Team working briefs

Nuovo Stadio Milano | Levy Italia

Internal bid working document. Client requirements, indicative dates and proposed internal actions retain their stated status. Named owners, resources and final solutions require confirmation.

Contents

How the teams work together . . . 2
BUILT . . . 3
E15 . . . 6
Italy Design & Technical . . . 9
Culinary & Italy Procurement . . . 12
Operations & Mobilisation . . . 15
Technology & Data . . . 18
Creative & Marketing . . . 21
Sustainability & Food Safety . . . 24
People & Staffing . . . 27
International References . . . 30
Commercial & Finance . . . 33
Italy Legal & Insurance . . . 36
Bid Leadership & Italy Sales . . . 39
Internal workback . . . 42
Client interfaces & responsibility . . . 44

How the teams work together

THE SHARED OUTPUT

A concept is ready for the bid when demand, space, menus, service, technology, people and commercial assumptions agree.

E15 Demand & evidence Scenarios, peaks, measures.

BUILT Experience & space Formats, flows, options.

ITALY + OPERATIONS Feasibility & delivery Menus, approvals, resources.

FINANCE + LEGAL Price & commitment Phases, terms, approvals.

Every design change returns to the same demand model, operating assumptions and cost plan.

Working allocation from the team note

Italy: company/legal/local evidence, insurance, inclusion, menus/locations and local design resources. Levy: international references and project approach, execution, technology, staffing and marketing inputs. Pricing: Levy with Italy Sales. Proposed consultants and appointments still need confirmation.

BUILT

Turn the fan promise into a venue that can deliver it.

Lead the integrated F&B experience and concept workstream: connect physical space, service formats, technology and the commercial brief. Coordinate with Italy's design team and the Client-appointed designers. BUILT's proposed role extends beyond equipment and CAPEX.

The question to answer

What should we build, where, and why will it work?

Inputs needed

Latest drawings and Exhibit G; E15 demand ranges; Italy's menu and service brief; approved venue and club positioning; sponsor constraints; available budget and design programme.

01 / Experience & spatial concept

Develop a zoned F&B concept for GA, premium, players/staff and event catering. Map the journey from arrival and aperitivo to pre-match, half-time and departure. Compare traditional concessions, grab-and-go, self-service and premium service where appropriate.

Expected output: Annotated zoning diagram, outlet concept cards and service-format options. For every option: guest need, location logic, production method, replenishment route, accessibility and assumptions.

02 / Capacity & technical interfaces

Translate E15 demand and Operations throughput assumptions into indicative service-point, kitchen, storage, wash-up and waste requirements. Identify utilities, extraction, refrigeration, delivery, circulation and maintenance access interfaces with the qualified designers.

Expected output: Capacity brief and equipment principles; interface register identifying who designs, supplies, installs, approves, operates and maintains each element. Quantities remain conditional on validated plans and modelling.

03 / Options & design gates

Compare a compliant core concept with separately identified enhancements. Test operational impact, capital cost range, flexibility, maintainability and sustainability. Show how the design develops from review to commissioning.

Expected output: Option appraisal, phased consultancy deliverables and design review schedule. Recommend a preferred concept with reasons, unresolved dependencies and a Client decision at each gate.

BUILT | Deliverables & decisions

The minimum bid-ready package

Proposed structure for the first working submission. Confirm owner, effort and scope before committing the final offer.

1. A guest-journey board covering arrival, pre-match, half-time, post-match and relevant non-matchday use, with distinct needs for GA and premium guests.

2. An annotated zoning concept identifying food offer, service format, production/finishing, collection, replenishment, waste and accessibility for each proposed type of area.

3. An option schedule comparing the compliant core proposition and enhancements: benefit, spatial requirement, technology dependency, indicative cost basis and approval needed.

4. A technical interface register and phased design-consultancy deliverables schedule for Italy Design, appointed consultants and Finance.

Illustrative Milano application

For a busy concourse, develop a traditional concession, an assisted self-service option and a grab-and-go option against the same demand scenario. Show how guests choose, pay, collect and leave; how stock reaches the outlet; and how waste and returns are removed. Use this comparison to recommend the format, rather than selecting technology first. Without approved drawings, provide a labelled typology and a list of spatial requirements, not a claimed final layout.

BUILT | Review & handoff

Ideas to develop - not an agreed solution

• A “Taste of Lombardy” concourse: regional food identities adapted to different stand and crowd profiles, sharing efficient production and replenishment infrastructure.

• A scalable service kit: standard concession, assisted self-service and grab-and-go variants. Design for future change without committing every zone to one technology.

• A premium-to-plaza journey: assess whether selected hospitality offers can extend into exterior areas and non-matchday events, subject to rights, access, safety and demand.

Questions the team must close

• Which design decisions are still open, and where can F&B input influence the current stadium design?

• What peak demand and menu complexity must each zone accommodate?

• Which drawings, budget assumptions, building-services limits and Client approvals are needed to progress the preferred option?

Bring to the bid

A concise concept deck + annotated spatial brief + option/interface register + phase-by-phase consultancy scope.

Decision this enables

Choose the preferred concept and the scope that Levy can price and resource independently of an operating award.

Ready when

Each concept has a customer need, capacity rationale, operational route, cost assumption and named approval interface. Any missing drawing, budget or calculation is visible.

Handoff and dependencies

E15 supplies demand ranges > BUILT proposes layouts and formats > Italy Operations and Culinary validate delivery > Finance tests affordability > Client/design team approve.

Named owner: to confirm. First pass G1; challenge G2; final G3; approved release G4.

Response mapping: Exhibit A §05(i), (ii), (v), (vi); Exhibit F - Design Consultation and Approvals.

E15

Give the design a demand model it can stand behind.

Lead the proposed insight, demand and measurement workstream. Provide transparent scenarios and decision support. The bid must not present a forecast built on missing venue data as a validated commercial promise.

The question to answer

How much demand, at what time, in which place, and with what commercial effect?

Inputs needed

Event mix and attendance; seating/premium inventory; access and dwell-time assumptions; comparable transaction data; sample menus/prices; service rates; proposed outlet locations. Label every input supplied, benchmarked or assumed.

01 / Demand & consumer insight

Segment home-club fans, visiting supporters, families, premium guests, concert audiences, staff and non-matchday visitors where relevant. Model low/base/high event scenarios and demand by zone and time window, with a specific half-time stress case.

Expected output: Assumptions register; demand heatmap; forecast orders by zone and service window; guest-needs and value-perception hypotheses. Keep capture rate, basket value and repeat purchase as separate assumptions.

02 / Capacity & commercial scenarios

Test the service capacity of proposed formats with Operations. Compare queue implications, conversion, menu/product mix, labour deployment, waste, spend and outlet contribution. Assess technology as an option against the same baseline.

Expected output: A linked scenario model and option scorecard: what changes, why, input range, expected effect, confidence and sensitivity. Finance owns the final commercial offer.

03 / KPI & test plan

Define how queue time, satisfaction, stock availability, waste and outlet profitability will be measured. Specify source systems, data ownership, frequency and calculation rules. Propose pilot and test-event criteria.

Expected output: KPI dictionary; illustrative dashboard using clearly labelled sample data only; test-and-learn plan. Establish the food-waste baseline and measurement denominators with Sustainability and the Client.

E15 | Deliverables & decisions

The minimum bid-ready package

Proposed structure for the first working submission. Confirm owner, effort and scope before committing the final offer.

1. One assumptions workbook with separate tabs for event mix, attendance, guest segments, trading windows, capture, transactions, basket and confidence/source status.

2. A low/base/high demand model by event type, zone and time window; an annual view for Finance and a peak-service view for Operations/BUILT.

3. A comparative option scorecard covering queue implications, sales capture, labour, waste, cost and reliability, with sensitivities instead of a single unsupported point forecast.

4. A KPI dictionary and sample dashboard specification defining calculations, systems, owners, timing and how test-event data will validate the model.

Illustrative Milano application

Start with one clearly labelled football-match scenario. Divide demand into arrival, pre-match, half-time and post-match windows and allocate it to venue zones. Compare the same demand against alternative outlet/service configurations. Keep service-time assumptions visible and explain the limiting step: preparation, payment, collection or replenishment. Repeat the method for concerts and third-party catering once their inputs are available. Do not derive annual event volume from the stadium seat count.

E15 | Review & handoff

Ideas to develop - not an agreed solution

• Create a half-time pressure map to show where demand could exceed service capacity; use it to change layout, assortment or collection design before adding equipment.

• Build a technology decision scorecard comparing conventional tills, self-ordering, self-checkout and frictionless formats on throughput, inclusion, reliability and total cost.

• Model the year-round proposition separately: restaurant/plaza demand must have its own footfall and trading assumptions, rather than borrowing matchday economics.

Questions the team must close

• What annual event programme and configuration-specific attendance scenarios can the Client provide?

• Which comparable venue data are relevant, permitted for use and sufficiently granular to support service-rate assumptions?

• Which decisions will the model inform first: outlet location/capacity, technology choice, staffing, menu mix or investment?

Bring to the bid

One editable demand/capacity model + evidence and assumptions register + scenario summary + KPI dictionary.

Decision this enables

Agree the demand scenario and service assumptions used consistently in design, staffing and pricing.

Ready when

Inputs have provenance and confidence levels; units and time windows are explicit; peaks are tested; no invented revenue, capex, outlet count or percentage is presented as fact.

Handoff and dependencies

Italy/Client and reference venues supply inputs > E15 models demand > BUILT and Operations test options > Finance evaluates the economics > E15 measures trials.

Named owner: to confirm. First pass G1; challenge G2; final G3; approved release G4.

Response mapping: Exhibit A §05(i)-(ii); RFP hospitality objectives; Exhibit B - technology and reporting.

Italy Design & Technical

Make the concept fit the actual building and approval process.

Coordinate the Italian technical response and interfaces with the Client's architects, kitchen consultant, engineers and qualified local professionals. Confirm who is responsible for each formal design and submission.

The question to answer

How does the F&B concept become coordinated, approvable design?

Inputs needed

Current stadium design status, drawings, design responsibility matrix, consultant appointments and authority submission milestones.

01 / Design gap review

Review received plans against the F&B brief. Record gaps in space, flows, accessibility, equipment and building services, including interfaces with security and event operations.

Expected output: Annotated design review and prioritised gap register.

02 / Consultant scope

Identify required specialist support and whether appointed by Levy or directly by the Client. Obtain scope, qualifications, availability and best fee estimates for Client-direct consultants.

Expected output: Consultant schedule, contact details, relevant experience and estimated fees; explicit appointment assumptions.

03 / Coordination & approval

Map design submissions, review cycles, local approval support and change control to the live programme. Identify accountable qualified designers and authority interfaces.

Expected output: Design deliverables register and responsibility matrix; authority/approval pathway for confirmation.

Italy Design & Technical | Deliverables & decisions

The minimum bid-ready package

Proposed structure for the first working submission. Confirm owner, effort and scope before committing the final offer.

1. A drawing and information register recording revision, design stage, review status and outstanding F&B information.

2. A technical gap review linking each issue to the affected space, service, design discipline and required decision.

3. A consultant/appointment schedule covering Levy-appointed versus Client-direct roles, deliverables, availability, qualifications and best fee estimates.

4. A responsibility and design-review schedule linked to Exhibit C, including local approval support and agreed change control.

Illustrative Milano application

Take one proposed kitchen-to-concourse route and coordinate the whole chain with the appointed designers: receiving, storage, production, dispatch, vertical/horizontal distribution, outlet finishing and waste returns. Record where the concept depends on lifts, access rights, utilities or an unfinished design decision. The bid should show how these interfaces will be managed, even where final dimensions are not yet available.

Italy Design & Technical | Review & handoff

Ideas to develop - not an agreed solution

• Use one interface register for kitchen equipment, MEP, structure, fire strategy, accessibility, ICT and F&B operations.

• Make operational acceptance criteria part of each design gate, including replenishment and maintainability.

Questions the team must close

• Which drawings and area schedules are approved, and which remain in development?

• Who holds each design, engineering, permitting and sign-off appointment?

• What review turnaround and design-resource commitment must be included in the consultancy fee?

Bring to the bid

Coordinated technical scope + consultant/fee schedule + design responsibility and approval register.

Decision this enables

Confirm consultant appointments, design liability boundaries and deliverables included in the consultancy fee.

Ready when

No statutory designer or contractor responsibility is attributed to Levy without an agreed appointment; Client-direct consultant estimates are included.

Handoff and dependencies

BUILT supplies the concept; Italy technical professionals coordinate formal design; Operations validates use; Client approves scope and appointments.

Named owner: to confirm. First pass G1; challenge G2; final G3; approved release G4.

Response mapping: Exhibit A §05(ii)-(iii); Exhibit F design scope; Exhibit C programme.

Culinary & Italy Procurement

Make Milan unmistakable, and every menu deliverable.

Italy leads facility menus and locations under the team's working allocation. Levy Culinary contributes international stadium experience, premium differentiation and operational menu development.

The question to answer

What will guests eat, and how will we produce it at stadium pace?

Inputs needed

Club/venue identities; outlet typologies; supplier capability and seasonality; equipment/space options; sponsor categories; E15 demand and price/value insight.

01 / Menu architecture

Develop GA, premium, staff/players and third-party event propositions. Define format, preparation, holding, finishing and service needs; show a credible plant-based offer at every outlet.

Expected output: Menu architecture and representative concept menus; recipes, allergens, portions and costs developed to the stage supported by data.

02 / Local sourcing & circularity

Build a Lombardy and surrounding-region supplier route toward 50%+ ingredients within three seasons. Assess supply continuity, packaging, reusable systems, donation and waste separation.

Expected output: Supplier strategy and phased sourcing plan with measurement basis and open commercial/quality checks.

03 / Performance & event catering

Outline players/staff meal windows, secure service, dietary/allergen controls and nutrition-team coordination. Include third-party event production, service and changeover scenarios.

Expected output: Separate catering service briefs, operational dependencies and sample tasting proposition. Nutrition requirements must be agreed with club specialists.

Culinary & Italy Procurement | Deliverables & decisions

The minimum bid-ready package

Proposed structure for the first working submission. Confirm owner, effort and scope before committing the final offer.

1. A menu architecture by GA, premium tier, players/staff and third-party event service, stating the audience, occasion and service style.

2. Representative menu/concept cards showing regional identity, preparation/finishing approach, dietary/allergen controls, portion logic and costing status.

3. A kitchen/equipment and sourcing brief linked to each concept, including local-supplier capacity and alternatives for continuity.

4. A tasting/service-demonstration proposal and a roadmap for the regional-sourcing and plant-based targets, with explicit measurement assumptions.

Illustrative Milano application

Develop a Lombardy-led offer that can work in both a high-volume concourse and a hosted premium environment. Explain which components can share production and sourcing, and which require distinct finishing, presentation or staffing. For players/staff, describe a separate service process built around schedules, secure access and club nutrition-team requirements. These are proposed concepts until menus, partners and operating arrangements are approved.

Culinary & Italy Procurement | Review & handoff

Ideas to develop - not an agreed solution

• Regional classics engineered for reliable holding and fast finishing, supported by seasonal specials rather than an unmanageable assortment.

• Distinct hospitality tiers through product, hosting and service ritual; test chef collaborations only once availability, commercial rights and capacity are established.

Questions the team must close

• Which products and categories are constrained by sponsorship or exclusivity?

• Which local suppliers can sustain event peaks, seasonality and traceability at the required quality?

• What meal volumes, timings and dietary requirements apply to players, staff and third-party catering?

Bring to the bid

Menu/service architecture + production/equipment brief + sourcing roadmap + players/staff and event catering plans.

Decision this enables

Approve the proposed food offer, production strategy and partner shortlist for Client consideration.

Ready when

Chef names and suppliers are labelled potential until agreed; every menu concept links to space, equipment, service rate, cost and dietary controls.

Handoff and dependencies

Italy Culinary defines the food > BUILT/Design allow for production > Operations validates service > E15 tests mix > Finance prices the scenario.

Named owner: to confirm. First pass G1; challenge G2; final G3; approved release G4.

Response mapping: Exhibit A §05(ii), (v); RFP culinary identity and sustainability objectives.

Operations & Mobilisation

Prove the experience survives the busiest minutes.

Validate the concept as a live venue operation and prepare a conditional mobilisation approach for any operating scope selected by the Client.

The question to answer

Can food, people and stock move safely when the stadium is full?

Inputs needed

Demand by window/zone; outlet and production concepts; deliveries/access restrictions; staffing rules; event and security operating plans.

01 / Service & logistics

Map deliveries, receiving, storage, preparation, dispatch, replenishment, returns and waste. Compare service formats and calculate capacity from defensible service times.

Expected output: Service-flow diagrams and capacity assumptions; storage/stock and equipment-management plan.

02 / Resilience & staffing

Model peak deployment, cross-training, break cover and event changeovers. Define responses to POS/network failure, refrigeration faults, stock shortages and restricted access.

Expected output: Event operating model, labour assumptions, fallback procedures and key training requirements.

03 / Opening readiness

Define phased mobilisation, access/handover dependencies, recruitment, supplier onboarding, equipment testing, rehearsals, test events and readiness acceptance.

Expected output: Mobilisation workback and readiness checklist, to be rebased once opening and access dates are confirmed.

Operations & Mobilisation | Deliverables & decisions

The minimum bid-ready package

Proposed structure for the first working submission. Confirm owner, effort and scope before committing the final offer.

1. A complete event-day operating sequence covering ordering, receiving, storage, preparation, outlet supply, service, close-down and reconciliation.

2. A service-format/capacity schedule with staffing assumptions and explicitly stated production, payment and collection rates.

3. A logistics/storage and maintenance plan identifying delivery access, stockholding, replenishment, smallwares, waste and equipment responsibilities.

4. A phased mobilisation/readiness plan with recruitment/training, handover conditions, tests, rehearsals, failure procedures and acceptance criteria.

Illustrative Milano application

Use a half-time surge to test the proposed operating model. Show who replenishes an outlet while the service team remains in position, how stock is signalled, where collection queues can form and what happens if a payment device or kitchen process fails. Then test the changeover to a different event format. This exposes operating requirements that should be designed into the building before opening.

Operations & Mobilisation | Review & handoff

Ideas to develop - not an agreed solution

• Walk a product and a team member through the design to expose crossing routes and hidden replenishment constraints.

• Use staged test events to measure queue, dispatch and replenishment performance before accepting the operating configuration.

Questions the team must close

• What are the permitted delivery routes, access windows and security restrictions?

• Which service rates can be supported by relevant evidence or a practical test?

• What must be handed over, commissioned and approved before a test event or full opening can proceed?

Bring to the bid

Execution plan + logistics/storage flows + peak-service model + mobilisation and resilience plan.

Decision this enables

Validate which formats and capacity assumptions can credibly support GA <5-minute and premium <3-minute average queues.

Ready when

The model covers the whole supply-to-service chain and named venue interfaces; active construction/site access assumptions are explicit.

Handoff and dependencies

E15 demand > Operations capacity > BUILT layout changes > People staffing > Technology fallback tests.

Named owner: to confirm. First pass G1; challenge G2; final G3; approved release G4.

Response mapping: Exhibit A §05(i)-(iii); Exhibit B operating scope and maintenance.

Technology & Data

Connect the guest journey to a resilient operating system.

Define the F&B technology architecture and stadium integration requirements. Hardware, software and relevant platforms require Client approval; no supplier is selected by this brief.

The question to answer

Which technology solves a service problem, and how does it integrate?

Inputs needed

Client ICT architecture, stadium app/CRM/IPTV plans, security requirements, proposed service formats, E15 data specification and operational fallbacks.

01 / Integration architecture

Connect POS/cashless payments, ordering, inventory, kitchen/fulfilment, CRM/data and stadium reporting. Define data flows, interfaces and responsibilities.

Expected output: System diagram, integration/data requirements and procurement/approval matrix.

02 / Guest-facing options

Assess mobile pre-order and geolocated collection, premium in-seat delivery, digital menus in IT/EN/ES, wait-time displays and smart-fridge/automated retail pilots.

Expected output: Options by zone and use case; dependencies, inclusion considerations, cost inputs and measurable pilot criteria.

03 / Control & resilience

Specify testing, service support, network/payment failure procedures, data/privacy review and safe content control for prices, allergens and availability.

Expected output: Testing and fallback plan; data governance and menu-content approval workflow.

Technology & Data | Deliverables & decisions

The minimum bid-ready package

Proposed structure for the first working submission. Confirm owner, effort and scope before committing the final offer.

1. A system architecture diagram connecting POS, payments, ordering, fulfilment, stock, menu content, CRM/data, dashboards and stadium platforms.

2. A technology option matrix by venue zone: service problem, proposed solution, guest benefit, integration, support and lifetime-cost implications.

3. A responsibility schedule identifying selection/approval, procurement, installation, configuration, data ownership and ongoing support.

4. A test/pilot and fallback plan, including approved content changes, accessibility, network/payment interruption and operational recovery.

Illustrative Milano application

For mobile pre-order, map the full transaction from menu availability and payment through production, pickup notification, collection and reconciliation. Identify who changes stock availability and prevents orders exceeding fulfilment capacity. Compare the proposition with a conventional service baseline; a new ordering channel should only enter the proposed solution if it improves the whole service journey.

Technology & Data | Review & handoff

Ideas to develop - not an agreed solution

• Separate ordering from collection capacity: an app can increase congestion if production and pickup are not designed together.

• Test dynamic pricing within Client-approved rules and a clear fan-value policy; model the effect before committing to deployment.

Questions the team must close

• What stadium app, payment, CRM, network and IPTV decisions have already been made?

• Which integrations, data controls and Client approvals are mandatory?

• How will each service continue safely and accurately when connectivity or a component fails?

Bring to the bid

Technology architecture + zone-by-zone option matrix + interface and testing plan.

Decision this enables

Choose technologies to include in the base concept, pilot or defer, with clear ownership and approval.

Ready when

Menu-board procurement/install stays with Client oversight; operator programming is approval-controlled. Fallbacks and lifetime cost are included.

Handoff and dependencies

E15 specifies information; Operations specifies service; BUILT specifies physical interfaces; Client ICT and Legal confirm integration and controls.

Named owner: to confirm. First pass G1; challenge G2; final G3; approved release G4.

Response mapping: Exhibit A §05(ii); Exhibit B §1D-E; Exhibit F; RFP technology objectives.

Creative & Marketing

Give two clubs one exceptional food destination.

Create a coherent F&B story that respects both club identities and Milan's culture. Develop the marketing approach for the proposed management model, including non-matchday potential.

The question to answer

Why will guests arrive earlier, choose the offer and return?

Inputs needed

Venue/club brand rules, audience insight, menus, premium tiers, calendar, sponsor inventory, approved rights and CRM/data permissions.

01 / Identity & guest communication

Develop outlet concept stories, tone, wayfinding principles and digital-menu hierarchy with BUILT and Culinary. Account for different club/event modes.

Expected output: Experience narrative, concept boards and guest communication principles.

02 / Commercial calendar

Propose game-day, VIP, seasonal and event-led promotions; sponsor co-promotions and channel plans. Define objectives, owners and measurement for each campaign.

Expected output: Illustrative annual activation calendar, launch plan and campaign briefs with indicative budget inputs for Finance.

03 / Premium extension & 365-day use

Develop a plaza/fan-zone and beyond-stadium premium concept. Test local-operator options, access, logistics, licensing, safety and demand before forecasting returns.

Expected output: Concept and feasibility brief for non-matchday/premium extension, with rights and partner dependencies.

Creative & Marketing | Deliverables & decisions

The minimum bid-ready package

Proposed structure for the first working submission. Confirm owner, effort and scope before committing the final offer.

1. An experience narrative and concept-board set showing Milan identity, both club modes and how food, spaces and service communicate the proposition.

2. An illustrative activation calendar for matches, VIP moments, seasonal offers, concerts/other events and non-matchday opportunities.

3. Campaign briefs naming audience, offer, channels, operational prerequisites, cost inputs, approval and measurement.

4. A premium-extension/plaza feasibility brief separating proposed concepts, required rights, potential partners, logistics and demand evidence.

Illustrative Milano application

Build a proposed pre-match aperitivo activation as a complete experience: audience, offer, arrival timing, area, service format, communication and sponsor fit. Include food-led/non-alcohol options and applicable restrictions. For a year-round plaza concept, explain what would bring visitors on a non-matchday and what trading/access conditions it needs. Do not present a potential KERB or chef contribution as a confirmed partnership.

Creative & Marketing | Review & handoff

Ideas to develop - not an agreed solution

• Build aperitivo into the arrival story where alcohol rules permit, with food-led alternatives and a clear service plan.

• Explore a curated local food-market programme, including a potential KERB contribution, subject to Client approval and commercial feasibility.

Questions the team must close

• Which club, stadium and sponsor approvals govern names, designs, products and campaigns?

• Who owns the relevant audiences, CRM permissions, hospitality sales and channels?

• What evidence supports the non-matchday proposition and who controls the required areas and trading rights?

Bring to the bid

Marketing plan + activation calendar + concept boards + premium-extension feasibility brief.

Decision this enables

Agree the venue positioning, activation priorities, rights and approval route.

Ready when

No chef, brand, sponsor or KERB appointment is implied; commercial outcomes remain hypotheses until modelled and agreed.

Handoff and dependencies

E15 audience insight > Creative proposition > Culinary/Operations delivery > Client brands/sponsors approve > E15 measures.

Named owner: to confirm. First pass G1; challenge G2; final G3; approved release G4.

Response mapping: Exhibit A §05(iv)-(vi), §08(iii); RFP brand and commercial objectives.

Sustainability & Food Safety

Build the environmental commitments into the operating design.

Translate the RFP's sustainability targets into feasible actions, measurements and responsibilities, with Italy's quality, food-safety and procurement teams.

The question to answer

What must be designed now to make Day 1 and Year 3 targets credible?

Inputs needed

Packaging/supplier specifications; menu plan; kitchen design; waste infrastructure; venue LEED process; utilities metering and proposed measurement baselines.

01 / Opening requirements

Define reusable-cup circulation, wash capacity, return points, water refill and packaging specification toward zero single-use plastics from Day 1.

Expected output: Opening circularity plan and infrastructure requirements.

02 / Improvement pathways

Develop waste prevention, donation, separation and on-site composting feasibility; link to sourcing and plant-based objectives. Agree denominators and baselines.

Expected output: Target/action/owner/measure register and roadmap through three seasons/Year 3.

03 / Assurance & venue certification

Map food safety, allergens, supplier approval and operational controls; identify evidence required to contribute to mandatory stadium LEED Gold.

Expected output: Assurance and evidence plan aligned with qualified Italy teams and the venue's certification consultant.

Sustainability & Food Safety | Deliverables & decisions

The minimum bid-ready package

Proposed structure for the first working submission. Confirm owner, effort and scope before committing the final offer.

1. A target-delivery matrix linking every relevant Client objective to action, infrastructure, owner, cost input, measure and timing.

2. An opening circularity plan for reusable cups, washing, returns, water refill, packaging specification and waste segregation.

3. A three-season/Year 3 improvement roadmap covering responsible sourcing, plant-based menus, prevention, surplus donation and composting feasibility.

4. An assurance/evidence plan for food safety, allergens, supplier controls, waste baselines and the contribution to stadium LEED Gold.

Illustrative Milano application

Trace a reusable cup from issue to return, wash, storage and reuse. Quantify the assumptions that will eventually determine stock, wash capacity, return locations and labour, using the agreed demand model rather than invented volumes. Apply the same end-to-end approach to food waste: measure where it arises, prevent it first, then assess safe redistribution and remaining waste streams.

Sustainability & Food Safety | Review & handoff

Ideas to develop - not an agreed solution

• Design cup returns and waste sorting as part of crowd flow, not an afterthought.

• Measure waste by operational stream to distinguish overproduction, spoilage and plate waste before setting reduction actions.

Questions the team must close

• What waste, water, energy and washing infrastructure is included in the stadium design?

• How will local ingredients, plant-based items and food-waste reduction be measured?

• Which donation/composting arrangements and venue-certification evidence are feasible and require Client approval?

Bring to the bid

Sustainability delivery matrix + circularity/infrastructure brief + baseline and assurance plan.

Decision this enables

Confirm feasibility, cost and measurement of each commitment, including composting and donation arrangements.

Ready when

LEED Gold is a stadium requirement, not a claim that Levy Italia holds that certification. No unverified corporate certificate or partner is presented as current.

Handoff and dependencies

Culinary/Procurement specify products; BUILT designs infrastructure; Operations runs controls; E15 measures; Client certification team confirms evidence.

Named owner: to confirm. First pass G1; challenge G2; final G3; approved release G4.

Response mapping: RFP sustainability objectives; Exhibit A §05(v); Exhibit B energy and operating obligations.

People & Staffing

Name the people, then show their real commitment.

Coordinate Exhibit E with Italy and workstream leaders. Separate consultancy resourcing from conditional operating staffing.

The question to answer

Who is available to deliver each phase, and for how much time?

Inputs needed

Workstream scopes and milestones; consultant requirements; operations staffing scenarios; actual availability and CVs; Italy workforce/inclusion approach.

01 / Named leadership

Confirm Project Director/Principal, Overall Operations Manager, Lead Chef and other key personnel; identify any dual-role arrangements.

Expected output: Completed Exhibit E, relevant CVs and project organisation chart.

02 / Phase effort

Obtain hours/days or other explicit commitment levels by person and phase; reconcile with workload, programme and price.

Expected output: Commitments matrix linked to the consultancy fee model and current project backlog.

03 / Delivery workforce

Outline recruitment, local capability, training, inclusion and event staffing assumptions. Confirm consultant and subconsultant names and qualification evidence.

Expected output: Full staffing approach and specialist schedule; operating headcounts remain scenario-based until demand is validated.

People & Staffing | Deliverables & decisions

The minimum bid-ready package

Proposed structure for the first working submission. Confirm owner, effort and scope before committing the final offer.

1. Completed Exhibit E and a CV pack for the proposed Project Director/Principal, Overall Operations Manager, Lead Chef and other key personnel.

2. An organisation chart identifying delivery accountability, specialist support, consultant interfaces and any dual-role arrangements.

3. A person-by-phase effort and availability matrix linked to the programme, current commitments and consultancy fee.

4. An operating workforce approach covering local capability, recruitment, training, inclusion and scenario-based event staffing.

Illustrative Milano application

For each consultancy phase, show which named person does the work, which specialist supports it and the expected commitment. Distinguish the core project team from occasional support and from future event staff. Confirm real availability before presenting a name as committed. Roberto Carvelli remains pending appointment in the team note; the brief must not convert that pending position into a confirmed appointment.

People & Staffing | Review & handoff

Ideas to develop - not an agreed solution

• Show the difference between a named core delivery team and supporting specialists called in at defined gates.

• Use availability checks to reconcile Hamburg/current-project commitments with the proposed Milano effort.

Questions the team must close

• Who is actually available for the proposed design and review periods?

• Which individuals cover multiple roles, and can their combined workload be delivered?

• What Italy-specific workforce, training and inclusion inputs must be reflected in the staffing model?

Bring to the bid

Exhibit E + CV pack + org chart + phase-effort and availability matrix.

Decision this enables

Confirm actual appointments and availability. Roberto Carvelli remains pending appointment in the working team note.

Ready when

No historical Atlas name is treated as an assigned Milano resource; every proposed person has an agreed role, CV and effort.

Handoff and dependencies

Each workstream confirms scope and resources > People consolidates > Finance costs > Italy/Bid Leadership approve names.

Named owner: to confirm. First pass G1; challenge G2; final G3; approved release G4.

Response mapping: Exhibit A §05(iii); Exhibit E; §06 Italy workforce inclusion.

International References

Show the design expertise behind the venue names.

Compile the five international references agreed in the team note: Tottenham, Johan Cruijff ArenA, Aston Villa, The O2 and Wimbledon. Italy provides its local experience separately.

The question to answer

What did we actually deliver, and who can verify it?

Inputs needed

Approved venue records and client permissions; actual scope, dates, cost/value, team and service format data; ongoing project/backlog information.

01 / Comparable project dossiers

Complete fields a-g for work in the last ten years. Distinguish original contract dates from relevant services delivered during the period. Emphasise design consultation where evidenced.

Expected output: Five comparable-project dossiers, with explicit gaps rather than inferred facts.

02 / Client validation

Confirm project-owner/representative name, title, address and email; obtain five reference-client contacts and permission/current accuracy.

Expected output: Validated reference schedule. Final project cost and total contract value remain distinct from annual turnover.

03 / Ongoing capacity & live sites

Complete Exhibit D for Hamburg and other applicable major commitments. Obtain concrete evidence for any claim of work within an active construction site.

Expected output: Exhibit D/backlog schedule and specific construction-phase case narrative where supported.

International References | Deliverables & decisions

The minimum bid-ready package

Proposed structure for the first working submission. Confirm owner, effort and scope before committing the final offer.

1. Five consistent international reference dossiers: Tottenham, Johan Cruijff ArenA, Aston Villa, The O2 and Wimbledon, subject to completed and approved evidence.

2. For each dossier, all a-g fields: location, owner contact, description/cost/value, format percentages, operations manager/team, scope and applicable live-construction narrative.

3. Five current and permitted client-reference contacts, with name, title, address and email verified.

4. Exhibit D with relevant current commitments/backlog, including Hamburg information where applicable, and a gap tracker for outstanding evidence.

Illustrative Milano application

For Tottenham or Aston Villa, show a specific, evidenced design or refurbishment contribution rather than relying on the venue name. Explain the problem, Levy's actual scope, the design intervention and its relevance to Milano. Keep annual turnover separate from total contract value and final project cost. Only claim work within an active construction site when the source confirms the circumstances, not merely that a refurbishment took place.

International References | Review & handoff

Ideas to develop - not an agreed solution

• Use one case-study structure: challenge, Levy scope, design intervention, delivery evidence and relevance to Milano.

• Ask venue teams to confirm a non-overlapping service-format percentage breakdown with a stated denominator.

Questions the team must close

• Which reference facts can the account team and client verify and release?

• What denominator makes the service-format percentage split accurate and non-overlapping?

• Which examples demonstrate design consultation, construction coordination and mobilisation in the relevant ten-year window?

Bring to the bid

Five a-g dossiers + five client references + Exhibit D + validated design/construction evidence.

Decision this enables

Choose which evidence can be included and which missing fields need escalation before release.

Ready when

No use of turnover as contract value; no assumption that refurbishment proves concurrent live construction; no proposal treated as a won contract.

Handoff and dependencies

Venue account teams supply facts > reference lead validates > BUILT selects relevant lessons > Bid integrates.

Named owner: to confirm. First pass G1; challenge G2; final G3; approved release G4.

Response mapping: Exhibit A §04(i)-(iii); Exhibit D. Italy owns §04(iv) Italian-law experience.

Commercial & Finance

Price a consultancy that stands on its own.

Levy works with Italy Sales on pricing under the team note. Cost the required design appointment separately from concession, premium and catering operating alternatives.

The question to answer

What are we committing to, and what is the financial basis?

Inputs needed

Scope/deliverables; phase effort and rates; programme; consultant estimates; design options; E15 operating scenarios; legal and insurance positions.

01 / Consultancy fee

Build fees by phase, showing resourcing, deliverables, consultant inputs, expenses, assumptions and any exclusions. Account for design iteration and the long pre-opening period.

Expected output: Exhibit F consultancy offer supported by a phase-fee model and scope/effort reconciliation.

02 / Operating alternatives

Model concessions, premium F&B and catering separately and together if proposed. Show investment, profit share and other terms with transparent attendance, spend, labour and cost assumptions.

Expected output: Separately identified financial alternatives and sensitivities. Clarify the term conflict: Exhibit B up to five years versus Exhibit F minimum ten years for operations.

03 / Approval & value

Test optional enhancements, sponsor restrictions, discount pass-through, asset transfer, maintenance and downside scenarios. Reconcile proposed liabilities and approvals.

Expected output: Commercial decision paper and approved financial assumptions shared across the proposal.

Commercial & Finance | Deliverables & decisions

The minimum bid-ready package

Proposed structure for the first working submission. Confirm owner, effort and scope before committing the final offer.

1. A consultancy fee schedule by phase, linked to deliverables, people/effort, consultant requirements, expenses and qualifications.

2. A completed Exhibit F with required design terms separated from any offered concession, premium and catering operating alternatives.

3. A transparent financial scenario model using the same event, attendance, service, menu and labour assumptions as the technical response.

4. An approval paper showing sensitivities, investment/asset treatment, key contract assumptions and separately priced beneficial alternates.

Illustrative Milano application

Evaluate a service-format enhancement against a compliant core option. Identify its capital and operating costs, expected service impact and the demand assumptions required for a commercial benefit. Show the effect under low/base/high scenarios and make any operating-term assumption explicit. Consultancy pricing must remain understandable if Levy does not receive operating rights.

Commercial & Finance | Review & handoff

Ideas to develop - not an agreed solution

• Show how a design decision changes both construction cost and the recurring operating result.

• Use a common base case across E15, staffing, service capacity and the financial offer; track the effect of each variant.

Questions the team must close

• Which scope and effort are included in the stand-alone design fee?

• What operating-term basis will be proposed while the five-year/ten-year discrepancy is unresolved?

• How do supplier discount pass-through, equipment transfer, maintenance, sponsorship constraints and downside cases affect the offer?

Bring to the bid

Phase-fee table + completed Exhibit F + separate operating scenarios + sensitivity and approval record.

Decision this enables

Approve the stand-alone consultancy fee and which operating alternatives or cost/schedule alternates to submit.

Ready when

No assumed operating award subsidises an unexplained design fee. No invented budget, guaranteed volume or missing per-cap target is silently filled in.

Handoff and dependencies

People/BUILT define effort/scope > Finance costs > E15/Operations support scenarios > Legal tests terms > authorised leadership approves.

Named owner: to confirm. First pass G1; challenge G2; final G3; approved release G4.

Response mapping: Exhibit A §02, §07; Exhibit F; Exhibit B; Agreement response.

Italy Legal & Insurance

Make the offer's qualifications explicit and usable.

Italy leads entity, legal, insurance and eligibility evidence under the working allocation. Coordinate specific contract redlines with the commercial and technical offer.

The question to answer

Which obligations can we accept, and what needs clarification?

Inputs needed

Draft Agreement; RFP and written addenda; proposed entity/team; scope and price; current insurance certificates; subcontractor and sponsor plans.

01 / Bidder & compliance pack

Confirm the contracting entity and Levy Italia trading designation; compile company/register/claims evidence, Italy permits and insurance details. Check the supplied municipal eligibility form's applicability.

Expected output: Approved corporate, insurance and eligibility pack; clear list of outstanding evidence.

02 / Contract response

Review liability, design responsibility, payment, term, investment/asset treatment, exclusivity and termination with specialists. Submit specific tracked amendments as required.

Expected output: Tracked Agreement response aligned with the fee and technical scope; no generic reservation replacing required redlines.

03 / Confidentiality & approvals

Confirm subcontractor notification/NDA steps, Client approval rights and internal authority to release. Resolve validity/date conflicts and confirm any written extension.

Expected output: Clarification and approval register; release requirements and supplier disclosure controls.

Italy Legal & Insurance | Deliverables & decisions

The minimum bid-ready package

Proposed structure for the first working submission. Confirm owner, effort and scope before committing the final offer.

1. An approved bidder/entity and corporate evidence pack, including current register information, relevant claims disclosures and verified certificates.

2. The insurance response with current evidence, relevant limits, proposed coverage and identified contractual gaps.

3. Specific tracked Agreement amendments aligned with the proposed technical scope, fee, programme and responsibility matrix.

4. A clarification and release register covering deadline/validity, operating term, eligibility-form applicability, consultants/NDA steps and signatory authority.

Illustrative Milano application

Take a design deliverable and trace the professional responsibility behind it: who prepares, who coordinates, who reviews and who can approve. Align that allocation with the proposed fee and contract wording so that a marketing statement does not unintentionally imply an unpriced statutory design role. Resolve the supplied eligibility form’s apparent connection to a different municipal procedure before using it.

Italy Legal & Insurance | Review & handoff

Ideas to develop - not an agreed solution

• Keep one clause/issue register showing the commercial effect and proposed wording for each material qualification.

• Separate Client approval, professional design responsibility and operating accountability in the matrix.

Questions the team must close

• Which legal entity and trading designation will sign and perform the work?

• What material obligations need explicit amendment or qualification in the bid?

• Which written Client instructions and approvals are still required before release?

Bring to the bid

Legal/entity evidence + insurance response + tracked Agreement edits + priority clarification register.

Decision this enables

Resolve acceptance/qualification of material obligations and approve the final legal bidder identity.

Ready when

Certificates and coverage are verified; the municipal form is not signed blindly; confidentiality permissions and Client approvals are respected.

Handoff and dependencies

Technical/Finance identify exposure > Legal proposes terms > Italy authorised signatories approve > Bid includes the exact agreed position.

Named owner: to confirm. First pass G1; challenge G2; final G3; approved release G4.

Response mapping: Exhibit A §01, §03, §08; RFP Articles 3, 5-6; Exhibit H; draft Agreement.

Bid Leadership & Italy Sales

Turn specialist contributions into one deliverable offer.

Own the integrated response, evidence status and release process. The work packages on this page are proposed internal assignments, not confirmed staffing or deadlines.

The question to answer

Can every promise be traced to an owner, resource, price and approval?

Inputs needed

All workstream outputs; latest written Client instructions; team allocation; open questions; form/addenda; signatory and submission arrangements.

01 / Single brief & decisions

Confirm the deadline/time, source pack and scope choices. Assign a named owner to each work package and decide what must be resolved before concept and price freeze.

Expected output: Live responsibility/decision register, version-controlled assumptions and internal workback.

02 / Compliance & integration

Assemble all eight Exhibit A sections, B/C scope/programme response, D/E templates, F, corporate/insurance/NDA evidence and specific contract redlines. Check consistency of design, people and fees.

Expected output: One complete indexed proposal with compliance cross-check and resolved contradictions.

03 / Release & receipt

Obtain approvals and signatures; acknowledge addenda; check all fields and attachments. Submit through the RFP email route and obtain receipt confirmation.

Expected output: Final signed electronic pack and submission/receipt record. Tasting/interview preparations depend on the revised Client schedule.

Bid Leadership & Italy Sales | Deliverables & decisions

The minimum bid-ready package

Proposed structure for the first working submission. Confirm owner, effort and scope before committing the final offer.

1. One compliance index mapping the Proposal Form and all eight Exhibit A sections to the exact response documents and owners.

2. One controlled assumptions/decisions register shared across concept, demand, staffing, fees and contract response.

3. An agreed internal workback with accountable owners, integration reviews, evidence deadlines and approval gates.

4. The final signed electronic submission, attachment/version checks, acknowledged addenda and recorded receipt.

Illustrative Milano application

Run an integrated review using one illustrative matchday scenario. Ask BUILT to explain the layout, Culinary the offer, Operations the service flow, E15 the demand basis and Finance the economics. Resolve conflicting assumptions before editing the final prose. A polished narrative should emerge from an agreed solution and evidence; it cannot substitute for them.

Bid Leadership & Italy Sales | Review & handoff

Ideas to develop - not an agreed solution

• Run a single integrated review around one event scenario to catch inconsistent menu, queue, staffing, layout and pricing assumptions.

• Set internal gates relative to the confirmed deadline rather than presenting an unapproved calendar as a Client requirement.

Questions the team must close

• Which deadline, time zone, addenda and submission instructions are confirmed in writing?

• Who owns every missing input and which omissions materially affect compliance or price?

• Have all technical, commercial and legal changes been reflected consistently in the final pack?

Bring to the bid

Integrated proposal + compliance tracker + signed release and receipt record.

Decision this enables

Release only the scope, statements, names and terms that the approved pack can support.

Ready when

Every mandatory item is included or explicitly addressed; unresolved material inputs are visible and qualified; submission is verified, not merely sent.

Handoff and dependencies

All workstreams > Italy/Levy integration > technical, commercial and legal sign-off > authorised submission.

Named owner: to confirm. First pass G1; challenge G2; final G3; approved release G4.

Response mapping: RFP/Proposal Form; Exhibit A §§01-08; working allocation from Sebastiano Goggia.

Internal workback

PROPOSED INTERNAL WORKBACK

T means the confirmed Client submission deadline. The offsets below are planning recommendations, not Client dates or appointments. Bid Leadership must confirm the written extension and then agree actual dates with the teams.

G0

Immediately

Control the brief

Bid/Italy: confirm deadline/time and pack; assign owners; request Exhibit G and priority inputs; decide operating options to develop.

Exit: one brief, one owner per workstream, one assumptions register.

G1

Suggested T - 10 days

First evidence & concepts

All teams: first-pass outputs and gaps. E15 demand scenarios, BUILT concept options, Italy menus/design inputs and reference data.

Exit: reviewable material, with assumptions and missing data visible.

G2

Suggested T - 7 days

Integrated challenge

BUILT, E15, Italy Design, Culinary, Operations and Finance test one coherent concept; Legal and Technology review interfaces.

Exit: preferred concept and agreed basis for scope, staffing and price.

G3

Suggested T - 4 days

Freeze the proposed offer

Complete phases/fees, E/CVs/effort, D/references, responsibility matrix and contract edits. Resolve or explicitly qualify material gaps.

Exit: complete proposal ready for technical, commercial and legal approval.

G4

Suggested T - 2 days

Approve & release

Authorised review/signatures; check addenda, form and attachments; confirm delivery arrangements. Submission and receipt by T.

Exit: approved electronic pack and receipt record after sending.

If the confirmed deadline leaves less time, compress and reassign the gates explicitly. Do not treat the unconfirmed 23 October time as a safe assumption.

Client interfaces & responsibility

INTERFACES & RESPONSIBILITY

Use this as a starting point for the required responsibility matrix. Confirm appointments, scope boundaries and contractual accountability in the proposal.

F&B concept, demand, service formats

Proposed Levy / Italy lead

BUILT + E15, with Culinary/Operations

Client / appointed specialists

Approve brief, experience and relevant operating choices.

Coordinated layouts, specifications, approval support

Proposed Levy / Italy lead

Italy Design, with BUILT and appointed consultants

Client / appointed specialists

Architects/engineers retain contracted professional responsibilities; authorities determine statutory approvals.

Technology selection and integration

Proposed Levy / Italy lead

Technology, with E15/Operations

Client / appointed specialists

Prior Client hardware/software approval and stadium ICT coordination.

Menus, products, prices, brands and suppliers

Proposed Levy / Italy lead

Italy Culinary/Procurement + Commercial

Client / appointed specialists

Client approval and sponsorship/exclusivity requirements apply.

Menu boards / signage / portable carts

Proposed Levy / Italy lead

Define functional needs and collaborate; program approved menu content

Client / appointed specialists

Client oversees the relevant design, purchase and installation under Exhibit F.

Staffing, CVs, effort and key personnel

Proposed Levy / Italy lead

People + workstream leaders

Client / appointed specialists

Client approval rights over key personnel and relevant operating staffing matters.

Commissioning and opening

Proposed Levy / Italy lead

Design/Operations coordinate F&B readiness for agreed scope

Client / appointed specialists

Contractor/site handover, Client access and opening decisions must align.

Operating delivery, maintenance and reporting

Proposed Levy / Italy lead

Operations + Finance/E15, only for awarded services

Client / appointed specialists

Client oversight, approved reporting and final Agreement determine obligations.

Final fee, terms and submission

Proposed Levy / Italy lead

Commercial, Legal, Bid Leadership and authorised signatories

Client / appointed specialists

Client evaluates, clarifies and selects; appointment requires a definitive agreement.

THE TEST BEFORE RELEASE

Every promise needs an owner and a basis.

Named person · available effort · input/assumption · deliverable · approval · cost · dependency.

Review outstanding decisions >