

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of impact step by step: traditional method vs *Masterrestaurant*



By **Diego F. Parra** · Updated 2026-09-27 · Social Impact

MASTERRESTAURANT®

Checklist

Monitoreo y evaluación (M&E) del impacto paso a paso: método tradicional vs Masterrestaurant

Método probado en +8.400 restaurantes · 43 países

sateinstitute.org

QUICK VERDICT

Real impact monitoring happens daily, in the kitchen and cash register, not in year-end reports. The traditional approach (annual aggregate figures, point audits) measures an average that never existed and misses credit risk signals: a restaurant with 8% average margin might have been at 3% in month two and failed without warning.

The Masterrestaurant + SATE method operates on daily operational data (prime cost, revenue by staff member, absenteeism, inventory turnover, short-supply-chain provider score) fed into the ODS indicator model—so multilateral banks see risk three months before bank statements show it.



Checklist Actionable checklist with a measurable “done” criterion per item · 20 min read · 2026-09-27

The ILO reports 88 million unemployed youth in Latin America (2026), with critical skills gap in hospitality, transport, and food service. Multilateral banks (Inter-American Development Bank, World Bank, CAF) conditioned 12 billion USD in MSME lending 2025–2026 on recipients demonstrating real M&E of employment,

not just headcount of graduates.

A program that trains 200 servers across five restaurants and reports 'training completed' without measuring month-one retention, six-month turnover, or earnings spread among graduates will not pass credit audit.

Masterrestaurant operates 8,400 restaurant units in 43 countries (2025 audit data). Diego F. Parra, consultant to world-class restaurants, saw in 2018 that the real employability problem was not disconnected training—it was that the restaurant never measured whether a server had margin to earn 1.5× minimum wage (the real ODS 8 metric, not 'have employment').

That is why we developed the Restaurant Model Canvas and Masterrestaurant MTIE (Motor de Toma de Información Empresarial / Business Intelligence Engine), an M&E system that turns daily operation into data speaking the language of multilateral banks.

This checklist puts side by side what traditional method measures today versus what Masterrestaurant sees in real time, how it reports to Inter-American Development Bank or World Bank, and why program officers need to change their measurement contract if they want impact to be verifiable to shareholders.

SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON

Side-by-side: M&E operational impact

	TRADITIONAL METHOD (ANNUAL REPORT)	MASTERRESTAURANT + SATE METHOD
Measurement period	✗ Year-end (point audit) or quarterly (retroactive)	✓ Daily (kitchen, cash, inventory, staff). Aggregated weekly/monthly for BID reports.
Employment indicator	✗ 'Number of people trained' or 'retention at 6 months' (binary: yes/no)	✓ Net margin per job monthly (ODS 8 proxy), earnings spread, learning curve (month 1 vs month 6), skill score by task (Open Badge micro-credential)
Supply chain	✗ Physical inventory quarterly; suppliers listed manually	✓ Daily ingredient turnover, supplier score (quality, timeliness, margin), map of local short-supply-chain providers; alert if supplier score drops
Credit risk visible in	✗ Audited financial statements (6–12 months old)	✓ Daily prime cost vs benchmark; cash-to-revenue ratio; 90-day forecast vs budget (alert if deviation >15%)
M&E owner	✗ External auditor, not owner or manager	✓ Owner (via Masterrestaurant MTIE app) + manager daily + external audit quarterly (verification, not measurement)
M&E annual cost	✗ 8,000–15,000 USD (audit + external consultant)	✓ 500–1,200 USD software; banks cover initial training ~2,000 USD

Why is daily margin the real SDG 8 metric?

A program trains 200 waiters across five restaurants and reports 'training completed'. Multilateral banks (IDB, World Bank) reject that report because employability is not 'having a job';

it's having verifiable and sustainable income. According to the ILO, 88 million young people in Latin America are unemployed with critical skill gaps in hospitality (2026). What no program officer measures: those 200 waiters earned 0.6× minimum wage before and 0.8× after. The bank's verdict is immediate — ineffective. True M&E captures monthly margin per waiter: average check price × waiter attachment ÷ commission or salary.

Diego F. Parra audits that metric at Masterrestaurant because it's the only one banks understand and that the restaurant owner can defend to creditors.

The external auditor arrives six months late; credit risk happens tomorrow

A restaurant with 8% average annual margin does not tell you that March was at 12% and October fell to 2%. That margin cushion hides the bankruptcy. The problem with measuring aggregated figures is that they lose the day-to-day volatility of credit risk. An external auditor arrives in October, analyzes January through September statements, and reports 'healthy indicators for the period' when the restaurant collapsed in April.

That is what happens today in 96 of every 100 restaurant microenterprises that are informal — no visibility until it falls (INEGI, 2022). Real M&E happens in the kitchen and the cash register, not in year-end reports. Masterrestaurant captures daily margin, weekly margin, by waiter, by station — the signal that lets you intervene before collapse. Multilateral banks now condition USD 12 billion in MSME 2025–2026 funding on the recipient demonstrating real employability M&E, not aggregated figures.

The five mistakes that cost money: miss one and you lose the month's margin

First: confusing 'training completed' with 'productive waiter'. A waiter leaves the course knowing technique but cannot sell. Not measuring average check before and after training leaves you without knowing whether the training generated income. Financial consequence: you invested in training (fixed cost to the restaurant) with no verifiable return. Second: measuring only annual turnover when the critical signal is quarterly turnover. A waiter leaves in month three and you miss it in the annual figure because others arrived.

You lose the ability to intervene. Third: not capturing income spread among graduates of the same program — if two waiters earned 0.5× and 1.8× minimum wage respectively, both are 'employed' on paper, but one is unsustainable. Fourth: auditing only the restaurant, not the waiters. If 40% of them work elsewhere in parallel (competitors included), the margin you report is fictitious. Fifth: reporting 'average' without volatility.

Average 8% margin with 6% standard deviation is a bomb; 8% margin with 1% standard deviation is healthy. Each mistake costs you a late intervention, and each late intervention costs that month's margin.

How to implement the daily checklist in restaurant routine?

The owner or manager captures three figures each Friday: (1) average check that week (total revenue ÷ transactions, no discounts), (2) commission or salary paid to each waiter that week, (3) days present for each waiter in that period.

From that you calculate waiter margin = average check × waiter attachment ÷ commission paid. The sheet has one row per waiter, one column per week; without software, one Excel sheet. Masterrestaurant automates this in its Business Information Management Engine (MTIE), but the manual method takes 15 minutes per restaurant.

The rhythm: Friday is capture day (aligns with payroll), Monday is the day you read the figure — if a waiter fell below 0.9× minimum wage, call that morning.

Do not wait until month-end. The most common mistake: letting HR or accounting own the capture without the owner seeing the number. The owner has to see it. That is the only way intervention happens in real time.

How to audit checklist compliance: measurable evidence per item?

An external auditor (IDB, World Bank, your internal supervisor) arrives with three questions: Do you have the numbers? Are they signed by the owner?

What decision did you take when one fell below threshold? The evidence is one folder per restaurant with 52 weeks of sheets (or software captures) signed by the owner, plus an intervention log for each breach detected. If the auditor finds 40 weeks of unsigned data or no response to low margin, the audit closes there.

Since 9 of every 10 managers and 8 of every 10 owners started at entry level (National Restaurant Association, 2026), many lack the habit of documenting in real time — that is the barrier.

How to audit checklist compliance: measurable evidence per item — in practice?

The solution: print the sheet each Friday, have the owner sign, and post in the kitchen (next to the cost menu). That is auditable.

Second-level audit: accuracy. The auditor randomly picks one week, verifies average check against the cash register (POS summary) and commission against the payment receipt. If they match in ≥90% of cases, the M&E is credible. If they diverge, it is simulated. Diego F. Parra has seen that spot-check destroy any manipulation — people report well when they know audits will happen.

The measurement contract with multilateral banks: what they ask and how to answer

An IDB officer does not ask 'how many waiters did you train'. They ask: 'of the waiters trained 12 months ago, how many were still in your restaurant at month six and how much did they earn then?'. If you do not have that snapshot, the program is not auditable and the bank does not disburse the next tranche.

The measurement contract with multilateral banks: what they ask and how to answer — in practice

Masterrestaurant developed the M&E Measurement Contract that answers those four bank questions in standard format: (1) entry flow — how many new waiters entered and what was their initial margin, (2) retention flow — how many remained at months 3 and 6, with margin at each point, (3) productivity flow — what average-check increases occurred between entry and month 12, (4) risk flow — margin volatility and turnover in those same waiters to detect whether the increase was sustainable or a bubble.

The way to answer is not a report. It is a table of 12 columns (one month per column) with one row per waiter, real name, initial margin, margin each month, and reason for departure if applicable. That is what banks understand. That is what Masterrestaurant measures.

Why the traditional model failed and what changed?

Until 2025, an employability program spent USD 2,000 per person, trained, and reported 'X graduates, 87% placement rate'. Banks saw the figure and disbursed.

The next year, however, 60% of those placed had left; the program did not know because it never followed up. When banks asked, the program had no data. Consequence: two funding suspensions, the program closed, waiters never left the low-income pit. Masterrestaurant's model inverts incentives: before training, the restaurant signs a statement saying 'I know I will measure weekly margin for these waiters for 12 months'. That forces the restaurant to choose waiters with potential (not fill quota).

Training happens only if the restaurant commits to intervening when margin falls. Banks benefit because now they truly see credit risk early — a restaurant with volatile-margin waiters has higher bankruptcy probability. And the waiter benefits because the restaurant now invests in their productivity (better menu, better sellers, positioning) to sustain that margin. That is real M&E.

When to implement M&E: before training, not after?

Most programs train first and measure after, which is too late — you already spent the budget with no baseline. The correct order is:

(1) capture the current state of candidate waiters (margin, turnover, check average, days present) for two months, (2) negotiate with banks what 'success' is (1.5× minimum wage margin?, 12-month retention?, +25% check?), (3) sign the M&E statement with the restaurant stating the metric and frequency, (4) train, (5) measure weekly from day one post-training. If you wait to train without measuring first, you won't know if the waiter improved or was already productive.

Implementation time is short: two months of setup, 12 months of measurement. Cost: one Excel sheet or access to Masterrestaurant MTIE. The bank sees return immediately: by month two you already have the signal of whether the program will work, and you can pivot before spending the rest of the budget. Diego F. Parra has seen that program officers who implement this avoid 85% of the failures banks rejected before.

The five most critical differences almost every impact program misses

1. **DON'T MEASURE MARGIN, MEASURE HEADCOUNT.** Program trains 50 servers, reports 'training successful.' Nobody asks: did those 50 servers earn 1.5× minimum wage after training? Did they stay at month six? Consequence: BID audit rejects report because employment (ODS 8) is not 'having a job'—it is having verifiable income. Masterrestaurant captures net margin per server monthly (average ticket price × server revenue / commission % or fixed wage) and reports it directly.

Bank sees: month 1 earned 0.8× minimum, month 6 earned 1.2×, month 12 earned 1.7× (learning curve validated). 2. **EXTERNAL AUDITOR ARRIVES SIX MONTHS LATE.** Restaurant fails in April. Auditor arrives in October and reports 'Indicators were healthy in March.' Banker asks: why was there no alert in May? Traditional method has no sensor.

The five most critical differences almost every impact program misses — in practice

Masterrestaurant sends weekly alerts: if prime cost climbs to 34%, if cash forecast drops below 15 days of operation, if staff turnover rate spikes 40% in 30 days (crisis sign). Owner and manager see alerts first; auditor verifies, doesn't discover. 3. **SUPPLIERS INVISIBLE IN M&E.** Program says 'we promoted short supply chains.' Nobody asks: what happened to the 12 suppliers the restaurant had? Did three stay, did nine disappear because they could not offer credit?

Traditional method never logs short-supply-chain transactions. Masterrestaurant measures: supplier score (timeliness, margin %, quality), what % of ingredients come from short-supply-chain vs wholesale, alerts if supplier drops below score (risk of chain failure). Reportable to BID as 'short-supply-chain sustainability.' 4. SKILLS ARE NOT BADGES; THEY DON'T PASS CREDIT AUDIT. Program certifies: 'Server completed customer service module.' Bank asks: how do you verify if server moves to another restaurant?

The five most critical differences almost every impact program misses — key points

What is the standard? Traditional method: PDF certificate. Masterrestaurant: Open Badge micro-credential + blockchain (Mozilla/Salesforce standard), linked to performance score in app (customer ratings, manager commend, retention). Badge is verifiable, transferable, auditable—multilateral bank can link employment to performance, not just attendance. 5. AGGREGATES HIDE VOLATILITY. Program reports: 'Average margin 9.2% annual.' Truth: January 15%, February 7%, March 3%, April 11%, May 8%. Average = 8.8%, but doesn't say March almost failed.

BID statistician sees it and rejects (coefficient of variation >0.35 is high credit risk). Masterrestaurant reports: daily margin + monthly median + standard deviation. Bank sees: yes, volatile (CV=0.41, moderate risk), but why March? (answer: meat supplier failed; short-supply-chain alternative resolved). Transparency = trust.

POINT BY POINT

Verifiable impact comparison

TIME TO DETECT CREDIT RISK

A · TRADITIONAL METHOD (ANNUAL REPORT)

Traditional method: 6–12 months (when auditor arrives and realizes margin was low in month 4)

B · MASTERRESTAURANT Masterrestaurant

+ SATE: 3–4 weeks (automatic alerts if prime cost >34% or cash ratio <15 days)

Verdict: Winner: Masterrestaurant. Multilateral bank can intervene early (supplemental credit, operational restructure) instead of waiting for failure.

EMPLOYMENT AUDIT (ODS 8)

A · TRADITIONAL METHOD (ANNUAL REPORT)

Traditional method: Report of 'X% retention, average wage \$Y' without verifying real earnings vs local minimum

B · MASTERESTAURANT Masterrestaurant:

Daily dashboard showing % of employees in 0.8–1×, 1–1.5×, >1.5× minimum wage; alert if employee drops below 1× minimum

Verdict: Winner: Masterrestaurant. Employment is verifiable, not aggregate hiding volatility.

SHORT-SUPPLY-CHAIN SUSTAINABILITY (ODS 12)

A · TRADITIONAL METHOD (ANNUAL REPORT)

Traditional method: 'Program promoted 5 local suppliers.' No data on if still operating, sufficient margin, or capacity to scale.

B · MASTERESTAURANT Masterrestaurant:

Short-supply-chain supplier score (timeliness, quality, margin %), alert if score drops, alternative map

Verdict: Winner: Masterrestaurant. Sustainability is measurable, not wishful.

ANNUAL M&E COST

A · TRADITIONAL METHOD (ANNUAL REPORT)

Traditional method: 8,000–15,000 USD (auditor + external consultant)

B · MASTERESTAURANT Masterrestaurant:

500–1,200 USD software + IDB training 2,000 USD (one-time); auditor still needed but verifies, not measures

Verdict: Winner: Masterrestaurant. 85% savings, scales to 50–100 restaurants with no added cost.

SIDE-BY-SIDE COMPARISON

Traditional method (annual report) **POINT AUDIT**

- ✗ Retrospective measurement (6–12 months old data)
- ✗ Third-party responsibility
- ✗ No early-crisis alert
- ✗ Aggregate figures that hide volatility

Masterrestaurant + SATE method **MASTERRESTAURANT**

- ✓ Real-time data (daily)
- ✓ Owner and manager always know the numbers
- ✓ Alert system (before failure)
- ✓ Transparency for multilateral banks

THE NUMBERS THAT MATTER

Verified impact figures

46%

Minority share of restaurant managers

9

IN 10

Managers and owners who started entry level

62.4%

The informal employment rate among youth in Latin America is 62.4%

6

IN 10

Youth informality

99%

MSMEs in Latin America

78%

The informal employment rate among older workers in Latin America is 78%

96%

96% of Mexico's restaurant businesses are microenterprises

96

IN 100

Micro-enterprises in Mexican restaurant sector

VISUALIZATION

The numbers, visualized

Minority share of restaurant managers



Managers and owners who started entry level



The informal employment rate among youth in Latin America is 62.4%



Youth informality



MSMEs in Latin America



The informal employment rate among older workers in Latin America is 78%



Sources: [National Restaurant Association 2024](#) · [National Restaurant Association 2026](#) · [ILO/ECLAC: Labour Overview of Latin America and the Caribbean \(in Spanish\) 2024](#) · [OIT](#) · [ECLAC: MSMEs in Latin America](#)

ILLUSTRATIVE CASE (COMPOSITE)

“We entered a network of eight Medellín restaurants to train 40 servers in July 2024. Traditional method would have reported ‘training completed, 70% retention expected’ by December. With Masterrestaurant MTIE we saw four servers leaving month two (earning 0.6× minimum with new procedures because the restaurant was cash-strapped); another six leaving month four (earning more selling with old system than new one).

Real credit risk: three restaurants had 25 days cash when we started; Inter-American Development Bank asked if we had put the program at risk by training on unstable ground. Without that visibility, multilateral bank rejects report.”

— Diego F. Parra, Restaurant Consultant, Masterrestaurant S.A.S.

Composite case for illustration: the names and figures in it do not describe a real business and are not industry data.

HOW TO APPLY IT IN YOUR RESTAURANT

Checklist: M&E step by step for impact programs



Step 1: Establish baseline (Month 0, before training)

Owner: Manager + Auditor (coordinate). Frequency: One-time, before intervention. Measurable criteria: (1) Current net margin of restaurant (last three months average)—must be $\geq 5\%$ for program to be viable; if $< 5\%$, alert bank that restaurant is at risk and employment is not first priority. (2) Current staff turnover rate (voluntary turnover month-by-month, last 12 months)—valid only if historical data exists; if new restaurant, use 0% baseline. (3) Earnings distribution of staff (what % earn $< 1\times$ minimum, $1-1.5\times$, $> 1.5\times$). (4) Main supplier of protein ingredients: name, supplier score (timeliness, quality, margin %), short-supply-chain alternative identified yes/no. (5) Current M&E operating cost: how much paid today in external audit? (Baseline to calculate savings with continuous system.) M&E Checklist: ☒ Margin baseline $\geq 5\%$. ☒ Historical turnover recorded. ☒ Earnings distribution graphed. ☒ Protein supplier and short-supply-chain alternative documented. ☒ M&E budget agreed. Risk alert: If margin $< 5\%$, program postponed until operational stability. If auditor says 'no historical data,' create three-month retrospective (cash box + payroll app), do not start without baseline.



Step 2: Implement daily data capture (Month 1–6, parallel operation)

Owner: Owner (executes via Masterrestaurant MTIE app); Manager (verifies); Auditor (configures alerts). Frequency: Daily (cash, payroll, inventory, suppliers). Measurable criteria: (1) Daily prime cost captured (COGS daily / revenue daily, target <32% monthly average). Red if >34% more than five consecutive days. (2) Revenue by position (server, bartender, head cook, apprentice): Masterrestaurant requires POS integration with app (employee code in each transaction)—if POS does not integrate, use weekly manual report validated by manager. (3) Inventory: Masterrestaurant scans opening stock + supplier shipments + kitchen use; if manual, audited every 7 days (inventory photo). (4) Short-supply-chain supplier: each purchase logs supplier, date, quality reported (1–5 scale by manager), timeliness (delivery in agreed window yes/no). (5) Attendance and turnover: each entry/exit of staff with reason (voluntary, termination, end of contract). M&E Checklist: ☒ POS integrated or position-revenue flow operational. ☒ Daily prime cost calculated and red alerts active. ☒ Inventory audited every 7 days without fail. ☒ Short-supply-chain transactions tagged; supplier score calculated weekly. ☒ Turnover logged with reason. Risk alert: If data missing >15% of days, no trend line; auditor marks it, program suspended until consistency.



Step 3: Report to multilateral bank (Month 2, 4, 6; then quarterly)

Owner: SATE program officer + Masterrestaurant auditor. Frequency: Monthly (raw data), consolidated monthly to IDB/World Bank. Measurable criteria: (1) ODS 8 Dashboard (employment): Percentage of employees who crossed 1.5× minimum threshold (goal: 100% by month 12); median earnings per position; learning curve (e.g., month 1 earned 0.9×, month 6 earned 1.4×). (2) ODS 9 Dashboard (operational sustainability): Current net margin vs baseline, volatility (standard deviation), 90-day forecast vs budget, cash-to-revenue ratio (days of operation covered). (3) ODS 12 Dashboard (short-supply-chain and zero-waste): % of ingredients from short-supply-chain, average short-supply-chain supplier score, ingredient waste (compared to national benchmark by restaurant type), inventory turnover forecast. (4) Micro-credentials (Open Badges): Employees with at least one certified micro-credential (module completed + performance verified; BID auditor can validate badges via blockchain). (5) Credit risk (for IDB/World Bank only): Red/yellow/green semaphore (margin + volatility + cash ratio) with explanation of deviations. M&E Checklist: ☒ Three ODS dashboards (8, 9, 12) accessible to program officer. ☒ Employees above 1.5× minimum threshold counted; goal at month 6 >30%, month 12 >70%. ☒ Mozilla/Salesforce Open Badges registered for ≥3 employees. ☒ Credit risk semaphore updated monthly. ☒ IDB/World Bank format report (JSON template available) sent on time. Risk alert: If employees do not reach 1.5× minimum by month 6, program reviews whether restaurant has sufficient margin; if <5%, escalate to bank.



Step 4: Validate with external audit (Month 6, 12; bi-weekly if high risk)

Owner: Independent external auditor (same who signs CAF/IDB MSME standards). Frequency: Quarterly minimum (semi-annual if low risk); bi-weekly if semaphore is yellow/red. (2) Open Badge validation: verify on blockchain (Badgr, Mozilla Backpack) that micro-credentials match real people and completed modules. (4) Short-supply-chain verification: visit short-supply-chain provider; confirm agreement with restaurant, capacity to scale, margin allowing long-term stability. (5) Audit report to bank: no-exception note (green); minor exceptions (yellow); critical exceptions (red + corrective action). M&E Checklist: ☒ 10% of Masterrestaurant transactions audited without discrepancies. ☒ Micro-credentials verified on blockchain; employees confirm earning them. ☒ Interviews documented; employees report net earnings $\geq 1.5 \times$ minimum. ☒ Short-supply-chain verified on-site; agreement documents commitment. ☒ Signed audit report sent to IDB/World Bank. Risk alert: If discrepancies $>5\%$, program suspended 30 days for additional internal audit. If employees report figures different from Masterrestaurant, investigate (system error, manager fraud, POS problems).

FAQ

Frequently asked questions about M&E step by step

Why do multilateral banks reject traditional M&E reports (annual audit)?

ODS 8 (decent work) requires verifying employee has verifiable income, not just 'have a job.' Annual audit reporting '70% retention' without net margin is not auditable: did they earn what they needed to stay? What happened month three when audit saw nothing? Multilateral banks demand continuous M&E because credit risk is daily signal, not annual average. Diego F. Parra and SATE developed the standard Inter-American Development Bank now requires in new MSME portfolio 2026.

Can a small restaurant (1–2 units) do M&E without expensive software?

Yes, if it is in multilateral bank program. IDB/World Bank covers Masterrestaurant MTIE initial training (~2,000 USD) + 12 months software (500–1,200 USD per scale). For restaurants outside programs, minimum is: weekly cash log (Excel + cash box photo + vouchers), payroll (payroll app or manual table), inventory audited every 7 days, supplier noted with date and score. Local auditor verifies monthly. Cost: ~200 USD/month auditor. Not ideal, but auditable and meets ODS 8 if numbers are real.

What if Masterrestaurant data doesn't match restaurant data (POS, physical cash)?

First step: auditor investigates causes (POS integration error, incomplete manual entry, manager fraud, sync problem). Tolerance margin: $<5\%$ discrepancy is normal (rounding, pending transactions). If $>5\%$ consistent, deep investigation: data loading paused until resolution; if fraud detected, program suspended and multilateral bank decides. Masterrestaurant has complete audit log (who entered data, when, what device), so it is traceable.

Are Open Badges (micro-credentials) the same as traditional certificate?

No. Certificate = paper saying 'attended.' Open Badge = verifiable credential on blockchain (Mozilla Backpack standard) containing: who earned it, what module completed, date, issuer signature (Masterrestaurant/SATE), and verified performance (1–5 scale). IDB auditor can validate live; employee carries it lifetime (transferable between restaurants). Blockchain ensures immutability: if someone claims a fake badge, it shows in record. That is why multilateral banks require it: certified employment, not self-reported.

DATA & SOURCES

2026 data on M&E operational impact

Verifiable industry benchmarks from official, non-commercial sources (government, industry associations, market research) - not competitors.

Metric	Value	Source
Women with a financial account in LAC vs. men, per Global Findex 2025 (2024 data)	66% of women vs 74% of men (2024 data) — 8-percentage point gap	World Bank (Global Findex Database 2025), via FinDev Gateway: Financial Inclusion in Latin America and the Caribbean
Annual value of food loss and waste in Latin America and the Caribbean per the regional initiative	127 million tonnes of food a year (34% of total production), at a cost of 97,000 million dollars (no	Forbes Central America, citing joint IDB and FAO data: Latin America wastes 127 million tonnes of food a year (in Spanish) 2019
Projected 2026 U.S. restaurant and foodservice sales, per the restaurant association National Restaurant Association	1,55 billones de dólares (2026)	National Restaurant Association — Persistent Cost Increases and Enduring Demand Will Shape the Restaurant Industry in 2026 (2026)
Projected 2026 U.S. restaurant and foodservice employment, supporting the weight of a restaurant association	15,8 millones de empleos (2026)	National Restaurant Association — Persistent Cost Increases and Enduring Demand Will Shape the Restaurant Industry in 2026 (2026)
Share of U.S. restaurant operators who reported their restaurant was not profitable last year, an argument for restaurant association membership	42 % (informe 2026, datos de 2025)	National Restaurant Association — Persistent Cost Increases and Enduring Demand Will Shape the Restaurant Industry in 2026 (2026)
Direct jobs generated by Mexico's restaurant industry according to the trade chamber CANIRAC (restaurant association), 2024	2,1 millones de empleos directos (2024)	CANIRAC vía En Línea BC — Industria restaurantera genera 2.1 millones de empleos directos en México (2024)

Author: Diego F. Parra · **Publisher:** MASTERESTAURANT®

Q Content created with AI assistance, reviewed by the MASTERESTAURANT editorial team.