ELITE HOSPITALITY SOLUTIONS

FICTIONAL DEMONSTRATION / SYNTHETIC DATA

Venue Performance Diagnostic

An example of evidence-led restaurant management analysis

EXAMPLE VENUE
Example Restaurant A

REVIEW PERIOD
Illustrative four weeks

REPORT STATUS
Sample only

THE MANAGEMENT QUESTION

What evidence should be checked before changing labour hours to address roster productivity?

DECISION AT THIS STAGE

Do not change staffing based on aggregate sales and covers alone. First match demand, paid hours and service requirements.

NET SALES, EX GST

$42,000

Synthetic four-week value

GUEST COVERS

2,100

Same illustrative period

SALES / COVER, EX GST

$20.00

$42,000 ÷ 2,100

WHAT THIS EXAMPLE DEMONSTRATES

A disciplined sequence: frame the operating question, define a comparable baseline, identify missing evidence, assign the next action and confirm how the decision will be checked.

This is not an actual EHS client engagement, a completed diagnostic or evidence of realised financial or service results.

01 / BASELINE & DEFINITIONS

A baseline is not a diagnosis.

These three figures are invented for demonstration purposes and refer to the same illustrative four-week period.

MEASURE	FICTIONAL VALUE	DEFINITION	EVIDENCE
Net sales, ex GST	**$42,000**	Sales excluding GST for the same four-week period.	Synthetic input
Guest covers	**2,100**	Number of recorded guest covers in that period.	Synthetic input
Net sales per cover, ex GST	**$20.00**	$42,000 divided by 2,100 covers.	Calculated

CALCULATION CHECK

$42,000 ÷ 2,100 = $20.00 net sales per cover

THIS MEASURE CAN TELL MANAGEMENT

The net sales per recorded cover, assuming the sales and cover counts are accurate and defined consistently.

THIS MEASURE CANNOT TELL MANAGEMENT

Labour hours or cost; staffing adequacy; demand peaks; service speed; workload; guest satisfaction; or why staffing pressure may exist.

DATA-QUALITY CHECKS BEFORE A REAL COMPARISON

01 **Period alignment**
Sales, covers and paid hours must relate to comparable service windows.

02 **Consistent definitions**
Check cover counting, discounts, refunds, exclusions and GST treatment.

03 **Source reconciliation**
Check POS duplicates, report provenance, exceptions and trading conditions.

Evidence boundary: A correct ratio does not justify a roster decision without matched operational evidence.

02 / EVIDENCE GAP & INTERPRETATION

Ask what the first ratio misses.

The sample contains only aggregate net sales and covers. It does not contain the evidence needed to diagnose labour productivity.

AVAILABLE IN THIS FICTIONAL EXAMPLE

Four-week sales and covers, and the derived sales-per-cover calculation. No actual POS or roster extract is represented.

MISSING EVIDENCE TO REQUEST

01	**Demand by service period** Sales and covers by matched half-hour or other agreed service window.
02	**Paid labour hours** Paid hours for the same periods, with breaks and time definitions reconciled.
03	**Role and skills coverage** Kitchen and front-of-house skill mix during peaks and quieter periods.
04	**Workflow and service** Preparation and closing workload, operating hours and service expectations.
05	**Exceptional conditions** Closures, promotions, menu changes or unusual trading events.

HYPOTHESES WORTH TESTING / NOT FINDINGS

01 Peak and quiet trading periods may require different skill coverage.

02 The same total paid hours could be distributed differently across the week.

03 Opening, preparation and closing work may not track guest covers.

04 Menu preparation and service mix may affect workload per cover.

No staffing conclusion is justified yet. These hypotheses guide evidence requests; they are not findings about a real venue.

03 / ACTION & VERIFICATION

Give the next action an owner.

Illustrative register entry EX-01, not a completed engagement or a labour-reduction recommendation. A real engagement requires a written scope, permissioned source data and management review.

ISSUE	Labour adequacy cannot be assessed from aggregate sales and covers.
BASELINE	Four-week net sales $42,000 ex GST; 2,100 covers; synthetic only.
DATA SOURCE	Invented example values. No actual POS or roster system.
EVIDENCE CONFIDENCE	Arithmetic: high for stated inputs. Staffing implication: not established.
NEXT ACTION	Reconcile sales, covers and paid labour hours by comparable service periods; check roles and service requirements.
SUGGESTED OWNER	Venue manager (illustrative role, not a real employee).
DUE DATE	To be agreed; no committed date is invented.
EXPECTED MECHANISM	Better-aligned information may support comparing feasible roster options.
DEPENDENCIES	Reliable POS extracts, paid-hour data and operational context.
IMPLEMENTATION PROOF	Not available. No activity or result is claimed in this example.
VERIFICATION	Net sales ex GST per paid labour hour, checked alongside service quality and role coverage.
STATUS	INFORMATION REQUIRED · NOT IMPLEMENTED

CONDITIONAL FOLLOW-UP IF BETTER EVIDENCE BECOMES AVAILABLE

01 / DEFINE

Reconcile sales, covers, labour hours and service-period boundaries.

02 / EXPLAIN

Review demand, preparation and closing duties, and role coverage.

03 / COMPARE

Consider feasible alternatives only if evidence supports an issue.

04 / VERIFY

If an authorised trial proceeds, compare agreed measures and service impacts.

Have an operating question worth examining?

contact@elitehospitalitysolutions.com

elitehospitalitysolutions.com