

01 / Situation & scope

Plan purchasing with a clearer view of demand.

Restaurants / 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 16-person restaurant plans purchasing from till data, bookings and staff experience. Daily consolidation is manual.

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

Daily purchasing preparation and variance tracking, without automatic supplier orders.

What we would examine

Scenario dataset covering 12 weeks: sales, bookings, purchases and waste, with closures and events identified.

02 / Process & decisions

The process, department by department

Purchasing & inventory

Simulated starting point	Rebuild the list each morning
Proposed process	Purchasing suggestion from sales and bookings
Human approval	Head chef

Operations & production

Simulated starting point	Observe variances without a shared history
Proposed process	Track waste and shortages by service
Human approval	Operations manager

Human resources

Simulated starting point	Method dependent on one person
Proposed process	Documented routine and training for a backup
Human approval	Manager

The approach to compare

Compare a simple weekday forecast with a lightweight predictive model. Explain differences and propose an editable purchasing list.

What stays with the professional

The chef approves quantities and orders. Allergens, temperatures and hygiene remain governed by existing professional procedures.

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, bookings, purchases and waste, with closures and events identified.

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 a simple weekday forecast with a lightweight predictive model. Explain differences and propose an editable purchasing list.

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

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

Compare on weeks not used to prepare the model; track waste, shortages and correction time together.

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

Spend less time consolidating figures before service. Any waste reduction must be demonstrated separately.

Assumed monthly volume	26 daily planning sessions
Baseline time per unit	45 min
Target time, including human review	25 min
Monthly monitoring and maintenance	2 h

$26 \times (45 - 25) \div 60 - 2 = 6.7 \text{ h / month}$

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 : Compare on weeks not used to prepare the model; track waste, shortages and correction time together.

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