

Scheduling software

Where a new scheduling offer could compete

The decision

A small scheduling startup wants a clearer offer for independent consultants. Which competitive differences should shape its next landing-page test?

What the evidence suggests

A generic booking link is a crowded starting point. Test a specific consultant workflow and show the full path from qualification to booking. Price and feature count alone leave the buyer with little reason to switch.

COMPETITOR	PRICE / BILLING	OBSERVED OFFER
Calendly [1]	Standard: \$10/seat/month, billed yearly. Teams: \$16/seat/month, billed yearly.	Standard includes several calendar connections and reminders. Teams adds lead routing and round-robin scheduling.
Cal.com [2]	Teams: \$12/user/month on the yearly plan.	Its free individual tier offers unlimited event types and calendars. Teams adds routing forms, round-robin scheduling and branding removal.
SavvyCal [3]	Basic: \$10/user/month; Premium: \$17/user/month in the displayed annual-saving view.	Basic includes team scheduling. Premium adds a custom domain, assistant delegation and paid bookings.

How to read this comparison

Prices are public USD list-price observations. Calendly and Cal.com explicitly label yearly billing. SavvyCal displays a two-month saving beside these figures; confirm its billing selection and checkout total before quoting a buyer. Tiers are not feature-equivalent. No product account, checkout purchase or usability test was performed.

Three next moves

Hypotheses to test with buyers

1. Test one complete consultant workflow

Create a demo using one fixed scenario: qualify a lead, offer relevant meeting times and collect the information needed for the session. Put that workflow above a general feature list.

Basis: Calendly Teams and Cal.com Teams already bundle routing with scheduling [1,2].

Test: Show two headline variants to 10 relevant consultants. Record which workflow they need now and whether they will start a paid pilot. A preference alone is not a sale.

2. Make the switch cost explicit

List what transfers from the buyer's current process, what they must re-create, and what the pilot includes. Do not claim migration is automatic before it is implemented.

Basis: All three vendors advertise substantial scheduling capability [1-3]. The need to displace an existing workflow is our inference.

Test: Ask each interested buyer what prevents switching; offer a paid pilot with a written setup scope. Track paid acceptance and setup time.

3. Compare the relevant annual total

Publish a small comparison for the specific number of paid users and required capabilities. State the billing commitment, add-ons and verification date beside every figure.

Basis: Published prices use per-user or per-seat billing, and some capabilities sit in higher tiers [1-3].

Test: Have prospects choose a configuration before comparing price. Measure completed purchases and objections rather than clicks on the table.

Source appendix

[1] Calendly pricing | <https://calendly.com/pricing>

[2] Cal.com pricing | <https://cal.com/pricing>

[3] SavvyCal pricing | <https://savvykal.com/pricing>

Accessed 2026-09-05. Public vendor pages only. Facts and billing notes above are source observations; proposed actions and their tests are Keptline analysis.

This is an independent demonstration, not commissioned work or an endorsement. Suggested positioning is a hypothesis; public pages cannot establish customer satisfaction, conversion rates or willingness to pay.