Kitchen maintenance planning review

Fictional customer offer

Fictional teaching example. The business, records, people, prices, dates and decisions are invented. No client result, actual order, technical inspection, proven demand or Navigate service offer is claimed.

Customer facing specimen of the revised offer. The provider is the fictional maintenance firm in the Growth Opportunity guide. This page can be separated from the internal launch work that follows.

Who this is for

For an operations manager coordinating several commercial kitchens who needs a clear maintenance action list to discuss with site leads and the business owner. This is not emergency repair, a technical safety inspection or ongoing maintenance cover.

What you receive

For one agreed site, we review the supplied maintenance records, discuss the priorities with your site lead and produce a concise action brief. Each item identifies its record or reported basis, next action, responsible person and review date. You receive an editable brief, a PDF and one scheduled 45 minute handover conversation.

How you can use it

Use the brief to assign coordination tasks, identify missing evidence and ask the existing qualified provider about unresolved equipment issues. The following sample shows the brief's structure and level of detail. It does not diagnose faults, certify equipment or replace the existing repair provider.

Price and scope

Illustrative price AUD 650 per agreed site, excluding GST. Pay the agreed invoice before the scheduled review begins. Repairs, replacement work, certification, further site work and ongoing advice or cover are excluded. We agree any additional work and its price separately before proceeding.

What we need from you

Provide the equipment list, available service records and incident log, and nominate the manager and site lead who can clarify them. If records or access are insufficient, we agree a narrower useful scope or a new date before accepting payment for the review. The brief labels unresolved information.

Questions and corrections

Bring questions to the scheduled handover. Tell the named review contact about a factual error within five business days of delivery; we check it against the supplied record and return a corrected brief where needed. New investigation, repeated follow up and ongoing support need a separate agreement.

Next step

Ask your usual contact at the maintenance firm for a scope check and a sample brief. We confirm the site, records, scope, price and available dates in writing. Your enquiry is not a booking. A start date is confirmed only after scope acceptance, the required records and payment are received.

Ridge Street kitchen maintenance action brief

Fictional teaching example

Fictional representative delivery for the revised offer. Prepared 11 November 2026 for the operations manager and site lead. This is a records and coordination example, not a technical inspection or repair recommendation.

Decision and priorities

Resolve the record mismatch first, then ask the existing qualified provider to review the repeat dishwasher interruptions before the next planning meeting. Keep the separately arranged cold room service visible. This brief authorises no repair or equipment use decision. It gives the manager three specific coordination actions rather than a general list of faults.

Basis and limits

E1 is the site equipment list dated 5 November. E2 is the site's incident log recording dishwasher stops on 18 and 28 October; both entries say the machine was restarted, with no recorded cause. E3 is the provider's cleaning record dated 2 November for hood H01. E4 is the provider reminder for cold room C01 service on 18 November. These fictional records support the coordination actions below, not a diagnosis or a conclusion that equipment is safe.

Item and basis	Action and useful result	Owner and timing	Position on 11 November
Hood record reference E1 and E3	Correct the folder tag from H02 to H01. Retain the dated provider record unchanged and put its reference beside H01 in the equipment list.	Site lead Alex Completed 11 November	Reference corrected. H02 still has no matching cleaning record in the supplied file; request it rather than copy H01's record.
Dishwasher interruptions E2	Send the two dated log entries to the existing qualified provider and ask what further evidence or inspection they require. Record their response before choosing repair work.	Operations manager Sam Request by 12 November	Investigation request prepared, not sent or accepted. Cause and technical priority remain for the qualified provider.
Cold room service E4	Confirm the separately arranged 18 November visit with the provider and site lead. Add the confirmed contact and access arrangement to the shared calendar.	Site lead Alex Check by 13 November	Reminder received. Attendance and access are not yet reconfirmed; this review does not book the service.

Use at the handover

Sam opens this brief with Alex, checks that each named owner accepts their task and records any changed date. Alex can already see the corrected H01 reference. Sam uses the prepared dishwasher request below, rather than asking the provider to act on an unsupported diagnosis. Review open items on 16 November. No task is treated as agreed merely because a name appears here.

Prepared provider question

Our site log records dishwasher stops on 18 and 28 October. Both entries note a restart but do not identify a cause. What records or qualified inspection do you need to assess the issue? Please confirm your proposed scope, availability and any charge before work is booked. Sam will review your response with the site lead. This message is prepared only.

One record reference is corrected and the next two coordination actions are clear. Technical judgments and supplier commitments remain with the appropriate people. The output helps the manager act without pretending those decisions have already been made.

How the first review reaches useful delivery

Fictional teaching example

Internal plan for one further bounded trial. The stages below are proposed, not actual customer commitments. Keep the customer offer and delivery brief together when checking this path.

Find and assess fit

The owner uses the existing customer relationship to discuss a maintenance planning problem and show the offer plus sample brief. No bulk campaign is planned. If the customer needs emergency repair, certification or continuing cover, refer the question to the appropriate existing provider rather than sell this review as a substitute.

Agree the purchase

The owner checks one site's records and expected use, then sends the written scope and AUD 650 excluding GST price. The customer confirms the site, inputs, single handover and correction window. The owner approves exceptions. Do not accept payment while a material scope question is unresolved. A proposed date is not a confirmed booking.

Prepare and confirm

The coordinator checks that payment and agreed records have arrived, the manager and site lead are available and a real six hour work allowance is reserved without displacing repair commitments. Only then confirm the review and handover dates. Missing records or additional support needs go back to the owner for a changed scope or date.

Deliver and use

The reviewer traces each action to a supplied record or reported observation, checks names and dates, and marks technical unknowns. The manager receives the editable brief and PDF before the 45 minute handover. Together they walk through the first action, confirm responsibilities where actually agreed and identify the provider question that needs qualified judgment.

Correct an issue

The named review contact receives factual corrections within the stated five business day window. Check the original record, explain any remaining disagreement and issue a dated corrected version when appropriate. Repeated support or a new investigation is paused for a separate scope discussion; it is not silently absorbed into the fixed review price.

Review before extending

The owner records the further trial's total effort, including preparation, handover, corrections and follow up. Ask whether the manager could use the brief and what they still needed. Review actual scope acceptance and payment separately from compliments. Do not accept the remaining assumed sites or promise ongoing cover until the trial changes the decision.

The offer's limited support appears again in scope acceptance, preparation and correction. There is no automatic subscription, marketing consent, supplier booking or obligation to buy more.

The support expectation changes the launch

Fictional teaching example

Internal decision record. These figures extend the existing fictional Growth Opportunity case. The comparison is the whole six week first programme, including one time setup. Six or three purchases are scenarios, not established demand or accepted orders.

Resources and comparison basis

Six weeks; AUD excluding GST. Price 650 per site. Delivery time valued at 60 per hour; materials 50 and variable travel 30 per site. Setup is 12 hours valued at 720. There are 60 available hours after protected repair commitments. Standing overhead, acquisition effort, tax and other unlisted costs are excluded. Time value may not be additional cash wages. Payment timing needs a separate cash view.

Changed fact

In this new fictional extension, the buyer expects another two hours of explanation and follow up per site beyond the six hour case. At eight hours each, six reviews use all 60 hours including setup and lose 180 after the stated setup value. The previous wording left the support boundary unclear. This is a change in work, not merely a wording issue.

Whole programme scenario	Revenue	After stated setup	Total hours
6 sites at 650 and 6 hours each	3,900	540	48
6 sites at 650 and 8 hours each	3,900	-180	60
3 sites at 650 and 8 hours each	1,950	-450	36
6 sites at 750 and 8 hours each	4,500	420	60
3 sites at 750 and 8 hours each	2,250	-150	36

Choice and actual revision

Do not roll out six open ended reviews. Compare the narrower 650 offer with a separately priced support service, a higher review price or no expansion. The customer page now includes one scheduled 45 minute handover and a five business day factual correction window, excluding ongoing support. The specimen includes a manager walkthrough and prepared provider question, so a useful next action is supported. Scope acceptance and correction in the customer path carry the same boundary. A 750 price is not proven acceptable, and the revised 650 scope has not yet demonstrated a six hour delivery time.

One further trial

Owner's question: can a suitable manager use the revised brief without expecting continuing support, while total reviewer effort remains within six hours? Offer one further paid review only after the customer explicitly accepts the revised scope and a real slot is available. Record scope questions, actual payment, the manager's use of the first action and all preparation, handover, correction and follow up time. The owner reviews within five business days of delivery. No extra outreach or trial is authorised by this teaching example.

Decision conditions

If the customer needs ongoing support, do not call this bounded review a fit; develop a separately scoped offer or stop. If total work exceeds six hours or existing repair commitments suffer, pause further acceptance and revise the work or economics. If the manager cannot use the action brief, correct the output before offering more reviews. One useful, paid trial would justify considering another limited step, not a six site demand forecast or recurring service.

The next commitment

No further customer or trial is committed in this example. The next proposed action is the owner's scope check using the revised customer page and specimen. Record actual trial results here after delivery. The 720 setup value is included once in the whole programme comparisons above; if it is already incurred, do not charge it again as a new incremental cost. At 650 and six hours, one additional site's stated contribution is 210 before unlisted costs; this alone does not prove the next job is worth taking.

The launch remains limited and conditional. The useful result is a clearer offer, a usable delivery specimen and a test that can still stop the work. Revenue, contribution, cash and actual demand remain different questions.

Further working resources

Use a linked tool only when it helps the chosen job. The offer and sample do not require a full marketing plan or a new business plan.

Growth opportunity guide and working material

Customer research toolkit

Capacity planning working tool

Weekly cash forecast

Product and service launch planning combines offer design, a useful prototype, customer experience, delivery preparation and proportionate testing. These working tools and the fictional illustration are original Navigate material. A completed plan or an encouraging conversation does not establish demand or a viable launch.

Strategyzer Test Card guidance

GOV UK guidance on testing a substantive service prototype