Product Requirements Document

Food Quality Feedback

HelloFresh | George Innasi | Hello PM Batch 51 | June 2026

Field	Value
Status	Phase 3 Assignment
Version	2.0 (re-centered on Food Quality Feedback)
Author	George Innasi
Audience	Engineering, Design, Product
Phase 2 Goal	Improve retention among existing HelloFresh subscribers
P0 Solution	Food Quality Feedback — structured, per-ingredient quality reporting traced to the supplier

1. Executive Summary

HelloFresh is losing its most profitable subscribers, long-tenured customers who have already passed the unprofitable acquisition phase, because the weekly value calculation is shifting against them. Ingredient quality is declining quietly, the price gap versus groceries is widening, and there is no easy, trusted way for a subscriber to flag when a specific ingredient falls short.

This PRD proposes Food Quality Feedback: a lightweight, per-ingredient reporting mechanism. When a meal misses the mark, the subscriber tells us in a few taps exactly which ingredient dipped and what was wrong (wilted, bruised, spoiled, undersized, missing). Each report is traced back to its supplier batch, so problems are pinpointed at the source instead of guessed at.

Rather than HelloFresh claiming quality through an internal grade, this puts a clear, structured voice in the subscriber's hands. It converts the moment quality fails from a silent trust break into a two-way trust signal: the subscriber is heard, the issue is traced, and the fix happens at the supplier.

A note on credit: an automatic credit is intentionally out of scope for this phase. We cannot responsibly propose compensation without understanding the financial elements involved. The structured data this system captures is the input to a future credit model, in which subscribers would submit additional proof to claim a credit. For now the objective is to build the system that receives proper feedback in place of support tickets.

2. The Problem

P0 Problem Statement

Existing HelloFresh subscribers struggle to keep feeling that the per-serving price is worth paying week after week because the perceived value erodes as ingredient quality quietly declines and the price gap versus grocery alternatives widens with every increase, leading to subscribers skipping more frequently, gaming the cancel-and-resubscribe cycle to access new-customer pricing, and eventually churning without ever formally complaining, and HelloFresh losing its highest-LTV cohort right at the point where they become most profitable to retain.

Root Causes

RC1 Ingredient quality quietly declines over time, unverifiable by the subscriber.
RC2 The price gap versus grocery alternatives widens with each price increase.
RC3 Accumulated subscription value is invisible.
RC4 Long-tenured subscribers feel unrecognised relative to discounted new customers.
RC5 The weekly skip decision repeats indefinitely with no proactive intervention point.

This PRD targets RC1. The feedback mechanism gives subscribers a trusted way to surface quality problems and gives HelloFresh verifiable, supplier-level signal to fix them.

3. The User

Primary Persona: Sarah, the Stretched Professional

Who she is: 28-35, a full-time working professional in Canada, juggling a career, social commitments, and the mental load of feeding her household well.

Why HelloFresh: she subscribes to remove decision fatigue from weeknight cooking, not because it is cheaper than groceries. The value proposition is convenience, structure, and eating well without the planning overhead.

Where she is now: 6-14 months in. She is skipping 1-2 boxes a month, has "done the math" against groceries, and has noticed wilted produce or smaller portions. She has not complained. She is passively disengaging.

What she needs: an easy, trusted way to say "this ingredient was not good" and to feel that it was heard and acted on, without the friction of a support ticket she does not believe will change anything.

4. Why This Matters

Every data point below comes from Phase 2 research: 128 survey responses and 12+ direct interviews and Reddit DM conversations collected in June 2026.

Data point	Source	Implication
48% named lower price as the single most important fix	128-response survey (Q7)	Per-serving price is the primary churn lever; perceived value, not just headline price, is the battleground.
Ingredient quality decline raised by 7+ independent respondents (top posts 40-64 upvotes)	Reddit r/hellofresh and DMs	Quality erosion is real and felt most by long-tenure subscribers comparing against a remembered baseline.
A 247-box subscriber began buying ingredients independently rather than trust the box	Reddit (loves_bodyjewelry)	Quality frustration already triggers full workaround behaviour in the highest-LTV cohort.
CapIndependent2285 churned after a $13 manual credit for a box missing 40% of its ingredients	Reddit comment	Manual, friction-heavy resolution is exactly what a structured feedback channel must replace.
41% were already on a degraded delivery schedule (skipping at least monthly)	128-response survey (Q1, Q2)	Skipping is widespread and precedes cancellation; reversing it is the leading indicator of recovery.

5. The Solution

Why Food Quality Feedback

Two alternatives were considered and set aside.

A company-measured Ingredient Quality Score (A to F) was deprioritised because grading every ingredient in every box reliably is operationally hard: freshness in particular cannot be verified at dispatch, so a grade risks telling a subscriber "A" while they unbox a "C", which damages trust faster than no system at all. An automatic Auto-Credit Guarantee was deferred because a credit model cannot be proposed without understanding its financial elements and abuse controls.

Food Quality Feedback inverts the model: instead of HelloFresh claiming quality, the subscriber reports it. It is lighter to build, higher confidence, and produces ground-truth signal traced to the supplier. The feedback data also becomes the foundation a future credit model depends on.

Prioritization Rationale (RICE)

Selected from a 13-idea brainstorm using RICE (Reach x Impact x Confidence / Effort, 1-3 scale):

Solution	R	I	C	E	RICE	Why
Food Quality Feedback	3	3	3	1	27.0	Selected P0. Low effort, high confidence, addresses RC1 with supplier-level signal. No financial model required to start.
Value Transparency Dashboard	3	2	3	2	9.0	Reaches every subscriber; data exists. Prototyped as supporting.
Predictive Retention Outreach	3	3	2	3	6.0	High reach; confidence docked for ML validation. Prototyped as supporting.
Ingredient Quality Score (A to F)	2	3	3	3	6.0	Deprioritised: hard to grade every ingredient reliably at dispatch.
Auto-Credit Quality Guarantee	3	3	2	2	9.0	Deferred: needs a financial model and abuse controls; fed by this feedback data later.
Tenure Milestone Rewards	2	2	2	2	4.0	Addresses RC4. Prototyped as supporting.

6. How It Works

Live prototype gallery (all prototypes): https://george-innasi.github.io/hellofresh-project-assignment/

Prototypes:

Food Quality Feedback (P0, addresses RC1): https://george-innasi.github.io/hellofresh-project-assignment/view-04-ingredient-quality-feedback.html

Value Transparency Dashboard (addresses RC3): https://george-innasi.github.io/hellofresh-project-assignment/view-01-value-transparency-dashboard.html

Predictive Retention Outreach (addresses RC5): https://george-innasi.github.io/hellofresh-project-assignment/view-02-predictive-retention-outreach.html

Tenure Milestone Rewards (addresses RC4): https://george-innasi.github.io/hellofresh-project-assignment/view-03-tenure-milestone-rewards.html

User Flow

Step 1 — Rate the meal. After a delivery, the subscriber sees their recent recipes and can give each a quick thumbs up or down. A thumbs up records a positive signal; a thumbs down opens the report flow.

Step 2 — What was the issue. The subscriber picks the main issue: ingredient quality, recipe and instructions, portion size, packaging and delivery, or something else. Ingredient quality opens the per-ingredient flow.

Step 3 — Which ingredient(s). The recipe's actual ingredients are listed; the subscriber selects the one(s) that were below standard. Each ingredient shows its supplier so the report is traceable.

Step 4 — What was wrong. For each flagged ingredient the subscriber picks the problem: not fresh, wilted, bruised or damaged, spoiled, too small, or wrong / missing.

Step 5 — Confirmation. The subscriber sees a clear acknowledgement: the flagged ingredients, their suppliers, the problems reported, and a note that the issue has been logged and routed to the supplier quality review. No credit is promised in this phase.

7. Feature Requirements

P0 = must ship in v1. P1 = should ship if capacity allows. P2 = deferred to v2.

Feature	Description	Pri.	Notes
Feedback entry point	Thumbs up/down on recent recipes, plus a "report an issue" entry from the meal and home screen.	P0	Must be reachable in one tap from the delivery.
Issue categorisation	Structured issue types (ingredient quality, recipe, portion, packaging, other).	P0	Routes ingredient-quality reports into the per-ingredient flow.
Per-ingredient selection	Lists the recipe's ingredients with supplier shown; multi-select the ones at fault.	P0	Requires recipe-to-ingredient-to-supplier mapping.
Problem detail capture	Structured problem tags per flagged ingredient (not fresh, bruised, spoiled, etc.).	P0	Structured options, not free text, for clean signal.
Supplier-tracing backend	Maps each report to the supplier batch and routes it to a quality owner.	P0	Core of the value: ground-truth signal at the source.
Confirmation & acknowledgement	Shows what was reported and that it has been logged and routed; sets expectations (no credit yet).	P0	Acknowledgement is the trust mechanism in place of a credit.
Ops feedback dashboard	Internal view aggregating reports by ingredient and supplier batch.	P1	Turns individual reports into supplier action.
Photo / proof attachment	Optional photo with a report.	P1	Prerequisite data for a future credit model.
Credit model	Compensation tied to validated reports and submitted proof.	P2	Deferred: requires financial analysis and abuse controls.

8. Success Metrics

Type	Metric	Definition	Why it matters
Key	Monthly Subscriber Retention Rate	% of active subscribers at month start still active at month end.	Direct measure of the Phase 2 goal.
Secondary	Feedback Submission Rate	% of subscribers submitting at least one structured report per month, vs raising a support ticket.	Validates the mechanism is reaching subscribers and replacing vague tickets.
Secondary	Weekly Box Skip Rate	% of eligible deliveries skipped, averaged per month.	Leading indicator of churn; moves earlier than retention.
Guardrail	Feedback Acknowledgement Rate	% of reports the subscriber sees acknowledged and routed to a supplier review.	Ensures feedback does not become a black hole; an unactioned report erodes trust.

9. Risks and Mitigations

Impact (I) and Likelihood (L) rated H, M or L. Monitor High-impact rows daily in the first 30 days of pilot.

Assumption at risk	I	L	Mitigation	Detection signal	Containment
Subscribers will submit feedback instead of churning silently	H	M	One tap from meal and home screen; show the report was received; keep the flow short.	Feedback Submission Rate in first 4 weeks	Surface the prompt earlier (post-delivery notification); A/B test entry points.
Self-reported feedback is representative and not gamed	M	M	Structured options tied to specific ingredients; correlate with supplier batch data; rate-limit per delivery.	Reports per delivery and per-subscriber frequency	Flag abnormal subscribers or batches for manual review before acting.
Subscribers will not expect instant credit (credit deferred)	H	M	Frame value as "your feedback fixes this at the source"; never imply automatic compensation.	Complaints referencing "no refund" after submitting	Add a "how feedback is used" explainer; manual goodwill path for severe cases.
Feedback reaches and changes the supplier	H	L	Route each report to the supplier batch; assign a quality owner; report resolution back.	Acknowledgement Rate; time from report to supplier action	Fix ops routing before scaling the prompt.

10. Open Questions

Q: What recipe-to-ingredient-to-supplier-batch mapping exists today? The per-ingredient tracing depends on it; if incomplete, v1 may trace to supplier rather than exact batch.

Q: What is the current manual credit rate and what triggers it? This baseline informs the future credit model and its financial guardrails.

Q: What proof would a future credit model require, and how is abuse prevented? Needed before any compensation is attached to reports.

Q: Who owns supplier follow-up, and what is the target time from report to action? The acknowledgement guarantee depends on a defined ops owner.