TAPFLARE / RESEARCH & PRACTICAL GUIDANCE

# Website Redesign Quote Comparison: Scope Page Types First

> Tapflare is a flat-rate monthly subscription for graphic design and website development. A dedicated project manager assigns each request to senior designers and developers, so companies get steady creative and web output without hiring.

Published by Tapflare · 2026-11-21 · website redesign quote comparison · how to compare website design quotes · website redesign scope of work · website redesign page inventory · report design quote · annual report design cost · white paper design · design change control · flat rate design subscription · accessible pdf scope

Original article: https://tapflare.com/articles/scope-page-types-content-changes-before-comparing-quotes



### In this article

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction and Background
3. Key Changes in How to Compare Design Quotes
4. Implementation Considerations and Process Changes
5. Data Analysis and Evidence
6. Implications and Future Directions
7. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)
8. Conclusion

## Executive Summary

A quote for "a 40-page report" or "a 10-page website" is not a specification. Two suppliers can price the same page count against different page types, different outputs and different change terms, so the totals cannot be compared until the scope is normalized. This report proposes a quote scope and version-impact map for comparing design quotes, applied mainly to a designed research report, white paper or annual brand review built from supplied, approved content. The same page-type logic carries over to website redesigns, where templates, not pages, drive effort (bradfrost.com) (webfirst.uark.edu).

Published pricing shows why unit prices cannot be assumed. One report-design agency publishes a package of $1,190 for an annual report of up to 40 pages, with extra pages at $32 each in that tier (justmmedia.com). Another publishes a base layout for up to 8 pages plus add-ons for source files and charts, and separately states that a 32 to 48 page report with two revision rounds typically lands between $1,800 and $3,200 (reportsanddecks.com). A large subscription provider says each project gets its own quote and that subscriptions start at a $15,000 monthly minimum on an annual term (www.superside.com). A capacity-based subscription provider lists entry pricing from $2,200 a month for 2 hours of design time per business day (www.designpickle.com), although the page is inconsistent about whether billing is monthly or only on quarterly or annual cycles (www.designpickle.com). These are different units, so the buyer should ask for scope assumptions rather than invent a rate.

The deliverable is also plural. Adobe's packaging feature gathers the InDesign file, linked graphics, fonts and a report, and offers optional IDML and print PDF files, but it excludes fonts activated from Adobe Fonts (helpx.adobe.com). A finished PDF is therefore not the same thing as an editable source package. Accessibility is a further separate item: the PDF Association states that PDF/UA conformity by itself does not necessarily ensure accessible content (pdfa.org), and WebAIM notes that tags have no impact on a PDF's visual layout, so a preview cannot confirm them (webaim.org).

Late changes are where quotes diverge most. AIGA's standard agreement guidance treats a request outside the original scope as a change order stating added time and money (aiga.org), and Adobe documents that a regenerated table of contents overwrites manual edits (helpx.adobe.com). A text change after pagination can touch pages, the contents list, cross-references and every export. The practical sequence is: confirm content

readiness, inventory page types, approve a sample spread, freeze copy and data, quote each output separately, and agree a change quote before late edits. Subscription versus one-off cost can then be modeled from the buyer's own capacity and workload, with no assumed typical output per day.

## Introduction and Background

This report is written for marketing leads and agency account managers who must commission a research report, white paper, partner report or annual brand review from content that has already been written and approved. It is not guidance on statutory reporting, financial disclosures or accounting, and it does not assume the designer will write, research, edit or check figures. The decision it supports is practical: whether to buy a one-off editorial-design project, recurring layout production, or a separate editorial or research engagement first.

A buyer comparing website redesign quotes often holds several quotes that look similar and are priced very differently. The same mechanics apply to a designed report. Atomic design writing defines pages as specific instances of templates, so many pages can share one template (bradfrost.com). A university web team's project guide similarly lists templates and scope as items to determine up front, and tells clients to understand how many template pages a redesign will have (webfirst.uark.edu). For a report, the equivalent units are repeated layouts such as a text page, a table page, a chart spread and a pull-quote feature.

The evidence base here is deliberately narrow. Superside's article, dated December 1, 2025 and titled for 2026, showcases report concepts in print, digital and interactive forms (www.superside.com). It documents what is possible and, by its own description of one project, says the team shared references, explored options and refined a direction (www.superside.com). It does not publish stages, file formats, timelines or prices, so it is inspiration coverage and not a pricing benchmark. Adobe's help page on packaging files, updated June 2, 2026, is the most precise source on what a production package contains (helpx.adobe.com).

Three limits frame everything that follows. First, prices were read from providers' own public pages on November 21, 2026, and no provider page reviewed states a per-page price for report design in a subscription plan. Second, accessibility conformance cannot be promised from a visual preview, so criteria and specialist testing are scoped as their own items. Third, the publisher of this report, Tapflare, is a flat-rate monthly design and development subscription run through a dedicated project manager. It is a direct provider of one resourcing model discussed below, it is not a copywriting, research or editorial service, and it is not the right fit for a single one-off job, so readers needing those should look elsewhere.

## Key Changes in How to Compare Design Quotes

The following five changes replace a page-count comparison with a scope comparison. Each is a change in what the buyer asks for before any price is compared.

### Change 1: Replace the page count with a page-type inventory

The first change is to treat the manuscript as an inventory of page types. Content strategists recommend an inventory of every piece of content a site currently has (www.nngroup.com), followed by an audit that reviews each page or asset for accuracy, duplication and relevance (www2.gov.bc.ca). For redesigns, teams use these

steps to decide what to carry over and what to leave behind (www.nngroup.com), and one provincial government style guide says audits belong at the beginning of a site redesign (www2.gov.bc.ca). The inventory can be large: a UK transport content audit covered 7,396 items (gds.blog.gov.uk), and an early-years audit narrowed an original inventory of 430 pages to 196 shown to a policy contact (insidegovuk.blog.gov.uk). These are public-sector examples, not benchmarks for a report, but they show that inventory size and the amount of content actually kept can differ greatly.

For a designed report, the inventory is a matrix. *Table 1* below is an illustrative (Hypothetical Example) matrix for a 36-page partner report. The counts are invented to show the columns, not to suggest a typical report.

| Page type | Count | Content owner | Source status | Layout template | Complexity / dependency | Quoted work |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cover and inside cover | 2 | Marketing lead | Final approved copy, logo files supplied | One-off | Brand assets; print and screen cover crops | Concept and setup |
| Contents and section dividers | 5 | Designer builds, buyer approves | Headings frozen | Reusable | Contents list depends on heading styles | Template, quoted once |
| Text-led pages | 14 | Approved manuscript owner | Final, locked | Reusable (2 variants) | Page count shifts if copy changes | Per page type unit |
| Dense data tables | 6 | Analyst or data owner | Final figures supplied as spreadsheet | Reusable | Table breaks across pages; accessibility tagging | Quoted separately from page units |
| Charts and diagrams | 5 | Analyst; chart tool owner | Live in tool or flattened image (to confirm) | One-off each | Linked files, colour mode, alt text | Quoted per chart, not in page unit |
| One-off feature spreads | 2 | Marketing lead | Pull quotes, photography supplied | One-off | Image licences, bleed | Quoted per spread |
| Back matter and legal text | 2 | Buyer | Final text from the buyer's own reviewer | Reusable | Not checked by the designer | Page unit |

*Table 1* shows why equal pages are not equal work. Reusable layouts are set up once and applied many times, while one-off spreads and charts each need their own decisions. Adobe documents that a parent page holds repeating items such as headers, footers and page numbers, and that changes to the parent automatically update the pages that use it (helpx.adobe.com). That mechanism is why reusable layouts are typically cheaper to revise than one-offs, and why a quote should name how many parents or templates it assumes. Tables and charts should be listed beside, not inside, the page units, so that chart effort is not counted twice.

### Change 2: Price each output as its own deliverable

The second change is to treat print PDF, screen PDF, editable source and web edition as distinct quoted outputs. The technical distinctions are documented. Adobe describes a preset for desktop printing and proofing that downsamples images to 300 pixels per inch for colour and greyscale (helpx.adobe.com), and a separate smallest-file preset aimed at web, email and intranet distribution. The PDF Association describes the PDF/X family as supporting graphic arts and professional printing (pdfa.org), which is a print-exchange concern, distinct from accessibility.

A web edition is a different build again. InDesign's Publish Online converts print-ready documents into browser-based publications (helpx.adobe.com), and EPUB export offers reflowable layouts for adaptable text or fixed layouts for precise design (helpx.adobe.com). Adobe's HTML5 export notes that self-hosting fonts for a website may require a separate licence (helpx.adobe.com). A buyer who agrees a PDF and later requests a web edition has changed the output list, not just added a revision. *Table 2* shows an output and version table to attach to every quote.

| Output / version | What it is | Editability | Quoted separately? | Acceptance owner |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Print PDF | Print-ready file from a print preset, for a printer's specification | Not editable by the buyer | Yes, with colour and bleed assumptions | Buyer's print owner |
| Screen PDF | Smaller file for email and web download | Not editable | Yes | Marketing lead |
| Editable source package | Native file, linked assets, fonts as licensed, optional IDML | Editable if the buyer has the software and font rights | Yes: confirm included or priced | Buyer's brand or operations owner |
| Web edition | Browser-based or HTML version; different build | Depends on tool | Yes, as its own output | Marketing lead plus web owner |
| Accessible version | Stated criteria plus specialist testing | Depends on tool and fix path | Yes, criteria and testing as separate lines | Named accessibility reviewer |

The table is a list of questions more than a price list. One report-design provider states that its files are prepped for web, print and PDF (www.superside.com), which is a useful statement but does not say whether each is a separate quote line, and it adds no per-output price. The interpretive point is that each row needs a named acceptance owner, because acceptance triggers payment and starts the change-control clock. AIGA's guidance notes that delivered work is treated as accepted unless the client objects within a specified period (aiga.org).

Accessibility deserves its own scope lines. WCAG 2.2 defines three conformance levels, A, AA and AAA (www.w3.org), and states that its testable criteria are intended for use in design specifications, purchasing and contractual agreements (www.w3.org). W3C recommends against requiring Level AAA as a general policy (www.w3.org). WCAG can also be applied to documents, though the W3C notes that WCAG 2 was developed for the web and not for non-web information and communications technology (www.w3.org). A quote should therefore name a target and say which outputs it applies to. The W3C evaluation guidance says no tool alone

can determine whether a site meets accessibility standards and that knowledgeable human evaluation is required (www.w3.org). Adobe's own checker marks some items as needing a manual check because it could not check them automatically (helpx.adobe.com).

### Change 3: Replace open-ended revisions with a copy freeze and change control

The third change is to define when content is final and what happens afterward. Project-management literature defines scope creep as the slow growth of a project beyond its original work content and objectives (www.pmi.org), and advises a written, detailed baseline (www.pmi.org) together with an agreement on how that baseline will be changed (www.pmi.org). For a report, the baseline is the frozen manuscript, the frozen data, the approved sample spread and the output list.

AIGA's guidance asks proposals to state the number of revisions or refinements included (aiga.org). Quotes differ here: one web agency's comparison guide notes that some firms limit design rounds to 1, 2 or 3 (www.paperstreet.com), and one report-design agency publishes $99 per additional revision round for minor corrections (reportsanddecks.com). Providers on subscriptions describe revisions differently again: Design Pickle states that every plan includes revisions with no per-request fees (www.designpickle.com), while ManyPixels advertises unlimited requests and revisions (see Table 4). "Revision" is therefore not a unit; the quote must define a round and a new requirement.

A usable definition has four parts:

- **Freeze point:** copy and data are final at a named date, signed off by one approved manuscript owner.
- **One consolidated reviewer:** all comments reach the designer as a single list, so conflicting feedback is resolved by the buyer.
- **Round:** one consolidated list of corrections to frozen content, applied once.
- **New requirement:** anything that changes frozen copy, adds a page type, or adds an output, which triggers a change quote.

AIGA suggests a threshold for substantive change, such as a percentage of the original schedule (aiga.org), and its template terms say work on revised services does not begin until a signed revised proposal exists (aiga.org). The same guidance describes out-of-scope changes as chargeable on a time-and-materials basis with extended schedules (aiga.org). A related point on responsibility: AIGA lists information, content, schedules, decision-making and approvals among the client's duties (aiga.org). Content strategy guidance poses the same question as a planning item: who creates, reviews, approves and publishes the content (www.nngroup.com).

*Table 3* is a revision ledger (Hypothetical Example). It records the original scope, the request and the knock-on outputs, which is the version-impact map in compact form.

| Ref | Original scope | Requested change (after pagination) | Directly affected pages | Knock-on items | Outputs to regenerate | Quote basis |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| R1 | Frozen text, 14 text pages | Paragraph added to section 2 | Pages 9 to 12 reflow | Contents page numbers; cross-references | Print PDF, screen PDF, web edition | Change quote, time-based |

| Ref | Original scope | Requested change (after pagination) | Directly affected pages | Knock-on items | Outputs to regenerate | Quote basis |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| R2 | Data table frozen | One figure corrected in table | Table page 17 only | Chart 4 uses the same figure | Print PDF, screen PDF, chart file | Within a round if corrections only |
| R3 | PDF agreed, no web | Web edition requested | All pages | New build; font licence check; accessibility criteria | New output | New requirement, separate quote |
| R4 | Source package at handoff | Source files requested after final | None | Links and fonts gathered | Source package | Quoted if not already included |

The ledger shows that the same edit can be cheap or costly depending on its knock-on. Adobe documents that cross-references update automatically when destination content moves or changes (helpx.adobe.com), but the destination marker must stay in place. A regenerated table of contents overwrites manual edits, so corrections must be made in the headings themselves (helpx.adobe.com). A text change is therefore not only a text change.

## Change 4: Ask for the production package and an update protocol

The fourth change is to specify what the buyer receives. The recipient of an exported PDF cannot practically edit the design. Adobe's package command creates a folder with the InDesign file, linked graphics, fonts and a report (helpx.adobe.com), and the dialog offers options to include an IDML file for backward compatibility (helpx.adobe.com) and a print-ready PDF alongside the native document (helpx.adobe.com).

Four verification items follow from the documentation. Native software version matters: InDesign documents are version-specific and cannot be opened directly in earlier versions (helpx.adobe.com), and converted content may be modified or omitted if it depends on features missing in the older version (helpx.adobe.com). Links matter: documents with missing links may print or export at reduced resolution or fail entirely (helpx.adobe.com). Fonts matter too: Adobe's package help says its font-copy option excepts fonts activated from Adobe Fonts (helpx.adobe.com), and the Adobe Fonts licensing page says those fonts cannot be packaged or shared with designers or print bureaus (helpx.adobe.com). A client does not need a separate licence for documents with embedded font data, but needs one to edit the design (helpx.adobe.com). After a subscription ends, live-font files show a missing-fonts warning (helpx.adobe.com), and licensing is tied to an active subscription (helpx.adobe.com). Another vendor's font statement is simpler: all Google Fonts are open source and free of cost (developers.google.com), and they may be used commercially (developers.google.com). Packaging does not grant font rights, so the quote should list each typeface and who holds its licence.

Charts need a decision about live versus flattened. A chart pasted into Word from Excel can stay linked, updating when spreadsheet data changes (support.microsoft.com), while a chart inserted as a picture cannot be edited (support.microsoft.com). Chart-tool documentation shows the same split: Datawrapper's PDF exports are vector-based (www.datawrapper.de), its PNG exports become pixelated when scaled up (www.datawrapper.de), and it advises CMYK for print and RGB for digital reports (www.datawrapper.de).

Flourish notes that only SVG-containing templates allow SVG download (helpcenter.flourish.studio), and Tableau lists BMP, JPEG, PNG or SVG for image export (help.tableau.com). If charts arrive flattened, a data correction means a new chart from the buyer's analyst.

The update protocol for the next edition should ask:

- **Update time:** how long an update takes on a representative file, timed by the supplier on a sample.
- **Template ownership:** who owns the template and parent pages.
- **Software version:** which InDesign version is used (helpx.adobe.com).
- **Linked data:** where charts and images live.
- **Proofreading:** who checks the final text (www.nngroup.com).

None of these has a published benchmark, so the buyer should ask the supplier to time an update on a sample file rather than rely on a claim.

### Change 5: Normalize the price with a base fee model

The fifth change is arithmetic. Where a provider quotes per unit, the base fee model is:

**Base fee = concept and template setup + sum of (page-type count × that provider's quoted unit amount) + charts and tables specifically excluded from page units + agreed testing and output costs.**

Revisions are added from the provider's actual change terms or tracked time. If a provider quotes a fixed project price without per-page pricing, the model should not be forced onto it. Instead, ask for the scope assumptions: page types, counts, output list, revision rounds and exclusions. This avoids two errors: inventing a unit rate where none was published, and double-counting chart work already included in a page unit.

Published rate cards show how different the units can be. Reports & Decks publishes a base layout rate, per-page increments, an add-on for source files and a per-item rate for simple charts (reportsanddecks.com). JustM Media's tiers differ in what the source file costs: an editable source file is an add-on of $40, $66 or $106 in the smaller tiers and is included in the annual-report tier (justmmedia.com). A third provider lists an additional microsite page at 100 USD (www.annualreports.info). A fourth, a marketing agency, publishes a package price, a typical 4-page brochure at $2,500 including content and design (straightnorth.com), and a design studio publishes sample estimates for bespoke print projects, one at $28,000 (millercox.com). These cannot be compared without normalizing scope, and the last two include content services the designer may not otherwise offer.

## Implementation Considerations and Process Changes

### Step 1: Name the audience, owner and channels, and test content readiness

Before requesting any quote, write down the audience, the purpose, the single approved manuscript owner and the publication channels (print, screen, web). Then decide whether the content is ready. A content owner is needed for each task (www.nngroup.com), and W3C's accessibility roles guidance advises defining each role's responsibilities early (www.w3.org). If the manuscript is not final, an editorial step comes first. Editing is a separate service with its own pricing: the Editorial Freelancers Association states that its rate chart is based on

a survey of its members from November 2025 through mid-January 2026 (www.the-efa.org), and that it does not set rates (www.the-efa.org). Its chart lists copyediting, proofreading and developmental editing as separate rows from design (www.the-efa.org). Graphic designers, in the words of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, develop layout and production design for applications including reports (www.bls.gov), and the median annual wage for graphic designers was $62,960 in May 2025 (www.bls.gov). Layout is the designer's remit; research, writing and accounting are not.

### Step 2: Agree an initial sample spread and approval checkpoint

Ask each supplier to set the concept and template on a sample spread of each page type before full pagination. One provider describes sharing references, exploring options and refining a preferred direction (www.superside.com); the buyer should make that step an explicit sample spread. The sample spread tests the inventory: if a table or chart does not fit the template, it is discovered before 36 pages depend on it. The approval checkpoint should name the acceptance owner and the date after which template changes become change requests. Design systems exist to reduce the need to reinvent elements (www.nngroup.com), and the same economy applies to a report template.

### Step 3: Apply the same logic to a website redesign

The method works for a website redesign scope of work, page inventory and content audit. Teams treat the inventory as an early-project activity (www2.gov.bc.ca). NN/g suggests timeboxing the first inventory and audit, giving six weeks as an illustrative example rather than a benchmark (www.nngroup.com). Web-specific scope items include URL mapping, redirects and monitoring. Google advises mapping old URLs to new URLs (developers.google.com), keeping redirects for as long as possible (developers.google.com), and expecting temporary ranking fluctuation during a move (developers.google.com). A web design comparison guide from an agency says custom design can take 50 to 200 or more hours, a vendor figure and not an independent benchmark (www.paperstreet.com). W3C's evaluation methodology defines scope as all views, states and functionality of a digital product (www.w3.org) and notes that products with more pages typically need a larger sample (www.w3.org). A website quote that lists "5 pages" without templates, redirects, accessibility evaluation or content responsibilities is as under-specified as a report quote that lists "36 pages".

### Step 4: Scope accessibility and web editions explicitly

Official guidance leans toward HTML for accessibility. GOV.UK says HTML is the most accessible format for publishing documents (www.gov.uk), that PDFs often do not work well with assistive technologies (www.gov.uk), and that documents with a simple layout are easier to make accessible than complex ones (www.gov.uk). The U.S. federal Section508.gov page says policy requires agencies to prioritize HTML and use PDFs only when necessary (www.section508.gov). These are public-sector rules and not a universal requirement for commercial reports, but they set a reasonable expectation about which format is easier to make accessible.

If an accessible PDF is required, ask who tags it. WebAIM states that an untagged PDF would not be considered accessible (webaim.org), Adobe says tags are added more effectively in the authoring application than afterward in Acrobat (helpx.adobe.com), and automatic tagging cannot always correctly interpret complex page elements (helpx.adobe.com). InDesign can add structural tags on export (helpx.adobe.com), and

alternative text for a graphic is a manual step in its structure pane (helpx.adobe.com). PDF/UA defines technical features but does not cover how to achieve conformance (pdfa.org), so the production method and quality checks need their own quote lines. An accessibility statement is not a technical assessment or declaration of conformity (www.w3.org), and a basic software checker is only a first check (www.gov.uk) (www.w3.org). Specialist testing should be quoted separately and, per W3C, begin early and continue through the process (www.w3.org).

### Step 5: Model one-off project versus recurring capacity

The one-off versus subscription choice depends on the buyer's own workload, so the model uses buyer-entered numbers. Capacity-based subscriptions define capacity in different units. Design Pickle's entry price buys 2 hours of design time per business day (www.designpickle.com). Kimp states 2 to 2.5 hours allocated each business day (kimp.io). Penji describes its entry plan as equal to 2 to 4 hours daily (penji.co). Flocksy defines capacity as hours, with tiers up to full-time hours (www.flocksy.com). Superside's subscriptions begin at a monthly minimum on an annual term (www.superside.com). Capacity is therefore a unit of time or active requests, not a count of pages, and none of these pages publishes a per-page report price.

*Table 4* compares the resourcing models as the providers describe themselves on their own public pages, read on November 21, 2026. It includes the publisher as a direct provider of one model, and it records no output or savings claims.

| Provider | How capacity or price is defined (own page) | Source files / ownership (own page) | Notes for a report buyer |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Superside** | Per-project quote for each project (www.superside.com); subscriptions from a $15,000 monthly minimum, annual term (www.superside.com) | Not stated on pricing page | Report design is offered within subscriptions (www.superside.com) |
| **Design Pickle** | From $2,200 a month for 2 hours of design time per business day (www.designpickle.com) | Customer owns output (www.designpickle.com) | Page shows both "billed monthly" and quarterly or annual cycles (www.designpickle.com) |
| **Penji** | Entry plan equal to 2 to 4 hours daily (penji.co); Essentials listed at $995 a month (penji.co) | Not stated on pricing page | Multi-page decks may take longer (penji.co) |
| **ManyPixels** | Flat monthly pricing with unlimited requests and revisions (www.manypixels.co); monthly-toggle plans from $699 to $2,599 (www.manypixels.co) | Editable source files and full IP (www.manypixels.co) | Lists business reports among services (www.manypixels.co) |
| **Kimp** | Hours allocated each business day (kimp.io) | Source files for each design (kimp.io) | Turnaround from 24 hours (simple) to 2 to 4 days (complex) (kimp.io) |

| Provider | How capacity or price is defined (own page) | Source files / ownership (own page) | Notes for a report buyer |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Flocksy** | Hours-based tiers, flat monthly rate (www.flocksy.com) | Working files and source kept (www.flocksy.com) | Hours and rollover rather than pages |
| **Tapflare (publisher)** | **Flat monthly subscription, not billed per page or per project.** Publisher-supplied description, not independently verified: a dedicated project manager assigns requests to designers and developers against a daily allotment of hours set by the plan. Current prices are on the publisher's own pricing page, not reproduced here. | Source-file terms not stated on the pricing page; confirm in the contract | Suited to steady, ongoing layout and web production from supplied content. Not a copywriting, research or editorial service, and not the right fit for a single one-off job. Scope for long documents should be confirmed. |

The table shows that "unlimited" and "hours per day" are different capacity statements, and that source-file terms vary or are absent. The Tapflare row is the publisher's own description of its service and is not independently verified. Readers can compare the model against the publisher's current plans on the Tapflare pricing page.

The buyer-entered model has four inputs and no assumed output rate:

- **Monthly capacity (hours)** = hours per business day stated by the provider × business days the buyer enters.
- **Workload (hours)** = sum of (page-type count × the supplier's own hours estimate for that type) + estimated revision hours.
- **Months of capacity** = workload ÷ monthly capacity, rounded up to billing periods and term minimums.
- **Subscription cost** = months × monthly fee; **project cost** = the written quote plus agreed change quotes.

*Hypothetical Example:* a buyer enters 2 hours per business day and 21 business days, giving 42 hours a month. If the supplier estimates 80 hours of work, the model returns 80 ÷ 42, or 1.9 months, so two billing periods, before any term minimum. These hours are placeholders to show arithmetic and are not typical output. If a provider bills on a quarterly cycle, as one provider's FAQ describes, the minimum commitment is three months regardless of the arithmetic. The comparison with a fixed project quote then depends on whether later editions, revisions and web builds recur. A recurring subscription fits repeated production, whereas a one-off report with a frozen scope fits a project quote.

## Data Analysis and Evidence

The evidence on cost is a set of published rate cards that use different units. The figures below are as published on each provider's own page, read on November 21, 2026, unless a date is stated.

- **JustM Media (page dated October 23, 2026):** an annual report package up to 40 pages for $1,190 (justmmedia.com); extra pages $16, $20, $25 and $32 across its four tiers (justmmedia.com); source file included in the annual tier (justmmedia.com).
- **Reports & Decks:** published base, page-increment, source-file and chart rates, and a stated typical range of $1,800 to $3,200 for a 32 to 48 page report with two revision rounds (reportsanddecks.com); additional revision rounds $99 (reportsanddecks.com).
- **Annualreports.info:** an additional microsite page at 100 USD (www.annualreports.info).
- **Straight North:** a typical 4-page brochure at $2,500 including content and design (straightnorth.com).
- **MillerCox Design:** a sample design estimate of $28,000 for a bespoke print publication (millercox.com).

A worked example shows why the unit rate is incomplete. *Hypothetical Example:* using the JustM annual tier, a 50-page report is $1,190 for the first 40 pages plus 10 pages at $32, or $1,510, with the source file included (rates as listed above). A late request to add 4 pages after pagination would be $128 on the rate card, but the rate card says nothing about the cost of regenerating the contents list or exports, so a change quote is still needed. Using the Reports & Decks structure listed above, the base layout for up to 8 pages plus increments for the remaining pages, plus a source-file add-on and per-chart items, gives a figure that depends on how the page is parsed. The page's own stated typical range for a 32 to 48 page report is larger than the layout base alone, so the buyer should ask what the range includes.

Across the six subscription providers reviewed, the units were: per-project quote and a monthly minimum (Superside), design hours per business day (Design Pickle, Kimp), an hours-equivalent (Penji) (penji.co), flat monthly pricing with unlimited requests (ManyPixels) (www.manypixels.co) and hours-based tiers (Flocksy) (www.flocksy.com). Not one of those pages published a per-page price for report design. That absence is itself a finding: a buyer comparing a per-page rate card with a subscription cannot compute equivalence without estimating hours.

Labour-market and standards sources give context but not price: the EFA states that it does not set rates, so its figures are member-reported ranges (www.the-efa.org), and WCAG conformance is judged on full pages with no exclusion of part of a page (www.w3.org).

## Implications and Future Directions

The main implication is that the useful artifact is the scope sheet, not the unit price. A buyer who sends every supplier the same page-type matrix, output table and change terms will receive quotes that can be set side by side, and a supplier who refuses to state assumptions has told the buyer something about how a late change would be handled.

The practical use is to agree page types, source deliverables and change terms before asking for prices, while content is still being drafted.

Two open issues remain. No public benchmark exists for how long an update takes on a representative report file, so the update protocol must be tested with the supplier. And Adobe states that standard font agreements often do not permit sending font files to third parties without their own licence (helpx.adobe.com), so a supplier's handoff promise should be tied to a font list.

For resourcing, three routes follow from the scope sheet. A one-off editorial-design project suits a single report with a frozen scope. Recurring layout production suits a programme of reports, updates and web editions. A separate editorial or research engagement comes first when the manuscript is not approved. A flat-rate subscription can execute layout and web production from supplied approved content, but it is not a substitute for a writer, researcher or compliance specialist.

## Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

### How do buyers compare design quotes for a report or a website?

Normalize scope first. List page types, templates, content responsibilities, outputs, revision rounds and exclusions, and ask each supplier to price the same list. Templates and scope are the items to settle up front (webfirst.uark.edu), and rounds vary from firm to firm (www.paperstreet.com). A side-by-side comparison needs these rows:

- **Page types and templates:** the count of reusable layouts, separate from the count of pages (bradfrost.com).
- **Content responsibilities:** who supplies, edits and approves copy (www.nngroup.com).
- **Outputs:** print, screen, web and source package priced as separate lines.
- **Change terms:** revision rounds and the trigger for a change order (aiga.org).
- **Accessibility:** a stated target and who tests it (www.w3.org).

### What belongs in a scope of work template if the project is a website redesign?

For a website redesign, a scope of work template should contain:

- **Content inventory and audit:** every page or asset reviewed for accuracy, duplication and relevance (www.nngroup.com) (www2.gov.bc.ca).
- **Template list:** the reusable page layouts (bradfrost.com).
- **URL mapping and redirects:** old addresses mapped to new ones (developers.google.com).
- **Accessibility scope:** target level and evaluation scope (www.w3.org).
- **Named content owners:** one owner per content task (www.nngroup.com).
- **Change-order process:** how out-of-scope requests are priced (aiga.org).

### How do I scope a website redesign project?

Start with the audit (www2.gov.bc.ca), decide what to carry over (www.nngroup.com), count templates, and sequence changes. Google's guidance on site moves also advises doing a new domain, new CMS and new layout one at a time where possible (developers.google.com), which affects phasing for a combined redesign and migration.

### What should a design proposal checklist contain for a report or website?

A proposal checklist covers the following; the fonts, software and source-package lines apply mainly to designed reports, and the redirects line to websites:

- **Page types and counts**, with content owner for each.
- **Revision rounds:** the number included (aiga.org).
- **Fonts and software:** who holds licences and which version is used (helpx.adobe.com).
- **Source delivery:** what the package contains (helpx.adobe.com).
- **Accessibility:** criteria and testing as separate lines (www.w3.org).
- **Redirects and monitoring:** post-launch terms (developers.google.com).
- **Acceptance owner:** who signs off each output (aiga.org).

### What is a page inventory for a report or website redesign?

It is a list of pages, assets and templates with owner, status and treatment. It is the same instrument as a content inventory, a list of every piece of digital content currently held (www.nngroup.com).

### Is a content audit needed before a redesign?

Teams commonly start redesigns with an inventory and audit to decide what to keep (www.nngroup.com). A UK transport audit covered 7,396 items (gds.blog.gov.uk), which shows the effort can be substantial.

### What are the main cost factors for a report or website redesign?

Templates, features and design approach are cited by agencies as price drivers, and a vendor reports custom design at 50 to 200 or more hours (www.paperstreet.com). Revision rounds (www.paperstreet.com), source delivery, accessibility testing and content services add further lines.

### What is a flat-rate design subscription, and how does it differ from a project quote?

A project quote prices a defined scope. A subscription prices capacity, defined by hours per day or active requests, for example 2 to 2.5 hours per business day. Neither publishes a per-page price on the pages reviewed. The subscription is suited to repeated production and the project quote to a frozen, one-off scope.

## Conclusion

Page count does not specify a quote. For a designed report, and for a website redesign, a comparable quote names page types and counts, separates tables and charts from page units, lists each output and its acceptance owner, defines a copy and data freeze, and states how late changes are priced. The published evidence supports caution about unit rates: providers quote per project, per package, per page or per capacity, and none of the subscription pages reviewed published a report price per page.

The packaging documentation shows that an exported PDF is only one output, and that fonts, links, software version and chart format decide whether the buyer can update the file later. The accessibility sources show that conformance needs stated criteria and human testing, not a preview. The change-control sources show that a late text edit should be priced from its knock-on effects on pages, contents, cross-references and exports.

Buyers can use the scope sheet before any price is compared, then model one-off versus recurring cost from their own capacity and workload. Where the manuscript is not ready, an editorial engagement comes first; where a single frozen report is needed, a project quote fits; where reports, updates and web editions recur,

capacity-based production can be compared on the buyer's own hours.

## Source links

Links cited in this article, in order of first appearance. Full addresses are provided for readers using extracted text.


1. https://bradfrost.com/blog/post/atomic-web-design
2. https://webfirst.uark.edu/site-toolkit/project-flow-overview.php
3. https://justmmedia.com/en/blog/report-design-pricing
4. https://reportsanddecks.com/reports/annual-report-design
5. https://www.superside.com/pricing
6. https://www.designpickle.com/pricing
7. https://helpx.adobe.com/indesign/desktop/print/preflight/package-files-for-output.html
8. https://pdfa.org/resource/iso-14289-pdfua
9. https://webaim.org/techniques/acrobat
10. https://aiga.org/sites/default/files/2023-11/Standardformofagreement_2022update.pdf
11. https://helpx.adobe.com/indesign/desktop/indexes-and-references/add-a-table-of-contents/generate-maintain-tocs.html
12. https://www.superside.com/blog/report-design-examples
13. https://www.nngroup.com/articles/content-audits
14. https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/governments/services-for-government/service-experience-digital-delivery/web-content-development-guides/web-style-guide/content-design/inventory-audit
15. https://gds.blog.gov.uk/2017/10/12/transforming-transport-content-the-journey-so-far
16. https://insidegovuk.blog.gov.uk/2016/02/23/finding-things-audit-22-how-early-years-went
17. https://helpx.adobe.com/indesign/desktop/create-and-organize-pages/create-and-manage-parent-pages/create-parent-pages.html
18. https://helpx.adobe.com/indesign/desktop/save-export-and-publish/save-and-export/manage-pdf-presets.html
19. https://pdfa.org/resource/iso-15930-pdfx
20. https://helpx.adobe.com/indesign/using/publish-online.html
21. https://helpx.adobe.com/indesign/desktop/save-export-and-publish/export-to-epub/export-to-epub.html
22. https://helpx.adobe.com/indesign/using/export-to-html5.html
23. https://www.superside.com/ebook-digital-report-design/report-design
24. https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG22
25. https://www.w3.org/WAI/WCAG22/Understanding/conformance
26. https://www.w3.org/WAI/standards-guidelines/wcag
27. https://www.w3.org/WAI/test-evaluate
28. https://helpx.adobe.com/acrobat/using/create-verify-pdf-accessibility.html
29. https://www.pmi.org/learning/library/scope-creep-not-necessarily-bad-thing-3352
30. https://www.paperstreet.com/blog/design-detail-comparing-proposals-for-websites
31. https://www.nngroup.com/articles/content-strategy

32. https://helpx.adobe.com/indesign/desktop/indexes-and-references/references-and-bookmarks/insert-cross-references.html
33. https://helpx.adobe.com/indesign/desktop/troubleshoot/file-and-output-issues/cant-open-in-previous-versions.html
34. https://helpx.adobe.com/indesign/desktop/add-graphics-and-media/manage-links/links-panel-overview.html
35. https://helpx.adobe.com/fonts/using/font-licensing.html
36. https://developers.google.com/fonts/faq
37. https://support.microsoft.com/en-us/excel/insert-a-chart-from-an-excel-spreadsheet-into-word
38. https://www.datawrapper.de/academy/how-to-download-your-chart-as-a-pdf
39. https://www.datawrapper.de/academy/how-to-download-your-chart-as-a-png
40. https://helpcenter.flourish.studio/hc/en-us/articles/8761545595791-Understanding-image-download-options
41. https://help.tableau.com/current/pro/desktop/en-us/save_export_image.htm
42. https://www.annualreports.info/pricing
43. https://straightnorth.com/creative-services/pricing
44. https://millercox.com/much-cost-design-publication
45. https://www.w3.org/WAI/planning/arrm
46. https://www.the-efa.org/rates
47. https://www.bls.gov/ooh/arts-and-design/graphic-designers.htm
48. https://www.nngroup.com/articles/design-systems-101
49. https://developers.google.com/search/docs/crawling-indexing/site-move-with-url-changes
50. https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG-EM
51. https://www.gov.uk/guidance/publishing-accessible-documents
52. https://www.section508.gov/create/pdfs
53. https://helpx.adobe.com/acrobat/using/creating-accessible-pdfs.html
54. https://helpx.adobe.com/indesign/using/pdf-options.html
55. https://helpx.adobe.com/indesign/desktop/interactive-elements-and-forms/forms-and-pdfs/use-tags-for-accessible-pdfs.html
56. https://www.w3.org/WAI/planning/statements
57. https://www.w3.org/WAI/test-evaluate/preliminary
58. https://kimp.io/pricing
59. https://penji.co/pricing
60. https://www.flocksy.com/pricing
61. https://www.manypixels.co/pricing
62. https://helpx.adobe.com/fonts/using/package-font-files.html

THE PUBLISHER

# About Tapflare

Tapflare gives companies an on-demand design and web team for a flat monthly fee.

### How it works

Each subscriber has a dedicated project manager who learns the brand, assigns every request to a senior specialist in that kind of work, and reviews the result before it is delivered. Requests are submitted and discussed in the Tapflare portal, each plan includes a daily allotment of design or development time, and the client keeps full ownership of the export and source files.

### What it covers

Graphic design, custom illustration, presentation design, logos and brand guides, video editing and motion graphics, website and mobile-app mockups, and website development, from design mockups to HTML, to drag-and-drop builders or custom code.

### What it is not

Tapflare is not a marketing agency, a media-buying, SEO or copywriting service, a software product or a freelance marketplace. Where a reader needs one of those, the honest answer is to say so.

### Visit

See Tapflare and its pricing.

Articles published here explain general practice and cite their sources. Prices and plan contents, including Tapflare's own, change; check the provider's current pricing page before deciding.

**Website:** https://tapflare.com

This article is educational. Verify consequential medical, legal, financial, regulatory and technical decisions with appropriate professionals and the cited primary sources. Company services are described separately from the article's research findings.