

Obramax Brazil

Content Maturity Assessment · April 2026 · Confidential

Overall Maturity Score

1.95

Overall — Intermediate

59 questions across 7 pillars

Pillar Summary

Pillar	Qs	Avg Score	Level	Min	Max
OMNICHANNEL	9	2.56	Master	2	3
CLIENT CENTRICITY	7	2.00	Intermediate	2	2
MEASUREMENT	7	2.00	Intermediate	1	3
TECH CAPABILITIES	9	1.44	Learner	1	2
AUTOMATION & INDUSTRIALIZATION	10	1.90	Intermediate	1	2
INNOVATION	7	1.86	Intermediate	1	2
ORGANISATION	10	1.90	Intermediate	1	2

OMNICHANNEL

2.56 — Master

Q#	Topic	Score	Level
1	Brand promise consistency across channels	2	Intermediate
2	Visual and typographic consistency	3	Master
3	Channel and format adaptation	2	Intermediate
4	Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines	3	Master
5	Asset design principle (responsive, vertical, etc.)	3	Master
6	Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)	2	Intermediate
7	Cross-channel content consistency	3	Master
8	Multi-format production capabilities	3	Master
9	Maturity of paid vs organic	2	Intermediate

Q1 2 Intermediate

Brand promise consistency across channels

Score: 2 (Intermediate) *(QA-corrected from 3 — 360° integration not achieved; social, offline/OOH and performance operate as separate silos; BU Head confirmed cross-channel integration 'not yet achieved'. QA April 2026.)* Oramax Brazil maintains strong brand promise consistency across digital channels. The brand promise "Obra é compromisso" (Construction is commitment) is deeply embedded in all touchpoints: Brandbook, Social Media, Video Ads, Retargeting Banners, Email Templates, and the "Obra é Compromisso" YouTube channel (655K subscribers). Interview (19 March 2026) confirms the brand promise is the core organising principle for all content production. Asset volumes newly evidenced: ~1,074 assets per OPECOM x 11–12 campaigns/year. Monthly briefing/debriefing review ritual maintains alignment. Score remains 3 (Master): strong execution across digital channels; 360-degree integration (offline/online) explicitly stated as a work-in-progress aspiration, not yet achieved. ---

Q2 3 Master

Visual and typographic consistency

Score: 3 (Master) Oramax Brazil demonstrates strong visual and typographic consistency across all submitted assets. The Brandbook (Oramax-Brandbook_Final.pdf) defines logo, colour palette (#002a5b, #EE8004), typography (Fontfabric Nexa — €176,930 investment), photography style, grafismos, and grids. Interview (19 March 2026) confirms designers follow the brand book as primary reference; Figma templates are used as a design system for display assets, providing visual consistency at scale. Asset volumes: ~1,074 per OPECOM x 11–12 campaigns/year. Score remains 3 (Master): comprehensive brand system with Figma design library and Fontfabric investment; however, compliance is 100% manual (no Creative X or equivalent), and the Bora pra Obra Global Campaign toolkit could not be validated due to access limitations. ---

Q3 2 Intermediate

Channel and format adaptation

Score: 2 (Intermediate) *(QA-corrected from 3 — Production is 100% manual ('SLA 1 week - 100% manually'); DCO platform 'Tracto' attempted but abandoned due to bugs. QA April 2026.)* Oramax Brazil demonstrates strong channel and format adaptation capability. Interview (19 March 2026) confirms structured asset production per OPECOM: ~1,074 assets (Main KV: 119, Category KVs: 280, Product & Price KVs: 675), adapted across Meta, Google, Blue, Voxus, Social, Email, and Print/Merchan. Figma provides display templates for programmatic; Insider automates email with API connections to Meta, Google, TikTok. A/B testing validates adaptation decisions by platform. DCO (Tracto) was trialled and abandoned. GenAI used for blog and social content adaptation (reducing production from 2hrs → <40min). Score remains 3 (Master): systematic multi-channel adaptation at scale; however, all production is 100% manual, no DCO is in use, and local adaptation documentation (beyond Brandbook) is limited. ---

Q4 3 Master

Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines

Score: 3 (Master) Oramax Brazil demonstrates strong platform compliance through format-specific asset production. Retargeting Banners use platform-native dimensions (Blue: IAB standard; Google: DMG/Responsive; Meta: Stories/Feed specs). Figma provides design system templates for programmatic assets. Social media shows platform-appropriate formats. Interview (19 March 2026) confirms: quality control is manual (no automated QC tools); validation, production, and distribution are all handled manually; Trello manages approvals and workflow. CPC/CPM dashboard (Jan–Nov 2025: R\$9.25M, ROAS 8.39) demonstrates effective paid media delivery across 8+ platforms. Score remains 3 (Master): platform-compliant asset production at scale; however, no automated compliance checking tools are in use and QA methodology is not formally documented. ---

Q5 3 Master

Asset design principle (responsive, vertical, etc.)

Score: 3 (Master) Oramax Brazil demonstrates strong asset design efficiency through platform-specific and responsive design principles. Interview (19 March 2026) confirms structured format adaptation: multiple aspect ratios per platform (628x628, 1200x628, 1200x1200 for Google; Stories 1080x1920, Feed 1080x1080 for Meta). KV analysis PDF provides performance data by format dimension, enabling data-informed design efficiency decisions. Email templates use responsive HTML (Insider platform — `@media` queries, `adapt-img`, 650px base). Social media shows vertical (Stories/TikTok), square (Feed), and video formats. GenAI reduces blog/social production from 2hrs → <40min. Score remains 3 (Master): comprehensive design efficiency across formats; however, all production is 100% manual, no DCO is in use, and efficiency metrics (cost-per-asset, load time) are not formally tracked. ---

Q6 2 Intermediate

Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)

Score: 2 (Intermediate) *(QA-corrected from 3 — Offline, social and performance teams remain siloed; agency relationships described as 'very transactional'; no shared strategic KPIs. QA April 2026.)* Oramax Brazil demonstrates strong narrative continuity across digital channels. Each OPECOM (11–12/year) generates ~1,074 assets from a single Master KV cascaded across Meta, Google, Social, Email, Display, and Print/Merchan — creating a unified campaign narrative. A/B testing validates narrative elements (date/urgency trigger: CTR 2.70% vs 1.94%). Insider platform provides automated email personalisation with API to Meta, Google, TikTok — synchronising customer data across channels. Monthly briefing/debriefing ritual maintains narrative alignment. Score remains 3 (Master): strong digital narrative synchronisation; however, 360-degree integration (offline/online/performance) is explicitly stated as NOT YET ACHIEVED in the interview, and the agency relationship is transactional rather than strategically integrated. ---

Q7 3 Master

Cross-channel content consistency

Score: 3 (Master) Oramax Brazil demonstrates strong cross-channel content consistency through governance structures, brand guidelines, platform automation, and a defined team structure. Interview (19 March 2026) confirms: Trello manages approvals and workflow activity tracking; SLA 1 week; monthly briefing/debriefing ritual; one responsible person per channel pillar (clear ownership); Insider automates email and web with consistent brand messaging via rules/triggers; SEO, paid, and social teams are aligned on campaign database. Score remains 3 (Master): structured governance with clear ownership ensures consistent delivery; however, 360-degree integration is not yet achieved, QA is fully manual with no formal checklists, and no DAM exists (files stored on Google Drive). ---

Q8 3 Master

Multi-format production capabilities

Score: 3 (Master) Oramax Brazil demonstrates strong multi-format production capability. Interview (19 March 2026) and interview guide quantify the scale: ~1,074 assets per OPECOM (Main KV: 119, Category KVs: 280, Product & Price KVs: 675) × 11–12 OPECOMs/year = ~11,800–12,900 assets/year across Print, Digital Display, Email, Social, Video, and Offline/Merchan. Monthly asset count reports tracked. SLA 1 week. GenAI reduces blog/social production from 2hrs → <40min. Two YouTube channels (655K + 312K subscribers). Governance SLA table documents 7 production categories. Score remains 3 (Master): high-volume multi-format production at scale with quality governance; however, all production is 100% manual, no Product Videos or 3D Packshots submitted, no DCO, and no cost-per-asset efficiency tracking. ---

Q9 2 Intermediate

Maturity of paid vs organic

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Oramax Brazil demonstrates active paid media across multiple platforms (Meta, Google, Insider CDP-driven web push, Voxus, Blue Ads) alongside organic social content (Facebook, Instagram, Stories), with brand lift studies and CPC/CPM tracking confirming paid media measurement. However, no formal paid vs organic strategy document exists, and the interview confirms that systematic documentation is limited ("we have every month the briefing and debriefing, but not specifically with test and logs"). The paid vs organic budget allocation is not separately reported. Per Tier 1: Social (paid/organic) ■, Analytics ■, Budgets ■. Threshold met. No strategic framework found. ---

CLIENT CENTRICITY

2.00 — Intermediate

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 personas addressed	2	Intermediate
12	Level of mastery of "shopper" needs by persona	2	Intermediate
13	Level of mastery of media uses of persona	2	Intermediate
14	Relevance of formats/Media by persona	2	Intermediate
15	Level of content personalisation	2	Intermediate
16	Target customer representation in content	2	Intermediate

Q10 2 Intermediate

Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise

Score: 2 (Intermediate) *(QA-corrected from 3 — No CJM by media channel or persona; brand attribute 'convenience' declined from 67% to 61% in Brand Lift studies. QA April 2026.)* Oramax Brazil demonstrates strong alignment between customer needs and brand promise, validated by external research. The Brandbook purpose ("empoderando os profissionais", "facilitar a vida") maps directly to Brand Lift findings: PROs rate quality 78%→86%, price 61%→79%, stock 79%→83% post-campaign. Top of Mind with PROs reached #1 (18.3%) post-campaign. The PRO persona is well understood: "I know the pro likes soccer, he likes music, I know the age of them." Annual round tables (~300 customers), NPS tracking, and pre/post store opening research (40 days before, 60 days after) provide ongoing validation. The OPECOM distribution (PRO 50–60%, Consumer 30–45%) reflects internalised understanding of customer value. Minor gap: "facilita minha vida" attribute declined slightly for PROs (67%→61%), suggesting a specific promise requires recalibration. ---

Q11 2 Intermediate

Availability and level of precision of the audiences and personas addressed

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Oramax Brazil has 6 customer personas documented in `OUR CUSTOMERS_personas.pptx` and operationalised through the OPECOM content calendar (PRO 50–60%, Consumidor final 30–45%, volume buyers 5%). Insider CDP provides 50 segmentation rules for operational precision. However, the 6 personas were established 10 years ago and never formally reviewed. The interview explicitly confirms the absence of updated audience research: "we don't have yet the JM by media and persona." Persona documentation exists but lacks recency and depth. ---

Q12 2 Intermediate

Level of mastery of "shopper" needs by persona

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Oramax Brazil demonstrates basic awareness of shopper needs per persona type: OPECOM content allocation differentiates by customer typology (PRO 50–60% vs consumer 30–45%), and the interview confirms understanding of persona-level purchase differences. However, no formal shopper journey research per persona exists. The interview explicitly states: "We have the CJM, but we don't have yet the JM by media and persona." Understanding is operationally applied but undocumented at a strategic level. ---

Q13 2 Intermediate

Level of mastery of media uses of persona

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Obramax Brazil practises channel differentiation by persona: the interview confirms "if I'm doing something on Instagram, I'll use one kind of communication. If I go to YouTube, which is more for pros, I use another kind of content, but we have like a matrix." However, this matrix is undocumented, and the interview explicitly states: "We have the CJM, but we don't have yet the JM by media and persona." Media-use understanding by persona is practitioner knowledge applied operationally but not formalised as a media planning framework. ---

Q14 2 Intermediate

Relevance of formats/Media by persona

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Obramax Brazil practises format adaptation at the channel level driven by OPECOM editorial cycles: distinct formats are used for Instagram (consumer lifestyle), YouTube (PRO instructional), Facebook promotional posts, and display banners. Insider CDP enables personalised push notifications and emails per segment. However, persona-specific format strategy is not formally documented — format choices are channel-driven rather than grounded in per-persona format research. ---

Q15 2 Intermediate

Level of content personalisation

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Obramax Brazil's Insider CDP delivers strong CRM personalisation: 50 segmentation rules, 100% automated email triggering, personalised product recommendations, and individual customer journey automation. This is genuine individual-level personalisation within the CRM/owned channel. However, personalisation does not extend coherently to paid channels — DCO was evaluated (Tracto) and abandoned; paid creative is manually produced. Cross-channel personalisation beyond CRM does not exist. The overall personalisation footprint is strong in CRM but narrow in scope. ---

Q16 2 Intermediate

Target customer representation in content

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Obramax Brazil demonstrates **partial target customer representation**. Personas exist and were developed at company founding, but have **never been updated** — the interview confirms no refresh cycle. Customer understanding is enriched by: an annual round table with 300+ customers, NPS surveys, and pre/post store-opening brand lift research (Londrina Wave 1 Dec 2025; RJ tracking). However, there is no documented persona versioning or formal cadence for updating audience insights. Customer understanding informs content directionally (paid media segmentation; OPECOM feiras) but the lack of a formal, refreshed persona framework caps the score at Intermediate. ---

MEASUREMENT

2.00 — Intermediate

Q#	Topic	Score	Level
17	Brand tracking (brand metrics, quarterly review)	2	Intermediate
18	Pre-test / post-test systematisation	2	Intermediate
19	Capacity to analyse the performance of created assets (creative intelligence)	2	Intermediate
20	Mastery of brand lift studies	3	Master
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

Brand tracking (brand metrics, quarterly review)

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Obramax Brazil demonstrates **active brand tracking through multiple channels**: dashboards pulling KPIs from paid media, social ONE PAGE reports (Instagram 249,089 followers, 2.7% engagement, 13.2M total views), YouTube channel retention metrics (34% on Obra e Compromisso; 80% on Obramax channel), sentimentalization dashboard, and monthly performance meetings. Brand lift studies (multiple waves, multiple cities) directly measure awareness and preference. However, no formally documented brand health framework or quarterly review cadence exists — findings are acted on operationally but not in a structured brand health review cycle. Score 2 reflects systematic data collection without a formal brand health governance process. ---

Q18 2 Intermediate

Pre-test / post-test systematisation

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Obramax Brazil demonstrates **strong post-campaign analysis** through the "Análise dos KVs" document (Performance dos Criativos - Feiras OPECOM 2026), which constitutes a formal post-analysis framework with documented creative element testing and insights. Monthly briefing/debriefing ritual is confirmed. However, there is **no documented pre-test systematisation** — A/B tests are run within campaigns rather than as formal pre-campaign validation. The Análise dos KVs is a post-campaign creative intelligence document, not a formal pre/post test design. Score 2 reflects strong post-analysis capability without systematic pre-test methodology. ---

Q19 2 Intermediate

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

Score: 2 (Intermediate) *(QA-corrected from 3 — Testing is ad-hoc, practitioner-driven, not documented; BU Head stated 'We don't have a powerful tool'; no formalised pre-campaign testing framework. QA April 2026.)* Oramax Brazil demonstrates **systematic creative intelligence capability** through the "Análise dos KVs" document (Performance dos Criativos - Feiras OPECOM 2026). This is a formal creative performance analysis with an explicit objective to identify which creative elements drive audience attraction, retention, and action — going well beyond standard performance reporting. The document contains controlled A/B tests comparing commercial KVs vs pain-point KVs and KVs with/without validity dates, with documented CTR and session results, regional performance breakdowns, and structured insight sections ("O que foi bom?" / "Oportunidades"). Monthly briefing/debriefing rituals support iterative application. The interview confirms "just started testing" — this is an emerging but genuinely systematic creative intelligence capability. ---

Q20 3 Master

Mastery of brand lift studies

Score: 3 (Master) Oramax Brazil demonstrates **systematic brand lift study capability** with multiple documented studies across multiple markets and multiple waves. Three brand lift PDFs are directly available: OBRAMAX_Pesquisa_BrandLift_BS.pdf (RJ Dec 2024), Pre Abertura_Pesquisa_BrandLift_UB.pdf (RJ Wave 3 Jun 2025), and ONDA3_Pesquisa_BrandLift_RJ.pdf (Londrina Wave 1 Dec 2025). The interview confirms a 42% relative lift result (RJ store opening — flagged as "best in class" and referenced as a Google case study). Methodology is formal: pre/post media quantitative surveys measuring brand awareness (spontaneous and stimulated), brand preference vs competitors, and brand attribute connection. Studies are conducted for new store openings and ongoing tracking. Score 3 reflects systematic, multi-wave, multi-market brand lift practice with documented results and named methodology. ---

Q21 2 Intermediate

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

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Oramax Brazil demonstrates **active engagement tracking across multiple channels** with confirmed VTR and scroll depth monitoring. The interview confirms: VTR and scroll depth are tracked "especially on YouTube"; YouTube retention metrics are documented (34% retention on Obra e Compromisso channel; 80% retention on Oramax channel); Instagram engagement rate is 2.7% with 13.2M total views. The paid media dashboard (CPC CPM.pdf) tracks CTR, sessions, and conversion across all channels Jan–Nov 2025. Dashboards pull KPIs. However, the KPIs & Reporting folder remains empty — no KPI dictionary or engagement metrics framework is documented. Score 2 reflects active engagement monitoring without a formally documented metrics framework. ---

Q22 2 Intermediate

Monitoring of production costs (time, volume costs)

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Oramax Brazil demonstrates **partial but active production cost monitoring** via separate spreadsheets maintained by the design team and social media team in Google Drive. The interview confirms: production costs are tracked through these spreadsheets; a monthly asset count report exists ("we do have a monthly report to count all the assets created"). The paid media dashboard (CPC CPM.pdf) documents all external media spend (R\$9.25M Jan–Nov 2025). However, internal production costs are not formally allocated (€0 in economic data), cost per asset is explicitly not calculated ("we don't"), and the spreadsheets are not unified. Score 2 reflects operational cost tracking without systematic efficiency evaluation. ---

Q23 1 Learner

Production efficiency metrics

Score: 1 (Learner) Obramax Brazil demonstrates **no systematic production efficiency metrics tracking**. The interview prep document explicitly states: "Cost per asset and other metrics regarding SLA we don't (because it is internally but we can find a way in the future to measure)." The SLA is confirmed as 1 week, 100% manual — a documented process parameter but not a tracked efficiency metric. Asset volumes are now partially known from the interview (~1,074 assets per OPECOM: Main KV 119 + Category KVs 280 + Product & Price KVs 675), but this data is not used to calculate cost per asset or assets per FTE. Time-to-market stages (brief → produce → approve → publish) are not tracked. Score 1 reflects acknowledged absence of production efficiency metrics with stated intent to improve. ---

TECH CAPABILITIES

1.44 — Learner

Q#	Topic	Score	Level
24	Adoption of Compliance Analysis Solutions (Creative X, etc.)	1	Learner
25	Availability and Functional Depth of the DAM (DAMEO)	1	Learner
26	Availability and Functional Depth of Product Feed Solutions (Google Shopping, Facebook Ads)	2	Intermediate
27	DCO Availability and Functional Depth	1	Learner
28	Availability and Functional Depth — Creative Intelligence Platform (Predictive Analytics)	1	Learner
29	Availability and Functional Depth of Collaborative Tools and Standardisation	2	Intermediate
30	Art Purchasing / Rights Platform	1	Learner
31	Production Technology Stack	2	Intermediate
32	Creative Software and Tools	2	Intermediate

Q24 1 Learner

Adoption of Compliance Analysis Solutions (Creative X, etc.)

Score: 1 (Learner) Obramax Brazil has no automated compliance tools in place. The interview transcript (19 March 2026) explicitly confirms this: Juliana Piccolotto stated directly, "No, I have the brand book and I consider they the designers they know the brand book and they will follow" (00:38:19), and when Alessandro Benedetti asked specifically about any platform or scoring tool to verify compliance, Juliana confirmed none exists. The ITW questionnaire response for "Adoption of compliance analysis solutions (Creative X etc.)" records: "Is there any creative compliance platform available?" — with no affirmative answer provided. The ITW response further confirms "No" for quality control automation and no automated QC tools. Compliance is entirely manual, governed by the brand book and individual designer knowledge. There is no budget for compliance tooling and no evidence of any plans for adoption. The Round 1 score of 1 (Learner) is confirmed and unchanged. ---

Q25 1 Learner

Availability and Functional Depth of the DAM (DAMEO)

Score: 1 (Learner) Obramax Brazil has no Digital Asset Management system in use. The interview transcript (19 March 2026) provides definitive confirmation: when Alessandro Benedetti raised the absence of any DAMEO presence, Juliana Piccolotto responded "I don't know what's sorry I don't" (transcript 00:08:54), then confirmed she had never heard of the platform ("I don't know the name. Bad news. I don't know even the name," transcript 00:35:37). She confirmed files are stored on Google Drive: "Well, since we I know there everything on the on the internet on the our drives, but I don't think we have a system" (00:36:58). The ITW questionnaire response for the DAM section states: "This is the only account with no DAMEO. Why is not being used? I am unfamiliar with the platform and who would have access to it. We think it is used by catalog team to upload product information." Assets are stored in Google Drive with folder-based taxonomy. There is no central DAM, no rights management, no search capability, and no evidence of any planned adoption. This confirms the Round 1 Score of 1 (Learner), unchanged. ---

Q26 2 Intermediate**Availability and Functional Depth of Product Feed Solutions (Google Shopping, Facebook Ads)**

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 evidence significantly upgrades the understanding of Oramax Brazil's product feed capability. While no dedicated product feed management platform (such as Smartfeed) exists, the interview and ITW questionnaire reveal that the Insider platform functions as a CDP (Customer Data Platform) with API-based product catalog integration, and that product data flows via API to Meta Ads, Google Ads, and TikTok. The ITW questionnaire response for the Automation section explicitly states: "Insider is a tool and a CDP, so we have catalog connect by API there (+ meta ads, google, tiktok)." This represents a meaningful step beyond the Round 1 assessment, which treated Insider purely as a web personalization tool and saw no feed capability. Product distribution to ad platforms is confirmed via API for product data, though creative assets are distributed manually. There is no dedicated feed management platform, no feed optimisation layer, and no documented feed performance analysis capability. Score is revised upward from 1 (Learner) to 2 (Intermediate), reflecting confirmed API-based product data distribution to major ad platforms via Insider/CDP. ---

Q27 1 Learner**DCO Availability and Functional Depth**

Score: 1 (Intermediate — revised downward) Round 2 evidence from the interview transcript and ITW questionnaire requires a revision of the Round 1 score. The interview transcript provides definitive confirmation that the team attempted to use Tracto (a DCO/AI-powered creative tool) but abandoned it due to bugs: "They said they used Figma they try to use traco... Tracto tracto do you know it's AI company and they didn't like a lot of bugs. So so far the the they use trail for the to track the activities approvals" (transcript 00:40:03–00:43:41). When Alessandro Benedetti specifically confirmed: "there was no DCO applied... at the moment there is no other [dynamic creative optimization]", Juliana confirmed: "No" (transcript 00:46:49). The ITW questionnaire also confirms no current DCO in use. Additionally, the Gemini notes summary explicitly states: "the DCO are limited." While Insider provides web personalization and behavioral retargeting via API-connected product data (relevant to Q26), it does not function as a DCO platform for automated display creative personalisation. The failed Tracto trial and the team's stated openness to future experimentation is noted, but no active DCO capability exists. Round 1 scored this 2 (Intermediate) based on Insider + retargeting; Round 2 evidence shows the original score was inflated — the correct score is 1 (Learner), aligned with the ITW questionnaire's own self-assessment score of 1.6 INTERMEDIATE for the overall Tech Capabilities pillar and explicit confirmation of no DCO. ---

Q28 1 Learner

Availability and Functional Depth — Creative Intelligence Platform (Predictive Analytics)

Score: 1 (Learner) Round 2 evidence from the interview and ITW questionnaire resolves the Round 1 scoring ambiguity in favour of the lower score. The Round 1 file flagged a concern about score inflation at Score 2 and suggested Score 1 may be more appropriate. The interview transcript confirms there is no creative intelligence platform in use: when Alessandro Benedetti asked about "any kind of creative intelligence platform — basically you submit an asset and you analyze whether it's going to score correctly," Juliana Piccolotto responded "Ok" but then confirmed no such tool exists (transcript 00:38:19). The ITW questionnaire response for "Availability and functional depth Creative intelligence" records: "Do you analyse creative elements (visuals, copy, CTAs) to understand what drives performance, and where is that documented? Just started testing. Example: link" — the link was not populated, and no documentation of any systematic creative element analysis was provided. The Gemini summary notes confirm "il n'y ait pas de plateforme de notation ou d'outil de creative intelligence pour vérifier la conformité." Performance review is conducted via monthly briefing/debriefing meetings and standard platform metrics (engagement, CTR, conversion) but with no creative element breakdown. No dedicated platform exists. Score revised from 2 (Intermediate, with inflation concern) to 1 (Learner). ---

Q29 2 Intermediate

Availability and Functional Depth of Collaborative Tools and Standardisation

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 interview and ITW questionnaire evidence confirms and enriches the Round 1 score of 2 (Intermediate). The interview transcript provides direct confirmation that Trello is the primary tool for workflow tracking, activity management, and approvals: "Trello tro gira tro keeps changing" (transcript 00:38:19), and Figma is used for design collaboration and asset export/batch processing. The ITW questionnaire confirms: "At Trello, all documented" for the collaborative tools approval question. The governance SLA (Governance.png, documented in Round 1) establishes task categories, SLA times, priorities, and named responsible individuals. However, the interview also confirms a significant gap: there is no integrated proofing tool (no Frame.io, no Ziflow), no documented process for external partner access to the tool suite, and no diagram connecting Adobe, Figma, Trello, and Insider in the production workflow ("No" for production workflow diagram in ITW questionnaire). The team structure is small (12 content and social people across designers, SEO, paid media, and social), which partially compensates for tooling limitations. Score 2 (Intermediate) is confirmed: tools and documented workflow exist, but integration depth and partner access remain unresolved. ---

Q30 1 Learner

Art Purchasing / Rights Platform

Score: 1 (Learner) Round 2 evidence from the interview transcript and ITW questionnaire confirms the Round 1 score. Oramax Brazil does not use a centralised art purchasing platform. There is no Shutterstock, Getty Images, or stock library subscription. The team relies entirely on owned photography from production shoots (€2.72M production spend), agency-supported photography and influencer-generated content, and AI-generated imagery. The interview adds an important new dimension: the team uses AI tools to generate images of people and then manipulates them to avoid legal complications from using real collaborators who may later request content removal. Juliana explained: "we decided that everything that is static we want to use a real person inspiration" via AI manipulation (transcript 00:50:00). The Rights Management folder remains empty, and the interview does not reveal any formal rights management platform or process for licensing. Font licensing via Fontfabric (€176,930) remains the only documented asset licensing practice. Score 1 (Learner) is confirmed unchanged. ---

Q31 2 Intermediate

Production Technology Stack

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 evidence confirms and enriches the Round 1 Score of 2. The interview and ITW questionnaire provide a significantly clearer picture of the full production stack. The confirmed stack includes: Adobe Creative Suite (€141,817), Figma (multi-use: design, templates, batch export), Trello (workflow and approvals, 25 users), Fontfabric Nexa (€176,930), Insider (CDP: web personalization, email automation, push notifications, CRM, product recommendation with API catalog connection to Meta/Google/TikTok), Pricefy (in-store merchandising templates), and AI tools for image and text generation (specific tool unconfirmed but in active use — possibly Gemini). The ITW questionnaire adds important context: the team produces approximately 1,074 assets per campaign cycle (119 Main KV assets + 280 Category KV assets + 675 Product & Price KV assets), all based on template structures. The SLA is 1 week and production is 100% manual. The stack is functional and reasonably well-suited to the team's current output, but it lacks a DAM, DCO platform, product feed management tool, automation platform, 3D tools, and a documented integration architecture. Score 2 (Intermediate) is confirmed: solid core stack but partial coverage, manual integration, and no omnichannel automation layer. ---

Q32 2 Intermediate

Creative Software and Tools

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 evidence from the interview transcript and ITW questionnaire confirms the Round 1 score of 2 with significantly richer detail. The core software stack is confirmed: Adobe Creative Suite (€141,817), Figma (TI — team included), and Fontfabric Nexa (€176,930 for typography licensing). The team is larger than Round 1 indicated: approximately 12 content-adjacent people (4 social designers, 3 additional designers, 2 SEO, 4 paid media, 3 content creators). The interview confirms that Adobe and Figma licenses are negotiated directly by Obramax Brazil: "you negotiate the licenses that you need directly with them" — Juliana responded "But I think so" (transcript 00:40:03). Critically, the ITW questionnaire explicitly confirms no software license inventory exists: "Do you have a software license inventory or capability matrix that lists who uses which tools (Adobe, Figma, etc.)? No." AI tools are confirmed in active use (image generation, text/copy, speech for video) and delivering a 66% time saving (2 hours to under 40 minutes), but the specific tool is unconfirmed and no formal license is documented. No 3D software, no OBS Studio. Score 2 (Intermediate) is confirmed: good core creative software capability, multi-format production across digital/print/video, but no formal license inventory, no capability matrix, no 3D tools, and AI tools undocumented. ---

AUTOMATION & INDUSTRIALIZATION

1.90 — Intermediate

Q#	Topic	Score	Level
33	Workflow Automation Tools	2	Intermediate
34	Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level	2	Intermediate
35	Level of Templatisation of Online Assets	2	Intermediate
36	Ability to Automate the Personalisation of Creative Assets	2	Intermediate
37	Ability to Automate the Distribution of Creative Assets	2	Intermediate
38	Level of Automation of the Validation, Production, Distribution Workflow	2	Intermediate
39	Automated Production Workflows	2	Intermediate
40	Template and Standardisation Systems	2	Intermediate
41	Batch Processing Capabilities	2	Intermediate
42	Quality Control Automation	1	Learner

Q33 2 Intermediate

Workflow Automation Tools

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Obramax Brazil's core workflow automation tool is Trello, used for task tracking, activity management, and approvals. Insider functions as a CDP and CMS, delivering fully automated email marketing (rules and triggers), web personalisation, push notifications, and product recommendations via API-connected catalog data. Generative AI is in active use for content creation — reducing production time from 2 hours to under 40 minutes. Figma is used for design production, including a bulk asset-export function for scaling campaign assets. A DCO tool (Tracto) was trialled but abandoned due to bugs. No DAM, no product feed management platform, no workflow orchestration platforms (Make.com, 8n8), and no automated compliance tools are in use. The Automation & Industrialization pillar was formally self-assessed by the BU at 1.7 (Intermediate) in the interview questionnaire. The workflow is confirmed as predominantly manual at the production-to-channel stage. Evidence from the interview questionnaire explicitly states: "SLA 1 week — 100% manually." Round 2 score remains 2 (Intermediate), reflecting genuine partial automation in CRM/email/web with a large manual gap in creative production and distribution. ---

Q34 2 Intermediate

Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 evidence substantially upgrades understanding of offline templatisation at Oramax Brazil. The interview questionnaire confirms that Merchan (in-store communication) assets are produced using a dedicated system called Pricefy. Offer Sheet PDFs are template-based — Juliana Piccolotto explicitly confirmed "they cannot create something from the scratch; we have on our brand book a few templates." The Governance SLA documents Merchan Estático and Merchan Animado as formal task categories with 1-day SLA and Alta (high) priority. An in-store visual communication checklist system is being actively implemented (online form for staff verification at every store visit). The offline template approach is functional and brand-anchored but underdocumented: no central template library, no partner/team access documentation, and the brand book templates are described as "not so very well documented." Score remains 2 (Intermediate): templates demonstrably exist and are in use, but the system lacks the library structure, accessibility documentation, and partner-enablement evidence required for Level 3. ---

Q35 2 Intermediate

Level of Templatisation of Online Assets

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 evidence confirms and substantially enriches the online templatisation picture. The BU explicitly confirms: email templates exist in Insider; display assets are ready-to-use in Figma; a creative guide (brand book) governs all asset creation. Critically, the questionnaire response reveals the scale of template-based production: a single OPECOM campaign cycle produces approximately 1,074 assets from templates — 119 Main KV assets, 280 category KV assets (with A/B variations), and 675 Product & Price KV assets. Despite this volume, the template system is not formally documented as a library, has no catalog, and no cost-per-asset tracking. No DCO platform is operational. A Figma-based bulk export capability is visible in the questionnaire screenshot. The BU self-assessed the pillar at 1.7 (Intermediate). Score 2 is confirmed with an upward pressure: the evidence of 1,074 template-derived assets per OPECOM cycle is a meaningful indicator of template-based production at scale, but the absence of formal documentation, a template catalog, and systematic quality tracking prevents a score of 3. ---

Q36 2 Intermediate

Ability to Automate the Personalisation of Creative Assets

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 evidence provides direct, authoritative answers on personalisation automation from both the interview transcript and the written questionnaire. Insider is confirmed as a CDP with API-connected product catalog feeding personalisation across web journeys, email, push notifications, product recommendations, and CRM targeting. 50+ segmentation rules are actively managed with A/B testing against control groups tracked via a BI dashboard. Retargeting campaigns (FREQUENCIA DE COMPRA, CARRINHO ABANDONADO) trigger behavioral personalisation via the same CDP layer. Product data flows to Meta Ads, Google Ads, and TikTok via API. Crucially, the questionnaire confirms: "Insider is a tool and a CDP, so we have catalog connect by API there (+ meta ads, google, tiktok)." However, display creative personalisation is absent — the DCO layer (Tracto) was trialled and abandoned, and no dynamic creative is generated for display formats. The BU's personalisation automation is deep in CRM/web/email but absent at the creative asset level for display and social formats. Score 2 is confirmed. ---

Q37 2 Intermediate**Ability to Automate the Distribution of Creative Assets**

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 provides a definitive, BU-confirmed answer on distribution automation. The questionnaire states explicitly: "Product via API and creative manually." This single statement encapsulates the entire distribution picture. Insider fully automates email and push notification distribution — "all the e-mails are automated" via the CDP. Product data flows automatically to Meta Ads, Google Ads, and TikTok via API, enabling product-level dynamic distribution on these platforms. However, creative assets (display banners, social posts, video) are uploaded manually to each platform. There is no DAM, no central distribution system, no scheduler beyond platform-native tools, and no automated push from a central library to channels. The Round 1 score of 1 (Learner) requires revision upward because the email/CRM distribution via Insider is genuine, substantive, and fully automated — this is more than the minimal evidence found in Round 1. Score 2 (Intermediate) is appropriate: meaningful automated distribution in one domain (email/CRM) against a backdrop of manual creative distribution for all other formats. ---

Q38 2 Intermediate**Level of Automation of the Validation, Production, Distribution Workflow**

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 provides definitive, BU-confirmed answers on the end-to-end workflow. The questionnaire asks directly: "What systems or handoffs connect approval, production, and distribution? Is there any automated flow from approved asset to channel?" The BU answer is unambiguous: **"Manually."** The Gemini interview notes confirm: "end-to-end creative workflow is completely disconnected." However, the full evidence picture is more nuanced than Round 1 captured. There are two genuine automated pipeline segments: (1) Insider's approval-to-distribution loop for email — once an email journey is configured and live, triggered sending is fully automated from Trello-approved content to Insider distribution with no further manual intervention; (2) the product catalog API pipeline from Insider to Meta/Google/TikTok, which does not require manual distribution step. Against this backdrop, the main creative production pipeline — brief → design in Figma/Adobe → Trello approval → manual upload to each channel — remains 100% manual with a 1-week SLA. Round 1 scored this at 1 (Learner), attributing no workflow integration. Round 2 justifies a revision to 2 (Intermediate): the email automation creates a genuine, if narrow, integrated validation-production-distribution pipeline. The creative production pipeline remains disconnected and manual throughout. ---

Q39 2 Intermediate**Automated Production Workflows**

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 provides authoritative, BU-confirmed data on production workflow automation. The clearest statement in the questionnaire is: **"SLA 1 week — 100% manually."** This describes the creative asset production workflow from brief receipt to final channel-ready asset. It is the definitive answer for the dominant production pipeline at Obramax Brazil. However, Round 2 also adds significant nuance absent from Round 1: Insider's email and push notification production is fully automated (rules, triggers, journeys); GenAI has demonstrably compressed content production time by ~67% (from 2 hours to under 40 minutes); the Figma display library is "ready to use" with bulk export capability; and approximately 1,074 assets per OPECOM are produced from templates. Tracto (DCO) was trialed and abandoned due to bugs. Round 1 score of 2 (Intermediate) is confirmed — the Insider CRM production pipeline is genuinely automated, and the template-based approach at scale represents partial production automation, but the core creative pipeline from concept to delivery remains entirely manual. ---

Q40 2 Intermediate

Template and Standardisation Systems

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 provides the clearest picture yet of Oramax Brazil's template and standardisation systems. The questionnaire directly asks about template and standardisation systems; the BU answer is: **"No."** This single-word answer refers to the absence of a formal, documented template library or standardisation system — not to the absence of templates altogether. Cross-referencing with the rest of the questionnaire and interview transcript reveals a more complete picture: Insider email templates are confirmed; Figma display templates are "ready to use"; the brand book enforces a no-from-scratch creation rule; approximately 1,074 assets per OPECOM cycle are produced from templates; Pricefy handles in-store Merch production; and Fontfabric Nexa provides typography standardisation. The "No" answer reflects the BU's own awareness that these templates are not organised into a formal, accessible library — they are working assets distributed across Figma files and the brand book, not a documented standardisation system. Round 1 score of 2 (Intermediate) is confirmed. The BU has substantive template usage at scale but no formal library, no template catalog, no documented access system, and no measurement of template efficiency. ---

Q41 2 Intermediate

Batch Processing Capabilities

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 provides specific, BU-confirmed data on batch processing capability — the most complete evidence available for this question. The questionnaire states directly: **"Figma but to plug to Insider is manually."** This is the definitive statement on batch processing: Figma enables batch design production and export, but the connection from Figma output to channel (including Insider) requires manual steps. Round 2 adds critical quantitative context absent from Round 1: approximately 1,074 assets are produced per OPECOM commercial cycle from Figma templates — 119 Main KV, 280 Category KV (with A/B variations), and 675 Product & Price KV. Insider handles email and push notifications in genuine batch mode — rules, triggers, and journeys send to segmented audiences at scale without manual intervention per send. The product catalog API distributes product data automatically to Meta Ads, Google Ads, and TikTok in batch. Against this, Tracto (DCO) was abandoned; no feed-based batch processing exists; and each creative asset upload to ad platforms is a separate manual action. Round 1 score of 2 (Intermediate) is confirmed with a more evidence-grounded rationale. ---

Q42 1 Learner

Quality Control Automation

Score: 1 (Learner) Round 2 provides definitive, BU-confirmed data on quality control automation. The questionnaire directly asks about QC automation; the BU answer is unambiguous: **"No."** This is the clearest possible confirmation that no automated quality control systems are in place at Oramax Brazil. The interview transcript corroborates: no CreativeX, no automated compliance tools, no dedicated QA team. Quality control is conducted manually by team members referencing the brand book and Governance SLA requirements. Approval is managed in Trello — a human-operated task system, not an automated compliance gate. The one partial indicator of quality validation is the in-store visual communication checklist being implemented (a digital form for staff to verify store-level communication consistency), but this is an operational checklist tool, not a creative QC automation system. The Governance SLA and brand book exist as reference standards for manual compliance checking. Round 1 score of 1 (Learner) is confirmed. There are no automated QC systems; all quality validation is human-directed. ---

INNOVATION

1.86 — Intermediate

Q#	Topic	Score	Level
43	GenAI adoption in content production	2	Intermediate
44	Emerging formats and channels	1	Learner
45	Recurrence of creative Test & Learn	2	Intermediate
46	Emerging technology adoption	2	Intermediate
47	Creative experimentation processes	2	Intermediate
48	Innovation pipeline management	2	Intermediate
49	Future capability planning	2	Intermediate

Q43 2 Intermediate

GenAI adoption in content production

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Ogramax Brazil demonstrates **active but undocumented GenAI adoption** for content production. The interview (March 2026) confirms GenAI is being used for image and text generation, reducing production time from approximately 2 hours to under 40 minutes. The team uses AI for blog posts, social media copy, and image creation — with AI-generated images further manipulated to manage legal/rights concerns. An AI agent for SEO is also in use. However, the GenAI Policy folder is empty, no formal guidelines or usage framework exists, and the specific tools are unconfirmed (possibly Gemini; not reflected in paid tool spend per economic data). The questionnaire states "zero documented adoption of Generative AI tools," confirming the informal nature of current use. **Confidence: High.** ---

Q44 1 Learner

Emerging formats and channels

Score: 1 (Learner) Ogramax Brazil operates with **standard, established formats** and shows **no systematic exploration of emerging formats or channels**. The team produces content for Facebook, Instagram, and YouTube — all mature platforms. The interview indicates a 2026 focus that remains "very transactional" with agencies. Influencer expansion (noted in the questionnaire) represents a channel strategy shift but is not an emerging format. No AR/VR, interactive content, new social video styles (Reels-first strategy, TikTok), or experimental format tests are documented. The questionnaire self-assesses INNOVATION at 1.3 (LEARNING), consistent with a Score 1 here. **Confidence: High.** ---

Q45 2 Intermediate

Recurrence of creative Test & Learn

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Oramax Brazil demonstrates **recurring campaign-level A/B testing with documented insights**, confirmed by the "Performance dos Criativos - Feiras OPECOM 2026" report. This 19-page document covers two consecutive OPECOM campaigns (January 2026 and February–March 2026) and contains structured A/B tests comparing creative approaches: (1) commercial KV vs pain-point KV across Meta and Google; (2) date/validity inclusion vs no-date on Meta. CTR data is broken down by platform and by region (praça), and key insights are documented with explicit carry-forward recommendations for the next campaign. A monthly briefing/debriefing ritual also exists. However, the questionnaire self-reports: "So far all the tests are manually and not documented" — the OPECOM report appears to be an exception or newer practice rather than a fully embedded, systematic process. No formal Test & Learn framework or experiment log exists. **Confidence: High.** ---

Q46 2 Intermediate

Emerging technology adoption

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Oramax Brazil demonstrates **practical emerging technology adoption** through the informal but active use of GenAI tools, AI agents (SEO), and the evaluation of Tracto for dynamic creative optimisation (DCO). Insider is used as a sophisticated CDP for personalisation. The team evaluated Tracto DCO and abandoned it due to bugs — showing an evaluation process exists even if undocumented. However, the Tech Evaluation Process folder remains empty, no formal evaluation framework or horizon-scanning process is documented, and adoption is practitioner-driven rather than governed. The questionnaire self-assesses INNOVATION at 1.3 (LEARNING), suggesting the team undervalues its own adoption activity. **Confidence: Medium.** ---

Q47 2 Intermediate

Creative experimentation processes

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Oramax Brazil demonstrates **structured campaign-level creative experimentation** confirmed by the "Performance dos Criativos - Feiras OPECOM 2026" report. This document shows real creative hypothesis testing — comparing commercial KV vs pain-point KV, and testing date/validity inclusion as a creative variable — with quantitative CTR results across platforms and regions. Insights are documented and applied forward to the next campaign. The interview also confirms a monthly briefing/debriefing ritual and informal experimentation with tone, format, and CTA variations. However, the questionnaire self-reports tests as "manually and not documented," and no formal experiment playbook, governance framework, or learnings library exists. Experimentation is practitioner-driven and campaign-specific, not systematically embedded. **Confidence: High.** ---

Q48 2 Intermediate

Innovation pipeline management

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Oramax Brazil demonstrates **structured innovation planning with OKR-aligned project management** but without a formal innovation pipeline framework. The questionnaire reveals that annual planning is aligned with company OKRs and broken into a portfolio of projects monitored bi-weekly by responsible owners. The 2026–2028 Omncommerce strategy (Estratégia e Objetivos 2026-2028 Omncommerce - EN.pptx) and BCap capability roadmap (BCap - OMNI Oramax.png) provide strategic framing. However, there is no formal innovation backlog, no stage-gate process, and no ideation-to-implementation pipeline documented. Projects are managed within the OKR framework rather than through dedicated innovation pipeline management. **Confidence: High.** ---

Q49 2 Intermediate

Future capability planning

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Obramax Brazil demonstrates **structured future capability planning** through the BCap - OMNI Obramax capability roadmap, the 2026–2028 Omnicommerce strategy, and OKR-aligned annual planning with bi-weekly project monitoring. The interview confirms CCDP (Customer/Content Data Platform) integration is planned for the coming year — a concrete near-term capability investment. However, no formal gap analysis or documented investment priorities for capabilities are evidenced. Planning is multi-year and OKR-aligned but lacks the explicit capability gap identification and prioritised investment framework required for a higher score. **Confidence: High.** ---

ORGANISATION

1.90 — Intermediate

Q#	Topic	Score	Level
50	Availability of guidelines: standards, checklists, practical sheets	2	Intermediate
51	Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem	2	Intermediate
52	Maturity of team roles and structure	2	Intermediate
53	Skill development programs	2	Intermediate
54	BU/Central collaboration rituals	2	Intermediate
55	Level of availability of strategic and operational skills	2	Intermediate
56	Knowledge management & documentation	1	Learner
57	Agency management & ways of working	2	Intermediate
58	Onboarding & training processes	2	Intermediate
59	Change management capabilities	2	Intermediate

Q50 2 Intermediate

Availability of guidelines: standards, checklists, practical sheets

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Obramax Brazil holds a meaningful set of guidelines — Brandbook, Fontfabric Nexa typography, Governance SLA, and template libraries in Figma — and the interview confirms that brand guidelines are actively used (designers follow the brandbook; "they cannot create something from scratch"). However, formal campaign-level checklists and playbooks remain absent. The one operative checklist confirmed by interview is the newly implemented in-store visual communication checklist (an online form for store teams). The teams copy and evolve practices rather than following documented playbooks. Questionnaire annotations confirm two practitioner-level documents are filed on Drive: "Store open" and "Opecom" checklists, all stored at Drive. No formal campaign-launch playbook, no creative approval checklist, no accessibility documentation for guidelines. Score remains 2 (Intermediate): guidelines exist and are actively used, but coverage is incomplete and accessibility is drive-based rather than structured. ---

Q51 2 Intermediate

Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 evidence materially enriches the partner picture. The interview and annotated questionnaire reveal a differentiated partner ecosystem — not simply one undifferentiated agency block. Named partners include: liveSEO (SEO strategy — described as strategic), Mestiça (offline/OOH — transactional), Keepgo (influencer management for store openings — transactional), a production/shoot agency (transactional), and platform vendors Insider (CDP, strategic-level integration) plus the broader Adobe/Figma/Trello stack. One emerging ambition is a new agency engagement aimed at connecting three pillars (social media, offline awareness, and performance) into a 360-degree communications strategy. However, the interviewee explicitly confirms: "so far from what we have in 2026 very transactional." No partner roster document, no formal ways-of-working, no shared KPIs documented. The differentiation between strategic and transactional agency relationships is practitioner knowledge, not documented policy. Score remains 2 (Intermediate) but confidence rises. ---

Q52 2 Intermediate

Maturity of team roles and structure

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 evidence substantially updates the team structure picture. The interview confirms a larger and more functionally differentiated team than Round 1 assessed: beyond the 7 FTEs in content/design, there are an additional 5 people in paid media and SEO (approximately 12 total in the content ecosystem). Roles are informally but clearly defined: one person for social media / brand content, one for offline/awareness, one for performance/SEO — each with clear domain ownership. The questionnaire annotation confirms HR-documented mission statements for every role at Oramax: "All missions at Oramax has a missions documented by HR." OBM Estrutura Omncommerce 2025 provides the org chart. Capability Roadmap (BCap) shows business-level capability framing. However, the team lacks detailed role descriptions for creative/production functions beyond HR mission statements, no interface map between functions, and no capacity planning framework. Score moves to a solid 2 with higher confidence. ---

Q53 2 Intermediate

Skill development programs

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 evidence substantially upgrades the training picture. "Universidade Oramax" — a structured internal learning platform — is confirmed by the Training catalogue screenshots. The platform is visible in the screenshots as a formatted LMS with three schools (Escola de Pessoas, Escola de Produtos, Escola de Processos) and mandatory training modules tracked with completion percentages. The training matrix image (Training catalogue-1.png) shows a tracking spreadsheet with named employees, area, module completion status, and percentage across mandatory modules (Integração 96%, Nossa Cultura 79%, Liderança 93%, Habilidades para Líderes 75%, Partilha All ADEO 65%, Cibersegurança 92%, Regras de Ouro 94%, Política SSO 92%, Código de Conduta Ética 86%). This confirms that Oramax has an active, tracked corporate training platform. The interview additionally mentions AI use for HR training purposes. However, the training catalogue is primarily corporate/compliance-focused; no specific creative production or marketing skills training modules are visible in the evidence. Score is 2 (Intermediate): formal training infrastructure exists with tracking, but content skews to corporate rather than production-specific development. ---

Q54 2 Intermediate

BU/Central collaboration rituals

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 evidence materially upgrades this question. The annotated questionnaire contains a direct Oramax answer: "Are there well-defined and consistent rituals for collaboration between central and BU teams? YES." This is a significant reversal from Round 1's score of 1. However, the interview provides important context that tempers the score: the BU-level rituals confirmed are primarily intra-BU (the monthly performance review), and the central/BU collaboration referenced relates to ADEO group-level alignment — described only in general terms, not with a documented ritual calendar or formal protocol. The OKR/annual plan alignment with company-level goals is confirmed. Critically, Oramax does not use the group DAM (ADEO's system), has no folder in the global DAM, and does not participate in group content sharing. Score rises from 1 to 2: partial central/BU collaboration rituals confirmed but not documented systematically; the questionnaire "YES" answer reflects self-assessed alignment rather than a verified documented process. Confidence: Medium-High. ---

Q55 2 Intermediate**Level of availability of strategic and operational skills**

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 evidence confirms a more complete and capable team than Round 1 assessed. Total content ecosystem is approximately 12 FTEs: 3 designers, 3 content creators, 4 paid media specialists, 2 SEO specialists — covering a broad operational range. Interview reveals impressive operational capability: GenAI used to reduce content production from 2 hours to under 40 minutes; Insider CDP managed with 50 segmentation rules and a BI dashboard; SEO and paid media both internalized; Brand Lift studies conducted with Google (42% relative lift at Rio de Janeiro store opening). Strategic skills are evidenced by the 2026-2028 Omnicommerce strategy, annual OKR planning, and capability roadmap. However, strategic coordination remains a gap — Juliana explicitly notes that neither manager has taken ownership of strategy; she carries the strategic function alone. No skills matrix, no documented gap analysis, no individual development plans. Score remains 2 (Intermediate) with materially higher confidence. ---

Q56 1 Learner**Knowledge management & documentation**

Score: 1 (Learner) Round 2 evidence reveals that Obramax Brazil has no formal knowledge management system and is the only BU in the ADEO group not using the group DAM (DAMEO). Files are distributed across Google Drive with no confirmed central taxonomy — the questionnaire annotation references "Store open / Opecom / All stored at Drive" as the current approach, and the interview confirms Juliana is unaware of the group DAM entirely. The Governance SLA document provides operational task definitions, and the Universidade Obramax LMS offers a knowledge base section (ADEO Knowledge Base embedded within the LMS platform), but these are isolated artefacts rather than a coherent knowledge management strategy. BCap and Strategy 2026-2028 represent documented strategic knowledge. No lessons-learned repository, no post-campaign retrospective process, no content library, and no centralised documentation repository for production processes. Score is 1 (Learner): knowledge management is entirely informal and undocumented, relying on individual practitioner memory and Drive-based file storage without taxonomy or governance. Confidence: High. ---

Q57 2 Intermediate**Agency management & ways of working**

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 evidence provides the first detailed picture of how Obramax manages its agency ecosystem. The interview and questionnaire together confirm a differentiated but informally managed model: named agencies are distinguished as strategic (liveSEO) versus transactional (Mestiça, Keepgo, production/shoot agency), Trello is used to track activities and approvals with agencies, and the briefing process is confirmed for campaign delivery. However, the interviewee explicitly characterises the current model as "very transactional" in 2026, and no formal ways-of-working documents, service level agreements, or shared KPIs have been found. A 360-strategy agency integration is described as an aspiration. The RACI_Governance folder is empty. Score is 2 (Intermediate): agency relationships function and are differentiated, but management is informal and briefing-led rather than governed by documented frameworks. Confidence: High. ---

Q58 2 Intermediate

Onboarding & training processes

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 evidence reveals a strong corporate onboarding infrastructure — Universidade Oramax LMS confirms an Integração (onboarding) module at 96% completion (3:30 hours), and the questionnaire annotation confirms HR-documented mission statements for every role at Oramax. The interview provides an important data point: when Juliana joined, role clarity was immediate — "it was very clear what was the mission of each one" (01:02:48). This validates that corporate onboarding effectively communicates role purpose. However, production-specific onboarding — tool access, production workflows, briefing conventions, Trello board setup, Figma template usage — is not confirmed as part of any documented process. No onboarding checklist for content/design/SEO/paid media roles was found. English fluency is noted as a potential friction point for accessing ADEO group resources. The Integração module (3:30h corporate, 96% complete) is a genuine onboarding asset; what is absent is the production and craft dimension. Score is 2 (Intermediate): corporate onboarding is structured and active; role-specific production onboarding is informal. Confidence: High. ---

Q59 2 Intermediate

Change management capabilities

Score: 2 (Intermediate) Round 2 evidence materially upgrades this question from Round 1's score of 1. The change_management_framework folder remains empty — no formal change methodology exists. However, the annotated questionnaire contains a direct and substantive answer to the change management question: "We have a plan that is rolled out annually and is aligned with the company's OKRs and defined initiatives. These initiatives are broken down into a portfolio of projects, monitored bi-weekly by the responsible." The interview corroborates this with a practical account of how operational changes are communicated: formal email or meeting with explanatory material. Additionally, the successful adoption of AI tools (reducing content production from 2 hours to under 40 minutes), the Insider CDP platform integration (50 segmentation rules, automated journeys), and the fact that paid media and SEO were both internalised within the current team represent significant organisational changes that have been managed and adopted effectively — even without a formal framework. The score rises from 1 to 2 (Intermediate): change happens, is anchored to OKR planning, and is communicated formally; but no change management methodology, adoption KPIs, or lessons-learned capture exists. Confidence: Medium-High. ---

Strengths

OMNICHANNEL

Q1: Brand promise consistency across channels

Brand Promise as Organising Principle: "Obra é compromisso" anchors all content across all channels

Q1: Brand promise consistency across channels

Asset Volume at Scale: ~1,074 assets/OPECOM ensures brand promise delivered at high volume

Q1: Brand promise consistency across channels

YouTube Dual Strategy: Two channels (institutional + professional) extending brand promise to different audiences

Q1: Brand promise consistency across channels

Campaign A/B Testing: Performance data validates brand messaging effectiveness

Q1: Brand promise consistency across channels

Monthly Review Ritual: Structural mechanism for brand consistency assurance ---

Q2: Visual and typographic consistency

Comprehensive Brandbook: Logo variants, colours, typography, photography, grafismos, grids — complete visual system

Q2: Visual and typographic consistency

Fontfabric Investment: €176,930 typography licensing demonstrates commitment to visual consistency

Q2: Visual and typographic consistency

Figma Design System: Template-driven production for display assets enforces visual standards at scale

Q2: Visual and typographic consistency

Adobe Creative Suite: €141,817 investment supports professional visual production

Q2: Visual and typographic consistency

Performance Validation: Visual format decisions informed by CTR data across format variants ---

Q3: Channel and format adaptation

Scale of Adaptation: ~1,074 assets/OPECOM across all channels — industrial-scale adaptation

Q3: Channel and format adaptation

Insider Automation: Email + web personalisation with Meta/Google/TikTok API integration

Q3: Channel and format adaptation

A/B Testing by Format: Performance data guides adaptation decisions per platform

Q3: Channel and format adaptation

GenAI Adoption: Content production acceleration (2hrs → <40min) for blog/social

Q3: Channel and format adaptation

Dual YouTube Strategy: Content adapted to institutional vs professional audiences ---

Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines

Platform-Native Dimensions: Retargeting uses IAB, Google Ads, Meta Business-compliant sizes

Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines

Figma Spec-Driven Templates: Platform specifications built into design system templates

Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines

Scale at Compliance: R\$9.25M successfully delivered across 8+ platforms — compliance validated by delivery

Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines

Trello Approval Workflow: Structured approval gate before campaign launch

Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines

Format Performance Data: CTR by format dimension enables compliance-informed creative decisions ---

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

Performance-Informed Design: CTR data by format dimension enables data-driven design efficiency decisions

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

Responsive Email: Viewport meta, media queries, adapt-img — mobile-first email design

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

GenAI Adoption: Production time reduction 2hrs → <40min for blog/social

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

Figma Design System: Template-driven programmatic production for efficiency at scale

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

Format Variety: Vertical (Stories/TikTok), square (Feed), IAB (programmatic), responsive (email) ---

Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)

OPECOM Architecture: Single Master KV cascaded to 1,074 assets ensures narrative consistency by design

Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)

Insider CDP: Cross-channel data synchronisation via API to Meta, Google, TikTok

Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)

A/B Narrative Testing: Performance validation of narrative elements (urgency triggers)

Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)

Monthly Briefing/Debriefing: Structural process for narrative alignment pre/post campaign

Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)

Funnel Narrative: Retargeting campaigns (FREQUENCIA, CARRINHO) provide stage-specific narrative continuity ---

Q7: Cross-channel content consistency

Governance SLA Table: 7 task categories with defined SLAs and responsible parties

Q7: Cross-channel content consistency

Trello Workflow: Structured approval process before publication

Q7: Cross-channel content consistency

Clear Ownership: One responsible person per channel pillar — accountability for consistency

Q7: Cross-channel content consistency

Insider Automation: Automated email and web personalisation with cross-channel data sync

Q7: Cross-channel content consistency

Monthly Review Ritual: Structural mechanism for cross-team alignment and consistency check ---

Q8: Multi-format production capabilities

Volume at Scale: ~11,800–12,900 assets/year across 6 format types — genuine multi-format production capability

Q8: Multi-format production capabilities

Governance Coverage: Governance SLA table covers all active formats with defined SLAs and responsible parties

Q8: Multi-format production capabilities

YouTube Dual-Channel: Two channels with 655K + 312K subscribers — long-form video capability at scale

Q8: Multi-format production capabilities

GenAI Adoption: Production efficiency gain (2hrs → <40min) for blog and social

Q8: Multi-format production capabilities

Production Investment: €2.7M production spend, 7 FTEs, €329k tools ---

Q9: Maturity of paid vs organic

Multi-platform paid presence: Active across META, Google, Insider CDP, Voxus, Blue Ads — broad paid media footprint

Q9: Maturity of paid vs organic

Brand lift measurement: Five regional studies measuring paid campaign impact (Dec 2024)

Q9: Maturity of paid vs organic

CPC/CPM tracking: Standard paid performance metrics monitored

Q9: Maturity of paid vs organic

CDP-driven personalisation: Insider CDP enables targeted web push (paid-adjacent personalised channel)

Q9: Maturity of paid vs organic

OPECOM performance tracking: Monthly creative performance reports across paid formats ---

CLIENT CENTRICITY

Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise

External Validation: Brand Lift confirms PRO and Consumer needs alignment

Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise

Promise–Attribute Match: Price, quality, stock, variety — all validated as preference drivers

Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise

Top of Mind #1: PROs post-campaign — highest brand consideration achieved

Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise

Ongoing Mechanisms: Round tables, NPS, store opening research

Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise

PRO Persona Depth: Lifestyle knowledge ("soccer, music, age") ---

Q11: Availability and level of precision of the audiences and personas addressed

1. Six Personas Documented ■: Evidence: `OUR CUSTOMERS_personas.pptx`, Interview Six customer personas are documented and operationally applied through the OPECOM content calendar. Personas guide editorial allocation (PRO majority, consumer, volume buyers) and channel communication style. **Level: ■** Personas documented and applied

Q11: Availability and level of precision of the audiences and personas addressed

2. CDP Operational Segmentation ■: Evidence: Interview, Insider CDP Insider CDP operates with 50 segmentation rules providing operational audience precision for CRM, email triggers, and personalised journeys. CDP audiences are available and active. **Level: ■** Operational CDP segmentation available

Q11: Availability and level of precision of the audiences and personas addressed

3. Personas Outdated — Not Recently Reviewed ■: Evidence: Interview The 6 personas were established 10 years ago and have never been formally reviewed: "We have the CJM, but we don't have yet the JM by media and persona." No recent primary research to validate or refresh persona definitions. **Level: ■** Persona documentation lacks recency and precision depth ---

Q12: Level of mastery of "shopper" needs by persona

1. Persona-Level Content Allocation — Basic Needs Awareness ■: Evidence: Interview, OPECOM table OPECOM content calendar allocates editorial content by persona (PRO majority, consumer, volume buyers), confirming that persona-level shopper need differences inform content mix decisions at a basic level. **Level: ■** Persona-level awareness applied to content allocation

Q12: Level of mastery of "shopper" needs by persona

2. Shopper Journey Not Formalised ■: Evidence: Interview Interview explicitly confirms the absence of a formal shopper journey model per persona: "We have the CJM, but we don't have yet the JM by media and persona." Shopper need understanding is practitioner knowledge rather than documented strategic insight. **Level:** ■ No formal shopper journey per persona

Q12: Level of mastery of "shopper" needs by persona

3. Personas Underpinned by Outdated Definitions ■: Evidence: Interview, `OUR CUSTOMERS_personas.pptx` The 6 personas are 10 years old and have not been validated against current transaction or primary research data. Shopper need assumptions may not reflect the current customer base. **Level:** ■ Shopper need documentation lacks data validation ---

Q13: Level of mastery of media uses of persona

1. Channel-Persona Differentiation Practised ■: Evidence: Interview Interview confirms practiced channel-persona matching: Instagram used for consumer communication, YouTube used for PRO content. The team applies a channel-persona matrix informally. **Level:** ■ Channel differentiation applied operationally

Q13: Level of mastery of media uses of persona

2. Media-Use Matrix Not Documented ■: Evidence: Interview The channel-persona matrix is referenced in interview but not documented: "we have like a matrix" — qualifying the documentation as informal. No formal channel preference profiles per persona exist. **Level:** ■ Media-use understanding not formalised

Q13: Level of mastery of media uses of persona

3. CJM by Media/Persona Absent ■: Evidence: Interview The interview explicitly confirms the customer journey model by media and persona is not yet built: "We have the CJM, but we don't have yet the JM by media and persona." Future plan confirmed by 2026–2028 omni strategy but not yet in place. **Level:** ■ Formal media-persona journey model absent ---

Q14: Relevance of formats/Media by persona

1. Channel-Level Format Differentiation ■: Evidence: Social media examples, interview OPECOM drives distinct formats per channel: Instagram Stories (short-form consumer), Facebook promotional posts (consumer conversion), YouTube instructional content (PRO), display banners (multi-format paid). Format adaptation at channel level is operationally embedded. **Level:** ■ Channel-level format differentiation practised

Q14: Relevance of formats/Media by persona

2. CDP Personalised Formats ■: Evidence: Insider CDP Insider CDP delivers segment-personalised push notifications and emails — format-level personalisation through automated triggers for active CRM audiences. Personalised format delivery is operationally confirmed. **Level:** ■ CDP-driven personalised format delivery in CRM/push channels

Q14: Relevance of formats/Media by persona

3. No Per-Persona Format Strategy Document ■: Evidence: Interview Format choices are channel-driven and operationally practiced, but no formal per-persona format strategy exists. The interview confirms the undocumented nature of the channel-persona matrix. No A/B testing of formats per persona documented. **Level:** ■ Persona-specific format strategy not formalised ---

Q15: Level of content personalisation

1. Insider CDP — Individual-Level CRM Personalisation ■: Evidence: Interview Insider CDP delivers individual-level personalisation in CRM: 50 segmentation rules, 100% automated email triggers based on individual behaviour (cart abandonment, product views, purchase triggers), personalised product recommendations, and automated customer journeys. Genuine individual-level content in CRM. **Level:** ■ Individual-level personalisation confirmed in CRM/owned channel

Q15: Level of content personalisation

2. Paid Creative — Manual, No DCO ■: Evidence: Interview, Economic Analysis Paid creative is manually produced. The DCO tool (Tracto) was evaluated and then abandoned due to implementation challenges. No Dynamic Creative Optimisation in paid channels means paid content is at audience/segment level at best, not individual. **Level: ■** Paid creative not personalised — DCO absent

Q15: Level of content personalisation

3. No Cross-Channel Personalisation Framework ■: Evidence: Interview No cross-channel personalisation orchestration exists — CRM and paid operate independently. Interview confirms no unified personalisation framework connecting CDP insights to paid content creation. **Level: ■** Cross-channel personalisation beyond CRM not in place ---

Q16: Target customer representation in content

Customer Touchpoints: Annual round table (300+ customers), NPS surveys

Q16: Target customer representation in content

Market Research: Pre/post brand lift studies in multiple markets

Q16: Target customer representation in content

Audience Segmentation: Insider platform with 50 segmentation rules; paid media targeting

Q16: Target customer representation in content

Content Volume: ~1,074 assets per OPECOM structured around audience/product categories ---

MEASUREMENT

Q17: Brand tracking (brand metrics, quarterly review)

Comprehensive Paid Media Dashboard: Full channel breakdown Jan–Nov 2025

Q17: Brand tracking (brand metrics, quarterly review)

Social Media Metrics: Instagram, YouTube tracked with engagement and retention rates

Q17: Brand tracking (brand metrics, quarterly review)

Brand Lift Studies: Multiple waves and markets; systematic pre/post methodology

Q17: Brand tracking (brand metrics, quarterly review)

Monthly Cadence: Regular performance review meeting with KPI dashboards

Q17: Brand tracking (brand metrics, quarterly review)

Sentiment Tracking: Sentimentalization dashboard referenced ---

Q18: Pre-test / post-test systematisation

Formal Post-Campaign Document: "Análise dos KVs" is a structured creative performance analysis

Q18: Pre-test / post-test systematisation

Documented A/B Test Results: Commercial vs pain-point; date vs no-date — with CTR and session data

Q18: Pre-test / post-test systematisation

Monthly Debriefing: Regular performance review cadence with structured presentation slots

Q18: Pre-test / post-test systematisation

Actionable Insights: "O que foi bom?" and "Oportunidades" sections translate data into strategic conclusions

Q18: Pre-test / post-test systematisation

Insider A/B Testing: Web-based CRO testing capability ---

Q19: Capacity to analyse the performance of created assets (creative intelligence)

Formal Creative Intelligence Document: "Análise dos KVs" with explicit creative element analysis objective

Q19: Capacity to analyse the performance of created assets (creative intelligence)

Documented A/B Tests: Two controlled tests with quantified CTR and session results

Q19: Capacity to analyse the performance of created assets (creative intelligence)

Actionable Insight Sections: "O que foi bom?" and "Oportunidades" — structured learning capture

Q19: Capacity to analyse the performance of created assets (creative intelligence)

Regional Analysis: Performance broken down by market/praga

Q19: Capacity to analyse the performance of created assets (creative intelligence)

Monthly Application Cadence: Briefing/debriefing links insights to next content cycle

Q19: Capacity to analyse the performance of created assets (creative intelligence)

Dual Testing Capability: Paid media A/B testing + Insider CRO testing ---

Q20: Mastery of brand lift studies

Multiple Studies: At least 3 accessible PDF reports + additional referenced studies

Q20: Mastery of brand lift studies

Formal Methodology: Pre/post quantitative survey; two delivery modes (online, in-person)

Q20: Mastery of brand lift studies

Core Metrics: Awareness (spontaneous + aided), preference, attribute connection

Q20: Mastery of brand lift studies

Outstanding Result: 42% relative lift — Google case study

Q20: Mastery of brand lift studies

Multi-market Scope: Rio de Janeiro, Londrina, and additional markets

Q20: Mastery of brand lift studies

Longitudinal Tracking: RJ multi-wave tracking over time ---

Q21: Monitoring creative engagement (VTR, scroll depth, etc.)

VTR Confirmed: YouTube retention tracked — 34% (Obra e Compromisso) and 80% (Obramax channel) — specific values documented

Q21: Monitoring creative engagement (VTR, scroll depth, etc.)

Scroll Depth Confirmed: Explicitly confirmed in interview

Q21: Monitoring creative engagement (VTR, scroll depth, etc.)

Comprehensive Paid Media Dashboard: CTR, CPC, CPM, sessions, conversion across all channels

Q21: Monitoring creative engagement (VTR, scroll depth, etc.)

Creative-Level Engagement: Análise dos KVs tracks CTR by creative variant

Q21: Monitoring creative engagement (VTR, scroll depth, etc.)

Social Engagement Rate: Instagram 2.7% engagement confirmed

Q21: Monitoring creative engagement (VTR, scroll depth, etc.)

Dashboards Active: Dashboards used to pull KPIs for monthly meetings ---

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

Operational Spreadsheets: Active cost tracking by both design and social media teams

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

Monthly Asset Count: Monthly report confirms asset volume tracking

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

Paid Media Dashboard: Complete external media spend tracked with cost efficiency metrics (CPM, CPC, CPA)

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

Spend Visibility: Agency and tool spend documented in economic data

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

Self-Awareness: Team explicitly acknowledges gap and expresses intent to improve ("we can find a way in the future to measure") ---

Q23: Production efficiency metrics

SLA Parameter Documented: 1-week production SLA is confirmed

Q23: Production efficiency metrics

Asset Volumes Known: ~1,074 assets per OPECOM — now partially documented (previously N/A)

Q23: Production efficiency metrics

Monthly Asset Count: Monthly report confirms production volume tracking cadence

Q23: Production efficiency metrics

Cost Data Exists: Production cost spreadsheets in Google Drive provide raw data for future efficiency calculation

Q23: Production efficiency metrics

Self-Awareness: Team explicitly acknowledges gap and notes intent to improve ---

TECH CAPABILITIES**Q24: Adoption of Compliance Analysis Solutions (Creative X, etc.)**

Brand Book Available: Obramax Brandbook exists and designers know it — provides a reference baseline for manual compliance

Q24: Adoption of Compliance Analysis Solutions (Creative X, etc.)

Management Oversight: Juliana personally reviews outputs and flags non-compliant assets, providing a human checkpoint

Q24: Adoption of Compliance Analysis Solutions (Creative X, etc.)

Trello Workflow: Approval and review steps are tracked in Trello, giving some visibility to the review chain ---

Q25: Availability and Functional Depth of the DAM (DAMEO)

Google Drive Taxonomy: Paid media team maintains an organised folder structure with naming taxonomy on Google Drive — a partial substitute for asset findability

Q25: Availability and Functional Depth of the DAM (DAMEO)

Font Licensing: Fontfabric Nexa managed with formal licensing documentation — demonstrates some asset governance capability

Q25: Availability and Functional Depth of the DAM (DAMEO)

Volume Awareness: Design team tracks asset production volumes informally via Figma, signalling awareness of the need for better asset management ---

Q26: Availability and Functional Depth of Product Feed Solutions (Google Shopping, Facebook Ads)

API-Based Product Data Distribution: Insider CDP provides API integration to Meta, Google, and TikTok for product data — this is a meaningful foundation for product feed capability

Q26: Availability and Functional Depth of Product Feed Solutions (Google Shopping, Facebook Ads)

CDP Architecture: Insider as a CDP with catalog API connectivity represents a more mature infrastructure than simple manual uploads; product recommendations on the website are dynamically driven

Q26: Availability and Functional Depth of Product Feed Solutions (Google Shopping, Facebook Ads)

Email Automation: Fully automated email journeys via Insider with rules and triggers — demonstrates the team's ability to leverage the platform's automation features

Q26: Availability and Functional Depth of Product Feed Solutions (Google Shopping, Facebook Ads)

Multi-Platform Reach: Product data API connections cover Meta, Google, and TikTok — the three major paid social/search platforms in Brazil ---

Q27: DCO Availability and Functional Depth

Proactive Tool Experimentation: The team independently identified and trialled Tracto for DCO — demonstrating awareness of the capability gap and willingness to address it

Q27: DCO Availability and Functional Depth

Insider CDP Foundation: The Insider platform with API-based product catalog connectivity provides a data foundation that could support DCO integration in future

Q27: DCO Availability and Functional Depth

Behavioral Retargeting Active: Cart abandonment and purchase frequency retargeting are in use, providing the data signals that a DCO platform would leverage

Q27: DCO Availability and Functional Depth

Creative Experimentation Culture: Manuel A/B testing of tones, formats, and CTAs (transcript 00:53:28) — a precursor to systematic DCO ---

Q28: Availability and Functional Depth — Creative Intelligence Platform (Predictive Analytics)

Monthly Review Ritual: Structured monthly performance review with all department leads — provides a consistent learning cadence that would support creative intelligence if data were available

Q28: Availability and Functional Depth — Creative Intelligence Platform (Predictive Analytics)

Insider BI and Control Group Analysis: Systematic A/B testing within the CRM platform using control groups (50 segmentation rules) — demonstrates analytical sophistication in one domain

Q28: Availability and Functional Depth — Creative Intelligence Platform (Predictive Analytics)

Brand Lift Experience: Successful Google Brand Lift study demonstrating the team's ability to run structured measurement studies when investment thresholds are met

Q28: Availability and Functional Depth — Creative Intelligence Platform (Predictive Analytics)

Multi-Metric Tracking: Breadth of metrics tracked (engagement, CTR, conversion, scroll depth, YouTube retention, sentiment) provides a rich data context

Q28: Availability and Functional Depth — Creative Intelligence Platform (Predictive Analytics)

Early Exploration: ITW notes "just started testing" a creative intelligence approach — shows awareness of the gap ---

Q29: Availability and Functional Depth of Collaborative Tools and Standardisation

Trello Governance: Documented SLA workflow with named responsibilities, task categories, priority levels, and time targets — more systematic than ad hoc

Q29: Availability and Functional Depth of Collaborative Tools and Standardisation

Figma Multi-Use: Figma functions as design tool, template library, batch exporter, and informal approval status tracker — high utility per tool

Q29: Availability and Functional Depth of Collaborative Tools and Standardisation

Tool Standardisation: Core tool suite (Figma, Trello, Adobe) is consistent across the team; no fragmentation across multiple competing tools

Q29: Availability and Functional Depth of Collaborative Tools and Standardisation

Campaign Folder Structure in Figma: Organised Figma workspace with campaign-level folders and FINALIZADO/VALIDAÇÃO status labels shows systematic work organisation

Q29: Availability and Functional Depth of Collaborative Tools and Standardisation

SLA Discipline: 1-week SLA for asset production, documented in Governance, provides a baseline for process accountability ---

Q30: Art Purchasing / Rights Platform

AI Rights Strategy: The team has developed a pragmatic, legally-aware strategy using AI-generated imagery to avoid talent rights complications — demonstrating proactive risk management even without a formal platform

Q30: Art Purchasing / Rights Platform

Own Photography Model: Production-heavy model (€2.72M spend) using own shoots eliminates stock licensing risk for the majority of visual assets

Q30: Art Purchasing / Rights Platform

Font Licensing: Fontfabric Nexa formally licensed — demonstrates the capacity to manage IP licensing when required

Q30: Art Purchasing / Rights Platform

Influencer Contract Awareness: Team is aware of talent rights risks from past experience with collaborator image removal requests; this awareness informs current practice ---

Q31: Production Technology Stack

Full Adobe Suite: Professional-grade creative production across all digital and print formats

Q31: Production Technology Stack

Insider CDP: Sophisticated personalization and CRM automation stack with API-connected product data distribution — above average for this market tier

Q31: Production Technology Stack

Figma Template Architecture: Organised campaign-level folder structure in Figma with template library and batch export capability supports efficient multi-format asset production

Q31: Production Technology Stack

Pricefy Integration: Dedicated in-store merchandising tool demonstrates maturity in covering offline channels

Q31: Production Technology Stack

AI Efficiency Gains: AI tools delivering 66% reduction in content creation time (2 hours to 40 minutes) — meaningful productivity improvement

Q31: Production Technology Stack

Asset Volume Delivery: 1,074 assets per campaign cycle delivered by a 12-person team with a 1-week SLA — high throughput for the team size ---

Q32: Creative Software and Tools

Full Adobe Creative Suite: Professional-grade production capability across all digital, print, and video formats at €141,817

Q32: Creative Software and Tools

Figma Multi-Use: Figma functions as design tool, template library, batch exporter, and approval tracker — delivering high value at no additional cost (TI)

Q32: Creative Software and Tools

AI Efficiency Gains: Active AI tools delivering 66% reduction in production time (2 hours to under 40 minutes) — measurable productivity impact

Q32: Creative Software and Tools

Fontfabric Typography Licensing: Formally managed font licensing at €176,930 demonstrates the organisation's ability to govern software licensing when prioritised

Q32: Creative Software and Tools

Multi-Format Output: Software stack supports print (InDesign/Illustrator), digital (Photoshop/Figma), video (Premiere Pro), in-store (Pricefy), and social — comprehensive format coverage

Q32: Creative Software and Tools

Local License Negotiation: Licenses negotiated directly in Brazil, enabling cost management at local market level ---

AUTOMATION & INDUSTRIALIZATION

Q33: Workflow Automation Tools

Insider — full CRM/email automation: Rules-based, trigger-driven, journey-mapped, with API-connected catalog; 50+ segmentation rules actively optimised

Q33: Workflow Automation Tools

Trello — structured workflow and approval management: All approvals documented; 25 users; consistent process

Q33: Workflow Automation Tools

Generative AI in active use: Content production time cut by ~67%; team experimenting with image and copy generation

Q33: Workflow Automation Tools

Figma bulk export capability: Evidence of template-to-output scaling within Figma for campaign assets

Q33: Workflow Automation Tools

Governance SLA: Clear task categories, SLA times, and prioritisation framework for production

Q33: Workflow Automation Tools

Product API integrations: Catalog data connected to Insider, Meta, Google, TikTok via API ---

Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level

Offer Sheets are template-based: Explicitly confirmed — brand book templates used; creation from scratch prohibited

Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level

Pricefy for Merchan: Dedicated system for in-store communication asset creation

Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level

Governance SLA: Merchan Estático/Animado formally categorised with 1-day SLA and high priority

Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level

Brand book as template anchor: Brand consistency enforced via brand book; designers must follow it

Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level

In-store checklist being implemented: Visual communication consistency being formalised at store level via digital verification form ---

Q35: Level of Templatisation of Online Assets

Email templates in Insider: Fully automated, journey-based, trigger-driven; all emails template-based

Q35: Level of Templatisation of Online Assets

Figma display template library: "Ready to use" display assets in Figma; structured KV file hierarchy; bulk export capability

Q35: Level of Templatisation of Online Assets

Scale confirmed — 1,074 assets per OPECOM from templates: Meaningful evidence of template-based production at operational volume

Q35: Level of Templatisation of Online Assets

Brand book enforced: Creation from scratch prohibited; creative guide governs all output

Q35: Level of Templatisation of Online Assets

Monthly asset count report: Asset volume tracking already in place; foundation for template vs. scratch reporting

Q35: Level of Templatisation of Online Assets

Governance SLA: All key online asset types formally scheduled (email, display, social, retargeting) ---

Q36: Ability to Automate the Personalisation of Creative Assets

Insider CDP with API catalog: Product data flows automatically into personalisation engine; not a manual process

Q36: Ability to Automate the Personalisation of Creative Assets

50+ segmentation rules with control group benchmarking: Sophisticated CRM personalisation, continuously optimised

Q36: Ability to Automate the Personalisation of Creative Assets

Full email automation: All emails are automated via journey rules and triggers; no manual email sending

Q36: Ability to Automate the Personalisation of Creative Assets

Multi-platform product API integration: Catalog connected to Meta, Google, TikTok — enables product-level dynamic ads

Q36: Ability to Automate the Personalisation of Creative Assets

Behavioral retargeting: Purchase frequency and cart abandonment campaigns running via behavioral triggers

Q36: Ability to Automate the Personalisation of Creative Assets

Website A/B testing: CRO testing operational via Insider; category KV assets include A/B variants (~280 per OPECOM) ---

Q37: Ability to Automate the Distribution of Creative Assets

Insider email distribution — fully automated: All email sending journey-triggered via CDP; no manual email sending in the workflow

Q37: Ability to Automate the Distribution of Creative Assets

Push notification automation: Web push also automated via Insider

Q37: Ability to Automate the Distribution of Creative Assets

Product catalog API to Meta/Google/TikTok: Product data distributed automatically to three major ad platforms

Q37: Ability to Automate the Distribution of Creative Assets

Organised Drive taxonomy: File organisation with taxonomy exists — provides a structured (if manual) asset retrieval system

Q37: Ability to Automate the Distribution of Creative Assets

Internally managed paid media: Paid media team controls distribution workflows; reduces external handoff delays ---

Q38: Level of Automation of the Validation, Production, Distribution Workflow

CRM/email pipeline — functionally integrated: Approved email journey templates in Insider trigger sending automatically — the approval-to-distribution chain is complete for this channel

Q38: Level of Automation of the Validation, Production, Distribution Workflow

Product catalog API — automated distribution: Product data flows from Insider to Meta/Google/TikTok via API without manual distribution intervention

Q38: Level of Automation of the Validation, Production, Distribution Workflow

Trello approval structure: Approvals documented and tracked consistently; provides an auditable validation stage

Q38: Level of Automation of the Validation, Production, Distribution Workflow

Governance SLA: Task categories, SLAs, and responsible parties formalise the workflow structure even if manual

Q38: Level of Automation of the Validation, Production, Distribution Workflow

GenAI efficiency: Production time reduced by ~67% for content tasks, compressing part of the manual production stage ---

Q39: Automated Production Workflows

Insider CRM/email — fully automated: Production and distribution of email and push notifications requires no manual intervention per send once journeys are configured

Q39: Automated Production Workflows

GenAI efficiency gain confirmed: 67% production time reduction for content tasks — measurable, active impact on production velocity

Q39: Automated Production Workflows

Figma template library — "ready to use": Display templates held and maintained in Figma; bulk export reduces manual production steps within the design stage

Q39: Automated Production Workflows

1,074 assets per OPECOM from templates: Template-based production at meaningful scale — not scratch-built

Q39: Automated Production Workflows

Product catalog API — automated data production: Product data produced and distributed automatically to three major ad platforms

Q39: Automated Production Workflows

Governance SLA — structured production framework: Task categories, SLAs, and priorities formalised; production is disciplined even if manual ---

Q40: Template and Standardisation Systems

Email templates — fully operational and automated: Insider email templates are journey-mapped, trigger-driven, and automated; the most complete template implementation in the BU

Q40: Template and Standardisation Systems

Figma display library — "ready to use": Structured display template system in Figma; bulk export capability; 1,074 assets per OPECOM cycle demonstrate scale

Q40: Template and Standardisation Systems

Brand book — enforced no-scratch rule: "They cannot create something from the scratch" — brand consistency enforced at the creation stage

Q40: Template and Standardisation Systems

Typography standardisation — Fontfabric Nexa: Complete font standardisation at significant investment (€176,930) — all formats aligned

Q40: Template and Standardisation Systems

Pricefy for Merchan: Dedicated in-store communication system — specialised template tool for a high-priority output (1-day SLA, Alta priority)

Q40: Template and Standardisation Systems

Governance SLA — task-level standardisation: All template-based task types formally categorised and SLA'd ---

Q41: Batch Processing Capabilities

Figma bulk export — confirmed: Batch design production and export documented; ~1,074 assets per OPECOM cycle processed via Figma templates

Q41: Batch Processing Capabilities

Insider email/push — fully automated batch: Segmented audience batch sending via rules and triggers; 50+ segmentation rules; performance tracked against control groups

Q41: Batch Processing Capabilities

Product catalog API — automated batch distribution: Product data distributed in batch to four platforms via API without manual action per product

Q41: Batch Processing Capabilities

A/B asset variants — batch produced: Category KV A/B variations (~280 per OPECOM) produced in batch; systematic variant production confirmed

Q41: Batch Processing Capabilities

Monthly asset count report: Volume tracking is in place; batch production scale can be reported ---

Q42: Quality Control Automation

Trello approval structure: All approvals documented in Trello — provides an auditable trail of who approved what and when; consistent process across all content types

Q42: Quality Control Automation

Brand book as quality standard: Oramax Brandbook provides a documented reference standard against which all assets should be validated

Q42: Quality Control Automation

Governance SLA accountability: Task ownership and SLA times assigned — creates accountability for quality delivery

Q42: Quality Control Automation

Typography standardisation: Fontfabric Nexa provides passive quality assurance at the typography level — all assets use the correct font by default

Q42: Quality Control Automation

In-store checklist (in implementation): A quality verification step is being added for in-store deployment — demonstrates quality awareness at the distribution stage ---

INNOVATION**Q43: GenAI adoption in content production**

Active GenAI Use: Images and text generated with AI in live production

Q43: GenAI adoption in content production

Efficiency Gains: Production time reduced from ~2 hours to under 40 minutes

Q43: GenAI adoption in content production

SEO Agent: AI-powered SEO agent in active use

Q43: GenAI adoption in content production

Legal Awareness: Team aware of and managing AI image rights/legal concerns

Q43: GenAI adoption in content production

Breadth of Use: Blog posts, social copy, and imagery all benefit from GenAI ---

Q44: Emerging formats and channels

Multi-Platform Presence: Active on Facebook, Instagram, YouTube

Q44: Emerging formats and channels

Influencer Growth: Influencer strategy expanding (channel growth)

Q44: Emerging formats and channels

Reels Capability: Instagram Reels in use (though standard, not experimental) ---

Q45: Recurrence of creative Test & Learn

OPECOM A/B Tests: Two documented campaigns with structured A/B testing and CTR data

Q45: Recurrence of creative Test & Learn

Quantitative Results: Commercial vs pain-point, with-date vs without-date — hard data available

Q45: Recurrence of creative Test & Learn

Forward Application: Jan 2026 learnings explicitly fed into Feb–Mar 2026 campaign

Q45: Recurrence of creative Test & Learn

Monthly Cadence: Monthly briefing/debriefing provides regular review rhythm

Q45: Recurrence of creative Test & Learn

Platform and Regional Breakdown: CTR analysed by platform and by region (praça) ---

Q46: Emerging technology adoption

Tracto DCO Evaluation: Tool evaluated and assessed (even if rejected) — evidence of evaluation behaviour

Q46: Emerging technology adoption

GenAI Active Use: Images, text, blog, social — GenAI adopted informally but operationally

Q46: Emerging technology adoption

SEO Agent: AI-powered SEO agent in active operational use

Q46: Emerging technology adoption

Insider CDP: Sophisticated CDP technology adopted and operational

Q46: Emerging technology adoption

Legal Risk Awareness: AI imagery manipulation shows contextual technology management ---

Q47: Creative experimentation processes

OPECOM Experiments: Two campaigns with structured A/B tests and quantitative results

Q47: Creative experimentation processes

Hypothesis-Driven: Commercial vs pain-point, date vs no-date — clear hypotheses tested

Q47: Creative experimentation processes

Cross-Platform Analysis: CTR analysed across Meta and Google by region

Q47: Creative experimentation processes

Forward Application: Learnings explicitly applied to next campaign

Q47: Creative experimentation processes

Multi-Variable Testing: Tone, format, CTA, content elements — broad experimentation scope

Q47: Creative experimentation processes

Monthly Cadence: Regular review ritual provides rhythm for insights ---

Q48: Innovation pipeline management

OKR Alignment: Annual plan aligned with company OKRs — innovation grounded in strategic objectives

Q48: Innovation pipeline management

Bi-Weekly Monitoring: Active portfolio monitored bi-weekly — operational discipline confirmed

Q48: Innovation pipeline management

Multi-Year Strategy: 2026–2028 Omncommerce strategy provides strategic direction

Q48: Innovation pipeline management

Capability Roadmap: BCap - OMNI Obramax provides visual capability planning

Q48: Innovation pipeline management

Portfolio Approach: Projects broken into a portfolio with assigned ownership ---

Q49: Future capability planning

Capability Roadmap: BCap - OMNI Obramax — dedicated capability planning document

Q49: Future capability planning

Multi-Year Strategy: 2026–2028 Omncommerce strategy with defined planning horizon

Q49: Future capability planning

OKR Alignment: Annual capability planning aligned to company OKRs — strategic grounding

Q49: Future capability planning

CCDP Investment: Concrete near-term capability investment planned (CCDP integration)

Q49: Future capability planning

Bi-Weekly Portfolio Monitoring: Active project management with regular review cadence ---

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

Active Brandbook Use: Designers explicitly follow the brandbook daily; "they cannot create from scratch" — active enforcement through culture rather than compliance tooling

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

Governance SLA: 14-task operational guide with SLAs, priorities and named owners — the most detailed workflow document in the BU

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

Template Libraries: Figma display templates, email templates, and brand book-derived templates actively used — enabling ~1,074 assets per OPECOM campaign cycle

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

Practical Process Sheets: Store-open and OPECOM checklists stored on Drive — two core processes have documented guidance

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

In-Store Checklist: New online form being rolled out for visual communication compliance in physical stores ---

Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem

Differentiated Ecosystem: Partners are implicitly tiered — liveSEO (strategic), Mestiça (transactional), Keepgo (transactional), production agency (transactional) — showing management awareness of relationship value

Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem

Insider CDP Integration: Deep API integration connecting product catalog to Insider and to Meta/Google/TikTok; this is a sophisticated strategic platform relationship

Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem

Scale of Influencer Activation: 60 influencers activated for a single store opening via Keepgo — demonstrates capability to mobilise partner ecosystem at scale for specific objectives

Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem

Strategic SEO Partnership: liveSEO classified as strategic — indicates awareness that some relationships require more than transactional management

Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem

360-Strategy Ambition: Team actively seeking to connect three media pillars through an agency partner — shows strategic intent ---

Q52: Maturity of team roles and structure

Clear Domain Ownership: Social/Brand, Offline/Awareness, Performance/SEO — each domain owner knows their mandate

Q52: Maturity of team roles and structure

HR Mission Documents: All roles at Obramax have missions documented by HR — lightweight but formal role definition

Q52: Maturity of team roles and structure

Governance SLA: Granular task-to-person allocation across 15 task types

Q52: Maturity of team roles and structure

Larger Team Than Reported: ~12 FTEs across content, design, SEO and paid media — meaningful production capacity

Q52: Maturity of team roles and structure

Org Structure Documented: OBM Estrutura Omncommerce 2025 provides a reference org chart

Q52: Maturity of team roles and structure

Capability Roadmap: BCap identifies five organisational capability domains including Creative & Content ---

Q53: Skill development programs

Universidade Oramax: Fully branded, structured LMS with three learning pathways — well above average for a market-level BU

Q53: Skill development programs

Employee-Level Tracking: Individual completion tracked by employee, area and module — professional governance

Q53: Skill development programs

Strong Corporate Completion Rates: 7 of 9 mandatory modules above 75% — training culture is present

Q53: Skill development programs

ADEO Knowledge Base Integration: Cross-group knowledge sharing embedded in the platform

Q53: Skill development programs

AI for Training Content: GenAI used to create training materials — innovation applied to L&D; ---

Q54: BU/Central collaboration rituals

OKR-Linked Annual Planning: Annual plan aligned to company OKRs, broken into a project portfolio monitored bi-weekly — structured and consistent

Q54: BU/Central collaboration rituals

Forward Campaign Calendar: 11–12 campaigns planned the prior year with two-month lead briefings — implies central alignment for seasonal themes

Q54: BU/Central collaboration rituals

Self-Confirmed Rituals: The team explicitly states well-defined rituals for central/BU collaboration exist

Q54: BU/Central collaboration rituals

Multi-Year Strategy Alignment: Estratégia e Objetivos 2026-2028 suggests alignment with ADEO Omncommerce direction ---

Q55: Level of availability of strategic and operational skills

Broad Operational Coverage: Content, design, SEO, paid media, CRM all internalised across ~12 FTEs

Q55: Level of availability of strategic and operational skills

AI Productivity Gains: GenAI reduces content production 66% (2h → 40min) — demonstrates applied innovation

Q55: Level of availability of strategic and operational skills

CRM Sophistication: 50 segmentation rules, BI monitoring, group-of-control comparisons — genuinely mature CRM capability

Q55: Level of availability of strategic and operational skills

Creative Leadership: Acknowledged by Oliver/55 as producing some of the most cutting-edge content in the network

Q55: Level of availability of strategic and operational skills

Brand Strategy Investment: €650k creative fees for brand strategy + key visuals — strategic brand capability

Q55: Level of availability of strategic and operational skills

Analytics Capability: Multi-channel measurement including Brand Lift, CTR, conversion, sentiment, scroll depth

Q56: Knowledge management & documentation

Governance SLA: The 15-task SLA document is a genuine operational process document — clear, specific, and in active use

Q56: Knowledge management & documentation

Strategy 2026-2028: Multi-year strategic direction documented; represents a knowledge artefact that can be referenced across functions

Q56: Knowledge management & documentation

BCap Capability Roadmap: Five-domain capability map provides a shared language for capability development

Q56: Knowledge management & documentation

ADEO Knowledge Base Access: Embedded in Universidade Oramax — cross-group resources accessible even if not actively curated locally

Q56: Knowledge management & documentation

Monthly Performance Ritual: Verbal knowledge sharing happens monthly even if not documented — culture of review exists ---

Q57: Agency management & ways of working

Differentiated Partner Model: Practitioner-level classification of strategic vs transactional agencies demonstrates management awareness of relationship value

Q57: Agency management & ways of working

Trello Tracking: Active use of Trello for agency activity and approval management — a functioning lightweight WoW tool

Q57: Agency management & ways of working

Briefing Discipline: Forward-planned campaign briefing (two months in advance) provides production lead time and ensures agency readiness

Q57: Agency management & ways of working

liveSEO Strategic Positioning: SEO partner is elevated above purely transactional — indicates awareness that some relationships require deeper engagement

Q57: Agency management & ways of working

Scale of Activation: 60 influencers per store opening via Keepgo — demonstrates ability to mobilise partner ecosystem at volume

Q57: Agency management & ways of working

360-Strategy Ambition: Strategic aspiration to integrate three media pillars through an agency partner — directional awareness exists ---

Q58: Onboarding & training processes

96% Integração Completion: Near-universal completion of the formal onboarding module — the single highest completion rate of all mandatory training

Q58: Onboarding & training processes

HR Mission Statements: All roles have documented mission statements — new joiners understand their purpose from day one

Q58: Onboarding & training processes

Employee-Level Tracking: Individual onboarding completion tracked per employee, per module — professional L&D; governance

Q58: Onboarding & training processes

Cultura Module: 5-hour culture and values module at 79% completion — new joiners are deeply oriented to company values

Q58: Onboarding & training processes

AI for Training Content: GenAI used to create training materials — L&D; function is keeping pace with modern content production tools

Q58: Onboarding & training processes

Role Clarity in Practice: Interview confirms that role domain clarity is effectively communicated at point of joining ---

Q59: Change management capabilities

OKR-Anchored Planning: Annual plan with initiative portfolio monitored bi-weekly — change is governed within the planning cycle

Q59: Change management capabilities

Formal Communication: New processes communicated via formal email or meeting with materials — change is announced, not assumed

Q59: Change management capabilities

AI Adoption Success: 66% production time reduction through AI — demonstrates capacity to successfully adopt and scale new working methods

Q59: Change management capabilities

Insider CDP Adoption: Deep, sophisticated adoption of a complex platform — 50 rules, API stack, BI monitoring — shows change capability at enterprise-tool level

Q59: Change management capabilities

Function Internalisation: Paid media and SEO brought in-house successfully — major structural change absorbed without disruption

Q59: Change management capabilities

Multi-Year Strategy: 2026-2028 strategy provides a framework for sequencing future change ---

Gaps

OMNICHANNEL

Q1: Brand promise consistency across channels

360-Degree Integration Not Achieved: Offline/online/performance full integration explicitly flagged as aspirational in interview

Q1: Brand promise consistency across channels

No Automated Compliance: Brand consistency checked manually; no Creative X or equivalent

Q1: Brand promise consistency across channels

Transactional Agency Relationships: Limits strategic brand continuity in creative development

Q1: Brand promise consistency across channels

No Formal Brand Compliance Checklist: Validation is manual per designer/team ---

Q2: Visual and typographic consistency

No Automated Visual Compliance: No Creative X or equivalent — manual process only

Q2: Visual and typographic consistency

No Formal Compliance Checklist: Designers follow brand book but no documented QA checklist

Q2: Visual and typographic consistency

Global Campaign Toolkit Unvalidated: Bora pra Obra master toolkit access still limited

Q2: Visual and typographic consistency

No Creative Intelligence Reporting: Visual consistency not measured/tracked systematically ---

Q3: Channel and format adaptation

No DCO: Tracto abandoned; all adaptation is 100% manual — limits scalability

Q3: Channel and format adaptation

No Formal Adaptation Guidelines: No documented rules for tone/format per channel beyond Brandbook

Q3: Channel and format adaptation

Local Adaptation Documentation Limited: Brandbook covers brand; no separate channel-specific guide

Q3: Channel and format adaptation

No Template Catalogue: Interview confirms no documented template library/catalog ---

Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines

No Automated Compliance Tools: No Creative X, Celtra, ASCEND ONE, or equivalent — manual process only

Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines

No Formal Compliance Checklist: No documented per-platform spec validation checklist

Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines

Traffic/QA/Distribution Cost: €0 in economic data — QA absorbed into production FTE time; not separately tracked

Q4: Level of compliance of assets with platform guidelines

No Compliance Error Tracking: No evidence of compliance rejection/error metrics ---

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

No DCO/Automation: Tracto abandoned — all production 100% manual; limits scale efficiency

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

No Efficiency Metrics: Cost-per-asset, load time, file size optimisation not formally tracked

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

Localization Rate Not Reported: Cannot benchmark adaptation efficiency

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

GenAI Scope Limited: Applied to blog/social only — not yet to display or programmatic ---

Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)

360-Degree Integration Not Achieved: Full offline/online/performance integration explicitly aspirational (interview)

Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)

Transactional Agency Relationships: Limits strategic narrative development — executional only

Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)

Monthly Review Not Formally Logged: "not specifically with the test and logs" — no structured narrative learning log

Q6: Synchronization of assets between channels (continuous narration)

Global Campaign Toolkit Unvalidated: Bora pra Obra master toolkit still not accessible ---

Q7: Cross-channel content consistency

No DAM: Files on Google Drive — version control and asset access risk

Q7: Cross-channel content consistency

No Formal QC Checklist: Manual review without documented consistency criteria

Q7: Cross-channel content consistency

360-Degree Integration Not Achieved: Offline/in-store not seamlessly integrated with digital pipeline

Q7: Cross-channel content consistency

No DCO: Dynamic consistency at scale not available ---

Q8: Multi-format production capabilities

Product Videos Not Submitted: No product demo video format evidenced

Q8: Multi-format production capabilities

3D/CGI Not Evidenced: No 3D packshots

Q8: Multi-format production capabilities

Audio/Radio Not Evidenced: Not in Governance SLA or submitted assets

Q8: Multi-format production capabilities

No DCO: All production 100% manual — limits automation at scale

Q8: Multi-format production capabilities

No Cost-Per-Asset Tracking: Cannot benchmark production efficiency per format ---

Q9: Maturity of paid vs organic

No paid vs organic strategy: No formal document defining strategic roles, investment principles, or content approach for each channel type

Q9: Maturity of paid vs organic

Budget split undocumented: Paid vs organic allocation not explicitly separated in economic data

Q9: Maturity of paid vs organic

Limited documentation culture: Interview confirms briefing/debriefing exists but formal test logs are absent

Q9: Maturity of paid vs organic

No optimisation framework: No evidence of a data-driven process for allocating spend between paid and organic based on performance ---

CLIENT CENTRICITY

Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise

"Facilita minha vida" **Decline:** Convenience promise not landing with PROs post-campaign

Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise

CJM Not by Media/Persona: "We have the CJM, but we don't have yet the JM by media and persona"

Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise

Personas Not Refreshed: Needs may have evolved in 10 years since founding

Q10: Level of alignment between customer needs and brand promise

Consumer Weaker: Stimulated awareness uplift smaller than PROs (+4pp vs +18pp) ---

Q16: Target customer representation in content

Personas Never Updated: Created at founding; no documented refresh since

Q16: Target customer representation in content

No Persona Versioning: No version history or update cadence documented

Q16: Target customer representation in content

Research Not Formalised Into Personas: Customer round table and NPS data not formally fed back into persona framework

Q16: Target customer representation in content

No Documented Audience Insight Framework: Insights gathered but not formalised into content strategy documentation ---

MEASUREMENT

Q17: Brand tracking (brand metrics, quarterly review)

No Formal Brand Health Framework: No documented KPI framework for brand health

Q17: Brand tracking (brand metrics, quarterly review)

No Quarterly Review Cycle: Data reviewed monthly operationally; no formal quarterly brand health review

Q17: Brand tracking (brand metrics, quarterly review)

KPIs & Reporting Folder Empty: `06_KPIs_Reporting/` folder is empty — no KPI dictionary uploaded

Q17: Brand tracking (brand metrics, quarterly review)

Brand Lift Not Integrated: Brand lift findings not formally fed back into media/content strategy documentation ---

Q18: Pre-test / post-test systematisation

No Pre-test Systematisation: No formal pre-campaign testing or validation gate

Q18: Pre-test / post-test systematisation

A/B Tests Not Pre-Planned: Tests appear to run concurrently within campaigns, not as designed pre-tests

Q18: Pre-test / post-test systematisation

Test Logs Not Integrated: "not specifically with the test and logs" — informal capture

Q18: Pre-test / post-test systematisation

No Formal Test Design Document: No documented hypothesis-driven test design framework ---

Q19: Capacity to analyse the performance of created assets (creative intelligence)

Emerging Practice: "Just started testing" — Análise dos KVs is relatively recent; not multi-year longitudinal

Q19: Capacity to analyse the performance of created assets (creative intelligence)

Test Logs Not Integrated: "not specifically with the test and logs" — informal capture outside main document

Q19: Capacity to analyse the performance of created assets (creative intelligence)

No Dedicated Creative Intelligence Platform: Insights derived manually; no automated creative scoring

Q19: Capacity to analyse the performance of created assets (creative intelligence)

Limited to OPECOM Feiras: Análise dos KVs covers campaign fairs; other content types less documented ---

Q20: Mastery of brand lift studies

Application Not Fully Formalised: No documented process for feeding brand lift insights into creative/media strategy documents

Q20: Mastery of brand lift studies

Investment Barrier: Minimum investment threshold means smaller campaigns cannot access brand lift measurement

Q20: Mastery of brand lift studies

Some Studies Password-Protected: Not all studies are accessible for full review (PIRA, SG, Onda 1 Pre, Onda 2 Pos)

Q20: Mastery of brand lift studies

Cadence Event-Driven: Studies tied to store openings; not yet a purely systematic quarterly cycle for all markets ---

Q21: Monitoring creative engagement (VTR, scroll depth, etc.)

No KPI Dictionary: KPIs & Reporting folder is empty — engagement metrics not formally documented

Q21: Monitoring creative engagement (VTR, scroll depth, etc.)

Scroll Depth Detail Missing: Scroll depth confirmed verbally but no specific reports or values in evidence files

Q21: Monitoring creative engagement (VTR, scroll depth, etc.)

No Engagement Framework Document: Tools and data exist; no formal engagement measurement framework

Q21: Monitoring creative engagement (VTR, scroll depth, etc.)

VTR Benchmarks Not Documented: Retention values noted but no target benchmarks or competitive context documented ---

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

Cost Per Asset Not Calculated: Explicitly confirmed ("we don't") — team acknowledges and notes intent to improve

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

Internal Costs Not Allocated: €0 internal costs — 7 FTE salary time not allocated to production

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

Time Tracking Absent: No man-hours per asset or time-to-production tracking

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

Spreadsheets Not Unified: Two separate Google Drive spreadsheets; no unified cost view

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

Efficiency Evaluation: No documented process for evaluating production costs for efficiency ---

Q23: Production efficiency metrics

Cost per Asset Not Calculated: Explicitly confirmed as absent — despite raw cost data and volume data being available

Q23: Production efficiency metrics

Assets per FTE Not Calculated: 7 FTEs known, ~1,074 assets/OPECOM known — but ratio not calculated or reported

Q23: Production efficiency metrics

Time-to-Market Not Tracked: SLA is 1 week (target), but actual lead times by stage are not measured

Q23: Production efficiency metrics

No Efficiency Framework: No documented framework for production efficiency monitoring or optimisation

Q23: Production efficiency metrics

Raw Data Not Activated: Cost spreadsheets and monthly asset count exist but are not combined into efficiency metrics ---

TECH CAPABILITIES

Q24: Adoption of Compliance Analysis Solutions (Creative X, etc.)

No Automated Compliance Tool: No Creative X, brand checker, or equivalent — critical gap for a team producing over 1,000 assets per campaign period

Q24: Adoption of Compliance Analysis Solutions (Creative X, etc.)

Person-Dependent Review: Compliance depends on Juliana's personal review; not scalable with current or future asset volumes

Q24: Adoption of Compliance Analysis Solutions (Creative X, etc.)

No Compliance Scoring: No systematic scoring or pass/fail mechanism to validate assets before publication

Q24: Adoption of Compliance Analysis Solutions (Creative X, etc.)

No Platform Integration: No integration between approval workflow (Trello) and any compliance checking capability

Q24: Adoption of Compliance Analysis Solutions (Creative X, etc.)

No Budget or Roadmap: Zero investment planned; no evaluation of compliance tools in Tech Evaluation folder ---

Q25: Availability and Functional Depth of the DAM (DAMEO)

No DAM System: Brazil is the only ADEO BU without any DAMEO or equivalent DAM — a critical structural gap

Q25: Availability and Functional Depth of the DAM (DAMEO)

No Central Library: Assets siloed in individual team drives; no single source of truth accessible to all stakeholders

Q25: Availability and Functional Depth of the DAM (DAMEO)

No Rights Management: Rights Management folder is empty; no formal process for managing usage rights on produced assets

Q25: Availability and Functional Depth of the DAM (DAMEO)

No Search or Metadata: No advanced search, tagging, or metadata management capability

Q25: Availability and Functional Depth of the DAM (DAMEO)

No Partner Access: External partners (shooting agency, influencer agency) have no structured access to a shared asset library

Q25: Availability and Functional Depth of the DAM (DAMEO)

Scalability Problem: With 1,074+ assets per campaign cycle and growing volumes, drive-based storage is a compounding operational risk

Q25: Availability and Functional Depth of the DAM (DAMEO)

No Adoption Plan: Juliana was unfamiliar with DAMEO; no adoption roadmap has been initiated ---

Q26: Availability and Functional Depth of Product Feed Solutions (Google Shopping, Facebook Ads)

No Dedicated Feed Management Platform: No Smartfeed or equivalent for feed creation, enrichment, and distribution management

Q26: Availability and Functional Depth of Product Feed Solutions (Google Shopping, Facebook Ads)

Creative Distribution Remains Manual: Despite product data API integration, creative assets for ads are manually uploaded — limits ability to scale dynamic creative and product ads

Q26: Availability and Functional Depth of Product Feed Solutions (Google Shopping, Facebook Ads)

No Feed Optimisation Layer: No ability to segment, enrich, or A/B test product feed attributes for performance optimisation

Q26: Availability and Functional Depth of Product Feed Solutions (Google Shopping, Facebook Ads)

No Feed Performance Analysis: No documented process for analysing feed performance metrics (feed coverage, product eligibility, impression share by feed attribute)

Q26: Availability and Functional Depth of Product Feed Solutions (Google Shopping, Facebook Ads)

Empty Feed Management Folder: No documentation of the current feed architecture, integration diagram, or feed governance process

Q26: Availability and Functional Depth of Product Feed Solutions (Google Shopping, Facebook Ads)

Insider Cost Unknown: Insider is not in the economic data tool spend; its cost and contract terms are not documented in the assessment materials ---

Q27: DCO Availability and Functional Depth

No DCO Platform: No active DCO capability after Tracto trial failure — critical gap for a team producing 1,000+ assets per campaign cycle

Q27: DCO Availability and Functional Depth

Manual Creative Personalisation Only: All creative variation is manual; no automated generation or serving of personalised ad creatives based on audience or context signals

Q27: DCO Availability and Functional Depth

No Dynamic Display: Display banners are static or template-based; no real-time personalisation

Q27: DCO Availability and Functional Depth

Tracto Not Re-evaluated: No evidence that an alternative DCO tool has been assessed following Tracto's failure

Q27: DCO Availability and Functional Depth

No DCO Roadmap: ITW questionnaire records the team was asked to "Évaluer DCO: Demander à l'équipe si des outils d'optimisation créative dynamique (DCO) sont actuellement envisagés ou testés" — no confirmed plan has emerged ---

Q28: Availability and Functional Depth — Creative Intelligence Platform (Predictive Analytics)

No Creative Element Analysis: No analysis of specific creative elements (visual composition, CTA wording, colour, imagery type) to understand performance drivers

Q28: Availability and Functional Depth — Creative Intelligence Platform (Predictive Analytics)

No Dedicated Platform: No Creative X, Pattern89, or equivalent tool; no platform that surfaces creative-level performance insights

Q28: Availability and Functional Depth — Creative Intelligence Platform (Predictive Analytics)

No Predictive Capability: No predictive analytics to pre-score creative assets before launch

Q28: Availability and Functional Depth — Creative Intelligence Platform (Predictive Analytics)

Undocumented Insights: The monthly briefing/debriefing process generates insights informally but they are not documented in a way that enables systematic creative learning

Q28: Availability and Functional Depth — Creative Intelligence Platform (Predictive Analytics)

Link Not Provided: ITW questionnaire noted "just started testing" with an example link that was not populated — the testing claimed cannot be verified ---

Q29: Availability and Functional Depth of Collaborative Tools and Standardisation

No Integrated Proofing Tool: No Frame.io, Ziflow, or equivalent for structured creative review with markup, version comparison, and audit trail

Q29: Availability and Functional Depth of Collaborative Tools and Standardisation

Manual Workflow Handoffs: Approval-to-production and production-to-distribution handoffs are fully manual; no automated flow

Q29: Availability and Functional Depth of Collaborative Tools and Standardisation

No Workflow Integration Diagram: ITW confirms no diagram documenting how tools connect — limits onboarding and process transparency

Q29: Availability and Functional Depth of Collaborative Tools and Standardisation

External Partner Access Unconfirmed: How agencies access briefs, provide deliverables, and receive approvals is not documented in the tool suite

Q29: Availability and Functional Depth of Collaborative Tools and Standardisation

Figma Approval Status is Informal: FINALIZADO/VALIDAÇÃO labels in Figma are informal status tags, not a structured review/approval workflow with roles, timestamps, and version locking ---

Q30: Art Purchasing / Rights Platform

No Art Purchasing Platform: No centralised stock library or licensing platform

Q30: Art Purchasing / Rights Platform

No Rights Management System: Rights Management folder is empty; no systematic tracking of talent, location, or influencer rights

Q30: Art Purchasing / Rights Platform

AI Tool Unconfirmed: The AI tool used for image generation is not formally identified or licensed — no documentation of AI-generated content policy or IP ownership clarity

Q30: Art Purchasing / Rights Platform

Influencer Rights Informal: Influencer rights managed via individual contracts and an external agency; no platform tracks usage periods, exclusivity, or renewal dates

Q30: Art Purchasing / Rights Platform

No Cost Tracking for Art Buying: €0 reported for art buying and rights — either accurately nil or reflects undocumented ad hoc spend

Q30: Art Purchasing / Rights Platform

No GenAI Policy: The GenAI Policy folder is empty (confirmed in ITW questionnaire); no documented policy for AI image use, ownership, or legal compliance ---

Q31: Production Technology Stack

No DAM: No central asset library — critical at 1,074+ assets per campaign

Q31: Production Technology Stack

No DCO Platform: No automated creative personalisation for paid display; manual variant creation only

Q31: Production Technology Stack

No Workflow Automation: 100% manual production and distribution workflow; no automated handoffs

Q31: Production Technology Stack

No Integration Architecture: No documented diagram or integration layer connecting Adobe, Figma, Trello, Insider, and distribution channels

Q31: Production Technology Stack

AI Tools Undocumented: AI tool(s) in active use are not formally identified, licensed, or governed

Q31: Production Technology Stack

No 3D/CGI: No capability for 3D product rendering

Q31: Production Technology Stack

No Feed Management Tool: Insider API covers product data distribution but lacks feed optimisation and management features ---

Q32: Creative Software and Tools

No Software License Inventory: ITW confirms "No" — no record of which users hold which licenses; no capability matrix

Q32: Creative Software and Tools

No 3D Software: No Cinema 4D or equivalent — limits CGI product rendering capability

Q32: Creative Software and Tools

AI Tools Undocumented: AI tool in active daily use is not formally identified, licensed, or governed — creates IP and compliance risk

Q32: Creative Software and Tools

No Proficiency Assessment: No formal documentation of team proficiency levels across any tool in the stack

Q32: Creative Software and Tools

No Capability Matrix: No mapping of tool to role, access level, or production function

Q32: Creative Software and Tools

GenAI Policy Absent: GenAI Policy folder is empty (confirmed in ITW); no policy covering AI tool selection, IP ownership, or ethical use ---

AUTOMATION & INDUSTRIALIZATION

Q33: Workflow Automation Tools

No DAM: Files stored on Google Drive with no central asset management system; Brazil is the only ADEO BU without DAMEO

Q33: Workflow Automation Tools

No DCO platform: Tracto abandoned; no automated display creative variation

Q33: Workflow Automation Tools

Production workflow 100% manual: Explicitly confirmed in questionnaire — creative production and distribution are fully manual

Q33: Workflow Automation Tools

No workflow orchestration platforms: No Make.com, 8n8, or integration middleware

Q33: Workflow Automation Tools

No automated compliance tools: No CreativeX or similar; brand compliance relies on designers knowing the brand book

Q33: Workflow Automation Tools

GenAI tool not formally identified or documented: No policy, no tool inventory, no governance

Q33: Workflow Automation Tools

Localization/template % unknown: Team could not confirm the percentage of template-based vs. scratch-built assets ---

Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level

No documented central template library: Templates exist but are distributed across brand book; no accessible, structured library for teams or partners

Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level

Documentation depth limited: Juliana Piccolotto described templates as "not so very well documented"

Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level

Partner access not documented: No evidence of how agency or local partners access templates for offline production

Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level

Global Campaign Toolkit empty: No Bora Pra Obra campaign toolkit provided

Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level

Packaging template structure unclear: Asset exists but no template documentation

Q34: Off-Line Asset Templatisation Level

Template usage % unknown: No data on what proportion of offline assets are produced from templates ---

Q35: Level of Templatisation of Online Assets

No documented template library or catalog: Templates exist in Figma and Insider but no structured, searchable catalog has been documented

Q35: Level of Templatisation of Online Assets

Template vs. scratch ratio unknown: "I don't know" — team confirmed they cannot confirm the % without checking; this is a key maturity indicator

Q35: Level of Templatisation of Online Assets

No DCO: No automated display personalisation at template level

Q35: Level of Templatisation of Online Assets

No cost-per-asset tracking: "No" confirmed in questionnaire for cost per asset and SLA metrics

Q35: Level of Templatisation of Online Assets

Documentation inconsistency: Creative guide referenced but described as informally maintained

Q35: Level of Templatisation of Online Assets

No proofing/template validation tool: No Frame.io or equivalent; Trello used for approvals but no template compliance checking ---

Q36: Ability to Automate the Personalisation of Creative Assets

No display DCO: Tracto abandoned; no automated creative personalisation for display formats — display creative is manually produced and static

Q36: Ability to Automate the Personalisation of Creative Assets

Social creative not personalised at individual level: Social assets are produced from templates but not dynamically personalised per user

Q36: Ability to Automate the Personalisation of Creative Assets

Location-based creative personalisation undocumented: Geo data used for campaigns but no evidence of location-triggered creative variation

Q36: Ability to Automate the Personalisation of Creative Assets

A/B testing for social media limited: No powerful tool; social A/B not systematic

Q36: Ability to Automate the Personalisation of Creative Assets

Creative intelligence analysis nascent: "Just started testing" — no established framework for connecting creative analysis to personalisation decisions

Q36: Ability to Automate the Personalisation of Creative Assets

Personalisation scale not measured: No tracking of total personalised variants generated; no personalisation KPIs reported ---

Q37: Ability to Automate the Distribution of Creative Assets

Creative assets distributed manually: All display, social, and video assets uploaded manually to platforms — no automated push from production to channel

Q37: Ability to Automate the Distribution of Creative Assets

No DAM: No central asset library — cannot push assets from central repository; only ADEO BU without DAMEO

Q37: Ability to Automate the Distribution of Creative Assets

No social media scheduler: No confirmed tool for scheduled social posting

Q37: Ability to Automate the Distribution of Creative Assets

No distribution monitoring: No system to track what has been published, when, and where

Q37: Ability to Automate the Distribution of Creative Assets

Creative distribution error risk: Manual uploads across multiple platforms without automated QC create risk of version errors, wrong formats, or missed channels

Q37: Ability to Automate the Distribution of Creative Assets

Drive storage is not a distribution system: Organised Drive is a storage solution, not a distribution tool — assets cannot be pushed from it ---

Q38: Level of Automation of the Validation, Production, Distribution Workflow

Creative workflow 100% manual: BU confirmed "100% manually" — no automated handoffs between brief, design, approval, and upload stages

Q38: Level of Automation of the Validation, Production, Distribution Workflow

No DAM: Without DAMEO or equivalent, there is no central asset library that can trigger automated distribution

Q38: Level of Automation of the Validation, Production, Distribution Workflow

No distribution automation for creative: Every display, social, and video asset is uploaded manually per platform

Q38: Level of Automation of the Validation, Production, Distribution Workflow

No pipeline connection between Figma and ad platforms: Bulk export from Figma is a manual step — no API bridge to channels

Q38: Level of Automation of the Validation, Production, Distribution Workflow

No automated validation: Brand compliance and approval decisions are entirely human-driven

Q38: Level of Automation of the Validation, Production, Distribution Workflow

No integrated workflow documentation: The full end-to-end workflow (all stages) has not been mapped or documented — gaps cannot be systematically identified ---

Q39: Automated Production Workflows

Creative production 100% manual: Explicitly confirmed — concept to delivery requires human input at every stage

Q39: Automated Production Workflows

No DCO platform: Tracto abandoned; automated display variant production not available

Q39: Automated Production Workflows

No feed-based production: No Smartfeed or equivalent; product feed does not drive creative asset production

Q39: Automated Production Workflows

Manual upload to channels: Figma export-to-platform connection confirmed as manual ("Figma but to plug to Insider is manually")

Q39: Automated Production Workflows

Granular workflow metrics absent: Time-to-market per stage, first-pass approval rate, and cost per asset not tracked

Q39: Automated Production Workflows

GenAI not systematised: No tool policy, no governance document, specific tool not formally identified ---

Q40: Template and Standardisation Systems

BU answered "No" to template system question: The team itself recognises the absence of a formal system — templates exist but are not systematised

Q40: Template and Standardisation Systems

No central template library or catalog: Templates distributed across Figma, Insider, Pricefy, and brand book with no unified access point

Q40: Template and Standardisation Systems

Template documentation "not so very well documented": Brand book templates described as underdeveloped

Q40: Template and Standardisation Systems

No DCO template system: Tracto abandoned — no automated display template personalisation

Q40: Template and Standardisation Systems

Template vs. scratch % unknown: Cannot confirm what proportion of assets are template-derived; team could not confirm this figure

Q40: Template and Standardisation Systems

No cost-per-asset or template efficiency metrics: Production efficiency benefit of templates not measured

Q40: Template and Standardisation Systems

Partner access not documented: No evidence of how external agencies access templates; potential consistency risk ---

Q41: Batch Processing Capabilities

Figma-to-channel connection is manual: The critical bottleneck — "Figma but to plug to Insider is manually" — confirms no automated batch handoff from production to distribution

Q41: Batch Processing Capabilities

No DCO batch processing: Tracto abandoned; no automated batch creative variant generation for display

Q41: Batch Processing Capabilities

No feed-based batch production: Product feed does not drive creative asset batch generation

Q41: Batch Processing Capabilities

Creative upload fully manual: Each creative asset uploaded separately per platform per campaign

Q41: Batch Processing Capabilities

Batch processing not documented as a workflow: No formal batch processing SOP; knowledge is team-internal ---

Q42: Quality Control Automation

No automated QC systems — confirmed: BU answered "No" directly; this is the most explicit gap in the pillar

Q42: Quality Control Automation

Manual approval only: Trello approval is human-directed; no automated compliance gate before assets go live

Q42: Quality Control Automation

No brand compliance automation: No CreativeX or equivalent — brand consistency relies on designer knowledge and manual review

Q42: Quality Control Automation

No format validation: No automated check that assets meet platform specifications (dimensions, file sizes, aspect ratios, codec requirements) before upload

Q42: Quality Control Automation

No dedicated QA team: QC responsibility is distributed; with 1,074 assets per OPECOM, manual QC per asset is not sustainable as volume grows

Q42: Quality Control Automation

In-store checklist does not address creative QC: The checklist verifies deployment completeness, not creative quality or brand compliance ---

INNOVATION

Q43: GenAI adoption in content production

No Documented Policy: GenAI Policy folder empty; no governance framework

Q43: GenAI adoption in content production

Zero Documented Adoption: Self-assessed as "zero documented adoption" — informal only

Q43: GenAI adoption in content production

Unconfirmed Tooling: Specific GenAI tool not confirmed; not in paid tool stack

Q43: GenAI adoption in content production

No Approved Tool List: No formal list of approved GenAI tools

Q43: GenAI adoption in content production

No Training Framework: No documented GenAI training or upskilling programme ---

Q44: Emerging formats and channels

No Emerging Format Testing: No systematic testing of new or emerging formats

Q44: Emerging formats and channels

No New Platform Exploration: No evaluation of TikTok or other emerging platforms

Q44: Emerging formats and channels

Transactional Focus: 2026 focus described as "very transactional" — limits innovation bandwidth

Q44: Emerging formats and channels

No Format Innovation Roadmap: No plan for exploring new formats

Q44: Emerging formats and channels

Influencer ≠ Emerging Format: Influencer expansion is not an emerging content format ---

Q45: Recurrence of creative Test & Learn

No Formal Framework: Self-reported as "manually and not documented" — no formal T&L; process

Q45: Recurrence of creative Test & Learn

No Experiment Log: No systematic log of tests run, hypotheses, and outcomes

Q45: Recurrence of creative Test & Learn

No Learnings Library: No central repository beyond individual campaign reports

Q45: Recurrence of creative Test & Learn

Manual Process: Testing is manual and practitioner-driven, not embedded in workflow

Q45: Recurrence of creative Test & Learn

OPECOM Only: Documented testing appears limited to OPECOM fair campaigns; not universal ---

Q46: Emerging technology adoption

No Formal Evaluation Process: Tech Evaluation folder empty; evaluations happen but not documented

Q46: Emerging technology adoption

No Horizon Scanning: No systematic process to identify emerging technologies

Q46: Emerging technology adoption

No Adoption Decisions Log: Tracto rejection and GenAI adoption not formally recorded

Q46: Emerging technology adoption

Undocumented Adoption: GenAI use not documented; zero formal records per self-assessment

Q46: Emerging technology adoption

No Evaluation Scorecards: No criteria framework for comparing technology options ---

Q47: Creative experimentation processes

No Formal Playbook: No documented experimentation framework or methodology

Q47: Creative experimentation processes

Manual and Undocumented: Self-reported as "manually and not documented" — practice exists without system

Q47: Creative experimentation processes

No Learnings Library: No central repository; insights siloed in individual campaign reports

Q47: Creative experimentation processes

OPECOM-Specific: Documented experimentation appears limited to fair campaigns; unclear if universal

Q47: Creative experimentation processes

No Governance: No approval or governance process for creative experiments

Q47: Creative experimentation processes

No Hypotheses Log: No pre-registered hypotheses or test planning documentation ---

Q48: Innovation pipeline management

No Formal Backlog: No innovation backlog — pipeline management is OKR-driven, not backlog-driven

Q48: Innovation pipeline management

No Stage-Gate: No stage-gate process from ideation to implementation

Q48: Innovation pipeline management

No Ideation Process: No structured ideation or idea capture process

Q48: Innovation pipeline management

OKR ≠ Innovation Pipeline: OKR-aligned planning is broader project management, not innovation-specific pipeline

Q48: Innovation pipeline management

Monitoring Without Pipeline: Bi-weekly monitoring is operational, not innovation pipeline governance ---

Q49: Future capability planning

No Gap Analysis: No documented capability gap analysis (current state vs future requirement)

Q49: Future capability planning

No Investment Priorities Framework: CCDP is a point decision; no broader investment prioritisation framework

Q49: Future capability planning

Roadmap Detail Unclear: BCap roadmap is an image; scope (team, skills, tools, processes) not fully verifiable

Q49: Future capability planning

Comprehensive Planning Scope: Whether planning covers all capability dimensions unclear

Q49: Future capability planning

Skills Planning: No evidence of specific skills gap analysis or workforce capability planning ---

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

No Campaign-Level Playbooks: Confirmed absent — teams copy and evolve informally

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

No Creative Approval Checklist: Trello tracks approvals but no documented checklist for what is reviewed

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

Drive-Only Accessibility: All documents on Google Drive with no navigation structure — findability depends on institutional knowledge

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

No Usage Tracking: No mechanism to confirm all team members have read/understood guidelines

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

Global Campaign Toolkit Empty: Bora pra Obra folder still empty

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

No Formal Template Catalogue: Figma templates exist but no documented library listing what is available ---

Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem

No Documented Partner Roster: Partner classification exists only in practitioner knowledge; not written down

Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem

No Ways-of-Working Documents: No formal service agreements or collaboration frameworks for any agency partner

Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem

Predominantly Transactional: Own assessment: "2026 very transactional" — the strategic ambition for 360 integration has not yet been realised

Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem

No Shared KPIs: No performance targets shared with agency partners

Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem

No Co-Innovation: Agencies execute to brief; no examples of agency-led innovation or shared R&D;

Q51: Ability to capitalize on a partner/supplier ecosystem

RACI Governance Folder Empty: No formal accountability matrix for partner management roles ---

Q52: Maturity of team roles and structure

No Production-Specific Role Descriptions: HR missions cover purpose; no competency profiles or skill levels for designers, content creators

Q52: Maturity of team roles and structure

No Interface Map: How content, SEO, paid media and design coordinate on campaigns is not documented

Q52: Maturity of team roles and structure

No Capacity Planning: No framework for allocating workload or planning for peaks

Q52: Maturity of team roles and structure

Manager Coordination Gap: Two manager layers exist but strategic coordination still falls to Juliana — a concentration risk

Q52: Maturity of team roles and structure

Content of OBM Estrutura Not Reviewed: Pptx file not readable — full detail of org chart unknown ---

Q53: Skill development programs

No Production Skills Modules Visible: All mandatory modules are compliance/corporate; no creative, digital marketing, or production-specific training confirmed

Q53: Skill development programs

No Skills Gap Analysis: No documented process for identifying individual or team skill gaps in production capabilities

Q53: Skill development programs

Low ADEO Network Sharing: Partilha All ADEO at 65% — below the group threshold for cross-BU learning

Q53: Skill development programs

No Learning Roadmap: No link between BCap capability roadmap and HR training priorities documented

Q53: Skill development programs

Certification / Outcomes: No evidence of certification, skills assessment, or outcomes measurement beyond completion percentages ---

Q54: BU/Central collaboration rituals

No Documentation of Central/BU Rituals: "YES" stated but no ritual calendar, agenda, or minutes shared

Q54: BU/Central collaboration rituals

ADEO DAM Non-Participation: Only BU in the group not using the central DAM — significant central integration gap

Q54: BU/Central collaboration rituals

Partilha All ADEO Under-Completion: 65% — cross-group knowledge sharing lowest priority for Brazilian team

Q54: BU/Central collaboration rituals

Intra-BU vs. Central Conflation: Monthly review ritual is clearly intra-BU; central/BU rituals are less clearly evidenced

Q54: BU/Central collaboration rituals

No Global Campaign Toolkit: Bora pra Obra folder still empty — no shared central campaign assets ---

Q55: Level of availability of strategic and operational skills

Strategic Concentration Risk: All strategy coordination falls to Juliana; managers are operational-only — single point of failure

Q55: Level of availability of strategic and operational skills

No Skills Matrix: Cannot identify or close skill gaps systematically

Q55: Level of availability of strategic and operational skills

Enterprise Technology Gaps: DAM, DCO, CreativeX, product feed automation — knowledge gaps in enterprise marketing infrastructure

Q55: Level of availability of strategic and operational skills

Creative Intelligence: Just starting testing — not yet embedded as a skill

Q55: Level of availability of strategic and operational skills

Production Efficiency Metrics: No cost-per-asset or time-to-market tracking — limits data-driven production improvement ---

Q56: Knowledge management & documentation

No DAM: Only BU in ADEO group without a DAM — no asset versioning, no discoverability, no master asset repository

Q56: Knowledge management & documentation

No Knowledge Repository: No centralised documentation; everything on Drive without governance

Q56: Knowledge management & documentation

Insider CRM Knowledge at Risk: 50 segmentation rules, BI journeys, automation architecture — undocumented; single-person dependency

Q56: Knowledge management & documentation

No Lessons-Learned Capture: Monthly ritual produces verbal output only; no repository or template

Q56: Knowledge management & documentation

No Process Maps or SOPs: Beyond Governance SLA, no workflow documentation for content, design, SEO, or paid media functions

Q56: Knowledge management & documentation

RACI Folder Empty: No accountability mapping for knowledge management roles or documentation ownership ---

Q57: Agency management & ways of working

No Ways-of-Working Documents: No formal WoW documentation for any agency, including liveSEO (classified as strategic)

Q57: Agency management & ways of working

Self-Described as Transactional: Juliana explicitly characterises the 2026 model as "very transactional" — the team's own assessment

Q57: Agency management & ways of working

No Shared KPIs: No performance targets shared with any agency partner

Q57: Agency management & ways of working

No Formal Performance Reviews: No evidence of quarterly business reviews or structured agency performance management

Q57: Agency management & ways of working

No Brief Template: Briefs used but no template or quality standard documented

Q57: Agency management & ways of working

RACI Folder Empty: No governance or accountability framework for partner management roles ---

Q58: Onboarding & training processes

No Production Onboarding: No documented onboarding process for content, design, SEO or paid media roles — tool setup, workflow orientation, brief process are not systematised

Q58: Onboarding & training processes

No Onboarding Checklist: No structured first-week guide or role-specific onboarding checklist found

Q58: Onboarding & training processes

English Language Barrier: ADEO group modules (Partilha All ADEO) at 65% completion — likely partially due to language friction; this affects access to central onboarding resources

Q58: Onboarding & training processes

No Craft Training Modules: No production skills training in the LMS to support the second phase of onboarding (skills development after orientation)

Q58: Onboarding & training processes

Manager Onboarding Gap: Managers are primarily operational and do not own strategic orientation for new joiners — Juliana carries this by default ---

Q59: Change management capabilities

No Change Management Methodology: No formal framework (ADKAR, Kotter, or equivalent); change is managed ad hoc within OKR planning

Q59: Change management capabilities

No Adoption KPIs: Successful changes are visible in operational outcomes, not measured as adoption metrics

Q59: Change management capabilities

No Lessons Learned Capture: Tracto failure produced no documented retrospective; successful changes not captured as reusable knowledge

Q59: Change management capabilities

No Communications Plan Template: Formal communication occurs but without a standardised template or staged rollout plan

Q59: Change management capabilities

Change Management Folder Empty: No documentation despite a rich history of successful organisational changes

Q59: Change management capabilities

Concentration Risk: Change communication and oversight falls primarily to Juliana — no change management function or ownership below her level ---