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# **Executive Summary**

BiteBlend wants to completely transform the online meal delivery market by providing an extremely user-friendly and customized experience. BiteBlend aims to improve consumer pleasure and engagement by offering customized recommendation engines, dynamic menu displays, and advanced filtering options that adapt to individual preferences and dietary needs.

# **Introduction**

Although the market for food delivery has expanded rapidly, consumers still want more individualized and user-friendly services. In order to satisfy these needs, BiteBlend offers a novel solution that raises the bar for the user experience in food delivery apps.

## **Background**

With the proliferation of food ordering apps, users are often overwhelmed by choices and find it challenging to locate meals that fit their specific dietary preferences or current desires. BiteBlend addresses this gap by offering tailored recommendations and an enhanced discovery process.

## **Current Situation**

With multiple food ordering applications, consumers are frequently overloaded with options[[1]](#footnote-0) and need help to choose meals that satisfy their particular dietary requirements or present cravings. BiteBlend fills this void by providing personalized suggestions and an improved search interface.

## **Description of the problem and opportunity**

User satisfaction diminishes due to decision fatigue caused by the current platforms' need for more personalization and interaction. The proposed features of BiteBlend are intended to revolutionize this process by improving the intuitiveness, fun factor, and compatibility of meal ordering with personal preferences.

## **MOV**

| **Area of Impact** | **The project will be successful if it:** |
| --- | --- |
| Customer | Achieves interaction from 50% of customers at least 2 times over a month within 3 months. |
| Strategic | Has at least 10 restaurants using the app for promotion within 6 months. |
| Financial | Gained over 50 premium users within 6 months. |
| Operational | Launched an update to fix bugs and address user recommendations within 3 months. |
| Social | Increased social media presence across Facebook, Instagram, TikTok, and Youtube within 2 months. |

## **How Achieving the project’s MOV will support the organization’s goal and strategy**

Achieving the MOV is consistent with BiteBlend's strategic objective to dominate the food delivery industry in terms of client retention and satisfaction. BiteBlend will stand out in a crowded market and build a devoted user base by offering a personalized and simple ordering experience.

# **Alternatives**

## **Mood-Based Recommendation:**

People's moods frequently affect the foods they choose to eat. Including recommendations based on mood can offer highly customized options, increasing user happiness and streamlining the purchase process.

## **Customized Filters:**

Users have a wide range of needs and preferences, from dietary limitations to flavor preferences. Users may locate precisely what they want, when they want it, with the use of personalized filters based on category, user activity, delivery time, and other factors.

## **Gamification and Reward for Fast Ordering:**

By adding fun and competitive aspects, gamification can dramatically improve user engagement. Fast ordering rewards encourage prompt decision-making and boost order frequency, which is advantageous for the platform and users alike.

## **Use Voice Search:**

For consumers who are multitasking, voice search provides a quick, hands-free way to place orders. This feature can potentially increase the app's attractiveness and accessibility, reaching a more extensive user base.

## **Display Ongoing Deals:**

Emphasizing current specials and promotions might entice customers to try new foods and eateries, resulting in a rise in order volume. Additionally, it improves consumers' overall experience and happiness with the platform, adding value for them.

# **Analysis of alternatives**

For a thorough evaluation, we'll consider the following criteria with assigned weights reflecting their importance:

* User Adoption (30%),
* Implementation Complexity (20%),
* Cost (20%),
* Potential Revenue Increase (15%), and
* User Satisfaction (15%).

The estimated risk value indicates the likelihood of successful implementation and positive impact, with higher values representing lower risk.

## **Data Collection & Metrics**

* **User Adoption**: Track feature usage rates and new user sign-ups attributed to the feature through app analytics.
* **Implementation Complexity**: Evaluate based on development time estimates, required technical expertise, and integration complexity with existing systems.
* **Cost**: Estimate based on development, maintenance, and any additional operational costs.
* **Potential Revenue Increase**: Project based on anticipated increases in average order value, order frequency, and user base growth.
* **User Satisfaction**: Measure through post-implementation surveys, user reviews, and Net Promoter Score (NPS).

## **Alternative Analysis**

| **Criteria** | **Weight** | **Mood-based recommendation** | **Customized Filters** | **Gamification and Rewards** | **Voice Search** | **Ongoing Deals Display** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **User Adoption** | 30% | 8 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 7 |
| **Implementation Complexity** | 20% | 6 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 8 |
| **Cost** | 20% | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 7 |
| **Potential Revenue Increase** | 15% | 9 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| **User Satisfaction** | 15% | 9 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 4 |
| **Estimated Risk Value** |  | 7.3 | 7.2 | 6.7 | 6.25 | 6.6 |

**Note**: The composite score determines the risk values. Higher score alternatives have less risk and better chances of successful implementation and a positive impact on the company.

### **Mood-based Recommendation**

* **User Adoption**: High potential due to the unique and personalized nature of recommendations, likely attracting users interested in a tailored dining experience.
* **Implementation Complexity & Cost**: Moderate complexity and cost, as developing mood-recognition algorithms requires advanced technology and expertise, but the investment is justified by the high potential for user engagement.
* **Potential Revenue Increase & User Satisfaction**: The highest scores in these categories reflect the strong appeal of personalized experiences, likely leading to increased order frequency and a loyal user base.

### **Customized Filters**

* **User Adoption**: Similar to mood-based recommendations, offering users the ability to fine-tune their search based on specific preferences can significantly enhance the user experience.
* **Implementation Complexity & Cost**: Comparable to mood-based recommendations, with a slightly higher cost due to the need to categorize and tag a vast array of menu items accurately.
* **Potential Revenue Increase & User Satisfaction**: Slightly lower than mood-based recommendations, as while highly useful, they may not offer as unique a selling proposition.

### **Gamification and Rewards:**

* **User Adoption**: Expected to be high as gamification adds an element of fun and competition, encouraging more frequent use.
* **Implementation Complexity & Cost**: Lower complexity and cost compared to more technologically advanced features, making it a cost-effective way to engage users.
* **Potential Revenue Increase & User Satisfaction**: Lower scores in these areas reflect the challenge of translating game elements into sustained revenue growth and long-term satisfaction.

### **Voice Search**

* **User Adoption**: Potentially lower due to varying user comfort levels with voice technology and its applicability in noisy environments.
* **Implementation Complexity & Cost**: Similar complexity and cost to mood-based recommendations, but potentially lower user adoption reduces its risk value.
* **Potential Revenue Increase & User Satisfaction**: Moderate impact expected, as while convenient, it may not significantly alter ordering habits or frequency.

### **Ongoing Deals Display**

* **User Adoption**: Expected to be moderate, as deals and promotions are common features in food ordering apps.
* **Implementation Complexity & Cost**: Higher complexity due to the need for real-time updates and partnerships with restaurants, justifying the higher cost.
* **Potential Revenue Increase**: Lower potential revenue increase as deal-seekers may not convert to regular customers.
* **User Satisfaction**: Significantly lower, as constant promotion of deals may not contribute to a personalized or satisfying user experience.

## **Financial Analysis**

| **Discount rate** | **6.00%** |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Assume the project is completed in Year 0 |  |  | **Year** |  |  |  |
|  | **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **Total** |  |
| Costs | **150,000** | **40,000** | **40,000** | **40,000** |  |  |
| Discount factor | 1.00 | 0.94 | 0.89 | 0.84 |  |  |
| **Discounted costs** | **150,000** | **37,600** | **35,600** | **33,600** | **256,800** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Benefits | **0** | **200,000** | **200,000** | **200,000** |  |  |
| Discount factor | 1.00 | 0.94 | 0.89 | 0.84 |  |  |
| **Discounted benefits** | **0** | **188,000** | **178,000** | **168,000** | **534,000** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Discounted benefits - costs | (150,000) | 150,400 | 142,400 | 134,400 | **277,200** | **NPV** |
| Cumulative benefits - costs | (150,000) | 400 | 142,800 | 277,200 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **ROI** | **108%** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Payback in Year 1** | | |  |  |  |

Our analysis shows a fantastic positive NPV of 108%. This means we can expect a profitable return on our investment.

## **Proposed Recommendation**

The suggested strategic improvement for BiteBlend is a Mood-Based Recommendation based on the most significant assessed risk value. Its strong potential for user acceptance, revenue growth, and user pleasure outweighs the modest implementation difficulty and expense. By providing a highly customized experience consistent with the app's goal of reinventing the meal ordering experience via innovation and customization, this feature sets BiteBlend apart in the industry.
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