

01 / Situation & scope

Plan production with evidence, not guesswork alone.

Bakeries / France

These cases show how we would apply our method to different professional situations. Business profiles, countries, timelines and gains are illustrative assumptions. They do not describe completed client engagements.

A seven-person bakery adjusts production daily. Sales, unsold products and special orders are not consolidated in one view.

Simulated schedule	6 weeks
Support planned in the scenario	7 consulting days
Assumed internal commitment	3 person-days

Consulting days are spread across the schedule and do not mean full-time attendance. Internal days are additional. Scope and a quote must be agreed for a real engagement.

Proposed audit scope

Planning for selected product families, without autonomous control of production.

What we would examine

Scenario dataset covering 12 weeks: sales, unsold items, special orders and shortages by product family.

02 / Process & decisions

The process, department by department

Operations & production

Simulated starting point	Decide quantities from scattered notes
Proposed process	Editable plan by product family
Human approval	Head baker

Purchasing & inventory

Simulated starting point	Manually assemble ingredient needs
Proposed process	Preparation list checked against actual inventory
Human approval	Purchasing lead

Management & planning

Simulated starting point	Track waste without linking it to decisions
Proposed process	Adjustment log and weekly indicators
Human approval	Manager

The approach to compare

Compare weekday averages with demand forecasting. Separate bread and pastries; show a range instead of presenting one figure as certain.

What stays with the professional

The baker adjusts and approves quantities against production constraints. Recipes, allergens and food safety remain under professional control.

03 / Timeline & deliverables

From audit to an independent team

A simulated engagement timeline, with a decision and deliverable at every stage. Rollout depends on test results.

Week 1 | 1.5 consulting days - Observe & measure

Scenario dataset covering 12 weeks: sales, unsold items, special orders and shortages by product family.

Proposed deliverable : Process map, baseline measurement and issue register.

Week 2 | 1 consulting days - Scope & decide

Compare simplification, existing features and AI. Define scope, access, full costs and stop criteria before building.

Proposed deliverable : Audit report, priority matrix and test protocol.

Week 3 | 2 consulting days - Prototype

Compare weekday averages with demand forecasting. Separate bread and pastries; show a range instead of presenting one figure as certain.

Proposed deliverable : Limited prototype, test set and approval workflow.

Weeks 4-5 | 1.5 consulting days - Test & decide

Assess unsold items and shortages together on comparable days. Do not accept an improvement that worsens availability.

Proposed deliverable : Comparative assessment: proceed, adjust or stop.

Week 6 | 1 consulting days - Train & hand over

Train users on routine and exceptional cases. Appoint an owner and document the manual fallback. If testing fails, hand over findings and a correction plan.

Proposed deliverable : Usage guide, team workshop and 30-day follow-up plan.

During the 30 days after an approved pilot: review metrics weekly, examine exceptions and decide whether to maintain, correct or expand the scope. This follow-up period is outside the scenario schedule and consulting days.

04 / Simulated gains & measurement

Simulated net time saving

6.7 h / month

Reduce planning preparation time and better document adjustments. Lower waste remains a separate hypothesis.

Assumed monthly volume	26 daily plans
Baseline time per unit	40 min
Target time, including human review	20 min
Monthly monitoring and maintenance	2 h

$26 \times (40 - 20) \div 60 - 2 = 6.7 \text{ h / month}$

If only half the volume benefits from the process, with the same monthly monitoring: 2.3 h / month

This calculation is a simulation, not a client measurement. Target time includes corrections and review. Time released is not a demonstrated cash saving; it depends on actual volume and adoption.

How we would verify the result

Compare both methods on a set separate from preparation examples. Measure total time, corrections, critical errors and actual use. Keep difficult cases in the assessment; suspend if quality or confidentiality deteriorates.

Professional acceptance criterion : Assess unsold items and shortages together on comparable days. Do not accept an improvement that worsens availability.

Cost advice, data preparation, integration, licences, training and maintenance before committing. Price, return on investment and revenue effects must be established for each engagement.

Before a pilot, define permitted data, access and any supplier reuse. Country-specific and professional rules must be checked for the real engagement.

Background reference: CNIL, using a generative AI system.

Explore this for our organisation - ORCHESTRATEUR.AI