Weekly Executive Operating Review

Harbor Service Co. | Week ending November 20, 2026

Fictional portfolio demonstration | November 2026 | Version 1.0. All company records, people, figures and outcomes in this sample are invented. No client deployment or measured AI benefit is claimed.

The decision for Monday

Hold the proposed branch commitment. The current 30-day cash forecast ends at $195,000, which is $55,000 below the company's assumed $250,000 cash floor. That forecast already includes a $90,000 customer receipt. If it arrives late, ending cash falls to $105,000. Riley needs to confirm the collection and rebuild the forecast before we add an obligation.

The immediate operating problem is missed service commitments. I would put Jordan on the causes of late jobs and return visits, with a short exception review each morning. More sales will not resolve that problem on its own.

Measure	Current result	Comparison and implication
Posted monthly revenue	$1,200,000	Sales reports $1,260,000; $60,000 of unsigned change orders is excluded pending finance review. S1, S4
Gross margin	34.5%	Budget 37.0%; gross profit is $414,000, a $30,000 shortfall at the same revenue. S1
30-day ending cash	$195,000 forecast	$250,000 assumed minimum; $90,000 receipt is still unconfirmed. S1, S2
Jobs completed on time	42 of 50 | 84%	Target 90%; eight jobs missed the confirmed date. S3
Jobs needing a return visit	7 of 50 | 14%	Review threshold 8%; inspect the seven job records before assigning a cause. S3

Decisions requested

Morgan, CEO: hold the branch proposal until the cash condition is resolved; appoint Jordan to lead the service review. Riley, finance: bring a reconciled forecast and collection evidence to the November 23 review. The recommendations in this sample have not been approved.

Work and decisions that need an owner

Action	Owner and date	Evidence needed to close
Confirm the $90,000 receipt; refresh the cash forecast.	Riley | Nov 23	Customer remittance confirmation and bank receipt when available; documented forecast assumptions.
Review eight late jobs and seven return visits.	Jordan | Nov 24	Job-by-job cause and corrective action. The two groups may overlap; do not add them as 15 distinct jobs.
Reconcile the $60,000 revenue difference.	Casey + Riley | Nov 23	Approved change orders, invoice status and finance treatment. Keep the unapproved amount out of the posted result.
Clear the stale quote queue.	Casey | Nov 25	Review the 18 of 72 open quotes older than seven days; log customer status and next action.
Prepare a smaller territory test.	Taylor | Nov 27	Use the companion decision memo. No supplier or hiring commitment without Morgan’s release.

What I would bring back to the CEO

A cash update as soon as the collection status changes. A service update should identify whether the late work came from scheduling, materials, rework, or another cause. The packet does not establish that yet. I would not label it a staffing shortage simply because the team is busy.

If the receipt is delayed, Riley should propose dated collection and payment actions using confirmed counterparties and existing obligations. A possible credit facility is an open question; it is not available cash until its terms and availability are confirmed.

Authority and escalation

Taylor coordinates follow-through and records decisions. Morgan decides new spending and branch commitments. Finance validates cash and accounting treatment. A missed confirmed customer date goes to Jordan that day. An updated forecast below the cash floor goes to Morgan as soon as Riley identifies it.

Decision record for the review

Proposed status: HOLD branch commitment. CEO decision and date: not recorded. Cash owner: Riley. Service owner: Jordan. Next review: November 23. The packet deliberately leaves approval unrecorded because a recommendation is not evidence of an executive decision.

Fictional source packet and review notes

The brief above is derived from the following invented packet. “Recorded” means supplied within this scenario, not independently verified real-world information. Assumptions and unresolved items are kept visible.

Ref	Supplied record	Recorded values or limitation
S1	Finance close and 30-day cash worksheet Prepared Nov 20 by Riley	Posted revenue $1,200,000; direct costs $786,000; budget gross margin 37%. Opening cash $620,000; projected receipts $485,000; payments $910,000. Receipts include S2.
S2	Receivable note Prepared Nov 20 by Riley	$90,000 due Nov 23. Collection is assumed in S1 but no remittance confirmation is supplied.
S3	Service log Week ending Nov 20	50 completed jobs; 42 on time; 7 requiring a return visit. Targets: 90% on time; return-visit review threshold 8%. Causes and overlap are not supplied.
S4	Sales update and CRM queue Prepared Nov 20 by Casey	Sales reports $1,260,000, including $60,000 of unsigned changes. 72 open quotes; 18 older than seven days.
S5	Expansion planning sheet Prepared Nov 20 by Taylor	Full branch: $120,000 setup, $24,000 monthly overhead, $120,000 monthly sales assumption and 65% direct-cost ratio. Unapproved; demand is unverified.

Reproducing the calculations

Gross profit: $1,200,000 − $786,000 = $414,000; margin 34.5%. At 37%, gross profit would be $444,000, a $30,000 difference. Cash: $620,000 + $485,000 − $910,000 = $195,000. Without S2: $105,000. Service: 42 ÷ 50 = 84%; 7 ÷ 50 = 14%. Stale quotes: 18 ÷ 72 = 25%.

How this sample uses AI

Prepared with AI assistance as a portfolio example of the review process I would use. AI helped assemble the fictional packet and draft the analysis; the arithmetic was checked separately. The finished example demonstrates source reconciliation and executive follow-through. It does not establish productivity gains or validate an automated decision system.

The proposed $250,000 cash floor and all targets are scenario assumptions. The companion Expansion Decision Memo uses the same starting cash forecast and expansion planning record.