

# Tecnomat Italy

Content Maturity Assessment · April 2026 · Confidential

Overall Maturity Score

1.42

Overall — Learner

59 questions across 7 pillars

## Pillar Summary

Pillar	Qs	Avg Score	Level	Min	Max
OMNICHANNEL	9	2.22	Intermediate	1	4
CLIENT CENTRICITY	7	1.29	Learner	1	2
MEASUREMENT	7	1.57	Intermediate	1	2
TECH CAPABILITIES	10	1.30	Learner	1	2
AUTOMATION & INDUSTRIALIZATION	9	1.00	Learner	1	1
INNOVATION	7	1.00	Learner	1	1
ORGANISATION	10	1.50	Intermediate	1	3

## OMNICHANNEL

## 2.22 — Intermediate

Q#	Topic	Score	Level
1	Consistency of the on/offline brand promise	3	Master
2	Visual/tone consistency across all media	2	Intermediate
3	Level of adaptation of messages/assets to activated channels/formats	2	Intermediate
4	Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines	2	Intermediate
5	Asset design principle (responsive, vertical, etc.)	2	Intermediate
6	Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)	1	Learner
7	Cross-channel content consistency	2	Intermediate
8	Multi-format production capabilities	4	Expert
9	Maturity of paid vs organic	2	Intermediate

## Q1 3 Master

## Consistency of the on/offline brand promise

**Score: 3 (Master)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates Master-level production execution with comprehensive multi-channel asset production across print, digital, social, video, and OOH channels. The brand is immediately recognizable across all channels, demonstrating that the brand promise is clearly identifiable through execution excellence. High-volume systematic production (2,500 OOH assets annually, 71% of total production) demonstrates operational mastery and consistent brand application at scale. Visual coherence and brand identity are strong across all channels, with complete logo library supporting consistency. While explicit brand promise documentation may be implicit rather than formally stated, the brand promise is demonstrably identifiable through exceptional execution quality and immediate brand recognizability. The organization has initiated brand guidelines (partial 2025 version) and demonstrates systematic brand application through production volume and consistency. This score reflects Master-level capability in making the brand promise identifiable through production excellence, even if formal documentation is still developing. ---

## Q2 2 Intermediate

## Visual/tone consistency across all media

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates visual consistency foundation through comprehensive logo system (multiple variations and formats) and partial brand guidelines (2025 partial version), with evidence of multi-channel asset production across print, digital, social, video, and OOH channels. The organization produces high-volume OOH content (2,500 assets, 71% of total) suggesting systematic visual application. However, guidelines are incomplete, typography documentation has gaps (Font Library discrepancy noted), tone framework is not documented, and there is no evidence of campaign-specific visual/tone guidelines or systematic cross-channel consistency audits. The score reflects intentional framework development but not yet mastery of comprehensive visual and tone consistency across all channels. ---

**Q3 2 Intermediate****Level of adaptation of messages/assets to activated channels/formats**

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates comprehensive channel coverage with 3,527 assets annually across 10+ channels (OOH, social media, video, web, display, e-commerce, print, SEO, PPC), with evidence of channel-specific asset production and format variations. The organization shows channel awareness through workflow timing differences (social: 3-4 weeks, TVC: 4 months, e-commerce: 2-3 weeks). However, there is no documented channel adaptation framework, platform-specific optimization strategies are unclear, messaging adaptation is undocumented, and format specifications are missing. The high OOH volume (71% of assets) suggests format adaptation for OOH, but comprehensive multi-channel adaptation strategies and platform-specific optimization need verification. The score reflects channel coverage but not yet mastery of documented adaptation frameworks. ---

**Q4 2 Intermediate****Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines**

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates multi-platform asset production across social media (Meta, TikTok, LinkedIn), display advertising (Google, Meta), video platforms (YouTube, TikTok, TV), OOH, and e-commerce channels, with evidence of platform-specific content formats. The organization uses Hootsuite (€3,610/year via agency) for social media management, suggesting platform awareness. High asset volume (3,527 assets annually) suggests operational compliance is happening. However, quality control is manual review only with no automated compliance checks documented, material specification sheets are missing, and there is no documented compliance framework or evidence of how platform guideline changes are tracked and implemented. The score reflects platform coverage but not yet mastery of documented and systematic compliance management. ---

**Q5 2 Intermediate****Asset design principle (responsive, vertical, etc.)**

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** Tecnomat Italy produces assets across multiple formats (video, social media, display banners, web, e-commerce, OOH) suggesting responsive design awareness. The organization creates multi-format video assets (TV master + cutdowns, social video), social media assets in multiple formats (feed posts, stories, video), and display banners. High OOH volume (2,500 assets, 71% of production) suggests format adaptation. However, there is no documented responsive design framework, format specifications are missing, no evidence of automated multi-format generation tools, and file optimization strategy is unclear. The score reflects format awareness but not yet mastery of documented and systematic responsive design principles. ---

**Q6 1 Learner****Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy produces assets across multiple channels (OOH, social media, video, print, display, web, e-commerce) with 3,527 assets annually across 10+ categories, demonstrating multi-channel presence. The organization shows some asset reuse (26-75% reuse rates across categories), indicating basic cross-channel thinking. However, there is no evidence of systematic asset synchronization, Key Visual Master concepts, documented continuous narration strategies, or campaign coordination processes. The high OOH volume (71% of assets) suggests channel-specific production rather than synchronized multi-channel campaigns. Asset reuse appears tactical (e.g., web reusing e-commerce assets) rather than strategic (synchronized cross-channel campaigns). The score reflects multi-channel presence but not yet coordinated synchronization. ---

## Q7 2 Intermediate

## Cross-channel content consistency

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates content consistency through brand identity consistency (comprehensive logo system) and visual consistency (partial 2025 brand guidelines), with assets produced across multiple channels showing consistent brand application. The organization maintains visual consistency through logo usage and brand identity elements across 3,527 assets annually. However, there is no documented messaging consistency framework, campaign-wide messaging coordination is unclear, content guidelines beyond visual identity are missing, and consistency processes are not systematized or documented. The score reflects visual consistency foundation but not yet mastery of comprehensive content consistency including messaging. ---

## Q8 4 Expert

## Multi-format production capabilities

**Score: 4 (Expert)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates Expert-level multi-format production capabilities across print, digital, video, social media, and OOH formats with 3,527 assets annually across 10+ categories. The organization produces high-quality content with 70-100% first-pass approval rates (TVC 90%, E-commerce 70-90%), successfully coordinating comprehensive multi-format production through external agencies (78.4% external production spend, €1,501,000) managed by a lean team (2 FTEs). Production timelines demonstrate sophisticated management (TVC 4 months, E-commerce 2-3 weeks, Social 3-4 weeks, E-commerce refresh 3-4 days). **CRITICAL:** The question asks about "ability to produce" - external agency production through effective coordination demonstrates production capability. Only radio/audio production is lacking, with all other major formats comprehensively covered. The score reflects Expert-level capability in producing high-quality content across virtually all formats through strategic external agency coordination. ---

## Q9 2 Intermediate

## Maturity of paid vs organic

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates some differentiation between paid and organic content with separate social media folders (organic and paid), and produces both organic social posts (626 assets) and paid social content. The organization uses Hootsuite for social media management (billed via agency). However, limited evidence of documented paid vs organic strategy, resource allocation breakdown, or systematic optimization approaches. No clear evidence of separate performance tracking for paid vs organic, or strategic resource allocation between the two. The organization produces significant organic content (17.7% of assets are social media) but paid strategy maturity needs verification. ---

## CLIENT CENTRICITY

## 1.29 — Learner

Q#	Topic	Score	Level
10	Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise	2	Intermediate
11	Availability and level of precision of the audiences and persona addressed	2	Intermediate
12	Level of mastery of "shopper" needs by persona	1	Learner
13	Level of mastery of media uses of persona	1	Learner
14	Relevance of formats/Media by persona	1	Learner
15	Level of content personalisation	1	Learner
16	Level of adaptation of the representation of the target customer	1	Learner

## Q10 2 Intermediate

## Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates comprehensive customer research capability through Brand survey 2025 with qualitative and quantitative reports, showing current customer understanding and methodological rigor. Brand guidelines exist (partial 2025 version) providing brand framework foundation. However, brand promise articulation is unclear and not explicitly stated, there is no documented alignment framework connecting customer needs to brand promise, and fulfillment metrics to measure whether brand promise meets customer needs are missing. The score reflects strong research capability but not yet mastery of explicit needs-promise alignment. ---

## Q11 2 Intermediate

## Availability and level of precision of the audiences and persona addressed

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** Tecnomat Italy has a personas folder suggesting persona development, and customer research available (Brand survey 2025) which should inform persona definition. The organization produces content across multiple channels (OOH, social media, digital) suggesting audience targeting. However, limited visibility of persona documentation, audience sizes, precision levels, or systematic persona usage across channels. Personas may exist but documentation depth and precision need verification. The organization demonstrates customer research capability but persona precision and availability need strengthening. ---

## Q12 1 Learner

## Level of mastery of "shopper" needs by persona

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy has customer research available (Brand survey 2025 with qualitative and quantitative reports) which should inform shopper needs understanding, and a personas folder suggesting persona development. However, limited visibility of persona-specific shopper needs documentation. General customer research exists but detailed shopper needs per persona are unclear. The organization produces content across channels suggesting some understanding of customer needs, but persona-specific shopper needs precision needs significant strengthening. ---

**Q13 1 Learner****Level of mastery of media uses of persona**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** \*(QA-corrected from 2 — No evidence of content strategy adapted by persona. QA April 2026.)\* Tecnomat Italy produces content across multiple channels (OOH, social media, digital) and has KPI reports for social media platforms (Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn), suggesting understanding of platform preferences. The organization produces significant social media content (626 assets, 17.7%) and OOH content (2,500 assets, 70.9%), indicating channel selection. However, limited evidence of documented persona-media channel matching, persona-specific platform preferences, or systematic alignment between persona behaviors and media channel selection. Persona-media alignment needs verification. ---

**Q14 1 Learner****Relevance of formats/Media by persona**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** \*(QA-corrected from 2 — No evidence of content strategy adapted by persona. QA April 2026.)\* Tecnomat Italy produces content in multiple formats (video, images, display banners, OOH, social posts) across various channels, suggesting format awareness. The organization has KPI reports for social media platforms (Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn) indicating performance tracking. Social media content includes feed posts, stories, video, and influencer content, showing format variety. However, limited evidence of persona-specific format preferences, documented format-persona matching, or systematic format optimization by persona. Format relevance by persona needs verification. ---

**Q15 1 Learner****Level of content personalisation**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy produces content across multiple channels (OOH, social media, digital, e-commerce) with segment-based content production. The organization produces e-commerce assets (45 assets, 1.3%), web assets (100 assets, 2.8%), social media (626 assets, 17.7%), and has email templates suggesting email capability. However, there is no evidence of dynamic personalization, individual-level targeting (name-based, purchase-based, behavior-based), personalization tools (DCO, personalization platforms), or user data-based targeting. Content appears to be broad segment targeting rather than individual personalization. Tool investment is minimal (€415 direct tool spend for Adobe Photoshop). The score reflects content production capability but not yet individual-level personalization. ---

**Q16 1 Learner****Level of adaptation of the representation of the target customer**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy has a personas folder suggesting persona development and customer research available (Brand survey 2025), indicating customer understanding capability. The organization has KPI reports (Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn) suggesting performance tracking. However, limited evidence of systematic persona updates, version tracking, or regular review processes. No clear evidence of persona updates based on performance data, customer feedback, or market trends. Personas may exist but systematic update process needs significant strengthening. ---

## MEASUREMENT

## 1.57 — Intermediate

Q#	Topic	Score	Level
17	Frequency and depth of brand tracking	2	Intermediate
18	Level of systematization of pre-tests / post-tests	1	Learner
19	Capacity to analyse the performance of created assets (creative intelligence)	1	Learner
20	Mastery of brand lift studies	2	Intermediate
21	Monitoring creative engagement (VTR, scroll depth, etc.)	2	Intermediate
22	Monitoring of production costs (time, volume costs)	2	Intermediate
23	Production efficiency metrics	1	Learner

## Q17 2 Intermediate

## Frequency and depth of brand tracking

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** Tecnomat Italy has brand tracking capability through Brand survey 2025 (methodology, qualitative, quantitative reports), suggesting brand health measurement. The organization has KPI reports for social media platforms (Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn Jan-Oct 2025) indicating performance tracking. However, limited evidence of systematic brand tracking frequency, comprehensive brand metrics depth, or competitive positioning tracking. Brand survey 2025 suggests tracking capability but frequency and depth need verification. No clear evidence of regular brand health tracking cadence or comprehensive metrics coverage. ---

## Q18 1 Learner

## Level of systematization of pre-tests / post-tests

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy has KPI reports for social media platforms (Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn Jan-Oct 2025) and creative performance documentation, suggesting some post-campaign analysis capability. However, limited evidence of systematic pre-testing processes, formalized post-test procedures, or documented testing frameworks. No clear evidence of A/B testing, pre-launch creative concept testing, or standardized post-campaign analysis processes. Testing appears informal rather than systematized. ---

## Q19 1 Learner

## Capacity to analyse the performance of created assets (creative intelligence)

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy has KPI reports for social media platforms (Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn Jan-Oct 2025) and creative performance documentation, suggesting some performance tracking capability. However, limited evidence of creative intelligence analysis that identifies specific creative elements (visuals, copy, CTAs) driving results. No clear evidence of element-level analysis, creative pattern identification, or actionable insights extraction. Performance analysis appears focused on overall metrics rather than creative element analysis. ---

## Q20 2 Intermediate

## Mastery of brand lift studies

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** \*(QA-corrected from 1 — No brand lift, but quali + quanti studies exist. Upgrades to Intermediate. QA April 2026.)\* Tecnomat Italy has brand tracking capability through Brand survey 2025, suggesting brand health measurement. However, limited evidence of brand lift studies specifically measuring campaign effectiveness on brand metrics (ad recall, brand awareness lift, purchase intent). No clear evidence of campaign-specific brand lift studies, brand lift metrics tracking, or systematic application of brand lift insights to optimize media and creative strategies. Brand tracking exists but brand lift study methodology not clearly demonstrated. ---

## Q21 2 Intermediate

## Monitoring creative engagement (VTR, scroll depth, etc.)

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** Tecnomat Italy has KPI reports for social media platforms (Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn Jan-Oct 2025) indicating engagement tracking capability. The organization produces video content (52 assets including TV spots, social video, online video ads) and web content (100 assets), suggesting engagement measurement opportunities. However, limited evidence of deep engagement metrics (VTR, scroll depth, time-on-page) being systematically tracked. Engagement metrics appear focused on standard metrics rather than deep engagement indicators. Deep engagement measurement needs strengthening. ---

## Q22 2 Intermediate

## Monitoring of production costs (time, volume costs)

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates systematic cost tracking with total external spend (€1,631,000) and cost per asset (€462.43) calculated, showing clear cost awareness and analytical capability. Budgets folder exists indicating intentional budget management. Agency spend breakdown (€1,501,000 agency, €130,000 traffic/QA/distribution) demonstrates cost tracking by partner/category. **CRITICAL CONTEXT:** With 78.4% external agency production, detailed man-hours tracking per asset is unrealistic - agencies don't typically provide this level of granular time tracking. Cost tracking is appropriate for their production model (external agency coordination). **CRITICAL FINDING:** Cost per asset (€462.43) is 3.4x higher than benchmark (LM\_ITALY €135.45), suggesting significant cost efficiency opportunity - this may be due to channel mix (71% OOH) or production quality differences. The score reflects systematic cost tracking appropriate for external agency production model, though cost breakdown by asset type/category could be enhanced. ---

## Q23 1 Learner

## Production efficiency metrics

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates individual efficiency metrics documented including cost per asset (€462.43), productivity ratio (1,764 assets per FTE), time-to-market data by campaign type (social 3-4 weeks, TVC 4 months, e-commerce 2-3 weeks), and first-pass approval rates (70-100%). However, there is no systematic tracking framework documented, no efficiency optimization processes evident, no benchmarks or efficiency targets, and no metrics dashboard or reporting system. Efficiency metrics exist as data points but are not integrated into a systematic management framework. The score reflects efficiency data availability but not yet systematic efficiency management. ---



## TECH CAPABILITIES

## 1.30 — Learner

Q#	Topic	Score	Level
24	Adoption of compliance analysis solutions (Creative X, etc.)	1	Learner
25	Availability and functional depth of the DAM	1	Learner
26	Availability and functional depth of "Product Feed" solutions	2	Intermediate
27	DCO availability and functional depth	1	Learner
28	Availability and functional depth Creative intelligence	1	Learner
29	Availability and functional depth of collaborative tools	1	Learner
30	Art purchasing platform	1	Learner
31	Production technology stack	2	Intermediate
32	Creative software and tools	2	Intermediate
33	Workflow automation tools	1	Learner

## Q24 1 Learner

## Adoption of compliance analysis solutions (Creative X, etc.)

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates manual quality control process (manual review for all asset categories) and partial brand guidelines (2025 partial version) providing compliance framework foundation. However, there are no automated compliance tools identified (Creative X or similar), no automated brand guideline compliance checking, no platform policy automation, no legal disclaimer verification automation, and no compliance monitoring dashboard. Compliance processes are purely manual. The score reflects manual compliance capability but not yet automated compliance management. ---

## Q25 1 Learner

## Availability and functional depth of the DAM

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy does not have a DAM system in use. Economic data explicitly states "We haven't" for DAM systems. The organization produces 3,527 assets annually across multiple channels (OOH 2,500, Social 626, Video 52, Web 100, Display 60, E-commerce 45, etc.) but lacks a centralized digital asset management system. Asset management appears to be handled manually or through external agencies. No evidence of DAM accessibility, advanced features (search, rights management, integrations), or centralized asset management capabilities. **CRITICAL FINDING:** DAMEO is available through Adeo (parent company), presenting a quick implementation opportunity. The score reflects asset production capability but not yet centralized asset management. ---

**Q26 2 Intermediate****Availability and functional depth of "Product Feed" solutions**

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** \*(QA-corrected from 1 — Google Product feed confirmed. Upgrades from Learner to Intermediate. QA April 2026.)\* Tecnomat Italy produces e-commerce assets (45 assets, 1.3% of total) and has a Feed Management folder suggesting some feed awareness. However, economic data shows "We haven't" for feed management solutions. No clear evidence of centralized product feed solution, feed optimization capabilities, or feed performance analysis. Product feed management appears limited or non-existent. Feed management solution needed. ---

**Q27 1 Learner****DCO availability and functional depth**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates DCO awareness through Dynamic Creative folder existence, but economic data explicitly states "We haven't" for DCO platforms (Celtra, automation platforms). There is no DCO platform in use, no DCO access, and no dynamic creative personalization capabilities. Content personalization is limited (Q15 Score 1), confirming personalization capability gap across the board. The score reflects DCO awareness but not yet DCO platform implementation. ---

**Q28 1 Learner****Availability and functional depth Creative intelligence**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates basic performance tracking capability through KPI reports for Meta platforms (Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn Jan-Oct 2025) and creative performance folder documentation. However, there are no creative intelligence tools/platforms identified, no advanced analytics (predictive insights, automated recommendations), and no automated creative performance analysis. Creative intelligence analysis is limited (Q19 Score 1), confirming pattern of limited analytics capability. Performance analysis appears focused on basic reporting rather than advanced creative intelligence. ---

**Q29 1 Learner****Availability and functional depth of collaborative tools**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates minimal collaborative tools with Trello available (free, 10 seats) providing basic kanban/task management, but economic data explicitly states "We haven't" for workflow platforms (8n8, Make.com automation platform). With ultra-lean internal team (2 FTEs) but high external dependency (78.4% external spend, €1,501,000), there is critical need for collaboration tools to manage external partners/agencies. However, no comprehensive workflow tools, no automation platforms, no advanced collaboration features documented, and no workflow management system for external partners. The score reflects basic tool awareness but not yet comprehensive collaboration capability. ---

**Q30 1 Learner****Art purchasing platform**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates rights cost tracking with art buying and rights costs documented (€36,000 for Spot Radio rights) in economic data, showing financial awareness of art purchasing. However, economic data explicitly states "We don't have access" for major stock imagery platforms (Shutterstock, GettyImages), there is no centralized art purchasing platform, no rights management system, no license management documented, and no cost optimization strategy. Art purchasing appears managed manually or through external agencies. The score reflects cost awareness but not yet centralized art purchasing platform. ---

## Q31 2 Intermediate

**Production technology stack**

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates strong multi-format production capability (3,527 assets annually across OOH, Social, Video, Web, E-commerce, Print, Display) justifying Score 2 level capability. However, production technology investment is minimal with only Adobe Photoshop (€415, 1 seat) as internal tool, and economic data explicitly states "We haven't" for key tools (Figma, Sketch, video editing, 3D/CGI). **CRITICAL PARADOX:** 3,527 assets produced annually despite minimal internal tool investment (€415 only, 0.025% of total spend) - production happens without tools because 78.4% external spend means external agencies have/use the tools. The score reflects actual production capability, not tool investment. ---

---

## Q32 2 Intermediate

**Creative software and tools**

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates multi-format production capability (3,527 assets annually) justifying Score 2 level capability, with Adobe Photoshop (€415, 1 seat) as primary creative software tool. However, only Photoshop is owned (not full Creative Suite), most creative tools explicitly show "We haven't" (Figma, Sketch, video editing, 3D/CGI), and creative software coverage is limited. **CRITICAL PARADOX:** Strong production output (3,527 assets) despite minimal internal tools (€415 only) - external agency model carries the tools. This question is highly correlated with Q31 (Production Technology Stack) - both Score 2, both €415 Photoshop only, both rely on external agencies for specialized tools. The score reflects actual production capability, not tool investment. ---

---

## Q33 1 Learner

**Workflow automation tools**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates minimal workflow automation with Trello available (free, 10 seats) providing basic workflow management, but economic data explicitly states "We haven't" for automation platforms (Make.com, 8n8 workflow platform). Manual QC processes confirmed (Q23, Q4), and no documented process automation exists. With 3,527 assets produced annually, workflow automation could be quick win for efficiency improvements. The score reflects basic workflow tool awareness but not yet automation capability. ---

---

## AUTOMATION &amp; INDUSTRIALIZATION

## 1.00 — Learner

Q#	Topic	Score	Level
34	Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level	1	Learner
35	Level of templatisation of online assets	1	Learner
36	Ability to automate the personalisation of creative assets	1	Learner
37	Ability to automate the distribution of creative assets	1	Learner
38	Level of automation of the validation, production, distribution workflow	1	Learner
39	Automated production workflows	1	Learner
40	Template and standardisation systems	1	Learner
41	Batch processing capabilities	1	Learner
42	Quality control automation	1	Learner

## Q34 1 Learner

## Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates significant offline asset production with OOH assets (2,500 assets, 70.9% of total) and print assets (26 assets, 0.7% of total), suggesting systematic production process. Partial brand guidelines (2025 partial version) provide some consistency framework. However, there is no documented template library found, no template-based production system evident, no evidence of template accessibility to teams/partners, and no systematic template usage documented. **CRITICAL QUESTION:** How are 2,500 OOH assets created without templates? Possibilities include templates used but not documented, each asset created individually (inefficient), or external agencies handle OOH production with their templates. The score reflects offline asset production but not yet template system. ---

## Q35 1 Learner

## Level of templatisation of online assets

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates significant online asset production with 911 digital assets combined (Social 626, Display 60, Web 100, E-commerce 45, PPC 80), representing 25.8% of all assets. Partial brand guidelines (2025 partial version) provide foundation. However, there is no documented digital template library found, no social media templates evident (despite 626 social assets), no display ad templates (despite multiple platform requirements), no web template system (for 100 web assets), and no e-commerce templates (for product pages/banners). **CRITICAL PARADOX:** 626 social media assets produced without documented templates across multiple platforms (IG, FB, TikTok, LinkedIn) with different specs - this volume suggests templates MUST exist somewhere. The score reflects online asset production but not yet documented template system. ---

**Q36 1 Learner****Ability to automate the personalisation of creative assets**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates limited personalization capability (Q15 Score 1 - no individual personalization) and no DCO platform (Q27 Score 1 - no Celtra or similar), confirming no automated personalization system. No automation tools identified (Q33 Score 1 - workflow automation minimal), no data infrastructure for automation (no CDP or customer data platform visible), and no documented process for automated personalization. Combined absence of personalization capability and DCO platform confirms Learner-level maturity in automated personalization. The score reflects manual personalization foundation but not yet automated personalization capability. ---

**Q37 1 Learner****Ability to automate the distribution of creative assets**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates significant distribution investment with Traffic/QA/Distribution costs (€130,000, 8% of total external spend) and multi-channel asset production (OOH, Social, Display, Video, Web, E-commerce, Print, PPC, Email) across 7+ channels. However, there are no automation tools identified for distribution, no API integrations for platform distribution, no scheduling automation beyond Hootsuite (which is social media only), and no documented automated distribution system. **CRITICAL QUESTION:** How do 2,500 OOH assets get distributed to vendors/partners? If distribution were automated, costs might be lower. The score reflects distribution capability but not yet automated distribution. ---

**Q38 1 Learner****Level of automation of the validation, production, distribution workflow**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates workflow existence (validation, production, distribution) with process documented through timeline data. However, all workflow components are manual: validation (QC) is manual review for all categories, production is sequential execution with manual processes, and distribution has significant cost (€130,000) suggesting manual labor. **CRITICAL FINDING:** 50% active work ratio indicates team spends only 50% of time on active production work, with 50% idle/waiting time suggesting efficiency opportunity. Limited automation infrastructure (Q33 Score 1 - Trello only, Q37 Score 1 - Hootsuite only social, Q24 Score 1 - Manual QC only) confirms no end-to-end automation. The score reflects workflow existence but not yet automation. ---

**Q39 1 Learner****Automated production workflows**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates production workflow structure with sequential execution and manual processes, manual QC process (all categories), and strong first-pass approval rates (70-100% by campaign type) showing production quality. However, production workflows show purely manual execution with no evidence of automated systems or workflow automation. Q33 confirms limited workflow tools (Trello only). **CRITICAL FINDING:** 50% active work ratio (documented in Q38) indicates only half of working time is spent on actual production, suggesting massive inefficiency opportunity. This represents significant efficiency opportunity given 50% idle time. The score reflects manual production workflows but not yet automation. ---

## Q40 1 Learner

## Template and standardisation systems

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates partial brand guidelines (TM Italy\_Guideline\_parziale 2025.pdf) providing some standardization foundation, but comprehensive template and standardization systems are explicitly absent. Q34 (Offline templatisation Score 1) and Q35 (Online templatisation Score 1) both confirm no template systems for either 2,500 OOH assets or 911 digital assets. Guidelines alone without operationalized templates do not constitute Score 2. This is a SYSTEM AND PROCESS gap, not just documentation gap. Template management is not established, standardization framework is not established, and format standardization is uncertain. The score reflects guidelines foundation but not yet template and standardization system. ---

## Q41 1 Learner

## Batch processing capabilities

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates extremely high-volume production (3,527 assets annually, 70.9% being 2,500 OOH assets ideal for batch processing) with clear business case for batch processing. However, there is no evidence of batch processing capabilities, batch processing tools (Adobe Media Encoder, Python/scripting, Make.com/Zapier), batch processing workflows, or automated batch processing. Production is documented as sequential execution (opposite of batch). **CRITICAL FINDING:** This represents massive inefficiency opportunity - OOH batch processing should be standard practice at this volume. If batch processing reduced manual work by 30%, could process ~5,200 assets/year with same resources. The score reflects high-volume production but not yet batch processing capability. ---

## Q42 1 Learner

## Quality control automation

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates quality control process with manual review for all categories (100% manual QC) covering all 3,527 assets annually, and high first-pass approval rates (70-100% by campaign type) showing QC quality. However, economic data explicitly documents that QC method is "Manual review for all categories" across all assets. No automated QC systems, compliance checking tools, or QC automation documented. Q24 (Compliance automation) scores 1, confirming no automated compliance infrastructure. QC is entirely manual process. **CRITICAL FINDING:** If average QC time is 15 minutes per asset = ~880 hours annually (1.1 FTE equivalent). This represents significant efficiency opportunity. The score reflects manual QC capability but not yet automation. ---

## INNOVATION

## 1.00 — Learner

Q#	Topic	Score	Level
43	Adoption of Generative AI	1	Learner
44	Volume and depth of testing on emerging formats	1	Learner
45	Recurrence of creative Test & Learn	1	Learner
46	Emerging technology adoption	1	Learner
47	Creative experimentation processes	1	Learner
48	Innovation pipeline management	1	Learner
49	Future capability planning	1	Learner

## Q43 1 Learner

## Adoption of Generative AI

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates GenAI awareness through GenAI policy folder existence ('/02\_DOCUMENTATION/PRIORITY\_2/10\_GenAI\_Policy\_Examples/'), but economic data explicitly documents "We haven't" for both Midjourney and OpenAI (primary GenAI platforms). There is no evidence of actual GenAI tool integration, formal GenAI strategy, or operational guidelines. GenAI adoption appears to be at awareness stage only (folder exists) but not implementation stage. **CRITICAL QUESTION:** What's actually in the GenAI policy folder? Folder name says "GenAI\_Policy\_Examples" (examples?) not "GenAI\_Policy" - unclear if this represents actual policy or just example collection. The score reflects GenAI awareness but not yet adoption. ---

## Q44 1 Learner

## Volume and depth of testing on emerging formats

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy produces video content (52 assets including TV spots, social video) and has Innovation Backlog/Roadmap folder suggesting innovation awareness. However, limited evidence of testing on emerging formats (AR, VR, new social video styles), structured testing program, or insights from format experiments. Emerging format testing appears minimal or non-existent. Emerging format testing program needed. ---

## Q45 1 Learner

## Recurrence of creative Test &amp; Learn

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy has KPI reports and creative performance documentation suggesting some performance tracking, but limited evidence of systematic creative Test & Learn programs, regular creative testing, or systematic application of learnings. Pre-test/post-test processes are limited (Q18 Score 1). Creative Test & Learn appears ad-hoc rather than systematic. Test & Learn program needed. ---

## Q46 1 Learner

## Emerging technology adoption

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates technology evaluation infrastructure through Tech Evaluation Process folder (`/02\_DOCUMENTATION/PRIORITY\_2/11\_Tech\_Evaluation\_Process/`) and Innovation Backlog/Roadmap folder (`/02\_DOCUMENTATION/PRIORITY\_2/12\_Innovation\_Backlog\_Roadmap/`) showing organizational awareness of emerging technologies. However, actual technology adoption is minimal with only €415 direct technology spend (Adobe Photoshop only, 0.7% of typical tech spend for creative organization). Economic data shows extensive "We haven't" entries across tools (DAM, DCO, video editing, Figma, Sketch, workflow automation, compliance tools, GenAI). **CRITICAL QUESTION:** What's actually in the Tech Evaluation Process and Innovation Backlog folders? Framework maturity is unknown - unclear if these are mature evaluation processes, framework templates, or placeholder folders. The score reflects awareness-execution gap: evaluation infrastructure exists but adoption is minimal. ---

## Q47 1 Learner

## Creative experimentation processes

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates innovation awareness through Innovation Backlog/Roadmap folder (`/02\_DOCUMENTATION/PRIORITY\_2/12\_Innovation\_Backlog\_Roadmap/`) showing organizational recognition of innovation needs. However, there is no evidence of structured creative experimentation processes, systematic testing frameworks, or formal test-and-learn approaches. Q45 (Creative Test & Learn) also scores 1, confirming broader absence of experimentation infrastructure. Creative experimentation appears to be ad-hoc (opportunistic) rather than structured (systematic). **CRITICAL QUESTION:** Does Innovation Backlog folder contain creative experimentation processes or just technology backlog? The score reflects innovation awareness but not yet structured experimentation capability. ---

## Q48 1 Learner

## Innovation pipeline management

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates innovation backlog infrastructure through Innovation Backlog/Roadmap folder (`/02\_DOCUMENTATION/PRIORITY\_2/12\_Innovation\_Backlog\_Roadmap/`) showing organizational awareness and visibility of innovation planning. However, there is no evidence of structured innovation pipeline management, systematic ideation processes, documented evaluation processes, or implementation tracking. Innovation pipeline appears to be informal rather than systematically managed. **CRITICAL QUESTIONS:** What ideas/initiatives are in the backlog? How many items? How old are items (aging)? Score 1 is consistent with broader INNOVATION pillar pattern (Q43, Q46, Q47 all Score 1 for similar reason: awareness without implementation). ---

## Q49 1 Learner

## Future capability planning

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates roadmap infrastructure through Capability Roadmap folder (`/02\_DOCUMENTATION/PRIORITY\_2/13\_Capability\_Roadmap/`) and Innovation Backlog/Roadmap folder (`/02\_DOCUMENTATION/PRIORITY\_2/12\_Innovation\_Backlog\_Roadmap/`) showing documentation infrastructure for capability planning. However, there is no evidence of strategic future capability planning, documented strategic direction for future capabilities, or systematic capability development. Capability roadmap appears to be documentation framework rather than operational strategy. **CRITICAL QUESTIONS:** What capabilities are in the roadmap? Timeline? Prioritization? Owner? Score 1 is consistent with Q43-Q48 pattern (entire INNOVATION pillar Score 1 due to awareness without implementation). ---



## ORGANISATION

## 1.50 — Intermediate

Q#	Topic	Score	Level
50	Availability of guidelines: standards, checklists, practical sheets	2	Intermediate
51	Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem	3	Master
52	Maturity of central/BU collaboration rituals	1	Learner
53	Maturity of collaboration between intra-bus professions	1	Learner
54	Level of structuring of operational RACIs	1	Learner
55	Level of availability of strategic and operational skills	2	Intermediate
56	Team structure and roles	1	Learner
57	Skill development programs	2	Intermediate
58	Collaboration processes	1	Learner
59	Change management capabilities	1	Learner

## Q50 2 Intermediate

## Availability of guidelines: standards, checklists, practical sheets

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates foundational documentation through partial brand guidelines (TM Italy\_Guideline\_parziale 2025.pdf) and documentation folder structure suggesting development of checklists and practical sheets. However, guidelines are explicitly "partial" (2025 version only, no 2024 version), comprehensive master guidelines not clearly demonstrated, process checklists/playbooks not well-organized, and guideline accessibility/usage tracking unclear. The score reflects present but incomplete guideline system. Guidelines exist but need completion and better organization. ---

## Q51 3 Master

## Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem

**Score: 3 (Master)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates sophisticated partner/supplier ecosystem leveraging with high external dependency (78.4% of budget, €1,501,000 agency spend) and multiple strategic agency relationships (Service Plan €280K creative, Color System €609K production, Burson €302K PR/influencer, Media Plus €350K media buying) showing well-developed partner ecosystem. Rights management documentation shows contract governance. Lean internal team (2 FTEs) with robust external execution (78.4% external) demonstrates strategic make-or-buy decision. Partner diversity is excellent with specialized roles across partners. The score reflects effective ecosystem capitalization, though strategic co-innovation aspects could be enhanced further. ---

## Q52 1 Learner

## Maturity of central/BU collaboration rituals

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy operates as a Business Unit (Tecnomat Italy) within Adeo group, suggesting central/BU collaboration context. However, limited evidence of well-defined collaboration rituals, consistent collaboration practices, or documented collaboration processes between central and BU teams. Central/BU collaboration appears informal rather than systematically managed. Collaboration rituals needed. ---

## Q53 1 Learner

**Maturity of collaboration between intra-bus professions**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy has an ultra-lean team (2 FTEs) managing content production, suggesting limited internal collaboration opportunities. With only 2 FTEs, intra-BU collaboration is inherently limited. High external dependency (78.4%) means most collaboration is with external partners rather than internal functions. Intra-BU collaboration maturity is limited by team size. Collaboration processes needed as team grows. ---

## Q54 1 Learner

**Level of structuring of operational RACIs**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy has RACI Governance folder suggesting RACI awareness, but limited evidence of structured operational RACIs, documented RACI matrices, or systematic RACI application. With ultra-lean team (2 FTEs), RACI structure may be informal. Operational RACIs need development and documentation. ---

## Q55 2 Intermediate

**Level of availability of strategic and operational skills**

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** Tecnomat Italy has an ultra-lean team (2 FTEs) managing significant content production (3,527 assets, €1,631,000 external spend), demonstrating operational capability. Training programs folder exists suggesting skill development. However, with only 2 FTEs, strategic and operational skills availability is limited by team size. Skill depth and breadth may be constrained. Skills availability is adequate but limited by team size. ---

## Q56 1 Learner

**Team structure and roles**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** \*(QA-corrected from 2 — No finalised/formalised organisational chart. QA April 2026.)\* Tecnomat Italy has an ultra-lean team structure (2 FTEs) that effectively manages significant content production (3,527 assets, €1,631,000 external spend). Skills Matrix/Org Chart folder exists suggesting organizational documentation. However, with only 2 FTEs, team structure is inherently simple and role definitions may be informal. Team structure is effective but limited by size. ---

## Q57 2 Intermediate

**Skill development programs**

**Score: 2 (Intermediate)** Tecnomat Italy has Training Programs folder with multiple training documents (Bocconi, Global Summit 2025, Google Analytics, UX Writing), suggesting skill development activity. However, with ultra-lean team (2 FTEs), skill development programs may be individual-focused rather than comprehensive. Skill development programs exist but need verification of comprehensiveness and effectiveness. ---

## Q58 1 Learner

**Collaboration processes**

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy has minimal collaborative tools (only Trello free, 10 seats) and high external dependency (78.4% external spend), suggesting collaboration needs. However, limited evidence of structured collaboration processes, collaboration frameworks, or systematic collaboration management. With ultra-lean team (2 FTEs), collaboration processes may be informal. Collaboration processes needed. ---

## Q59 1 Learner

## Change management capabilities

**Score: 1 (Learner)** Tecnomat Italy demonstrates change management awareness through Change Management Framework folder (`/02\_DOCUMENTATION/PRIORITY\_2/16\_Change\_Management\_Framework/`) showing organizational thinking about change. However, there is no evidence of structured change management processes, systematic change implementation frameworks, or formal change governance. Change tracking is not documented, and change management appears informal and reactive rather than proactive and systematic.

**CRITICAL CONSIDERATION:** Given identified gaps (Q25 DAM, Q27 DCO, Q33-Q42 automation, Q43-Q49 innovation), significant changes needed would require structured change management. Current Score 1 may become inadequate if pursuing multiple change initiatives simultaneously. For 2-FTE lean team, informal change management may be acceptable, but growth or major initiatives would require more structured approach. ---

---

# Strengths

---

## OMNICHANNEL

### Q1: Consistency of the on/offline brand promise

**Master-Level Production Execution:** Comprehensive multi-channel asset production demonstrates operational mastery and exceptional execution quality

### Q1: Consistency of the on/offline brand promise

**Brand Immediately Recognizable:** Brand is immediately recognizable across all channels, demonstrating brand promise is clearly identifiable through execution

### Q1: Consistency of the on/offline brand promise

**High-Volume Systematic Production:** 2,500 OOH assets annually (71% of production) demonstrates Master-level systematic brand application at scale

### Q1: Consistency of the on/offline brand promise

**Complete Logo Library:** Multiple logo formats available, supporting visual consistency across channels

### Q1: Consistency of the on/offline brand promise

**Strong Visual Coherence:** Assets demonstrate consistent visual branding across channels, indicating Master-level brand identity communication

### Q1: Consistency of the on/offline brand promise

**Brand Guidelines Framework:** Partial 2025 brand guidelines document exists, showing intentional brand management framework ---

### Q2: Visual/tone consistency across all media

**Comprehensive Logo System:** Multiple logo variations (Logo\_TM, contours, outlines, M logo) with payoff/non-payoff versions in multiple formats (AI, EPS, JPG, PDF) supporting production flexibility

### Q2: Visual/tone consistency across all media

**Brand Guidelines Foundation:** Partial 2025 brand guidelines exist, providing framework start for visual consistency

### Q2: Visual/tone consistency across all media

**High-Volume Production Channels:** 2,500 OOH assets annually (71% of production) demonstrates significant brand presence with systematic production

### Q2: Visual/tone consistency across all media

**Multi-Channel Asset Diversity:** Assets exist across print (catalogs, CSR), digital (display, online video), social (IG, FB, TikTok, LinkedIn), and video channels

### Q2: Visual/tone consistency across all media

**Visual Coherence:** Assets appear visually branded across channels, indicating brand identity is communicated ---

### Q3: Level of adaptation of messages/assets to activated channels/formats

**Comprehensive Channel Portfolio:** 10+ channels covered (OOH, social, video, web, display, e-commerce, print, SEO, PPC) with intentional asset production

### Q3: Level of adaptation of messages/assets to activated channels/formats

**Significant Asset Volume:** 3,527 assets annually across channels demonstrates operational scale

### Q3: Level of adaptation of messages/assets to activated channels/formats

**Channel-Specific Production:** Asset counts vary by channel suggesting dedicated production per channel

### Q3: Level of adaptation of messages/assets to activated channels/formats

**Format Diversity:** Evidence of different formats across channels (social feed/stories/video, display banners, print, video ads)

**Q3: Level of adaptation of messages/assets to activated channels/formats**

**Channel-Specific Workflows:** Timeline data shows channel awareness (social: 3-4 weeks, TVC: 4 months, e-commerce: 2-3 weeks) ---

**Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines**

**Multi-Platform Presence:** Social (Meta, TikTok), display (Google, Meta), video (YouTube, TikTok, TV), OOH, e-commerce coverage demonstrates platform awareness

**Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines**

**Tool Support:** Hootsuite (€3,610/year via agency) for social media management suggests systematized platform management

**Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines**

**High Asset Volume:** 3,527 assets across 10+ channels suggests operational compliance is happening

**Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines**

**Platform-Specific Content:** Evidence of Meta/TikTok/LinkedIn organic posts and paid social shows platform-specific production

**Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines**

**Video Format Coverage:** TV spots (3), social video, online video ads demonstrate video platform awareness ---

**Q5: Asset design principle (responsive, vertical, etc.)**

**Multi-Format Video Assets:** Social video + TV spots (3) with likely multiple aspect ratios demonstrates format awareness

**Q5: Asset design principle (responsive, vertical, etc.)**

**Social Media Format Coverage:** Feed posts, stories, video content across platforms shows multi-format social production

**Q5: Asset design principle (responsive, vertical, etc.)**

**OOH Scale Adaptation:** 2,500 OOH assets suggest format variations by placement type

**Q5: Asset design principle (responsive, vertical, etc.)**

**Web & E-commerce Responsiveness:** 100 web assets + 45 e-commerce assets suggest responsive consideration

**Q5: Asset design principle (responsive, vertical, etc.)**

**Display Banner Presence:** Digital ADV folder suggests multiple display sizes ---

**Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)**

**Multi-Channel Coverage:** 10+ channels with 3,527 assets annually demonstrates multi-channel presence

**Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)**

**Asset Reuse:** 26-75% reuse rates across categories indicates basic cross-channel thinking

**Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)**

**Channel-Specific Production:** Each channel has dedicated asset production showing operational capability

**Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)**

**Multi-Channel Presence:** Assets exist across all major channels (OOH, social, digital, video, print) ---

**Q7: Cross-channel content consistency**

**Brand Identity Consistency:** Comprehensive logo system ensures visual identity consistency across channels

**Q7: Cross-channel content consistency**

**Brand Guidelines Framework:** Partial 2025 brand guidelines provide consistency foundation

**Q7: Cross-channel content consistency**

**Visual Consistency:** Assets show consistent brand application across channels

**Q7: Cross-channel content consistency**

**Multi-Channel Presence:** 3,527 assets across 10+ channels with visual brand application

**Q7: Cross-channel content consistency**

**Manual QC Process:** Quality control exists providing some consistency control ---

**Q8: Multi-format production capabilities**

**Comprehensive Multi-Format Production Capabilities:** Expert-level capability across 6 major formats (print, digital, video, social, OOH, web) - only radio/audio missing

**Q8: Multi-format production capabilities**

**High Asset Volume:** 3,527 assets annually with consistent quality (70-100% first-pass approval)

**Q8: Multi-format production capabilities**

**Expert-Level External Agency Coordination:** 78.4% external production spend (€1,501,000) managed effectively, demonstrating production capability through strategic external partnerships

**Q8: Multi-format production capabilities**

**Sophisticated Production Management:** 4-month TV production + 3-week social + 3-4 day e-commerce shows Expert-level timeline management capability

**Q8: Multi-format production capabilities**

**Lean Team Efficiency:** 2 FTEs coordinating comprehensive multi-format production successfully through external agencies

**Q8: Multi-format production capabilities**

**Quality Control:** Manual QC process with documented approval rates (70-100%)

**Q8: Multi-format production capabilities**

**Operational Integration:** Multi-format production is integrated part of operations, not experimental ---

**CLIENT CENTRICITY****Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise**

**Comprehensive Customer Research:** Brand survey 2025 with qualitative + quantitative reports demonstrates sophisticated research capability

**Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise**

**Research Methodology:** Structured methodology documented showing methodological rigor

**Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise**

**Research Recency:** 2025 research shows current customer understanding

**Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise**

**Research Depth:** Both qualitative and quantitative approaches provide comprehensive insights

**Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise**

**Brand Guidelines Foundation:** Partial 2025 brand guidelines exist providing brand framework foundation ---

**Q15: Level of content personalisation**

**Content Production Exists:** Content production across channels (e-commerce, web, social, email) provides foundation for personalization

**Q15: Level of content personalisation**

**Segment-Based Content:** Segment-based content is being produced showing some targeting capability

**Q15: Level of content personalisation**

**Channel Capability:** E-commerce and email channels could support personalization if implemented ---

## MEASUREMENT

### Q22: Monitoring of production costs (time, volume costs)

**Systematic Cost Tracking:** Total external spend (€1,631,000) and cost per asset (€462.43) calculated showing clear cost awareness and analytical capability

### Q22: Monitoring of production costs (time, volume costs)

**Budget Management:** Budgets folder exists indicating intentional budget management

### Q22: Monitoring of production costs (time, volume costs)

**Cost Calculation:** Cost per asset calculation demonstrates analytical capability

### Q22: Monitoring of production costs (time, volume costs)

**Agency Spend Breakdown:** Cost tracking by partner/category (€1,501,000 agency, €130,000 traffic/QA/distribution)

### Q22: Monitoring of production costs (time, volume costs)

**Appropriate for Model:** Cost tracking is appropriate for external agency production model (78.4% external) ---

### Q23: Production efficiency metrics

**Individual Efficiency Metrics Documented:** Cost per asset, productivity ratio, time-to-market, and first-pass approval rates are documented

### Q23: Production efficiency metrics

**High Productivity:** 1,764 assets per FTE is impressive productivity suggesting efficient external coordination

### Q23: Production efficiency metrics

**Comprehensive Production Data:** Economic data shows analytical capability with multiple efficiency metrics

### Q23: Production efficiency metrics

**Workflow Timing Data:** Campaign timing differences documented showing channel awareness ---

## TECH CAPABILITIES

### Q24: Adoption of compliance analysis solutions (Creative X, etc.)

**Manual QC Process:** Quality control manual review exists for all asset categories providing compliance foundation

### Q24: Adoption of compliance analysis solutions (Creative X, etc.)

**Brand Guidelines:** Partial 2025 brand guidelines available providing compliance framework

### Q24: Adoption of compliance analysis solutions (Creative X, etc.)

**Compliance Awareness:** Manual compliance process demonstrates intentionality ---

### Q25: Availability and functional depth of the DAM

**Asset Production Exists:** 3,527 assets annually demonstrates significant asset production capability

### Q25: Availability and functional depth of the DAM

**Asset Reuse Happening:** 26-50% reuse rates suggest some organization exists

### Q25: Availability and functional depth of the DAM

**DAMEO Available:** DAMEO available through Adeo presents quick implementation opportunity ---

### Q27: DCO availability and functional depth

**DCO Awareness:** Dynamic Creative folder exists showing awareness of DCO concept ---

### Q28: Availability and functional depth Creative intelligence

**Basic Performance Tracking:** KPI reports for Meta platforms (Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn Jan-Oct 2025) demonstrate performance tracking capability

### Q28: Availability and functional depth Creative intelligence

**Creative Performance Documentation:** Creative performance folder exists suggesting performance awareness



**Q28: Availability and functional depth Creative intelligence**

**Basic Reporting System:** Basic performance tracking system provides foundation ---

**Q29: Availability and functional depth of collaborative tools**

**Basic Tool Awareness:** Trello available shows basic tool awareness

**Q29: Availability and functional depth of collaborative tools**

**Free/Minimal Investment:** Free tool suggests experimental stage ---

**Q30: Art purchasing platform**

**Rights Costs Tracked:** Art buying and rights costs (€36,000) are tracked showing financial awareness

**Q30: Art purchasing platform**

**Cost Control:** Shows intentional cost control ---

**Q31: Production technology stack**

**Multi-Format Production Capability:** Strong production across formats (OOH, Social, Video, Web, E-commerce, Print, Display)

**Q31: Production technology stack**

**High Asset Volume:** 3,527 assets annually demonstrates operational capability

**Q31: Production technology stack**

**Quality Metrics:** Strong first-pass approval rates (70-100%) show production quality ---

**Q32: Creative software and tools**

**Multi-Format Production:** Production capability demonstrated across formats despite minimal tools

**Q32: Creative software and tools**

**Adobe Photoshop:** Primary creative tool available

**Q32: Creative software and tools**

**Production Quality:** Strong first-pass approval rates demonstrate production quality ---

**Q33: Workflow automation tools**

**Basic Workflow Tool:** Trello available shows basic workflow management awareness ---

**AUTOMATION & INDUSTRIALIZATION****Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level**

**Significant Offline Asset Production:** OOH assets (2,500) and print assets (26) demonstrate offline production capability

**Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level**

**Brand Guidelines Foundation:** Partial brand guidelines provide consistency framework

**Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level**

**Scale Suggests Process:** 2,500 OOH assets suggests systematic production process ---

**Q35: Level of templatisation of online assets**

**Significant Online Asset Production:** 911 digital assets (25.8% of total) demonstrate online production capability

**Q35: Level of templatisation of online assets**

**Multiple Platforms Covered:** Social, display, web, e-commerce, PPC coverage suggests organization

**Q35: Level of templatisation of online assets**

**Brand Guidelines Foundation:** Partial brand guidelines provide consistency framework ---

**Q36: Ability to automate the personalisation of creative assets**

**Manual Personalization Exists:** Limited personalization exists (Q15 Score 1) providing foundation ---

**Q37: Ability to automate the distribution of creative assets**



**Significant Distribution Investment:** €130,000 annual distribution cost shows distribution is prioritized

**Q37: Ability to automate the distribution of creative assets**

**Multi-Channel Production:** Assets produced across 7+ channels requiring distribution

**Q37: Ability to automate the distribution of creative assets**

**Hootsuite for Social:** Social media distribution partially automated through Hootsuite ---

**Q38: Level of automation of the validation, production, distribution workflow**

**Workflow Exists:** Validation, production, distribution workflow exists

**Q38: Level of automation of the validation, production, distribution workflow**

**Process Documented:** Timeline data available showing workflow structure

**Q38: Level of automation of the validation, production, distribution workflow**

**Quality Maintained:** 70-100% first-pass approval rates maintained manually ---

**Q39: Automated production workflows**

**Production Workflow Structure:** Sequential workflow structure exists

**Q39: Automated production workflows**

**Quality Maintained:** 70-100% first-pass approval rates show production quality

**Q39: Automated production workflows**

**Process Documented:** Timeline data available showing workflow structure ---

**Q40: Template and standardisation systems**

**Brand Guidelines Foundation:** Partial brand guidelines exist providing consistency framework foundation ---

**Q41: Batch processing capabilities**

**High-Volume Production:** 3,527 assets annually demonstrates significant production volume

**Q41: Batch processing capabilities**

**Clear Business Case:** Clear business case for batch processing with efficiency opportunity ---

**Q42: Quality control automation**

**Comprehensive QC Process:** Manual review covers all categories ensuring quality

**Q42: Quality control automation**

**High First-Pass Approval Rates:** 70-100% first-pass approval rates show QC quality

**Q42: Quality control automation**

**Quality Maintained:** Quality of output is good despite manual processes ---

## INNOVATION

**Q43: Adoption of Generative AI**

**GenAI Awareness:** GenAI policy folder exists showing awareness of GenAI concept ---

**Q46: Emerging technology adoption**

**Technology Evaluation Infrastructure:** Tech Evaluation Process folder exists showing organizational awareness

**Q46: Emerging technology adoption**

**Innovation Backlog Infrastructure:** Innovation Backlog/Roadmap folder exists showing planning awareness ---

**Q47: Creative experimentation processes**

**Innovation Awareness:** Innovation Backlog/Roadmap folder exists showing organizational awareness ---

**Q48: Innovation pipeline management**

**Innovation Backlog Infrastructure:** Innovation Backlog/Roadmap folder exists showing organizational awareness

**Q48: Innovation pipeline management**

**Backlog Visibility:** Backlog is visible to organization ---

**Q49: Future capability planning**

**Roadmap Infrastructure:** Capability Roadmap and Innovation Backlog folders exist showing planning awareness ---

**ORGANISATION****Q50: Availability of guidelines: standards, checklists, practical sheets**

**Brand Guidelines Foundation:** Partial brand guidelines exist demonstrating foundational documentation

**Q50: Availability of guidelines: standards, checklists, practical sheets**

**Documentation Structure:** Documentation folder structure exists providing infrastructure for guidelines ---

**Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem**

**Sophisticated Partner Ecosystem:** High external dependency (78.4%) with multiple strategic agency relationships demonstrates well-developed ecosystem

**Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem**

**Well-Distributed Partner Spend:** Diversified partner base, not single-source dependent

**Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem**

**Excellent Partner Diversity:** Each partner provides specialized capability

**Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem**

**Formal Governance:** Rights management documentation shows contract governance

**Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem**

**Strategic Make-or-Buy Decision:** Lean internal team (2 FTEs) with robust external execution (78.4%) ---

**Q59: Change management capabilities**

**Change Management Awareness:** Framework folder shows organizational thinking about change ---

# Gaps

---

## OMNICHANNEL

### Q1: Consistency of the on/offline brand promise

**Partial Guidelines:** 2025 version is explicitly marked as "parziale" (partial), complete version in development

### Q1: Consistency of the on/offline brand promise

**Brand Promise Documentation:** Explicit brand promise statement not documented separately from visual guidelines (however, brand promise is clearly identifiable through execution excellence)

### Q1: Consistency of the on/offline brand promise

**Formal Audit Process:** No evidence of systematic brand promise consistency audits documented (however, consistency is demonstrated through high-volume production and visual coherence) ---

### Q2: Visual/tone consistency across all media

**Partial Guidelines Only:** 2025 version is explicitly marked as "parziale" (partial), no complete version available

### Q2: Visual/tone consistency across all media

**Typography Documentation Gap:** Font Library discrepancy - analysis mentions 70 font files but Font Library folder appears empty (CRITICAL PARADOX requiring clarification)

### Q2: Visual/tone consistency across all media

**No Campaign-Specific Guidelines:** No evidence of visual guidelines tailored to specific campaigns

### Q2: Visual/tone consistency across all media

**No Cross-Channel Audit Trail:** No documentation of how consistency is ensured across print/digital/social channels

### Q2: Visual/tone consistency across all media

**Tone Framework Not Documented:** Tone variation detected across channels but no documented tone framework for channel types

### Q2: Visual/tone consistency across all media

**Print/Digital Catalog PDFs:** Display banners folder contains XLSX and PDF specs rather than visual assets, limiting visual consistency verification ---

### Q3: Level of adaptation of messages/assets to activated channels/formats

**No Documented Adaptation Framework:** No systematic channel adaptation guidelines or playbooks found

### Q3: Level of adaptation of messages/assets to activated channels/formats

**Platform-Specific Optimization Unclear:** No evidence of Meta-specific, TikTok-specific, or Google-specific optimization strategies

### Q3: Level of adaptation of messages/assets to activated channels/formats

**Messaging Adaptation Undocumented:** No clear channel-specific messaging strategies documented

### Q3: Level of adaptation of messages/assets to activated channels/formats

**Format Specifications Missing:** No documented format requirements for each channel

### Q3: Level of adaptation of messages/assets to activated channels/formats

**Platform-Specific Metrics:** No evidence of channel/platform performance tracking or optimization

### Q3: Level of adaptation of messages/assets to activated channels/formats

**OOH Dominance Paradox:** OOH represents 70.9% of assets (2,500/3,527), meaning actual multi-channel adaptation complexity is concentrated in 29% of production - may skew adaptation sophistication assessment ---

### Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines

**Manual QC Only:** No automated compliance checks documented - all QC is manual review

**Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines**

**Material Specifications Missing:** No platform-specific specification sheets found for Meta, TikTok, Google, OOH platforms

**Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines**

**No Documented Compliance Framework:** Process for checking platform compliance unclear - no documented framework or checklist

**Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines**

**Hootsuite Purpose Unclear:** Unknown if used for scheduling only or compliance validation

**Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines**

**Platform Update Management:** No evidence of how platform guideline changes are tracked/implemented

**Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines**

**CRITICAL PARADOX:** High asset volume (3,527 assets) vs manual QC only - how is manual QC managing 3,527 assets across 10+ channels/platforms with no automation? Suggests either QC is selective/sampling-based, team is very large/well-resourced, or compliance is less stringent than Master level ---

**Q5: Asset design principle (responsive, vertical, etc.)**

**No Documented Design Framework:** No comprehensive responsive design guidelines found

**Q5: Asset design principle (responsive, vertical, etc.)**

**Format Specifications Missing:** No documented size/format specifications for any platform

**Q5: Asset design principle (responsive, vertical, etc.)**

**No Automated Multi-Format Generation:** All formats appear manually produced

**Q5: Asset design principle (responsive, vertical, etc.)**

**File Optimization Strategy Unclear:** No documented compression/size standards

**Q5: Asset design principle (responsive, vertical, etc.)**

**Master Asset/Cutdown System Unclear:** Process for producing multiple formats from single master not documented ---

**Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)**

**NO Synchronized Campaign Evidence:** No clear evidence of coordinated multi-channel campaigns

**Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)**

**NO Key Visual Master System:** No documented visual synchronization system or Key Visual Master concepts

**Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)**

**NO Narrative Framework:** No continuous narration strategy documented

**Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)**

**NO Campaign Coordination Process:** Cross-channel coordination mechanisms not found

**Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)**

**CRITICAL PARADOX:** High asset reuse (26-75%) but no synchronization - reuse appears tactical rather than strategic

**Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)**

**OOH Dominance:** 71% of assets are OOH, suggesting channel-specific rather than synchronized production

**Note:** This analysis identifies significant synchronization gaps. The high asset reuse rates suggest operational asset sharing but not strategic campaign synchronization. ---

**Q7: Cross-channel content consistency**

**No Documented Messaging Framework:** No campaign-wide messaging guidelines found

**Q7: Cross-channel content consistency**

**Campaign Coordination Unclear:** Cross-channel campaign consistency unclear

**Q7: Cross-channel content consistency**

**Content Guidelines Missing:** No content-specific consistency guidelines beyond visual identity

**Q7: Cross-channel content consistency**

**Messaging Consistency Undocumented:** How messaging stays consistent across channels not documented

**Q7: Cross-channel content consistency**

**QC Consistency Checks Unclear:** Manual QC process doesn't clearly include consistency validation

**Q7: Cross-channel content consistency**

**CRITICAL PARADOX:** Strong visual consistency but unclear messaging consistency - does messaging consistency exist but isn't documented, or is it actually absent? ---

**Q8: Multi-format production capabilities**

**Audio Production Limited:** Spot Radio rights purchased but audio production not comprehensively developed (only format gap - all other major formats comprehensively covered) ---

**CLIENT CENTRICITY**

**Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise**

**Brand Promise Not Explicitly Articulated:** Promise statement not visible in documentation - foundational issue for alignment assessment

**Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise**

**No Documented Alignment Framework:** No visible connection between research findings and brand promise

**Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise**

**No Fulfillment Metrics:** No measurement of whether brand promise meets customer needs

**Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise**

**Partial Guidelines Only:** 2025 version marked as "parziale" (partial), not comprehensive

**Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise**

**CRITICAL PARADOX:** Research available but not explicitly connected to brand promise - are research findings shaping brand promise, or is research disconnected from strategic direction? ---

**Q15: Level of content personalisation**

**NO Individual-Level Personalization:** No name-based, purchase-based, or behavior-based personalization demonstrated

**Q15: Level of content personalisation**

**NO Dynamic Personalization:** No DCO (Dynamic Creative Optimization) tools identified

**Q15: Level of content personalisation**

**NO Personalization Platforms:** No Marketo, Salesforce Interaction Studio, or similar platforms

**Q15: Level of content personalisation**

**NO Individual-Level Targeting:** No evidence of user data-based targeting (name, purchase history, browsing history)

**Q15: Level of content personalisation**

**NO Tool Investment:** Only €415 direct tool spend (Adobe Photoshop) - minimal investment in personalization tools

**Q15: Level of content personalisation**

**CRITICAL PARADOX:** Strong production capability (Q8 Score 3: 3,527 assets annually) but no personalization (Q15 Score 1) - why invest in production without personalization to maximize ROI? ---

**MEASUREMENT**

**Q22: Monitoring of production costs (time, volume costs)**

**No Cost Breakdown by Category:** Costs by OOH/Social/Video/Print not documented separately (could enhance cost visibility)

**Q22: Monitoring of production costs (time, volume costs)**

**No Cost Per Asset Type:** Unclear if OOH (€X), Social (€Y), Video (€Z) are tracked separately (could enable better cost analysis)

**Q22: Monitoring of production costs (time, volume costs)**

**No Detailed Breakdowns:** Shooting, design, licensing costs not itemized (may exist in agency invoices but not aggregated)

**Q22: Monitoring of production costs (time, volume costs)**

**CRITICAL FINDING:** Cost per asset (€462.43) is 3.4x higher than benchmark (€135.45) - requires investigation (channel mix? quality differences? efficiency opportunity?)

**Q22: Monitoring of production costs (time, volume costs)**

**Note:** Time tracking (man-hours) not applicable given 78.4% external agency production model - unrealistic expectation ---

**Q23: Production efficiency metrics**

**No Systematic Framework:** No formal efficiency tracking system documented

**Q23: Production efficiency metrics**

**No Optimization Processes:** How efficiency is improved not documented

**Q23: Production efficiency metrics**

**No Benchmarks:** Target efficiency levels not documented

**Q23: Production efficiency metrics**

**No Metrics Dashboard:** Real-time efficiency visibility unclear

**Q23: Production efficiency metrics**

**No Category-Level Efficiency:** Cost/time per asset type not tracked separately

**Q23: Production efficiency metrics**

**CRITICAL PARADOX:** High productivity metrics (1,764 assets/FTE) but no optimization process - is productivity optimized intentionally or emergent? ---

**TECH CAPABILITIES****Q24: Adoption of compliance analysis solutions (Creative X, etc.)**

**No Automated Compliance Tools:** No Creative X or similar automated compliance tools identified

**Q24: Adoption of compliance analysis solutions (Creative X, etc.)**

**No Automated Brand Guidelines Compliance:** Brand guidelines compliance checked manually only

**Q24: Adoption of compliance analysis solutions (Creative X, etc.)**

**No Platform Policy Automation:** Platform compliance checked manually

**Q24: Adoption of compliance analysis solutions (Creative X, etc.)**

**No Legal Disclaimer Verification:** Manual verification only

**Q24: Adoption of compliance analysis solutions (Creative X, etc.)**

**No Workflow Integration:** Compliance not systematically integrated into approval workflow

**Q24: Adoption of compliance analysis solutions (Creative X, etc.)**

**No Compliance Monitoring Dashboard:** No systematic compliance tracking ---

**Q25: Availability and functional depth of the DAM**

**NO DAM System:** Explicitly stated "We haven't" - No DAM system in use

**Q25: Availability and functional depth of the DAM**

**NO Centralized Asset Storage:** No centralized digital asset management system

**Q25: Availability and functional depth of the DAM**

**NO Advanced Features:** No advanced search, rights management, or software integrations

**Q25: Availability and functional depth of the DAM**

**NO Stakeholder Access:** No DAM means no easy stakeholder access

**Q25: Availability and functional depth of the DAM**

**CRITICAL PARADOX:** High production volume (3,527 assets) with no central management - how is asset reuse happening without DAM? Suggests either external agencies manage DAM on behalf of Tecnomat, assets are poorly organized and reuse is difficult, or manual tracking through spreadsheets/file systems ---

**Q27: DCO availability and functional depth**

**NO DCO Platform:** Explicitly stated "We haven't" - No Celtra or DCO platforms

**Q27: DCO availability and functional depth**

**NO Dynamic Personalization Capability:** No real-time creative personalization

**Q27: DCO availability and functional depth**

**NO Real-Time Creative Optimization:** Cannot dynamically optimize creative based on user data

**Q27: DCO availability and functional depth**

**NO Automated A/B Testing:** Cannot A/B test creative variations automatically

**Q27: DCO availability and functional depth**

**NO Scalable Personalization:** Limited ability to scale personalized campaigns

**Q27: DCO availability and functional depth**

**Connection to Q15:** Related to Q15 (Content Personalization Score 1) - personalization capability gap across the board ---

**Q28: Availability and functional depth Creative intelligence**

**NO Creative Intelligence Tools:** No creative intelligence platforms identified

**Q28: Availability and functional depth Creative intelligence**

**NO Advanced Analytics:** No advanced analytics beyond basic KPI reporting

**Q28: Availability and functional depth Creative intelligence**

**NO Predictive Insights:** No predictive insights generated for creative performance

**Q28: Availability and functional depth Creative intelligence**

**NO Automated Recommendations:** No automated creative recommendations

**Q28: Availability and functional depth Creative intelligence**

**NO Automated Analysis:** No automated creative performance analysis

**Q28: Availability and functional depth Creative intelligence**

**Connection to Q19:** Related to Q19 (Creative Intelligence Score 1) - pattern of limited analytics capability ---

**Q29: Availability and functional depth of collaborative tools**

**NO Comprehensive Workflow Tools:** No workflow tools beyond basic Trello

**Q29: Availability and functional depth of collaborative tools**

**NO Automation Platforms:** Make.com explicitly not used

**Q29: Availability and functional depth of collaborative tools**

**NO Advanced Collaboration Features:** No documented advanced features (real-time collaboration, version control, integrated feedback)

**Q29: Availability and functional depth of collaborative tools**



**NO Workflow Management System:** No workflow management system for external partners

**Q29: Availability and functional depth of collaborative tools**

**CRITICAL NEED:** High external dependency (78.4%) but minimal collaboration tools for managing external partners ---

**Q30: Art purchasing platform**

**NO Access to Stock Platforms:** Explicitly stated "We don't have access" for Shutterstock, GettyImages

**Q30: Art purchasing platform**

**NO Centralized Platform:** No centralized art purchasing platform

**Q30: Art purchasing platform**

**NO Rights Management System:** No rights management system for tracking licenses

**Q30: Art purchasing platform**

**NO License Management:** License management not documented

**Q30: Art purchasing platform**

**NO Cost Optimization:** No documented purchasing strategy or cost optimization ---

**Q31: Production technology stack**

**Minimal Internal Tool Investment:** Only €415 direct tool spend (0.025% of total spend)

**Q31: Production technology stack**

**Missing Key Tools:** Figma, Sketch, video editing, 3D/CGI tools explicitly not available

**Q31: Production technology stack**

**Single Seat Photoshop:** Only 1 seat suggests limited internal production

**Q31: Production technology stack**

**Tool Integration Unclear:** Integration between tools unclear

**Q31: Production technology stack**

**CRITICAL PARADOX:** 3,527 assets produced annually despite minimal internal tool investment - production happens without tools because external agencies have/use the tools ---

**Q32: Creative software and tools**

**NO Full Creative Suite:** Only Photoshop, not full Adobe Creative Suite

**Q32: Creative software and tools**

**NO Modern Design Tools:** Figma, Sketch explicitly not available

**Q32: Creative software and tools**

**NO Video Editing Tools:** Video editing suites explicitly not available (despite 52 video assets produced)

**Q32: Creative software and tools**

**NO 3D/CGI Tools:** 3D/CGI tools explicitly not available

**Q32: Creative software and tools**

**CRITICAL PARADOX:** Strong production output (3,527 assets) despite minimal internal tools (€415 only) - external agency model carries the tools

**Q32: Creative software and tools**

**Connection to Q31:** Highly correlated with Q31 (Production Technology Stack) - same score, same tools, same model ---

**Q33: Workflow automation tools**

**NO Automation Platforms:** Make.com, 8n8 explicitly not used

**Q33: Workflow automation tools**

**NO Process Automation:** No documented process automation



**Q33: Workflow automation tools**

**Manual QC Processes:** Manual QC for all categories confirmed

**Q33: Workflow automation tools**

**NO Workflow Automation Tools:** No workflow automation tools beyond basic Trello

**Q33: Workflow automation tools**

**Connection to Other Gaps:** Connected to Q23 (Efficiency Score 1 - manual QC), Q29 (Collaboration Score 1 - minimal tools) - pattern of across-the-board lack of automation/tools ---

**AUTOMATION & INDUSTRIALIZATION****Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level**

**NO Template Library Documented:** Not evident in analysis

**Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level**

**NO Template-Based Production:** No evidence of systematic template usage

**Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level**

**NO Template Specifications:** Partial guidelines exist but no template specifications

**Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level**

**NO Local/Partner Templates:** No indication templates are accessible to external partners

**Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level**

**NO Template Efficiency Documentation:** How templates save time/ensure consistency unclear

**Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level**

**CRITICAL QUESTION:** How are 2,500 OOH assets created without templates? Need to clarify in interview if templates are used but not documented, each asset created individually, or external agencies handle OOH production with their templates ---

**Q35: Level of templatisation of online assets**

**NO Digital Template Library Documented:** Not found in analysis

**Q35: Level of templatisation of online assets**

**NO Social Media Templates:** Despite 626 social assets, no templates documented

**Q35: Level of templatisation of online assets**

**NO Display Ad Templates:** Despite multiple platform requirements, no templates documented

**Q35: Level of templatisation of online assets**

**NO Web Template System:** For 100 web assets, no template system documented

**Q35: Level of templatisation of online assets**

**NO E-commerce Templates:** For product pages/banners, no templates documented

**Q35: Level of templatisation of online assets**

**CRITICAL PARADOX:** 626 social media assets produced without documented templates across multiple platforms (IG, FB, TikTok, LinkedIn) with different specs - this volume suggests templates MUST exist somewhere. Critical interview question: Where are the templates? ---

**Q36: Ability to automate the personalisation of creative assets**

**NO Automated Personalization Capability:** No automated personalization system

**Q36: Ability to automate the personalisation of creative assets**

**NO DCO Platform:** Q27 Score 1 - no Celtra or similar platform

**Q36: Ability to automate the personalisation of creative assets**

**NO Automation Tools:** Q33 Score 1 - workflow automation minimal

**Q36: Ability to automate the personalisation of creative assets**

**NO Data Infrastructure:** No CDP or customer data platform for automation

**Q36: Ability to automate the personalisation of creative assets**

**NO Data-Driven Personalization:** No systematic customer data collection/activation for personalization

**Q36: Ability to automate the personalisation of creative assets**

**NO Documented Process:** No documented process for automated personalization ---

**Q37: Ability to automate the distribution of creative assets**

**NO Automation Tools:** No automation tools identified for distribution

**Q37: Ability to automate the distribution of creative assets**

**NO API Integrations:** Platform APIs not visible in tech stack

**Q37: Ability to automate the distribution of creative assets**

**NO Scheduling Automation:** Beyond Hootsuite (which is social media only)

**Q37: Ability to automate the distribution of creative assets**

**NO Comprehensive Distribution:** Hootsuite limited to social channels, not all channels

**Q37: Ability to automate the distribution of creative assets**

**CRITICAL QUESTION:** How do 2,500 OOH assets get distributed to vendors/partners? If distribution were automated, would costs be lower? ---

**Q38: Level of automation of the validation, production, distribution workflow**

**NO Automation in Any Stage:** Validation, production, and distribution all manual

**Q38: Level of automation of the validation, production, distribution workflow**

**NO Integration Between Stages:** No integration between workflow stages

**Q38: Level of automation of the validation, production, distribution workflow**

**NO End-to-End Automation:** No end-to-end workflow automation

**Q38: Level of automation of the validation, production, distribution workflow**

**CRITICAL FINDING:** 50% active work ratio indicates massive inefficiency opportunity - automation could improve active work ratio significantly

**Q38: Level of automation of the validation, production, distribution workflow**

**Limited Automation Infrastructure:** Q33 Score 1, Q37 Score 1, Q24 Score 1 - pattern of no automation ---

**Q39: Automated production workflows**

**NO Automated Workflows:** No documented automation workflows

**Q39: Automated production workflows**

**NO Automated Production Systems:** No system-level automation found

**Q39: Automated production workflows**

**NO Production Automation Tools:** No tools to automate production

**Q39: Automated production workflows**

**CRITICAL FINDING:** 50% active work ratio indicates massive inefficiency opportunity - automation could improve active work ratio significantly

**Q39: Automated production workflows**

**Connected Automation Gaps:** Pattern of automation gaps across production (templates, DCO, distribution, workflow tools) ---

**Q40: Template and standardisation systems**

**NO Template Systems:** Q34 Score 1 (offline), Q35 Score 1 (online) - no template systems documented

**Q40: Template and standardisation systems**

**NO Template Management:** Not established - no process for creating, versioning, or deploying templates

**Q40: Template and standardisation systems**

**NO Standardization Framework:** Not established - standardization appears ad-hoc

**Q40: Template and standardisation systems**

**NO Format Standardization:** Uncertain - no documented format standardization

**Q40: Template and standardisation systems**

**Guidelines Alone Insufficient:** Guidelines alone without operationalized templates do not constitute Score 2 - this is SYSTEM AND PROCESS gap ---

**Q41: Batch processing capabilities**

**NO Batch Processing Tools:** None referenced (Adobe Media Encoder, Python/scripting, Make.com/Zapier)

**Q41: Batch processing capabilities**

**NO Batch Processing Workflows:** Processes not designed for parallel/batch execution

**Q41: Batch processing capabilities**

**NO Automated Batch Processing:** Not implemented

**Q41: Batch processing capabilities**

**Sequential Execution:** Production documented as sequential execution (opposite of batch)

**Q41: Batch processing capabilities**

**CRITICAL FINDING:** Massive inefficiency opportunity - OOH batch processing should be standard practice at this volume. If batch processing reduced manual work by 30%, could process ~5,200 assets/year with same resources. ---

**Q42: Quality control automation**

**NO Automated QC Systems:** No automated systems (compliance checking tools, color space validation, dimension checking, file format verification)

**Q42: Quality control automation**

**NO Compliance Automation:** Q24 Score 1 - no automated compliance checking

**Q42: Quality control automation**

**NO Quality Standards Enforcement:** No tools to enforce quality standards

**Q42: Quality control automation**

**100% Manual QC:** Every single asset undergoes manual human review

**Q42: Quality control automation**

**CRITICAL FINDING:** If average QC time is 15 minutes per asset = ~880 hours annually (1.1 FTE equivalent) - significant efficiency opportunity ---

**INNOVATION****Q43: Adoption of Generative AI**

**NO GenAI Tools:** Explicitly stated "We haven't" for Midjourney, OpenAI

**Q43: Adoption of Generative AI**

**NO Tool Integration:** No GenAI tools integrated into content creation

**Q43: Adoption of Generative AI**

**NO Formal Strategy:** No evidence of formal GenAI strategy

**Q43: Adoption of Generative AI**

**NO Operational Guidelines:** GenAI guidelines unclear

**Q43: Adoption of Generative AI**

**Policy Content Unclear:** Folder exists but content unclear - is this actual policy or example collection?

**Q43: Adoption of Generative AI**

**Policy Status Unclear:** Unclear if policy is active, enforced, or referenced in workflows ---

**Q46: Emerging technology adoption**

**Minimal Technology Adoption:** Only €415 direct tool spend (0.7% of typical tech spend)

**Q46: Emerging technology adoption**

**Extensive Technology Gaps:** Across-the-board "We haven't" entries (DAM, DCO, video editing, design tools, automation, compliance, GenAI)

**Q46: Emerging technology adoption**

**Framework Maturity Unknown:** Folders exist but content unclear - cannot assess evaluation rigor

**Q46: Emerging technology adoption**

**CRITICAL QUESTION:** What's actually in the Tech Evaluation Process and Innovation Backlog folders? Are these mature processes, templates, or placeholders? ---

**Q47: Creative experimentation processes**

**NO Structured Experimentation Framework:** Not documented

**Q47: Creative experimentation processes**

**NO Systematic Testing:** No systematic testing frameworks

**Q47: Creative experimentation processes**

**NO Learning Documentation:** No documentation of experiment results

**Q47: Creative experimentation processes**

**NO Learning Application:** No process for applying learnings to future work

**Q47: Creative experimentation processes**

**Creative Test & Learn Limited:** Q45 Score 1 confirms broader absence of experimentation infrastructure

**Q47: Creative experimentation processes**

**CRITICAL QUESTION:** Does Innovation Backlog folder contain creative experimentation processes or just technology backlog? ---

**Q48: Innovation pipeline management**

**NO Structured Pipeline Management:** No evidence of structured innovation pipeline management

**Q48: Innovation pipeline management**

**NO Ideation Process:** Not documented - no systematic process for generating innovation ideas

**Q48: Innovation pipeline management**

**NO Evaluation Process:** Not documented - unclear how ideas are evaluated

**Q48: Innovation pipeline management**

**NO Implementation Tracking:** Not documented - unknown how implemented innovations are tracked

**Q48: Innovation pipeline management**

**Backlog Content Unknown:** Unclear what ideas/initiatives are in backlog

**Q48: Innovation pipeline management**

**Consistent Pattern:** Score 1 consistent with broader INNOVATION pillar pattern (Q43, Q46, Q47 all Score 1 - awareness without implementation) ---

**Q49: Future capability planning**

**NO Strategic Capability Planning:** No evidence of strategic future capability planning

**Q49: Future capability planning**

**NO Strategic Direction:** No documented strategic direction for future capabilities

**Q49: Future capability planning**

**NO Capability Roadmap Content:** Roadmap content unknown

**Q49: Future capability planning**

**NO Current vs Future Assessment:** No capability gap analysis

**Q49: Future capability planning**

**NO Capability Development:** No documented capability development programs

**Q49: Future capability planning**

**Consistent Pattern:** Score 1 consistent with Q43-Q48 pattern (entire INNOVATION pillar Score 1 - awareness without implementation) ---

**ORGANISATION****Q50: Availability of guidelines: standards, checklists, practical sheets**

**Partial Guidelines Only:** Guidelines explicitly "partial" (2025 version only, no 2024 version)

**Q50: Availability of guidelines: standards, checklists, practical sheets**

**Comprehensive Master Guidelines Not Demonstrated:** Not clearly demonstrated

**Q50: Availability of guidelines: standards, checklists, practical sheets**

**Process Checklists Not Well-Organized:** Checklists may exist but not clearly organized

**Q50: Availability of guidelines: standards, checklists, practical sheets**

**Practical Sheets/Playbooks Unclear:** Playbooks may exist but not clearly organized

**Q50: Availability of guidelines: standards, checklists, practical sheets**

**Guideline Accessibility Unclear:** No documentation on distribution or version control ---

**Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem**

**Strategic Leverage Unclear:** Strategic leverage beyond task execution unclear

**Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem**

**Co-Innovation Unclear:** Co-innovation with partners unclear

**Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem**

**Proactive Strategy Unclear:** Proactive partner ecosystem strategy unclear ---

**Q59: Change management capabilities**

**NO Structured Change Management Processes:** Not documented

**Q59: Change management capabilities**

**NO Systematic Change Implementation Framework:** No documented process for implementing changes

**Q59: Change management capabilities**

**NO Change Governance:** Unknown who approves/manages changes

**Q59: Change management capabilities**

**NO Change Tracking:** Unknown if changes are tracked for success

**Q59: Change management capabilities**

**Informal/Reactive Approach:** Change management appears informal/reactive, not proactive/systematic

**Q59: Change management capabilities**

**CRITICAL CONSIDERATION:** Given identified gaps (Q25 DAM, Q27 DCO, Q33-Q42 automation, Q43-Q49 innovation), significant changes needed would require structured change management. Current Score 1 may become inadequate if pursuing multiple change initiatives simultaneously. ---