RHYTHENCE — THE OPERATING SYSTEM FOR STAFFING AGENCIES

The Rhythence Impact Model

An illustrative, benchmark-grounded estimate of the operational time and cost impact Rhythence can have on a representative staffing agency — built for prospects who want to see the math, not just the pitch.

Prepared by the Rhythence team · hello@rhythence.com

Methodology: published third-party industry benchmarks applied to a stated, editable baseline agency profile, with two anonymised real-usage signals noted where relevant.

HOW TO READ THIS REPORT

Methodology

Rhythence currently serves a small number of live agencies, and this report does not use their data. Every figure in this document is built the same way, in three visible steps, so you can judge the estimate on its own logic rather than take it on faith:

1. A stated baseline agency

A representative “model agency” profile (opposite page) stands in for “a small-to-mid staffing agency.” Every number in this report is calculated against that one consistent profile. If your agency looks different, the same formulas apply — just swap in your own volumes.

2. A published external benchmark

For each module, we cite a specific, named third-party study or industry body (SHRM, Forrester, the American Payroll Association, Staffing Industry Analysts, HubSpot, and others) for what the manual version of that process typically costs in time or money. Sources are listed in full on the final page.

3. What the Rhythence feature specifically removes

We map the benchmark to the exact automation Rhythence ships — bulk timesheet entry, AI candidate matching, tokenised e-signatures, automated invoice generation — and estimate what's left once that manual step is gone.

What this is not: *a guarantee, an audit finding, or a substitute for your own financial data. Ranges are used deliberately instead of single decimal figures, because a real result depends on your actual volumes, wages, and client mix. Treat every number here as a reasoned starting estimate to test against your own operation — which is exactly what a demo is for. All dollar figures in this report are in Canadian dollars (CAD) unless otherwise noted.*

THE MODEL AGENCY

Baseline profile used throughout this report

Active clients	**10**	Assumption
Open positions per client (avg)	**10**	Assumption
Headcount slots per position (avg)	**10**	Assumption
Total contracted capacity	**1,000 slots**	10 × 10 × 10
Jobseekers in active talent pool	**300**	Assumption
Active workers on assignment / week	**~240**	80% pool utilisation
Weekly client invoices (consolidated per client)	**10 / week (≈ 43 / month)**	1 per client / week
New jobseeker onboardings / month	**~30**	10% monthly pool churn
New placements / month	**~25**	Tied to churn assumption

Back-office admin labour cost	**$30 / hr**	Adjust to your local market

Note: total contracted capacity (1,000 slots) reflects the ceiling of what the agency's clients could request. The 300-person talent pool is the actively managed workforce that fills and rotates through that capacity — this is what actually drives weekly timesheet, payroll, and invoicing volume, so it's the figure used in the calculations that follow, not the theoretical maximum.

MODULE 1

Payroll

Timesheets & pay processing

Canada's National Payroll Institute (with Deloitte) names payroll processing time and the payroll FTE-to-employee ratio as the core benchmarks Canadian organisations are measured against — a lower ratio signals heavy manual work, a higher one reflects automation. The Institute doesn't publish an exact minutes-per-timesheet figure, so we've paired it with the American Payroll Association's benchmark (6–9 minutes of staff time per timesheet) as directional supporting data. Separately, Staffing Industry Analysts data shows agencies typically lose 6–10 coordinator hours per pay period chasing down contractor timesheets, and finds agencies on automated pay-cycle workflows process payroll roughly 3x faster than those relying on email-based collection.

~67%
reduction in weekly payroll admin time

~25.5 hrs
freed per week for a 240-worker payroll run

~$3,300
in recovered back-office capacity per month*

The math

	Manual	With Rhythence
Timesheet entry (240/week @ ~7.5 min avg)	30.0 hrs/week	~10.5 hrs/week
Chasing / verifying submissions	~8 hrs/week	~2 hrs/week
Total weekly payroll admin	~38 hrs/week	~12.5 hrs/week

Rhythence's bulk timesheet entry (auto-loaded assignments, live payroll preview, automatic OT/premium/deduction calculation, one-click batch submit, automated pay-summary emails) is what removes the re-entry and most of the chasing. *At $30/hr assumed admin labour cost.

Sources: National Payroll Institute & Deloitte, “Beyond Paydays: The Evolution of Payroll in Canada” (2026); American Payroll Association (via faceclok.com, 2026) — US benchmark, directional; Staffing Industry Analysts, cited in US Tech Automations, “Automate Contractor Timesheet and Payroll in Staffing” (2026).

MODULE 2

Billing

Invoicing & financial tracking

Published accounts-payable benchmarks put manual invoice processing cost between $10 and $22 per invoice (industry average commonly cited around $15–$16), against $3–$5 for automated processing. Separately, manual data entry carries roughly a 1.6% error rate, with each mistake costing up to $53 once staff time and correction are counted. On the cash-flow side, Canadian businesses carry an average days-sales-outstanding (DSO) of 52 days, per Allianz Trade research — slightly worse than the 51-day US average, and the gap between “invoiced” and “collectible” that faster, cleaner invoicing closes. Businesses using AR automation get paid within two weeks of the due date 71% of the time, versus 47% for manual processes.

~73%
lower per-invoice processing cost

~$470
recovered per month (43 invoices)

71% vs 47%
paid within 2 weeks of due date, automated vs manual

The math

	Manual	With Rhythence
Cost per invoice (industry benchmark)	~$15	~$4
43 invoices / month	~$645 / month	~$172 / month

Rhythence builds invoices directly from approved timesheets, generates the PDF automatically, and routes delivery with CC and tracking built in — removing the manual re-keying that drives both the labour cost and the error rate above.

Sources: Lido, “Invoice Processing Cost Benchmarks” (2026), citing IOFM & Ardent Partners; Factura.ai (2026); Resolve, “13 Invoice Processing Stats” (2026); Allianz Trade, “What is DSO and How Do You Reduce It?” (2026); Chaser, “Accounts Receivable Stats” (2026).

MODULE 3

Placements

Positions, matching & calendar

SHRM's 2024 Talent Acquisition Benchmarks put the U.S. average time-to-fill at 44 days, and estimate an open position costs a business $4,000–$9,000 a month in lost productivity, overtime for remaining staff, and delayed revenue — roughly $200+ of value per day the role stays open. (No Canada-specific day-count is publicly published at this granularity; ACSESS, the Canadian staffing association, confirms the scale of the market this affects — a $24.7B-revenue industry moving roughly two million temporary workers, 13.6% of Canada's workforce.)

44 days	$4K–$9K	~$217/day
US industry-average time-to-fill (SHRM)	lost per month per open role (SHRM)	estimated value of each day shaved off fill time

How Rhythence actually affects this

What actually happens today, without Rhythence: a recruiter opens a spreadsheet or database of jobseekers, manually filters by skill, location, and availability, then manually cross-checks who's already committed elsewhere before reaching out one by one. This search-and-shortlist step is the slowest part of the ~44-day average fill cycle — before any interview or paperwork even starts.

What Rhythence does: the moment a position is created, its Position Matching view surfaces a ranked shortlist of jobseekers automatically, built from a similarity match between the jobseeker's profile and the position's requirements, already filtered by who has open capacity. The recruiter reviews a ranked list instead of building one from scratch. Assigning a match sends the jobseeker a notification and logs the assignment automatically — no separate outreach step.

Net effect: Rhythence doesn't touch the interview or paperwork stages — it collapses the search-and-shortlist stage from a manual, spreadsheet-driven process to an instant ranked list. That's the specific bottleneck it targets, not “AI makes hiring faster” in the abstract.

Real-world signal: one Rhythence client's actual usage shows this pattern in practice — early positions took nearly two months to fill while the team learned the matching workflow; by month seven, positions were filling in a day or two, and half of all consent documents were signed within two minutes (see Compliance, next page). One anonymised client, not a statistical claim about all agencies — included because it's a real example of the direction the numbers above point toward.

Sources: SHRM 2024 Talent Acquisition Benchmarks, cited in US Tech Automations, “Recruiting Automation Benchmark Report” (2026), and HRBench, “Time to Fill” (2026); ACSESS, “Industry Statistics” (2026).

MODULE 4

Compliance

Consent, documents & training

Forrester Research found that adopting electronic signatures reduced average contract cycle time from roughly seven days to about two hours — a 96% reduction. Other industry benchmarks put manual contract/consent turnaround at 4–10 days more broadly, largely driven by printing, mailing, and manual follow-up.

7 days → ~2 hrs
typical turnaround, manual vs e-signature

~30
new-hire agreements / month (model agency)

100%
of signatures carry an IP + timestamp audit trail

Every new jobseeker gets an employment agreement sent automatically, signed on a tokenised public page with no login required, and logged with an IP address and timestamp for audit purposes. For a model agency onboarding ~30 workers a month, that's roughly 30 fewer weeks a year an unsigned agreement is left exposed — a real, if hard to fully dollarise, compliance-risk reduction.

Real-world signal: across one Rhythence client's real, completed consent records, the median turnaround from sent to signed was 1.8 minutes — faster than the automated-industry benchmark above. One anonymised client, not a statistical claim about all agencies.

Sources: MySyn, “Can e-Signatures Close Deals Faster in 2026?” (2026), citing Forrester Research; eSignly, “Cut Contract Turnaround Time with Electronic Signature Software” (2026).

MODULE 5

Workforce

Jobseekers & clients

Independent HR-automation research puts manual employment/document verification at 15–30 minutes per check, with organisations processing 50–100 checks a month spending 12–25 hours on the task alone.

~11 hrs of manual verification time / month, model agency	**300** profiles continuously monitored for expiring documents	**Every** profile update triggers a fresh AI verification check

Rhythence runs AI document verification (SIN and work permits) automatically on every profile update, and continuously flags expiring documents by urgency across the full talent pool — not just the ones someone remembers to check manually. For ~30 new profiles a month, that's roughly 11 hours reclaimed — and it compounds with every hire, every month, indefinitely.

Sources: Vetty, “Automated Employment Verification: 5 Benefits for HR” (2026); HR Logics, “The Hidden HR Time Drain” (2026).

MODULE 6

Intelligence

Reports, AI & insights

HubSpot's 2025 State of Business Operations Report found SMB managers spend an average of 12.4 hours a week on manual reporting — roughly 30% of their productive work time — logging into multiple platforms, exporting data, and rebuilding spreadsheets by hand.

~4 hrs/wk conservatively recoverable (a third of the SMB average)	**8 reports** pre-built with CSV export, no manual compilation	**~$600** in recovered management time per month*

We've deliberately used a conservative slice of the published SMB benchmark, since Rhythence's reporting scope (timesheet, margin, invoice, deduction, rate list, clients, sales, envelope printing — all with CSV export and date/client filtering) is narrower than the full operations-reporting burden HubSpot measured. *At $35/hr assumed management labour cost.

Sources: US Tech Automations, “Small Business Performance Dashboard Automation: 2026 ROI Analysis,” citing HubSpot's 2025 State of Business Operations Report.

MODULE 7

Core Platform

The foundation every agency gets

Core Platform doesn't reduce a single process the way the other six modules do — it's the foundation that makes their numbers real. One login routes every one of your 8 role types to exactly what they need. Two-factor authentication is required for every internal user. Row-level security and encrypted document storage sit underneath everything above.

The BTL story here isn't a labour-hours estimate — it's consolidation and risk. Agencies running spreadsheets plus a separate e-signature tool plus a separate reporting tool plus a separate messaging channel are typically paying for, and reconciling between, several disconnected subscriptions and login systems. Core Platform is what lets the other six modules' numbers above actually compound in one place, rather than living in six different tools that don't talk to each other.

No industry benchmark is cited here — this section is deliberately qualitative, since tool-consolidation savings depend entirely on what an agency is currently paying for elsewhere.

PUTTING IT IN FINANCE TERMS

Above the line / below the line, translated

Some of the agencies we talk to ask specifically how Rhythence affects their “above the line” (revenue and margin capacity) versus “below the line” (operating cost) finances. We can't produce a real ATL/BTL number without your actual before-and-after financials — no vendor honestly can. What we can do is show you which lever each module pulls, using the operational estimates from this report, so you can plug in your own figures.

ABOVE THE LINE — revenue & growth capacity

Module	Lever	What it protects or grows
Placements	Faster fill, less recruiter admin	Protects the ~$4,000–$9,000/month value of every day a role stays open (SHRM)
Billing	Faster, more accurate invoicing	Improves days-sales-outstanding — frees working capital tied up in receivables (formula below)
Intelligence	Real-time margin visibility	Surfaces margin leakage a manual spreadsheet process would miss or catch late

BELOW THE LINE — operating cost & efficiency

Module	Lever	What it saves
Payroll	Less manual timesheet processing	~$3,300/month in back-office capacity, model agency
Billing	Cheaper per-invoice processing	~$470/month, model agency
Workforce	Automated document verification	~11 hrs/month, compounding with every hire
Compliance	E-signature vs. paper agreements	Turnaround from ~7 days to ~2 hours per new hire
Intelligence	Pre-built reports vs. manual pulls	~$600/month in recovered management time

A formula you can run on your own numbers

The strongest ATL story in this report is cash conversion, and it doesn't require any of our assumptions — only your own monthly billed revenue and current collection cycle:

Cash tied up in receivables = Monthly billed revenue × (DSO ÷ 30)

Example: an agency billing $500,000 CAD/month at Canada's 52-day average DSO has roughly $867,000 CAD sitting in receivables at any given time. Shaving just 7 days off that cycle through faster, cleaner invoicing frees up approximately **$116,700 CAD** in working capital — money that was already earned but not yet spendable.

Source: Allianz Trade, “What is DSO and How Do You Reduce It?” (2026).

HOW IT COMPOUNDS

Growth trajectory

Every figure in this report so far is a snapshot — what one month looks like for the model agency. Below is the same set of numbers carried forward: a straight-line projection of what a monthly figure becomes across a quarter and a year, so the scale is easier to hold in your head when comparing against a subscription cost or a hiring decision.

Module	Monthly	Quarterly	Projected annual
Payroll (back-office capacity)	~$3,300 CAD	~$9,900 CAD	~$39,600 CAD
Billing (processing cost)	~$470 CAD	~$1,410 CAD	~$5,640 CAD
Intelligence (management time)	~$600 CAD	~$1,800 CAD	~$7,200 CAD
Combined back-office savings	**~$4,370 CAD**	**~$13,110 CAD**	**~$52,440 CAD**
Workforce (verification time)	~11 hrs	~33 hrs	~132 hrs

Projected — a straight-line extrapolation of this report's modeled monthly figures (monthly × 3 for quarterly, × 12 for annual). This is not an observed trend; it's the same snapshot number held constant across time so the scale is easier to compare against a subscription cost or a hiring decision. A real agency's actual month-over-month and quarter-over-quarter figures will move with its own volume — typically upward, since back-office workload tends to grow with the business, not shrink.

Placements and Compliance aren't included in the dollar total above — their value shows up as speed and risk reduction, not a monthly labour-cost figure, so compounding them the same way would overstate what they're actually worth. Their trajectory is the trend itself: the Placements and Compliance pages each note what that speed-up looks like as adoption matures.

SOURCES

Full reference list

• National Payroll Institute & Deloitte, “Beyond Paydays: The Evolution of Payroll in Canada” (2026).

• American Payroll Association, timesheet processing time benchmark (US) — cited via faceclok.com, “The Hidden Cost of Manual Timesheets” (2026).

• Staffing Industry Analysts, contractor timesheet/payroll benchmarks — cited via US Tech Automations, “Automate Contractor Timesheet and Payroll in Staffing” (2026).

• IOFM & Ardent Partners, invoice processing cost benchmarks — cited via Lido, “Invoice Processing Cost Benchmarks” (2026).

• Factura.ai, “20 Invoice Processing Benchmark Statistics” (2026).

• Resolve, “13 Invoice Processing Stats: Manual vs. Automation” (2026).

• Allianz Trade, “What is DSO and How Do You Reduce It?” (2026), citing 2019 Canada/US DSO study.

• Chaser, “Accounts Receivable Stats Finance Professionals Need in 2026” (2026).

• SHRM, 2024 Talent Acquisition Benchmarks (US) — cited via US Tech Automations, “Recruiting Automation Benchmark Report” (2026), and HRBench, “Time to Fill” (2026).

• ACSESS (Association of Canadian Search, Employment and Staffing Services), “Industry Statistics” (2026).

• Forrester Research, e-signature contract cycle time findings — cited via MySyn, “Can e-Signatures Close Deals Faster in 2026?” (2026).

• eSignly, “Cut Contract Turnaround Time with Electronic Signature Software” (2026).

• Vetty, “Automated Employment Verification: 5 Benefits for HR” (2026).

• HR Logics, “The Hidden HR Time Drain” (2026).

• HubSpot, 2025 State of Business Operations Report — cited via US Tech Automations, “Small Business Performance Dashboard Automation: 2026 ROI Analysis” (2026).

This report is an illustrative estimate built from published third-party research and a stated model agency profile; it is not derived from any specific Rhythence client's financial data. The two “Real-world signal” notes (Placements, Compliance) are the only exceptions — real, anonymised operational timestamps from one live Rhythence client, included as directional evidence, not as statistical claims about all agencies. Nothing in this report is a guarantee of results. Actual outcomes depend on your agency's volumes, wage rates, and existing processes. We'd be glad to rebuild this model against your own numbers on a call.

Book a demo — rhythence.com/demo · hello@rhythence.com