



GO-TO-MARKET & PRICING

# What is revenue leakage? The gap between promised and collected revenue

Revenue leakage is a reconciliation gap, not a synonym for discounting: name the expected value, invoice, cash, reason code, and recovery boundary.

---

**Sinan Isoglu**, MBA (Quantic)

Commercial growth leader, lecturer and doctoral researcher

PUBLISHED

6 September 2026

READING TIME

10 min

WORDS

2,242

---

<https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-is-revenue-leakage/>

|                                                  |    |
|--------------------------------------------------|----|
| Management summary                               | 2  |
| What does revenue leakage measure?               | 3  |
| How is leakage different from price realization? | 4  |
| Which boundary should a team reconcile?          | 5  |
| What does a revenue-leakage ledger look like?    | 6  |
| Which gaps are not confirmed leakage?            | 8  |
| Can one leakage percentage identify the cause?   | 8  |
| What is revenue leakage not?                     | 9  |
| How can a team run the reconciliation?           | 9  |
| What can the evidence support?                   | 10 |
| References                                       | 11 |

## MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

Revenue leakage is the control problem between a declared net expected amount and what is later invoiced or collected. This article separates expected, contracted, invoiced, and collected revenue, then distinguishes approved credits, scope exclusions, timing, data defects, delivered-but-unbilled work, and invoice-to-cash gaps. A synthetic six-row ledger makes the line key, service period, currency, reason code, owner, and disposition visible. Stripe supplies a bounded practitioner description of expected income that was not earned or received; the reconciliation boundary, formulas, values, and review card are author synthesis. No benchmark, accounting policy, or causal recovery claim is implied.

Keywords: Revenue Leakage · Revenue Leakage Analysis · Pricing Leakage · Expected Revenue · Net Expected Revenue · Invoiced Revenue · Collected Revenue · Reconciliation Ledger · Collection Cutoff · Candidate Leakage · Revenue Operations · Price Realization · Data Lineage · Process Audit

At quarter close, a services team can show a signed scope, a delivery record, an invoice, and a bank receipt. The four amounts do not match. One person calls the difference a discount. Another calls it unbilled work. Finance calls it an overdue receivable. The report shows one shortfall, but it has not yet shown which boundary failed.

Revenue leakage is a candidate reconciliation gap between a declared net expected amount and a later invoiced or collected amount. It becomes actionable only when the line has a stable key, a defined service period, one currency rule, a reason, an owner, and a disposition. Until then, the gap is a signal to investigate, not proof that revenue was lost.

The useful question is therefore not “What percentage of revenue leaked?” It is: Which eligible line failed to travel from the declared commercial boundary to invoice and collection, and what evidence explains the difference?

## What does revenue leakage measure?

The word leakage suggests a hole in a pipe. In a revenue system, the pipe is a chain of boundary objects. A quote can become a contract, a contract can create an entitlement to bill, an eligible delivery can create an invoice line, and an invoice can become a receipt. Each transition can be measured, but the amounts must not be collapsed before the transition is understood.

Stripe’s practitioner guide describes revenue leakage as expected income that a business fails to earn or receive. Its examples include uncollected billing, under-pricing, unrecovered costs, billing errors, pricing discrepancies, contract non-compliance, and work that was delivered but not fully billed (Stripe, 2024). It also describes comparing potential revenue based on contracts, price lists, and inventory with actual revenue received. This is useful source context, not an accounting standard or a universal leakage taxonomy.

For a commercial review, define the objects like this:

**Table 1** What does revenue leakage measure?

| Boundary object                     | Question it answers                                                        | What it includes                                                             | What it does not establish                                  |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|
| Candidate expected value            | What amount is permitted by the declared commercial boundary?              | Eligible lines after approved credits and scope exclusions                   | That the amount was delivered, invoiced, or collectible     |
| Contracted or delivered entitlement | What evidence says the value may be billed?                                | Contract terms, eligible usage, accepted delivery, or another declared basis | That the invoice was complete or cash arrived               |
| Invoiced revenue                    | What amount was placed on an invoice?                                      | Invoice lines in the declared currency and period                            | That the invoice reflects every eligible line or was paid   |
| Collected revenue                   | What amount was received by the cutoff?                                    | Receipts mapped to the same eligible line population                         | That a shortfall was a pricing concession or permanent loss |
| Confirmed leakage                   | Which supported amount failed a declared billing or collection obligation? | A resolved reason, evidence, owner, and disposition                          | That recovery is legally or commercially possible           |

Table from this essay. Sources and interpretation are given in the article.

The word expected needs a rule. In one business it may mean the signed contract value. In another, it may mean billable usage or accepted milestones under a contract. A sales quote that was never approved is not automatically expected revenue. A requested feature that was never contracted is not an invoice shortfall. The article's formula is only interpretable after the expected-value boundary is written down.

## How is leakage different from price realization?

The neighboring terms often meet in the same review, but they do not answer the same question:

Table 2 How is leakage different from price realization?

| Object              | Primary question                                                              | Boundary to declare                                             |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Price realization   | How much of a reference price survives transaction terms and deductions?      | List, invoice, pocket, or collected-price object                |
| Revenue leakage     | Where does an eligible commercial amount fail to reach invoice or collection? | Expected, invoiced, collected, and reason-code objects          |
| Revenue process     | Which states, handoffs, and acceptance events produced the transition?        | Process instance, owner, event, exception, and outcome          |
| Event schema        | Can the transition history be reconstructed?                                  | Immutable event, actor, timestamp, record key, and source       |
| Revenue recognition | When is revenue recognized under the applicable accounting rule?              | Accounting policy, performance obligation, period, and evidence |

Table from this essay. Sources and interpretation are given in the article.

The price-realization article asks what price survives the transaction waterfall. A lower pocket price can be an approved commercial choice and therefore not leakage. T-08 asks a later question: if an eligible amount existed, where did it fail to become an invoice or a receipt?

The revenue-process article owns the cross-functional handoffs that can create the gap. The revenue event-schema article owns the records needed to reconstruct those transitions. A leakage ledger can point to a missing event, but it cannot recreate one that was never retained.

## Which boundary should a team reconcile?

Start with a line population, not a total revenue number. A usable reconciliation card declares at least these fields:

**Table 3** Which boundary should a team reconcile?

| Field                        | Decision it controls                                                                           |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Reconciliation key           | Which contract line, usage period, milestone, or service line is being matched?                |
| Expected-value rule          | Which approved contract, price, usage, or delivery evidence makes the line eligible?           |
| Scope and credit rule        | Which exclusions and approved credits reduce the expected amount before comparison?            |
| Service or delivery period   | Which work period is being reconciled, separate from invoice date and receipt date?            |
| Currency and conversion rule | Are all amounts comparable, and which date fixes the exchange rate if needed?                  |
| Invoice rule                 | Does zero mean not invoiced, not yet invoiced, or not eligible?                                |
| Collection cutoff            | At what date is an unpaid invoice classified as timing, overdue, or another state?             |
| Reason code and owner        | Which failure point is being investigated, and who owns the next action?                       |
| Disposition                  | Is the item reconciled, excluded, timing, recoverability review, corrected, or confirmed loss? |

Table from this essay. Sources and interpretation are given in the article.

These fields do not form a universal accounting chart. They make the selected control boundary reproducible. The event schema can supply the event primitives, while the discount article keeps persistent concession effects outside this reconciliation.

## What does a revenue-leakage ledger look like?

The following ledger is synthetic. It uses one currency, one service period, and a collection cutoff of 31 October 2026. Net expected revenue is defined after approved credits and declared scope exclusions. Positive gaps indicate a shortfall at the named boundary. The rows do not represent a customer, contract, invoice, cash account, or company result.

Figure 1 A synthetic revenue-leakage reconciliation ledger

| Line  | De-<br>clared<br>basis                                              | Net ex-<br>pected<br>EUR | Invoiced<br>EUR | Collec-<br>ted by<br>31 Oct<br>EUR | Candid-<br>ate gap<br>EUR | Reason<br>code                        | Disposi-<br>tion                |
|-------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| R-01  | Accep-<br>ted li-<br>cense<br>period                                | 1,200                    | 1,200           | 1,200                              | 0                         | None                                  | Recon-<br>ciled                 |
| R-02  | Accep-<br>ted im-<br>ple-<br>menta-<br>tion<br>work                 | 900                      | 750             | 750                                | 150                       | Missing<br>invoice<br>line            | Billing re-<br>view             |
| R-03  | Eligible<br>usage<br>after ap-<br>proved<br>credit                  | 450                      | 450             | 400                                | 50                        | Not yet<br>due at<br>cutoff           | Timing re-<br>view              |
| R-04  | Support<br>period<br>after ap-<br>proved<br>credit                  | 500                      | 500             | 500                                | 0                         | Ap-<br>proved<br>credit               | Recon-<br>ciled                 |
| R-05  | De-<br>livered<br>add-on,<br>eligible<br>to bill                    | 700                      | 0               | 0                                  | 700                       | De-<br>livered<br>but not<br>invoiced | Recover-<br>ability re-<br>view |
| R-06  | Unap-<br>proved<br>feature<br>request                               | 0                        | 0               | 0                                  | 0                         | Outside<br>declare<br>d scope         | Excluded                        |
| Total | Five eli-<br>gible<br>lines<br>plus one<br>excluded<br>re-<br>quest | 3,750                    | 2,900           | 2,850                              | 900                       | Not one<br>cause                      | Review by<br>reason             |

Author's synthetic reconciliation ledger grounded in Stripe (2024). Stripe supplies a bounded expected-versus-received comparison; the line key, fields, values, reason codes, and dispositions are author synthesis.

The total is a reconciliation, not a conclusion. The five eligible lines contain 3,750 EUR of net expected revenue, 2,900 EUR invoiced, and 2,850 EUR collected by the cutoff. The arithmetic therefore gives:

- Pre-invoice candidate gap:  $3,750 - 2,900 = 850$  EUR.
- Post-invoice candidate gap:  $2,900 - 2,850 = 50$  EUR.
- Promised-to-collected candidate gap:  $3,750 - 2,850 = 900$  EUR.

- Candidate gap ratio against net expected revenue:  $900 / 3,750 = 24.0\%$ .

The 24.0% is not a leakage benchmark. It is a synthetic control signal whose interpretation depends on the row states. R-02 has a missing invoice line. R-03 is not yet due at the cutoff. R-04 already includes an approved credit and therefore does not create a false loss. R-05 has delivery evidence but no invoice and deserves a recoverability review. R-06 never enters the denominator because the request was not within the declared scope.

## Which gaps are not confirmed leakage?

The classification step prevents a clean-looking percentage from becoming a false accusation:

Table 5 Which gaps are not confirmed leakage?

| Observed difference                        | First question                                                           | Provisional state                              |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Expected amount is above invoice           | Was the line eligible and delivered under the declared rule?             | Under-invoice or scope review                  |
| Invoice is above collected amount          | Was the invoice due at the cutoff, and is the receipt correctly matched? | Timing, overdue, dispute, or collection review |
| Approved credit reduces the amount         | Was the credit authorized before the expected-value boundary was fixed?  | Commercial term, not automatically leakage     |
| Requested work has no contract or approval | Does the line belong in the eligible population?                         | Excluded, not a shortfall                      |
| Amounts use different currencies           | Which conversion date and source rate apply?                             | Uninterpretable until aligned                  |
| One line appears twice                     | Which key proves uniqueness?                                             | Data defect before financial interpretation    |

Table from this essay. Sources and interpretation are given in the article.

This is why the article uses candidate leakage as a working state. A candidate gap can be worth investigating without being a confirmed loss. Confirmation requires evidence of entitlement or eligible delivery, a failed billing or collection obligation, a reason that survives review, and a disposition. Recoverability is a further question. A confirmed gap may be legally or commercially unrecoverable; a recoverable candidate may still be a timing state.

## Can one leakage percentage identify the cause?

No. The same 900 EUR total can arise from a missing invoice line, a not-yet-due receipt, an approved credit that was misclassified, or a duplicated expected line. Those cases have different owners and different next events. Aggregating them early destroys the information needed to act.

If a team needs rates, name the population and numerator:

These formulas are author conventions for a control review. Use signed values during reconciliation so over-invoicing, refunds, credits, and over-collection do not disappear behind a  $\max(0, \text{gap})$  function. If a dashboard displays only positive shortfalls, keep the signed residual and the reason-coded rows beside it.

Do not mix periods. A service-period expectation compared with a later invoice can be valid if the line key preserves the relationship. A booking-period expectation compared with a receipt-period amount needs an explicit lag rule. A foreign-currency invoice compared with a home-currency promise needs a conversion rule. A total that survives none of these tests is not a useful leakage measure.

## What is revenue leakage not?

It is not automatically a discount. An approved price concession belongs to the price and expected-value rule if it was authorized inside the declared boundary. The price boundary is a separate question from this reconciliation.

It is not automatically revenue recognition. Recognition timing follows the applicable accounting policy and evidence. This article does not determine when a company may recognize revenue.

It is not automatically fraud. A mismatch can come from scope, timing, data, contract interpretation, delivery, billing, or collection. A reason code should preserve uncertainty until the evidence supports a stronger conclusion.

It is not profitability. The gap amount says nothing by itself about cost to serve, margin, cash cost, tax, or the economics of recovery.

It is not proof that a control change increases revenue. Stripe lists process, technology, contract, training, collection, and recovery responses in its practitioner guide, but the page does not provide an observed result for this synthetic ledger. A before-and-after change would still need a defined population, observation window, comparison, and outcome.

## How can a team run the reconciliation?

Use the process below on one line population before building a company-wide dashboard:

- 1 Freeze the question. Write whether the review is promised-to-invoiced, invoiced-to-collected, or promised-to-collected. State the service period and collection cutoff.
- 2 Declare eligibility. Choose the contract, usage, delivery, or approval evidence that makes a line part of net expected revenue. Exclude unapproved requests explicitly.
- 3 Normalize the key. Join contract, delivery, invoice, and receipt records to one line key and one currency rule. Keep duplicates and unmatched rows visible.
- 4 Reconcile the amounts. Calculate the signed expected-to-invoice, invoice-to-cash, and expected-to-cash gaps. Preserve the residual instead of forcing it into a known cause.
- 5 Code and assign. Give each positive gap a reason, owner, status, next event, and review date. Separate timing, approved credit, scope, data, under-invoice, and collection states.
- 6 Close or escalate. Mark the row reconciled, excluded, corrected, timing, recoverability review, or confirmed loss. Record the evidence used and the boundary under which the disposition holds.

The output is not a single impressive percentage. It is a reviewable set of line objects that tells the next owner what to verify.

## What can the evidence support?

The Stripe source supports a bounded practitioner description of expected income that was not earned or received, example billing and contract failure areas, an expected-versus-received comparison, and investigation categories from order through payment (Stripe, 2024). It does not support an accounting standard, a portable leakage rate, a product claim, a recovery benchmark, or a causal conclusion.

The ledger, formulas, values, reason codes, and review sequence are author synthesis. They make the measurement boundary explicit so a team can decide what to verify next. They do not show that any particular control will recover money.

## REFERENCES

---

Stripe. (2024, February 28). What is revenue leakage? Here's how to detect it and prevent it. Source page

## END OF ESSAY

---

## HOW TO CITE THIS ESSAY

Isoglu, S. (2026, September 6). What is revenue leakage? The gap between promised and collected revenue. Sinan Isoglu.  
<https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-is-revenue-leakage/>

## KEEP READING

---

Go-to-market & pricing

### What is price realization? List price is not the cash collected

<https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-is-price-realization/>

Go-to-market & pricing

### What is price-volume-mix analysis? Separate price from what was sold

<https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-is-price-volume-mix-analysis/>

Go-to-market & pricing

### What is channel economics? Revenue share is not channel profit

<https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-is-channel-economics/>



**Sinan Isoglu**, MBA (Quantic)

Commercial growth leader, lecturer and doctoral researcher