COREXA

PRODUCT WORKFLOW STUDY

# From an isolated espresso recipe to a repeatable quality experiment and machine context

A brew-analysis workflow showing how Corexa can connect recipe variables, sensory result, machine and grinder settings, experiments and maintenance context.

Evidence level stated clearly throughout

**Repository-reviewed**
Capability basis

**Brew analytics**
Primary workflow

**Connected record**
Operating model

**Pilot required**
Outcome standard

THE CHALLENGE

# Why the existing process breaks down

Coffee quality changes for many reasons: dose, yield, time, grind, temperature, water, beans, grinder condition and machine performance. When a recipe is recorded without equipment and maintenance context, it is difficult to understand why a result improved or deteriorated.

01

### Recipes lack equipment context

The machine, grinder, burr condition and filtration state are not attached to the brew record.

02

### Variables change together

Several settings are adjusted at once, making the result difficult to attribute.

03

### Sensory scoring is inconsistent

Different users apply rating scales and descriptions differently.

04

### Failed experiments disappear

Only preferred recipes are retained, so teams repeat unsuccessful changes.

05

### Maintenance effects are missed

A cleaning, burr change or pressure repair is not connected to the quality shift.

06

### Recommendations overstate certainty

Small samples can be treated as proof of causation.

**The central risk** Brew data becomes noise when variables, equipment condition and evaluation method are not controlled and recorded together.

THE OPERATING MODEL

# A connected workflow around the machine

Corexa can store recipes and experiment logs against the relevant machine and grinder, define the variable being tested and relate quality observations to equipment events.

1

**Set baseline**

Record current recipe, equipment, beans, water and evaluation method.

2

**Choose variable**

Change one defined factor or clearly document a multi-factor test.

3

**Record extraction**

Capture dose, yield, time, settings and observed behaviour.

4

**Evaluate**

Apply the agreed sensory and technical scoring method.

5

**Compare context**

Review results beside maintenance, component and equipment history.

| COREXA CAPABILITY | OPERATIONAL CHANGE | WHY IT MATTERS |
|---|---|---|
| **Brew logs** | Stores recipe and extraction variables. | Teams can reproduce and compare actual settings. |
| **Experiment records** | Groups controlled trials and the variable under review. | Learning includes both successful and unsuccessful changes. |
| **Machine and grinder linkage** | Associates the brew with the equipment used. | Quality data has an operational context. |
| **Ratings and notes** | Captures sensory and technical observations. | Results are more useful than numbers alone. |
| **Maintenance history** | Shows cleaning, service and component changes. | Quality shifts can be investigated against equipment events. |
| **Analytics views** | Compares recipes and experiments over time. | Patterns can be explored without claiming causation prematurely. |

CREDIBILITY STANDARD

# What is supported - and what is not yet claimed

A credible case study distinguishes repository evidence, real workflow scope and future outcome hypotheses. The evidence level below is deliberately explicit.

### Repository capability

The repository includes brew logs, experiment logs, ratings, analytics, machine/grinder records and maintenance history.

### Connected operating model

The workflow is designed to keep brew analytics connected to the relevant machine, customer, site, job and responsible user.

### Credible limitation

Brew outcomes are influenced by uncontrolled variables and subjective assessment; analytics should support experiments, not present causal certainty from small samples.

### Pilot requirement

A defined cohort should be measured from baseline through controlled use before any productivity, cost, revenue or satisfaction outcome is published.

Not yet claimed: this case study does not present a measured productivity, revenue, accuracy or customer-satisfaction improvement. A controlled baseline and participant-approved result are required before those claims are published.

## Measurement plan for the publishable version

| MEASURE | EVIDENCE SOURCE | CREDIBLE REPORTING |
|---|---|---|
| **Complete brew record** | Log audit | Percentage containing agreed recipe, equipment and result fields. |
| **Single-variable compliance** | Experiment review | Trials changing only the stated factor or documenting exceptions. |
| **Recipe repeatability** | Repeated baseline runs | Variation in time, yield and score under nominally identical settings. |
| **Maintenance-linked change** | Timeline comparison | Quality shifts around documented equipment events, described as association. |
| **Experiment retention** | Experiment register | Successful and unsuccessful tests retained with conclusion. |
| **Reviewer agreement** | Duplicate sensory sample | Variation between assessors using the same scoring method. |

> *"A useful brew experiment records enough context to explain what changed, what stayed constant and how the result was judged."*

MAKE THE STORY TANGIBLE

# Show one recipe evolving through a controlled experiment

Present baseline settings, the chosen variable, extraction data, sensory result and relevant maintenance context. Clearly distinguish observation from proven causation.

**Connected workflow** — Representative view

**Set baseline**
Record current recipe, equipment, beans, water and evaluation method.

**Choose variable**
Change one defined factor or clearly document a multi-factor test.

**Record extraction**
Capture dose, yield, time, settings and observed behaviour.

**Evaluate**
Apply the agreed sensory and technical scoring method.

1. Baseline brew recipe linked to machine and grinder
2. Experiment definition and changed variable
3. Extraction and sensory result
4. Comparison with previous runs and maintenance timeline

## Recommended evidence-building sequence

**Phase 1 - Baseline**

Select a representative sample and record the current process, delays, errors and missing evidence.

**Phase 2 - Controlled workflow**

Apply one agreed Corexa process, ownership rule and completion standard for 8-12 weeks.

**Phase 3 - Verified result**

Report system-derived measures, dated screenshots and a participant-approved quotation.

## Build the publishable proof layer

Replace representative views with dated interface screenshots, a defined baseline, system-derived measures and an approved participant quotation.

corexa.com.au
sales@corexa.com.au

Publication note: capability descriptions are based on the Corexa repository supplied in July 2026. Confirm the deployed workflow, permissions, integrations and data quality before presenting a capability as a completed customer outcome.