Brand Execution Risk Assessment

A guided diagnostic to identify where speed, cost, consistency, visibility, and execution risk may be hiding inside your branded programs.

Speed to Market	Budget Control	Brand Consistency	Field Readiness	Waste Reduction	Program Visibility

How this is different from a basic scorecard:

This assessment captures score, risk level, evidence, examples, and the biggest friction point in each area - so the conversation moves beyond a number and toward what is actually causing the operational drag.

How to Use This Assessment

This is not meant to be a cold-prospect homework assignment. It can work as a light self-check, but it is most valuable as a guided discovery and onboarding conversation.

1. **Score the current state**
   Use 1-5 to rate how mature or reliable the process is today.

2. **Capture the evidence**
   Document why the score was given: spreadsheets, manual emails, outdated portals, multiple warehouses, tribal knowledge,

3. **Name the friction**
   Write the biggest frustration in each area. These answers are often more valuable than the numerical score.

4. **Map business impact**
   Connect gaps to speed, budget, brand consistency, field readiness, waste, rework, and visibility.

5. **Prioritize the next step**
   Focus on the 1-3 areas with the highest combination of low score and high business risk.

The goal is not to grade the team.

The goal is to uncover where branded programs may be creating unnecessary friction, cost, waste, inconsistency, or lack of visibility.

Executive Impact Map

Every question in this assessment connects back to business outcomes marketing, operations, procurement, and field leaders care about.

Speed to Market

Do requests, approvals, quotes, production, and fulfillment move fast enough to support launch timing?

Budget Control

Can teams prevent rework, rush fees, duplicate orders, excess inventory, and uncontrolled local spend?

Brand Consistency

Can the organization control approved assets, versions, materials, and local execution?

Field Readiness

Can locations, dealers, franchisees, or teams get the right materials at the right time?

Waste & Rework

Can the company reduce obsolete materials, excess inventory, avoidable reprints, and one-off fire drills?

Visibility & Reporting

Can leadership see usage, inventory, spend, delivery, exceptions, and improvement opportunities?

How to prioritize:

The highest-priority gaps are not always the lowest scores. Focus first where a weak process creates material risk to launch timing, cost, brand consistency, field execution, or leadership visibility.

1. Program Complexity & Ownership

Complex programs without clear ownership create delays, duplicated effort, and inconsistent accountability.

Rate the current process

1 = not reliable / mostly manual 3 = workable but inconsistent 5 = clear, repeatable, visible

- ☐ There is a clear owner for the branded materials program. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Requests are routed through a defined process. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Vendors, internal teams, and approvers understand their roles. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ The team has visibility into active projects and deadlines. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Exceptions and rush requests have a documented path. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

What evidence supports the score?

- ☐ Manual email requests
- ☐ Multiple request forms
- ☐ Unclear ownership
- ☐ Too many handoffs
- ☐ No project dashboard
- ☐ Other

Likely business impact

- ☐ Speed to market
- ☐ Budget control
- ☐ Rework
- ☐ Accountability

Biggest frustration in this area:

____

____

Specific example or evidence:

____

____

2. Brand & Version Control

Weak version control can put the wrong message, design, price, offer, or material into market.

Rate the current process

1 = not reliable / mostly manual   3 = workable but inconsistent   5 = clear, repeatable, visible

- ☐ Approved artwork, specs, and versions are easy for teams to access. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Local or regional variations are controlled and documented. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Teams know which materials are current, retired, or restricted. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Proofing and approval workflows are clearly defined. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Reorders use the correct approved version. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

What evidence supports the score?

- ☐ Old files in circulation
- ☐ Local vendor workarounds
- ☐ Multiple versions
- ☐ Approval confusion
- ☐ Outdated portal
- ☐ Other

Likely business impact

- ☐ Brand consistency
- ☐ Compliance
- ☐ Reprints
- ☐ Field readiness

Biggest frustration in this area:

Specific example or evidence:

3. Vendor & Production Workflow

Vendor and production friction slows quoting, creates rework, and makes quality harder to control.

Rate the current process

1 = not reliable / mostly manual 3 = workable but inconsistent 5 = clear, repeatable, visible

- ☐ Vendor selection is based on project fit, timing, geography, quality, and cost. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Quote requests include enough detail to avoid multiple requotes. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Proofs, approvals, and revisions are tracked clearly. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Quality-control checkpoints are defined. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Backup plans exist for rush work or vendor constraints. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

What evidence supports the score?

- ☐ Requotes common
- ☐ Spec gaps
- ☐ Too many vendors
- ☐ No QC checkpoints
- ☐ Rush fees
- ☐ Other

Likely business impact

- ☐ Speed to market
- ☐ Budget control
- ☐ Quality
- ☐ Rework

Biggest frustration in this area:

____

____

Specific example or evidence:

____

____

4. Inventory & Fulfillment Visibility

Low visibility into inventory and fulfillment creates waste, stockouts, obsolete materials, and poor decisions.

Rate the current process

1 = not reliable / mostly manual 3 = workable but inconsistent 5 = clear, repeatable, visible

- ☐ Current inventory is visible across active materials. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ The team knows what is moving, sitting, or becoming obsolete. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Reorder thresholds or replenishment triggers are defined. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Warehouse or storage locations are visible in one place. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Teams do not rely on email or tribal knowledge to know what is available. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

What evidence supports the score?

- ☐ Spreadsheets
- ☐ Multiple warehouses
- ☐ Warehouse reports
- ☐ Outdated portal data
- ☐ Tribal knowledge
- ☐ Other

Likely business impact

- ☐ Waste
- ☐ Obsolete inventory
- ☐ Stockouts
- ☐ Budget leakage
- ☐ Visibility

Biggest frustration in this area:

____

____

Specific example or evidence:

____

____

5. Field & Local Execution

If materials arrive but are not installed, used, or reordered correctly, the campaign can miss the intended result.

Rate the current process

1 = not reliable / mostly manual   3 = workable but inconsistent   5 = clear, repeatable, visible

- ☐ Locations or field teams receive clear instructions. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Materials are packed or versioned by location where needed. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Delivery status and exceptions are visible. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Teams can confirm whether materials were installed or used. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ There is a clear path for replacements, reorders, or issue resolution. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

What evidence supports the score?

- ☐ Location exceptions
- ☐ No install confirmation
- ☐ Missing materials
- ☐ Manual replacement requests
- ☐ No issue log
- ☐ Other

Likely business impact

- ☐ Field readiness
- ☐ Brand consistency
- ☐ Customer experience
- ☐ Rework

Biggest frustration in this area:

____

____

Specific example or evidence:

____

____

npn360°

6. Reporting & Optimization

Without reporting, teams cannot prove value, improve spend, reduce waste, or see where the process is breaking down.

Rate the current process

1 = not reliable / mostly manual   3 = workable but inconsistent   5 = clear, repeatable, visible

- ☐ Leadership can see spend, usage, inventory, and activity by program. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ The team can identify trends, repeat issues, and improvement opportunities. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Reports are available without manual spreadsheet assembly. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Post-program reviews happen consistently. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
- ☐ Data is used to improve future planning, quantities, sourcing, and fulfillment. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

What evidence supports the score?

- ☐ Manual reporting
- ☐ No usage trends
- ☐ Limited spend visibility
- ☐ No post-program review
- ☐ Disconnected systems
- ☐ Other

Likely business impact

- ☐ Visibility
- ☐ Budget control
- ☐ Planning
- ☐ Continuous improvement

Biggest frustration in this area:

____

____

Specific example or evidence:

____

____

Risk Summary

Summarize the highest-risk gaps by business impact, not just by score.

Highest-risk area #1:

Highest-risk area #2:

Highest-risk area #3:

These gaps may be affecting:

- ☐ Speed to market
- ☐ Brand consistency
- ☐ Waste / rework
- ☐ Budget control
- ☐ Field readiness
- ☐ Visibility and reporting

Executive framing:

What would improve if these gaps were solved? Faster launches? Less waste? Better local execution? Cleaner reporting? Fewer fire drills?

30-Day Action Plan

Use this page to turn assessment gaps into a focused next step.

Biggest operational risk:

What it may be costing us:

What needs to change:

Who owns the fix:

First 30-day action:

Action	Owner	Deadline	Status

Interactive Diagnostic Roadmap

The PDF starts the conversation. The interactive version turns it into an adaptive discovery engine.

1. Ask program context first

Program type, material types, locations, warehouse model, vendor count, and current ownership.

2. Identify current friction

The prospect selects what feels harder than it should and describes the biggest frustration in their own words.

3. Ask adaptive follow-ups

Low scores trigger deeper questions. Strong areas are not over-questioned.

4. Generate a risk profile

Output overall readiness, top risks, likely business impacts, and recommended next steps.

5. Create an internal brief

npn360 receives discovery notes, suggested questions, and likely solution areas.

6. Build benchmarks over time

Assessments can reveal trends by industry, company size, retail format, program type, and location count.

Long-term value:

Over time, this becomes a knowledge base that helps npn360 ask better questions, identify issues faster, and provide more strategic guidance based on actual data instead of assumptions.