CONFIDENTIAL ADVISORY REPORT

Valencia Indoor FEC Operational Assessment

Remote evidence-limited operational assessment

ATLAS DECISION INTELLIGENCE

PRODUCT	Operational Assessment
GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXT	València and Comunitat Valenciana, Spain
VENUE	Hypothetical operating indoor family entertainment centre
ASSESSMENT BASIS	External evidence and operating frameworks; no internal venue
PREPARED BY	ATLAS Entertainment

Prepared by ATLAS Entertainment

Confidential - Distribution restricted to authorised recipients

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary
2. Assessment Context and Objectives
3. Scope and Methodology
4. Venue / Business Overview
5. Operating Model
6. Organization and Governance
7. Staffing and Workforce Deployment
8. Guest Journey and Guest Experience
9. Admissions, Arrival and Entry Operations
10. Attraction / Experience Operations
11. Capacity, Throughput and Queue Management
12. Food, Beverage, Retail and Ancillary Operations
13. Maintenance and Asset Reliability
14. Safety and Operational Control Interfaces
15. Cleaning, Presentation and Facility Standards
16. Technology and Operational Systems
17. Procurement, Inventory and Supplier Dependencies
18. Operational KPIs and Performance Assessment
19. Cost Efficiency and Productivity
20. Operational Risks and Critical Gaps
21. Improvement Opportunities and Prioritized Action Plan
22. Conclusions, Sources, Assumptions and Limitations

Decision exhibits are embedded with the relevant chapters

1. Executive Summary

Assessment posture: This remote, document-free assessment concerns a hypothetical operating indoor family entertainment centre in València. It identifies applicable operating-control frameworks, evidence requirements and management verification priorities. It does not rate current venue performance, confirm deficiencies or establish regulatory compliance.

No internal venue records, management interviews, uploaded customer documents or site observations were available. Absence from the review pack is an evidence gap only; it does not establish that a control is absent, ineffective or non-compliant at the venue.

Decision priorities: Management can immediately organize a controlled evidence request covering the operating title and insurance conditions, emergency planning and drills, fire and accessibility records, attraction operating procedures, training and competence, food-safety controls, workplace-risk documentation, privacy records, maintenance evidence and reconciled operating data. Each item should first be classified as verified, partially evidenced, unavailable or not applicable.

Conditional response: Where evidence confirms an adequate and operating control, retain it and define its review cadence. Where evidence confirms a material gap, assign an accountable owner, determine legal or specialist dependencies and implement a proportionate corrective plan. Where evidence remains unavailable, keep the dimension unassessed and obtain document review, management confirmation, system extraction or on-site validation before making a performance or compliance conclusion.

Performance baseline: Attendance, demand, throughput, utilization, queues, uptime, staffing ratios, labor productivity, spend, cost ratios, guest satisfaction and incident rates remain unassessed. The recommended KPI pack is a measurement design, not a statement of current results. Management posture: verify critical legal-operational evidence first, then prioritize only confirmed gaps and begin data-driven optimization once reliable baselines exist.

2. Assessment Context and Objectives

Context: The subject is a hypothetical operating Indoor Family Entertainment Centre in València. Comunitat Valenciana's Ley 14/2010 regime, municipal procedures, and EU/EN/UNE standards frame the operating obligations. No internal documentation or site inspection was provided. Public sources were used only to define mandatory frameworks, methods and evidence requests; no public reviews were introduced as proxies for performance.

Objectives: 1) Identify near-term, defensible operating-control priorities that reduce regulatory, safety and service risk. 2) Specify the evidence and governance artefacts required to establish baseline assurance (licensing, emergency management, life safety, accessibility, GDPR, HACCP, PRL, EN 13814-2/UNE-EN 14960). 3) Propose a minimal KPI system and measurement cadence to enable demand-led staffing, queue management and commercial control. 4) Separate hypothesized journey risks from verified data and explicitly mark unassessed dimensions.

Decision relevance: The recommendations allow management to decide what to regularize in the next 0-60 days, which records to assemble for insurer and municipal conditions, and how to instrument operations for ongoing performance control. The exhibits translate authoritative references into operator-facing evidence lists and methods (e.g., queue sampling, dwell time, uptime logging) without asserting venue performance.

Boundaries and roles: This is an operational assessment standard, not a compliance certification, design review, engineering sign-off or safety audit. Competent specialists (fire, accessibility, PRL, food safety, EN 13814-2 technical lead) should validate domain specifics on-site once documents are assembled. Financial arithmetic is not included due to absent inputs; fiscal control guidance references RD 1619/2012 and AEAT cash limits only.

3. Scope and Methodology

Scope: Remote review covering operating model, governance, workforce, guest journey, admissions, attraction operations, capacity/queue management, F&B, maintenance and reliability interfaces, cleaning, safety/emergency management, technology and data protection, procurement/fiscal controls, KPIs/productivity, and operating risks with a prioritized 0-60 day plan.

Methodology: - Anchored to authoritative frameworks: Ley 14/2010 and municipal procedures for operating title; RD 393/2007 for Plan de Autoprotección; CTE DB-SI/DB-SUA and RD 173/2010 for fire/accessibility; EN 13814-2 and UNE-EN 14960 for attractions; EU 852/2004 and AESAN guidance for HACCP/training; AEPD guidance for GDPR/CCTV; RD 1619/2012/AEAT limits for invoicing/cash controls; PRL obligations under Ley 31/1995 and RD 486/1997.

- Built exhibits that define KPIs, workforce coverage, capacity methods, asset reliability records, cost/productivity controls, and a sequenced action plan.
- Marked all quantitative KPIs as unavailable due to no internal data. No estimates were made.
- Translated each regulatory anchor into concrete evidence requests and operator accountabilities.

Confidence and limitations: Confidence is high in the applicability of cited frameworks to an indoor FEC in València. Confidence is not applicable for performance levels because no internal evidence exists. Consequence: decisions should focus first on establishing governance artefacts and measurement systems; performance optimization should wait for baseline data. Next validation: targeted document pack review; exports from ticketing/POS, timekeeping, CMMS, incident and HACCP logs; on-site spot checks of exits, signage, accessibility routes, and attraction pre-use routines.