[Service Contract]

The Operator's Dictionary · https://kb.jeffreysummers.com/docs/service-contract/

Definition

The operator's contract to execute service. The Road 1 parent form. Service is the technical delivery of f&b — accuracy, timing, safety, technique, cleanliness, compliance. The operator is the party accountable for execution. Cast execute on operations where humans are the primary delivery mechanism. Tech executes or co-executes on operations where the exchange is mediated by systems (Transaction+), with humans in supporting or supervisory roles. Customers are the recipients on honest Road 1 operations. The Contract governs the operation's whole-business posture and inherits down into [The Customer Contract] at each visit and [The Cast Contract] at each shift. [The Service Contract] runs on both roads — Road 1 operations run service without hospitality; Road 2 operations run service underneath [The Hospitality Contract].

Family

Canon — MAJOR. Top-level. One of two operator parent contracts (paired with [The Hospitality Contract]). The Road 1 execution contract when it runs alone; a component underneath [The Hospitality Contract] when Road 2 is running. Inheritance root for [The Customer Contract] (Guest-side instance) and [The Cast Contract] (Cast-side instance) when the operation runs Road 1 alone.

Why Behind the Thinking

Service is executed (verb-pair lock). Execution requires an executor and an accountable party. [The Service Contract] names both — Cast or tech execute, operator is accountable. Naming the Contract cleanly separates service from hospitality in a way most operators collapse. Service can be perfect while hospitality is absent — chain casual dining is often exactly this. Hospitality can be genuine while service falters — a great neighborhood restaurant with a slow kitchen night still delivers hospitality. Both matter. Neither substitutes for the other. Service is the ground floor. Without clean service, hospitality has nothing to stand on.

[The Service Contract] is a legitimate contract. Not a lesser one. Operators built to facilitate transactional fulfillment cleanly are serving a real Customer population well when they deliver on the exchange. Counter service, QSR, quick service, take-out, delivery-primary — all real businesses running honest Road 1. The framework respects the coherent Road 1 operation as much as it respects the coherent Road 2 operation. The framework does not respect [Operator Arbitrage] — Road 1 execution dressed in Road 2 marketing — regardless of which direction the arbitrage runs from.

Breach on service is highly visible — wrong order, cold food, missed timing, safety violation. Breach cost is often reactive (comp the ticket, remake the dish, fire the vendor). Breach compounds when it becomes systemic — the operation's execution discipline decays, service failures become routine, and the operation loses trust it cannot recover with hospitality alone. On Road 1 operations, service failure is direct Contract failure — the exchange itself has broken. On Road 2 operations, service failure erodes the foundation hospitality stands on.

The operator is the accountability party. Standards, systems, equipment, training, staffing, scheduling — all his. Cast execution failures often trace to what the operator did or did not give Cast to work with.

Mine / Theirs / Ours (Ownership Map)

Written from the operator's seat.

Mine — the operator's:
The architecture of the transactional offer. The clarity of what is being sold. The systems that make the exchange clean, fast, and repeatable. The equipment, training, and standards that let Cast execute reliably. The pricing discipline that matches Road 1 cost structure to Road 1 compensation. The decision to run Road 1 by design, not by drift. The honesty of running Road 1 without pretending to run Road 2. The refusal to insert Road 2 compensation prompts (tips at counter) into a Road 1 exchange the Cast did not manifest Road 2 service inside.

Theirs — the Customer's:
Whether they accept the offer. Whether they compensate as agreed. Whether they return for the next transaction — on transactional terms, without expectation of relationship. Their satisfaction with the specified exchange. Their honest attribution of transactional value to what is actually a transactional contract.

Ours:
The transaction itself. The clean settle at close. Nothing carries forward by design — that is the Contract, not a failure of it. The operator does not owe the Customer relational Consideration under Road 1; the Customer does not owe the operator Road 2 loyalty. The contract is honest about what it is.

Failure vector: the operator running Road 1 while marketing Road 2 — selling relationship language against a transactional offer. Or running Road 2 investments against Road 1 economics. Both collapse the Contract by lying about which one it is.

Reciprocity Test (Manifest Level)

Written from the operator's seat.

What the operator must manifest to hold [The Service Contract]:
Road 1 architecture actually built. Clean execution systems. Working equipment. Trained Cast against the standards the operation requires. Pricing that matches Road 1 cost structure. Marketing that describes what the operation actually is — transactional fulfillment done cleanly. No Road 2 tip architecture inserted at settle. No relationship language inserted into marketing that the operation does not manifest.

What the Cast must manifest:
Technical competence held to the standard. Discipline against drift. The rehearsed habits that make execution reliable. Cast working Road 1 is not expected to manifest Road 2 hospitality — the Contract is transactional. Cast is expected to execute the exchange cleanly.

What the Customer must manifest:
Presence in the exchange. Compensation at Road 1 level for the exchange as specified. No expectation of relationship the Contract does not include. Honest attribution of transactional value to the transactional contract.

Asymmetry failure — counter-service tip prompt.
Operator runs [The Service Contract] cleanly on the delivery side — no Road 2 service manifested — then inserts a tip prompt at settle asking the Customer to compensate as if it were [The Hospitality Contract]. The Customer arrived to manifest Road 1. Compensated at Road 1 for the exchange. The prompt asks for Road 2 compensation on top. Cast did not deliver Road 2 service. Operator did not architect Road 2. This is [Operator Arbitrage] running from the Road 1 direction — Road 1 costs, Road 1 execution, Road 1 marketing, Road 2 compensation extraction. The public

backlash is a [Reciprocity Test] failure surfacing at national scale.

Asymmetry failure — dressed Road 2.
Operator runs [The Service Contract] cost structure underneath [The Hospitality Contract] marketing. Road 1 wages, Road 1 development, Road 1 systems — Road 2 pricing, Road 2 tips, Road 2 identity claims. [Operator Arbitrage] running from the Road 2 direction. Same mechanic, same P&L consequences.

The Contract only holds when the operator manifests it at every level. Honest Road 1 passes. Dressed Road 2 fails. Road 1 with Road 2 extraction fails. Both failures point back to the operator.

Pairs with

[The Hospitality Contract], [The Guest Contract], [The Customer Contract], [The Cast Contract], [The Operator Contract], [Reciprocity Test], [Operator Arbitrage], [Consent Erosion], [Consent Arbitrage], [2P Arbitrage], [Two Roads], [Amplification Principle], [Marketing as Architecture Amplification], [Lost Opportunity Tax], [The Affordability Lie], [Connection Floor], [Never Treat A Guest Better Than An Employee]