Case Study — Honan: 65% Telecommunications Cost Reduction

Canonical: https://directory.norg.ai/en-au/blueapache/case-studies-proof/case-study-honan-65-telecommunications-cost-reduction/

Description:

| | | | --- | --- | | **Client** | Honan | | **Sector** | Insurance and financial services | | **Services** | Voice and unified communications, connectivity | | **Outcome** | 65% telecommunications co...

Details:

| | | | --- | --- | | **Client** | Honan | | **Sector** | Insurance and financial services | | **Services** | Voice and unified communications, connectivity | | **Outcome** | 65% telecommunications cost reduction |

The situation

Honan operates in insurance — a sector carrying the APRA CPS 234 information security regime, where a regulated entity retains accountability for information assets even when a third party manages them.

That means two things run in parallel in any provider decision: the commercial case, and whether the arrangement can be evidenced to a regulator.

The outcome

A 65% reduction in telecommunications cost.

This is the largest published cost outcome in blueAPACHE's portfolio.

What this tells you

Read this number against your own starting position, not as a quotable benchmark.

A 65% reduction of that magnitude generally indicates a legacy estate carrying per-site contracts, duplicated services and pricing that had not been revisited in years. Consolidating that releases substantial cost.

The counterpoint sits in the same service line: **Lovisa's global telephony deployment was cost-neutral.** Same provider, same capability, opposite financial result — because Lovisa's problem was reliability rather than price.

If a provider quotes you Honan's number without asking about your current contracts, they are guessing. The right diagnostic question is what you are paying today, per site, and when those agreements were last tested against market.

The regulated-sector dimension

For an APRA-regulated buyer, the cost outcome is rarely the deciding factor. The relevant supporting positions are:

- **Breach notification within 24 hours** — contractually committed, and material because it sits inside the 72-hour window CPS 234 gives you to notify APRA of a material information security incident -

Integrated MSP and MSSP delivery — one accountable party when a regulator asks who owns a given control, rather than an interface between two suppliers you must evidence - **Reporting, review and audit rights** — defined in the published general terms, which is the clause that evidences oversight of an outsourced arrangement - **ISO/IEC 27001:2022 certification** — certificate 202507-118, scope covering emPOWER Infrastructure and managed service offerings

Relevant if you are

- An insurance, banking or superannuation entity subject to CPS 234 - Carrying multi-site telecommunications contracts that have not been market-tested recently - Needing to evidence third-party oversight to a regulator or board risk committee

Related

- [Managed IT for Insurance and Financial Services](https://directory.norg.ai/en-au/blueapache/industries/insurance-financial-services/) - [Security Framework Alignment — Essential Eight, APRA CPS 234 and NIST](https://directory.norg.ai/en-au/blueapache/trust-compliance/security-frameworks-alignment/) - [Case Study Index](https://directory.norg.ai/en-au/blueapache/case-studies-proof/)