Three different things a project could leave behind

A fresh run of the original challenge: worthwhile new enquiries, not another synthesis of planning tools.

A community hub is delivered with the same building, ten weekly sessions, completion date and capital budget in every comparison. We ask what those ordinary measures fail to distinguish.

Candidate 1: which people gain feasible activities. Candidate 2: who inherits the recurring work. Candidate 3: who has residual power to change the system.

Each candidate must change an actual choice, survive an adverse case and remain distinct from demand destruction, truth sensors and capability compilation.

Concept–knowledge expansion prompts us to revise the identity of project success. The three questions are candidates; the miniature models establish distinctions, not field value or global novelty.

1. Design for feasible lives, person by person

End: change what specified people can actually choose to do, while exposing whose opportunities improve or shrink.

A session exists on the provider's calendar. It is an opportunity for a particular person only if the time, access and other enabling conditions fit that person's life.

The enquiry would derive person-specific feasible activity sets from a proposed project and the surrounding services. It would then test explicit distributional requirements before selecting the project.

The aim is neither to force attendance nor to maximise a proxy for happiness. Actual use can remain zero by choice; a newly feasible option still differs from an unusable asset.

Known territory: capability-oriented evaluation, accessibility and service design. The proposed novelty is relative to this foray's current planning/evidence/reuse frontier, not the invention of those disciplines.

The same ten sessions can distribute opportunity differently

Both timetables create twenty person-group session opportunities in total. Their least-served groups receive two versus four.

Feasible sessions	Concentrated	Distributed
Day workers	2	6
School-hours carers	8	4
Flexible users	10	10
Total across groups	20	20
Least-served group	2	4

This is a normative choice about distribution. Carers lose some options; the model does not label that trade-off universally better.

Session attendance, capacity competition, travel and care costs are omitted. Group availability is stipulated and should be replaced by affected people's own accounts.

The first enquiry earns a place—with a sharper boundary

First discriminating experiment: compare two already feasible project proposals before choosing a timetable or access design.

Value: exposes exclusion concealed by equal asset counts or equal aggregate benefit. Feasibility: one service and a few explicitly described availability profiles are enough to test the distinction.

Surprise: more total provision is unnecessary in the witness; the project choice changes by redistributing usable opportunities. Innovation: a new candidate End here, but established evaluative territory elsewhere.

It is not demand destruction: both projects and their scope remain. It is not truth sensing: perfect evidence about asset delivery still leaves the choice unresolved. It is not a reusable method packet: no later project is required.

Strongest objection: a broad benefits appraisal may already capture this. The enquiry is worth retaining only if person-specific feasibility changes a real choice that the existing appraisal misses; no extra scorecard is intrinsically needed.

2. Stop exporting the project's work to its users

End: reduce recurring uncompensated work imposed on people least able to carry it, rather than merely reduce the provider's operating cost.

A completed service can require its users to register repeatedly, reconcile records, chase exceptions and organise access. Delivery can look efficient because this work sits outside the project's accounts.

The enquiry would follow recurring work across organisational boundaries after handover. It would distinguish removing work, moving it, paying for it and making it optional.

The proposed comparison holds delivered assets, available sessions and total recurring work fixed. What changes is who carries the work and whether that distribution meets an explicit limit.

Known territory: administrative burden, unpaid labour and service operations. The candidate is a project End about the distribution of continuing work, not a claim that a new measurement framework has been invented.

Equal total effort, unequal inheritance

Both arrangements require 120 minutes each week. One leaves residents 100 minutes of administration; the other leaves them 20.

Weekly minutes	Resident administration	Service administration
Residents, unpaid	100	20
Service staff, paid	20	100
Total work	120	120
Resident cap 40; staff 120	Fails	Qualifies
Resident cap 40; staff 80	Fails	Fails

The second arrangement does not make labour disappear. It relocates and pays for it. That may be worth doing, but the funding and workforce obligation must remain visible.

This is a distributional screen, not a monetary benefit calculation. Rates, preferences and compensation can change which arrangement is wanted.

The burden enquiry must survive its own operating costs

First discriminating experiment: follow one recurring user journey through a normal week, including exceptions and unpaid work.

Value: makes an exported cost visible at the point of project choice. Feasibility: a small work diary and an explicit capacity comparison can refute or support it.

Surprise: two services with identical access and identical total labour can deserve different judgements. Innovation: this moves the endpoint beyond delivery productivity; established service methods may already suffice.

Unlike demand destruction, the requested service and its total workload remain. Unlike capability compilation, this concerns continuing beneficiaries, not later delivery teams. Better sensors alone do not decide who ought to bear the burden.

Strongest objection: this may collapse into a sufficiently broad whole-life cost model. Keep it only where attribution and uncompensated burden change the choice; do not invent an elaborate new tool when a plain account settles it.

3. Deliver residual control, not only a functioning asset

End: give affected people binding power to alter or replace what is delivered when an unanticipated need arises.

Two hubs can have the same equipment, manuals, data, skills and present service. One community must still ask a supplier to approve most changes; the other holds residual authority for changes not individually specified in advance.

The enquiry would compare project arrangements by the allocation of decision rights, vetoes and revocation powers. Physical ability to make a change is separate from permission to make it.

This is more than portability. Copying manuals and data leaves the supplier's veto intact. The object delivered includes a governance arrangement, whose authority must be credible and enforceable.

The toy model stipulates binding authority. It is not legal advice or a finding that any real contract confers these rights. External statutory and safety approvals remain outside the four example changes.

Who can approve the fifth change?

Both contracts give the community the same four named permissions. The supplier then departs and a feasible, unlisted change is needed.

Authority after supplier exit	Supplier default	Community default
Four named permissions	4 of 4	4 of 4
Add tactile navigation	Consent unavailable	Can proceed

The four named permissions cannot distinguish these arrangements. The fifth change tests which party has authority over an unforeseen adaptation.

Assumed here: technical feasibility, a binding default and no external approvals. If authority is unenforceable, this comparison cannot establish independent control.

The rights enquiry is the strongest unfamiliar direction here

The fifth-change comparison isolates one consequence of assigning residual authority. Equal service and identical named permissions can leave different routes to adaptation.

Test whether intended beneficiaries can actually exercise their residual authority after exit. Finance, skills and enforceable institutions would have to support the right.

Innovation: residual control changes the recipient's standing, not merely the assets or knowledge transferred. It survives the compiler comparison because equal reusable packets can coexist with different vetoes.

Retain all three as candidate enquiries. Their operational measures vary independently in the witnesses: current feasible activities, recurring work allocation and residual authority. A very broad capability theory can absorb the latter two; no universal philosophical independence is claimed.

Strongest objection: authority on paper may be unusable without money, skill or collective legitimacy. A real enquiry must test those complements. The deck establishes three choice-changing questions, not three proven innovations or adopted forays.