

Methods note · Everyday practice

Repair when remaining life is a range

Omar Haddad · 9 October 2026

Fictional author and institute · Editorial demonstration, not peer reviewed

ABSTRACT

Repair decisions combine a visible quote with uncertainty about restoration, subsequent failure, software support, and the consequences of downtime. This methods note separates those questions through a fictional smartphone case with explicitly invented prices, probabilities, and service periods. European Commission smartphone requirements and repair-policy guidance establish relevant institutional conditions, while the GHG Protocol Product Standard informs the environmental boundary. The analysis explains why expected months are not guaranteed service, why cost per expected month is incomplete, and why deferred replacement must not be counted automatically as permanent avoidance. Financial vulnerability and access needs remain independent constraints. No model-specific reliability or climate benefit is estimated. The proposed conversation connects diagnosis, a defined service horizon, enforceable support, and responsibility for adverse outcomes.

Keywords: repair · remaining life · reliability · decision uncertainty

A source-based editorial text, not a report of original Still North research. Examples and imagery are illustrative.

The repair quote does not contain a lifetime

A repair can have a clear price and an uncertain outcome. Replacing a phone's battery may address a diagnosed fault without answering how long its display, charging connection, software support, or other components will remain adequate. The useful decision is not whether repair is admirable. It is whether a particular repair offers a credible route to the service a person needs, given uncertainty and the consequences of another failure.

This methods note uses a fictional smartphone decision to distinguish repair success, remaining useful life, and replacement timing. The synthesis draws on European Commission product requirements and repair-policy guidance, together with the GHG Protocol Product Standard. It is not a reliability study or individual consumer advice. All prices, probabilities, and service periods in the worked case are invented assumptions, not market observations or forecasts for any phone.

Useful life is the period in which a device safely and reliably meets its owner's requirements. It is not identical to physical survival. A phone that turns on but cannot support an essential accessibility feature or receive necessary security updates may no longer provide the required service. Conversely, cosmetic wear does not establish that a functioning device needs replacement.

Separate the uncertainties before calculating

Begin with diagnosis. Is there evidence of an isolated battery problem, or only a symptom such as rapid discharge? Ask a qualified repairer what the quote covers, what inspection has occurred, and which other faults remain possible. Damage, swelling, overheating, or other safety concerns are not invitations to perform an improvised repair. Follow the manufacturer's safety advice and use appropriately trained help.

Next distinguish the probability that the repair restores function from the period of useful service conditional on that restoration. A high chance of immediate success can coexist with a short remaining support window. A repair warranty can reduce financial risk, but its duration is not a promise that every component will survive. Record exclusions, repeat-fault treatment, turnaround, and access to a loan device.

Finally identify the user's exposure to failure. Missing a social message, losing access to work scheduling, and losing an essential communication aid are different consequences. Backups, alternative authentication routes, accessible loan devices, and nearby support change those consequences. They do not change a battery's physical reliability, but they can change which option is reasonable under the same technical uncertainty.

A fictional eighteen-month decision

Suppose a fictional owner needs a supported phone for the next eighteen months. An inspected battery replacement is quoted at £90, and a suitable refurbished replacement at £260. Those figures are invented for this example. The existing phone is assumed to have adequate software support for the full period, and neither option has an identified safety problem. If either assumption fails, the decision must be reformulated.

To expose the logic, consider an assumed repair pathway with two possible remaining service periods: eighteen months with probability 0.7, and three months with probability 0.3, followed by replacement. The expected service before another replacement is therefore $0.7 \times 18 + 0.3 \times 3 = 13.5$ months. This arithmetic describes the assumed branches. It is not an estimate derived from evidence, and the probabilities must not be presented as typical repair success rates.

The mean alone hides the owner's actual risk. Nobody receives thirteen and a half guaranteed months. In one

branch, the owner pays for a repair and then needs another device relatively soon. A person who cannot afford that second payment may reject the pathway even if its expected cost looks attractive. A programme offering a loan device, staged payment, or meaningful repeat-fault protection can alter that constraint.

Use the same horizon for both pathways. Replacing now also involves uncertain failure, warranty terms, and residual useful life at month eighteen. Do not assume perfect survival for the refurbished option merely because its price is higher. A fair comparison needs equivalent information about both devices, including support, condition, repair access, and what service remains at the end.

Why cost per expected month can mislead

Dividing the repair price by expected months is a screening description, not a complete decision rule. It omits replacement expenditure after early failure, time without a phone, data restoration, and the service remaining from a later purchase. It can also confuse the ratio of expected quantities with the expected value of a ratio. Specify the complete sequence of costs and service in each branch before averaging.

A small decision table is often sufficient. For each pathway, write the initial payment, possible later payment, downtime, relevant warranty protection, and endpoint condition. Where probabilities are unsupported, show branches without assigning weights. Ask which conclusions survive across the plausible branches. This avoids turning a repairer's qualitative judgement into a spurious decimal probability.

A useful threshold question is what additional service would make the repair acceptable to this owner, given their cash limit and reliability requirements. Then ask whether the diagnosis and support window make that service plausible. A threshold can be clear even when its likelihood is unknown. It tells the repairer which uncertainty matters instead of asking for an impossible guarantee of all future performance.

Environmental consequences require a separate pathway

The GHG Protocol Product Standard provides a framework covering production, use, and end of life. It does not justify subtracting an entire new phone's footprint whenever an existing phone is repaired. Repair may defer a replacement, change the model eventually bought, or preserve a device that would otherwise enter another user's hands. The environmental comparison must describe those consequences consistently.

In the fictional early-failure branch, both the repair and a subsequent replacement occur within the horizon. In the longer-life branch, replacement is deferred beyond it. A short horizon can make that deferral look like permanent avoidance. Report the timing and remaining service explicitly, or extend the analysis using justified replacement assumptions. Do not erase the next purchase merely because it occurs after the reporting date.

Repair parts, technician travel, shipping, temporary devices, and use-phase differences may matter. Their inclusion depends on the actual service system, not on a presumption that local repair has no footprint. Equally,

historical manufacturing emissions of an already owned phone are not newly generated by choosing to keep it. Distinguish an allocation of a product's life-cycle inventory from the incremental consequences of today's decision.

Use regulation as evidence about conditions, not outcomes

The Commission's [smartphone and tablet guidance](#) describes ecodesign and labelling rules applying to covered products placed on the EU market from June 2025. The requirements address matters including repair access, spare parts, battery durability, and software updates. These conditions can support longer use, but they do not establish the remaining life of a particular damaged phone.

The same guidance distinguishes a repairability class from durability and battery information. A device designed to be easier to repair is not necessarily cheaper to repair in every place, nor immune to other failures. Check the exact model, market, date, and available service. Requirements for newer products should not be assumed to apply retrospectively to every older device in a household drawer.

The Commission's [repair-directive explanation](#) describes a product-specific obligation framework and national implementation. Legal coverage, guarantees, and remedies must be checked in the relevant jurisdiction. This note does not interpret an individual contract. Its practical lesson is to ask about enforceable support and responsibility, rather than treating the word repairable as a complete consumer protection.

Limits and a better repair conversation

This method cannot produce model-specific survival probabilities from a quote, and it deliberately leaves unsupported probabilities unweighted. Failure modes may be correlated: water damage, for example, can make an isolated-component model inappropriate. Personal access requirements and financial vulnerability also resist a single universal score. Environmental inventory gaps remain even when the financial decision is straightforward.

The better conversation joins diagnosis to a defined service horizon and a plan for adverse outcomes. Ask what is known, what could fail next, what support remains, and who carries the cost if the repair does not deliver useful service. Repair then becomes neither a purity rule nor an automatic bargain. It becomes a concrete option whose uncertainty can be reduced, shared fairly, or accepted knowingly.

References

1. European Commission. [Smartphones and Tablets](#), official guidance on ecodesign, durability, repairability, and energy labelling.
2. European Commission. [Directive on repair of goods](#), official explanation of Directive (EU) 2024/1799 and implementation.
3. World Resources Institute and World Business Council for Sustainable Development (2011). [Product Life Cycle Accounting and Reporting Standard](#).