	250,646

Additional annual customer costs: initial allowance, rising 3% each year. These are sensitivities, not required charges.

Extra Year 1 cost EUR	3-year total cost EUR	3-year capacity net EUR
0	202,000	718,746
2,500	209,727	711,018
10,000	232,909	687,837

Other meaningful challenges

At 20%/40%/65% adoption and eight minutes saved, capacity net is EUR 465,034 and cash net at 50% is EUR 152,653. Using EUR 48/hour initially instead of EUR 45 changes base capacity net to EUR 772,401. A higher hourly value is not evidence that more expenditure can be avoided. A real launch delay may add parallel-running costs even if the revenue fee starts later.

Break-even that can be tested

At 80% coverage, 64,000 orders and EUR 45/hour, eight minutes saved is EUR 384,000. The EUR 82,000 fee plus EUR 2,500 extra work gives EUR 84,500 total annual customer cost. Break-even requires 1.76 saved minutes with full cost avoidance, or 3.52 minutes at 50%. Net benefit is EUR 299,500 and ROI is 354.4% with full cost avoidance; at 50%, net benefit is EUR 107,500 and ROI is 127.2%.

Reject unsupported upside

Do not repair a weak case by assuming higher sales or zero exceptions. Record downside tolerance before launch. Require a documented use for capacity, a finance-approved cash register where cash is claimed and a review when fees or order mix change.

Initial investment belongs with Qcommerce

Qcommerce funds the initial setup because it believes in a long-term collaboration. The commercial proposal then links recurring compensation to agreed net platform revenue. This aligns part of the fee with usage, but does not automatically align it with the customer's incremental profit: existing orders moving online can also attract fees.

Annual marginal covered-revenue band	Proposed rate	Fee at EUR 8m
First EUR 1m	2.0%	EUR 20,000
EUR 1m to EUR 2.5m	1.2%	EUR 18,000
EUR 2.5m to EUR 10m	0.8%	EUR 44,000
EUR 10m to 25m / 25m to 50m	0.5% / 0.3%	Not reached
EUR 50m to 100m / 100m to 250m	0.2% / 0.12%	Not reached
Total at EUR 8m	1.025% effective	EUR 82,000

What those rates mean for margin

At EUR 8m covered turnover and an assumed 20% product gross margin, product gross profit is EUR 1.6m; the EUR 82,000 fee uses 5.125% of it. Product margin remains an assumption. Large order values can increase fees without proportionally increasing removable administrative work.

Define the billable base

Bands reset annually and apply marginally to covered net invoiced product revenue after credits, excluding VAT. Agree treatment of shipping, cancellations and connected orders. No minimum fee, annual tariff increase or exit penalty is assumed. The schedule is proposed, not an agreed customer contract.

Make included services unambiguous

The agreement should list funded setup, agreed integration, hosting, support and maintenance, acceptance criteria, later changes, term, termination, export and continuity. Record any outside supplier charges before launch. Funding setup is an operating commitment; the illustrated fee bands remain a proposal until agreed.

Evaluate fairness against value and alternatives

No research establishes the proposed percentages as market-standard or optimal. Compare value per order, customer margin and a like-for-like supplier quote. A cap or different tariff may be appropriate if revenue rises without equivalent processing value. No alternative Qcommerce tariff is offered by this paper.

10 / ALTERNATIVES AND FIT

Qommerce should earn selection against a real shortlist

The assessments below are interpretations of vendor documentation [5-10], not independently tested rankings. Demonstrate the same representative orders and ERP behaviour on each shortlisted route.

Route	When it may fit	Key evidence to request
Current process / targeted automation	Low volumes, effective EDI or advisory orders	Cost of continuing work versus a narrow improvement
Existing ERP portal / Sana [8]	Supported SAP or Microsoft Dynamics; ERP-led pricing	ERP-version fit, exceptions, upgrade and outage behaviour
Shopify [5-7]	Standard wholesale or blended B2B/B2C	Plan catalog limits, direct account pricing, unit/configuration fit
BigCommerce B2B [9]	Account pricing, buyer portals, quoting and approvals	B2B package, connector, roles and exception handling
Adobe Commerce [10]	Broad B2B needs and an implementation ecosystem	Deployment/package scope, pricing and ongoing ownership
Custom build	Requirements materially exceed standard capabilities	Scoped delivery estimate, maintenance, security and succession
Qommerce	Customer-specific ordering with provider-led setup	Accepted workflow fit, measured value and sustainable delivery

Avoid a false enterprise-versus-custom choice

Shopify offers B2B catalogs on Basic, Grow and Advanced, with up to three active catalogs across B2B markets. Plus supports unlimited catalogs and direct company/location assignment [6]. A lower plan may be sufficient for simpler businesses. A public feature does not establish fit for complex wholesale units or all contract conditions.

Run one fair proof of concept

Test a repeat order, a contract-price exception, mixed units, rounding, approval, an amended order, a credit and ERP downtime. Score correctness and total staff effort before visual polish. Reject any route, including Qommerce, that cannot preserve agreed prices, access boundaries or reliable order transfer.

11 / PRICING AND TOTAL COST

Compare complete delivery boundaries

Public vendor pages checked 14 October 2026. Published prices are indications, not a supplier quote. Localised displays and contract terms can differ; obtain an EUR offer and confirm taxes, billing term and eligible features.

Route / source	Published price indication	What remains outside comparison
Shopify Basic / Grow / Advanced [5]	Observed annual-billing displays: EUR 27 / 79 / 289 monthly; reconfirm region	Apps, configuration, integration, internal work and transaction charges
Shopify Plus [7]	From EUR 2,100/month on 3-year term; EUR 2,250 on 1-year term	Variable pricing may apply; implementation and other charges need scoping
Sana [8]	Request pricing by plan and ERP	No comparable complete quotation established
BigCommerce B2B [9]	Scoped B2B package price to confirm	No complete B2B quotation established
Adobe Commerce [10]	Customised pricing request	Deployment, implementation and ongoing scope
Qcommerce proposal	EUR 202,000 fees over the illustrated 3-year adoption path; declining marginal bands; initial setup funded	Actual extra customer work or services outside agreed scope

What the published numbers can tell us

At unchanged prices, the observed lower-plan subscription displays imply EUR 972, EUR 2,844 and EUR 10,404 over 36 months. The Plus three-year subscription floor is EUR 75,600. These are subscription calculations, not complete implementation budgets. Qcommerce's illustrated fees are EUR 126,400 above that Plus floor; included setup and delivery scope must be priced before interpreting the difference.

Use one procurement worksheet

For each route, collect setup paid by the customer, three years of subscription/usage fees, adapters, apps, payment charges where relevant, support, maintenance, internal work, upgrades and exit. Identify who pays each item and when. Deduct only avoidable current costs, not sunk expenditure. Missing quotes remain unknown, never zero; keep the same order cohort and demonstrated benefit boundary.

Do not assert a cost advantage prematurely

Qcommerce can offer lower customer implementation burden without being the cheapest subscription. Its investment must translate into credible delivery and a useful operating result. Select the route with the strongest demonstrated fit and total economics for this wholesaler, not the most favourable headline comparison.

12 / A PILOT THAT CAN ANSWER THE HARD QUESTIONS

Keep customer effort low while making the evidence usable

Stage	Qcommerce prepares and executes	Customer checkpoint
Baseline	Order extract, segmentation, time-study plan and cost model	Approve access, cohort and business rules
Restricted launch	Setup, test cases, onboarding and reconciliation	Approve cases and release the cohort
Measure	Handling-time study, adoption report, exceptions and cost reconciliation	Confirm operational reality and any avoided expense
Decide	Downside forecast, improvement options and rollout/exit plan	Approve expand, adjust or stop

Measure the complete administrative change

Use a baseline period of roughly 2-4 weeks and an 8-12-week controlled pilot as planning suggestions, not implementation guarantees. Sample comparable orders across line counts, channels and complexity; 100 orders can be a starting point, not statistical assurance. Include failures, extra work and unchanged orders. Separate active time from waiting and use the weighted mean for cost.

Control bias and extrapolation

Freeze eligibility before launch. Compare before/after changes with a non-pilot cohort where practical and disclose selection effects. Track seasonality, staffing and other process changes. A short pilot may not establish retention or peak-load economics. Extrapolate with ranges and the measured mix, rather than applying the cleanest pilot orders to the whole business.

Define success before launch

Agree a spending limit, a minimum useful net saving, an adoption target and a cash or capacity-use hurdle. Record these as partner-specific criteria, not universal benchmarks. Pause affected flows for wrong prices, unauthorised data access or unreconciled missing/duplicate orders. Expand only after corrective actions and acceptance evidence support doing so.

Keep the measurement service with Qcommerce

Qcommerce should provide the collection tools, analysis and a short decision report. The customer validates assumptions and commercial choices rather than running an internal implementation project. Record actual customer time so that the low-effort service promise can itself be assessed.

13 / RELIABLE OPERATIONS AT GREATER COVERAGE

Growth depends on correct orders, not just a faster screen

Control	Acceptance evidence
Identity and access	Buyer sees only authorised accounts, products and prices; test cross-account access
Price and units	Representative totals reproduce agreed contracts; stale data follows approved rules
Order lifecycle	Submitted, accepted and rejected states are distinct; amendments and credits reconcile
ERP recovery	Retries do not duplicate orders; failed transfers are visible, recoverable and reconciled
Peak demand	Test order mix, pricing and synchronisation at agreed peaks and safety margin
Business continuity	Demonstrate restore and fallback; reconcile open orders after recovery

A clear responsibility split

The wholesaler decides commercial policy, credit acceptance and fulfilment. Qcommerce delivers the agreed service and coordinates integration and monitoring. Identify ERP supplier dependencies and the source of truth for every data set. A portal confirmation must not imply ERP acceptance or guaranteed stock unless that state has been verified.

Agree the service terms

Specify support hours, severity levels, response and restoration targets, measured availability, exclusions, retention, recovery objectives, hosting/subprocessors and incident communication. This paper supplies no numerical SLA. Production capability requires evidence in the partner environment; commercial availability and technical capacity must both be agreed.

Make improvement and exit part of delivery

Review exception effort, repeat ordering, coverage and service cost at agreed intervals. Prioritise extensions that remove recurring work. Define data export, transition assistance, deletion/retention and handling of open orders before launch. A long-term partnership should remain valuable through good execution and clear responsibilities.

Separate a credible proposition from an observed result

Status	What belongs in this class
Company operating commitment	Qcommerce leads and funds initial setup; low customer-effort objective; willingness to expand towards full order coverage
Published evidence	Historical APQC cost comparisons; CBS labour context; B2B adoption research; vendor features and price indications
Commercial proposal	Marginal revenue fees, included services and final contract terms
Assumptions	Order profiles, conditional 11/3-minute active handling, migration, EUR 45/hour, indexation, cash share, discount and extra-cost scenarios
Calculated outputs	Fees, capacity value, cash scenarios, sensitivity, break-even and NPV
Measured partner outcomes	None presented; validate costs, useful capacity, correctness and service reliability

Approve expansion when the evidence supports it

Require an accepted order flow, a measured net reduction in work, a credible plan for released capacity or avoided expenditure, an acceptable downside and a competitive total delivery cost. A positive capacity model alone is not proof of positive cash ROI. If the hurdle fails, improve scope or commercial terms, or stop with reconciled orders and an orderly transition.

The supplier case must also work

Qcommerce's initial investment is real even when customer setup is zero. Track delivery effort, hosting, support, maintenance and future change cost per partner. Fees must recover those costs over the agreed relationship. The five-profile summary provides assumed setup budgets and supplier contribution, not measured costs or margins. A sustainable contribution supports continued development; willingness to invest is not unlimited financing.

A concrete next step

Qcommerce prepares a short partner brief: first cohort, source access, representative orders, included setup, price basis, baseline, success thresholds and an expansion path. The wholesaler supplies a decision contact and validates commercial rules. The objective is a low-effort start and a measurable route to greater order coverage.

hello@qcommerce.nl | qcommerce.nl

15 / RESEARCH SOURCES

Original findings, dates and limitations

Sources checked 14 October 2026. Observed research years and scenario years are kept distinct.

[1] Mary Driscoll / APQC (2016). Cutting the Costs of Sales Order Processing. Figures 1-2 distinguish total management from channel costs. Sponsor commentary by Esker is not used as an ROI guarantee.

[Read original source \[1\]](#)

[2] CBS (2026). De arbeidsmarkt in cijfers 2025, Lonen en loonkosten. Table 5.8: economy-wide and trade wage/employer-charge context. Trade is broader than wholesale; figures are not role-specific.

[Read original source \[2\]](#)

[3] McKinsey & Company (12 September 2024). Five fundamental truths: How B2B winners keep growing. International, self-reported B2B Pulse survey; association is not causal evidence of Qcommerce results.

[Read original source \[3\]](#)

[4] Eurostat (27 February 2025). EU enterprises online sales reach new heights in 2023; dataset isoc_ec_esels. Enterprises with at least 10 persons employed in specified sectors; includes web/app and EDI sales.

[Read original source \[4\]](#)

Calculation conventions

All five profiles use conditional eight-minute savings, EUR 45/hour initially, 3% annual labour and extra-work indexation, 40%/65%/80% coverage and the complete declining marginal schedule. Customer setup is zero. Extra customer work starts at EUR 2,500 / 5,000 / 10,000 / 15,000 / 25,000. Full cost avoidance is the main cash condition; 50% is a sensitivity. Three-year ROI divides total net benefit by total customer cost, never an average of annual ROI percentages. NPV uses year-end values and an assumed 8% discount. The unindexed annual comparison uses 80% coverage at initial cost rates, so it differs from indexed operating Year 3. Amounts round to whole euros after calculation.

Evidence that would strengthen the decision

A representative partner order extract, a weighted time study, actual loaded costs, verified avoided expenditure, a forecast use for capacity, comparable supplier quotes and accepted production tests would replace the principal assumptions. Reconfirm public pricing before procurement. Do not describe an international or historical benchmark as a measured Dutch customer outcome.

Price and capability evidence for a fair shortlist

[5] Shopify Netherlands. Pricing. Observed EUR annual-billing displays require local currency/term confirmation.

<https://www.shopify.com/nl/prijzen>

[6] Shopify Help Center. Catalogs and pricing in B2B. Plan limits and company/location assignment.

<https://help.shopify.com/en/manual/b2b/catalogs/index>

[7] Shopify Plus. Pricing. Term rates, variable platform pricing and additional charge conditions.

<https://www.shopify.com/plus/pricing>

[8] Sana Commerce. Plans and pricing request. Supported ERP families, product plans and capabilities.

<https://www.sana-commerce.com/pricing/>

[9] BigCommerce. B2B ecommerce platform. Buyer accounts, pricing, quoting and approval capabilities; complete package price requires confirmation.

<https://www.bigcommerce.com/solutions/b2b-ecommerce-platform/>

[10] Adobe. Commerce packages and pricing. Deployment options, B2B scope and customised pricing.

<https://business.adobe.com/products/magento/pricing.html>

How these sources are used

Vendor pages support statements about their own listed products and prices. They are not independent evidence of cost advantage or customer savings. A feature list does not confirm acceptance of a partner's workflows; subscription prices do not establish complete implementation cost. Qcommerce's fee proposal must be assessed on the same basis.

RESEARCH / ORDER PROCESSING TIME

From published minutes to customer economics

Published evidence and transfer assumptions are separate. Figures concern administrative order processing, not picking, transport or payment waiting time.

Published benchmark: 11 minutes manual, 3 minutes automated

Esker (23 September 2025) reports medians of 11 manual minutes and 3 adjusted automated minutes from its global customer base, describing hundreds of customer-service departments. The 8-minute gap is a difference between published medians, not a verified mean paired saving per order. This supplier benchmark is neither an independent Dutch wholesale average nor evidence of Qcommerce performance. The public article does not disclose exact sample sizes per metric, weighting, process boundaries or an active-labour versus elapsed-time definition. [T1]

Dutch wholesale cross-check: approximately 4 minutes to less than 1

Incentro reports that Woodvision, a Dutch garden-timber wholesaler, needed approximately four employee minutes for nine steps into its ERP, with about four order lines. After automation, processing reportedly took less than one minute. This supports a conservative three-minute scenario for comparable intake work; it is one supplier-published customer case, not a sector average. It does not establish additional invoice or after-sales savings. [T2]

What we calculate, and what remains an assumption

Use 3 minutes as a conservative case-informed scenario and 8 minutes as a broader benchmark-informed scenario. Neither is a promised Qcommerce result. The 8-minute labour calculation is conditional on observing the same reduction in active employee time, including residual checking and exceptions. Do not average the two sources or label 11 minutes an arithmetic average. EUR 45/hour, average order values and 80% annual coverage remain planning assumptions.

Worked example: a EUR 10m wholesaler

EUR 10,000,000 / EUR 125 per order = 80,000 annual orders. At 80% coverage: 64,000 comparable orders. If active handling falls from 11 to 3 minutes: $8 / 60 \times \text{EUR } 45 = \text{EUR } 6$ saved labour cost per order; $64,000 \times \text{EUR } 6 = \text{EUR } 384,000$ annual labour value. No FTE conversion is used. The manual and residual labour values are EUR 528,000 and EUR 144,000 respectively. At three minutes saved, capacity value is EUR 144,000.

Qcommerce funds agreed initial setup.

[T1] Esker, 23 September 2025. [Order management benchmarks](#). [T2] Incentro, undated, accessed 14 October 2026. [Woodvision order intake case](#). Both are supplier publications.

RESEARCH / FIVE WHOLESALE SCENARIOS

What those minutes mean in euros

Annual figures at 80% coverage and EUR 45/hour. Money is shown directly, without FTE conversion. Full cost avoidance assumes the corresponding personnel expenditure is removed or a planned hire is avoided.

Annual wholesaler turnover	10m	25m	50m	100m	250m
Covered share of turnover	80%	80%	80%	80%	80%
Covered annual revenue, EUR	8,000,000	20,000,000	40,000,000	80,000,000	200,000,000
Assumed average order, EUR	125	200	300	500	1,000
Covered orders / year	64,000	100,000	133,333	160,000	200,000
Gross labour saving: 8 min	384,000	600,000	800,000	960,000	1,200,000
Less: Qcommerce annual fee	82,000	148,000	218,000	308,000	468,000
Less: extra customer work	2,500	5,000	10,000	15,000	25,000
Net saving: full cost avoidance	299,500	447,000	572,000	637,000	707,000
ROI: full cost avoidance	354.4%	292.2%	250.9%	197.2%	143.4%
Sensitivity: net at 50% avoidance	107,500	147,000	172,000	157,000	107,000
Sensitivity: ROI at 50% avoidance	127.2%	96.1%	75.4%	48.6%	21.7%

One ROI definition for every profile

$ROI = (\text{avoided labour cost} - \text{Qcommerce fee} - \text{extra customer cost}) / (\text{Qcommerce fee} + \text{extra customer cost})$.

Full cost avoidance requires expenditure to disappear or planned hiring to be avoided. At EUR 10m, EUR 384,000 gross saving less EUR 84,500 customer cost gives EUR 299,500 net benefit and 354.4% ROI. At 50% cost avoidance, net benefit is EUR 107,500 and ROI is 127.2%. Without avoided spending, the labour value represents capacity for growth.

Same commercial assumptions

Marginal rates on annual covered turnover: 2% to EUR 1m; 1.2% to 2.5m; 0.8% to 10m; 0.5% to 25m; 0.3% to 50m; 0.2% to 100m; 0.12% to 250m. Each rate applies only within its band. Customer setup is zero. Average order values are assumed profiles, not a measured relationship with turnover. The extra-work allowance is recurring ownership work, not a setup invoice.

Time-saving downside, separate from the main case

At three minutes saved and full cost avoidance, annual net benefits are EUR 59,500 / 72,000 / 72,000 / 37,000 / -43,000 in ascending turnover order. The negative EUR 250m result is a disclosed downside scenario. It must not be labelled as the eight-minute main-case return.

FINANCIAL SUMMARY / THREE YEARS

Five profiles, one calculation basis

Three operating years: average coverage 40% / 65% / 80%; eight minutes saved. Labour starts at EUR 45/hour. Labour, extra customer work and Qcommerce direct service costs rise 3% annually. All money is in EUR.

Annual wholesaler turnover	10m	25m	50m	100m	250m
Gross labour saving: 8 min	920,746	1,438,665	1,918,220	2,301,864	2,877,330
Less: Qcommerce fees	202,000	375,250	561,500	804,000	1,239,000
Less: extra customer work	7,727	15,455	30,909	46,364	77,273
Net saving: full cost avoidance	711,018	1,047,961	1,325,811	1,451,501	1,561,058
ROI: full cost avoidance	339.0%	268.2%	223.8%	170.7%	118.6%
Sensitivity: net at 50% avoidance	250,646	328,628	366,701	300,569	122,393
Sensitivity: ROI at 50% avoidance	119.5%	84.1%	61.9%	35.3%	9.3%
Qcommerce-funded setup	43,200	72,000	115,200	187,200	288,000
Qcommerce direct service cost	74,182	123,636	213,272	352,363	577,998
Qcommerce contribution after setup	84,618	179,614	233,028	264,437	373,002
Contribution / Qcommerce fees	41.9%	47.9%	41.5%	32.9%	30.1%

Totals use the same period and denominator

Three-year ROI equals total net customer benefit divided by total Qcommerce fees plus extra customer work. It is not the average of annual percentages. The unindexed annual illustration uses initial hourly and extra-work rates at 80% coverage; operating Year 3 includes two years of indexation and therefore differs. Product turnover, order values and the fee schedule do not inflate in this model.

Customer return and Qcommerce margin are different measures

Initial setup is funded by Qcommerce and included in its contribution after setup. It is zero in customer investment. Supplier contribution margin divides fees less direct service and setup costs by fees; it excludes company-wide overhead, financing and tax. It is not customer ROI or company net profit. The business plan includes company overhead and liquidity separately.

Evidence remains conditional

These figures are scenarios, not measured savings. Validate active time, comparable order mix, remaining checks and which costs are avoidable. Full order-flow coverage is the partnership ambition; the forecast assumes 80% by Year 3 and can include assisted orders. It does not promise 100% unattended processing.