

A national arrival. A local reason to try.

Cluckin' Good media response

An independent strategy study connecting research, media planning, budget allocation, measurement and partnerships. Developed by Meeno Zen with AI-assisted preparation and review.

[Reading edition / 10 September 2026](#)

Read alongside the interactive presentation or independently. This edition expands the supporting explanations, methods, questions and source notes. The calculation workbook contains the editable numerical inputs and all 252 market, phase and channel budget lines.

How to read the evidence

Cluckin' Good is a concept brand. The scenario brief defines the planning problem. Research supports only the claims its methods can establish. Client records and supplier proposals remain needed for live planning. Illustrative advertising quantities and prices demonstrate the budget calculations. They are not supplier quotes, delivery forecasts or proof of the best media mix.

[Interactive presentation](#)

The response, in order

01 / The brief

02 / The working method

03 / Evidence behind the plan

04 / Channel strategy

05 / Market media plan

06 / Channel and market budget

07 / Measurement framework

08 / Creators and partnerships

09 / Decisions and next steps

Appendix: the scenario brief and research register

01 / THE BRIEF

A national launch. Five decisions to get right.

Launch 45 stores with \$8.5 million in media: help people recognise Cluckin' Good, try it and join its rewards programme.

Purpose: Define the assignment before proposing the answer.

Deliverable: Introduces all five deliverables

Decision explained

The scenario describes a launch of 45 takeaway chicken stores across every Australian state and territory. It assigns \$8.5 million in media spending and asks for five outputs: channel strategy, a market schedule, a channel and market budget, measurement, and partnership recommendations.

The brief also tells us who the brand wants to attract and why its food should appeal. We use those facts, research and illustrative planning inputs to build the response. Each decision shows its evidence and any information the client still needs to supply.

Basis and limits

The campaign faces two linked problems: Cluckin' Good is new to a crowded category, and early advertising must reach people who can realistically buy from an open store. Those are the problems the channel strategy must address.

The response also explains an agency operating model for AI-assisted preparation and human review. It supports the five client deliverables.

The brief supplies goals and planning direction, not real customer records, booked media or campaign results. Illustrative inputs are used only to explain calculations and methods. They are not evidence that the proposed campaign has worked.

Method, checks and live requirements

Brief interpretation

Inputs: Original brief, all 12 sections

Preparation: Extracted the five outputs and connected them to the response sections.

Check applied: Requirement coverage against the original brief.

Required human action: Client marketing director: confirm the interpretation and resolve any brief conflict before live planning.

Is this a report of a completed campaign?

This is an independent strategy study for a concept brand. Published research informs the recommendations; the store schedule and planning records are illustrative. The completed work is the strategy, not an executed campaign.

Scenario brief: sections 1, 2 and 12

02 / THE WORKING METHOD

From brief to five checked deliverables.

A coordinating agent routes the work. Specialist functions prepare evidence and options. People provide facts, make consequential decisions and approve release.

Purpose: Explain how the five outputs are produced and checked.

Deliverable: Production method supporting all five deliverables

Decision explained

Start with the brief and its constraints. The Strategy AI agent turns them into assignments with a clear question, required inputs and expected output. Research, analytics, planning, creative and partnership work can proceed together when they do not depend on each other.

A missing store address goes to client operations. A missing audience finding goes to a research owner. A disputed calculation goes back to analytics. The coordinating agent keeps those dependencies visible, then assembles the returned work. A separate review function challenges the evidence and arithmetic before the human owner signs off.

The map describes how an agency can run this system. The current revision was prepared by one assistant using research, calculation and document tools. It does not claim that the proposed specialist agents ran independently or that any client approved the plan.

The connected system

The Strategy AI agent assigns work and combines the returned outputs. Research, analytics, planning, measurement and creative/partnerships exchange evidence through the coordinator and shared records. Calculation tools apply fixed formulas. Review returns defects for correction. Human owners supply unavailable inputs and approve consequential actions.

Client brief

Input / Sets the assignment

Receives: The original brief: \$8.5m, 45 stores, audiences, launch phases, targets and five requested outputs.

Work: Keep the brief unchanged. Extract its requirements into a checklist and record where each requirement is answered.

Returns: A requirements checklist linked to the original brief.

Check or human decision: The client clarifies contradictions. Later research cannot silently override a brief requirement.

Strategy AI agent

Coordinator / Assigns, connects and assembles

Receives: The brief, task progress, returned findings and unresolved questions.

Work: Assign a specific question and expected output to each specialist. Pass useful findings between specialists. Route missing inputs to the right person, then combine the work.

Returns: Assignments, decisions awaiting an owner, and one connected response.

Check or human decision: Wait when a required input or approval is missing. Do not let a specialist's completion message stand in for evidence.

Client & agency owners

Human decision / Supply facts and approve action

Receives: A named request, the decision it affects, evidence, cost and due date.

Work: Client operations supplies store records. The research owner commissions fieldwork. Investment confirms supplier terms. Client and agency approvers decide whether work can proceed.

Returns: Authorised records, supplier responses and recorded decisions.

Check or human decision: Only authorised people approve research spend, legal claims, regional flighting and media bookings. No such approvals are claimed in this case.

Research AI agent

Specialist / Finds and qualifies evidence

Receives: Questions about audience needs, media habits, channel results and partner suitability.

Work: Retrieve permitted sources, record the population and method, and state exactly what each finding supports. Ask for client or supplier evidence when public research cannot answer the question.

Returns: Cited findings and a list of specific unanswered questions.

Check or human decision: A public media-usage study does not prove local campaign effectiveness. Escalate that gap rather than turning it into a confident claim.

Data Analytics AI agent

Specialist / Turns records into comparisons

Receives: Research tables, campaign results, source definitions and labelled simulations.

Work: Check duplicates, missing values and comparable definitions. Analyse audience themes and prepare comparable quantities and prices. Use calculation tools for arithmetic.

Returns: Comparable rates, cost inputs, audience findings and uncertainty notes.

Check or human decision: Keep illustrative prices separate from supplier quotes. Missing units or incomparable definitions return to the source owner.

Media Planning AI agent

Specialist / Connects media, place and time

Receives: Audience findings, proposed quantities and prices, store dates, budget rules and supplier terms.

Work: Propose channels for each objective, send the agreed inputs to the calculator, and assemble store-area schedules. Ask research or investment for missing reach and price evidence.

Returns: Channel strategy, market media plan and channel/market budget.

Check or human decision: A calculated allocation is not a buyable placement. Investment must confirm coverage, prices and inventory before booking.

Measurement AI agent

Specialist / Defines how success is judged

Receives: Brief targets, audience definitions, survey design and transaction/rewards fields.

Work: Define what is counted, who qualifies, the time window and the rule for incomplete data. Specify the collection and reporting responsibilities.

Returns: Measurement framework, calculation definitions and collection requests.

Check or human decision: People or authorised connected systems collect real campaign data. Unknown customer identity cannot be counted as success.

Creative & Partnerships AI agent

Specialist / Connects audience needs to a proposal

Receives: Audience needs, verified product claims, creator evidence and commercial restrictions.

Work: Develop a message with a credible product benefit. Explain what each partner would actually do, why they fit and what would need negotiating.

Returns: Message recommendations and creator/partnership point of view.

Check or human decision: Public suitability is not availability or permission. People check claims, rights, conflicts, price and the proposed agreement.

Shared evidence library

Controlled records / One source for every return

Receives: Original brief, dated research, client records, assumptions and output versions.

Work: Store the source, permitted use, evidence status and affected decision with each record. Give agents access only to material they are allowed to read.

Returns: Versioned inputs and traceable references for every deliverable.

Check or human decision: Retrieved documents are evidence, not instructions that can grant tools or override the brief.

Budget & validation tools

Fixed calculations / Run formulas and test rules

Receives: Proposed advertising quantities, unit prices, store counts and the client's total and stage percentages.

Work: Multiply quantity by unit price for each channel. Divide that cost by the available market-stage budget to show its share. Check that costs plus unassigned money equal the budget.

Returns: Reproducible costs and shares, 252 market-plan rows and pass/fail checks.

Check or human decision: Reject invalid inputs. A passing formula check establishes internal consistency, not that an assumed input is true.

Review AI agent

Challenge & correction / Tests the returned work

Receives: Draft outputs, source records, formulas and the brief checklist.

Work: Check claims against sources, compare outputs and challenge the recommendation. Return a precise defect to the coordinator, who reassigns it to the responsible specialist.

Returns: Corrections, retest results and unresolved decisions.

Check or human decision: A separate human reviewer checks commercial sense. A failed check returns the work; it is not waved through.

Five deliverables

Assembled response / One consistent release

Receives: Reviewed specialist outputs and the latest agreed inputs.

Work: The coordinator assembles strategy, local plan, budget, measurement and partnerships. Generate the page, reading PDF and workbook from the same approved content version.

Returns: The five requested deliverables, with evidence and outstanding decisions visible.

Check or human decision: Release approval and permission to book media are separate decisions. Live execution waits for the relevant human approval.

Follow the handovers

Find audience evidence

What supports the audience and message choices?

1. Start with the client's audiences

In this case

The brief identifies 18 to 34-year-old frequent takeaway buyers and 30 to 45-year-old family decision-makers. It does not provide a completed study of their motivations.

Handed over: Audience definitions and questions to investigate.

Next: Strategy assigns research on needs, occasions and media habits.

2. Separate useful research from an unanswered question

In this case

Public research can establish category context and media use. It cannot, by itself, tell us which Cluckin' Good message will persuade nearby buyers at the actual menu price.

Handed over: Source-linked findings, with limits on what they can support.

Next: The coordinator requests client customer research and product proof.

3. Make the missing evidence actionable

Proposed live handover

No suitable client message study is supplied here. Ask the client whether one exists. If not, give the agency research owner the precise decision: which message improves willingness to try at the actual price?

Handed over: A research request with the target audience, messages, price and affected decision.

Next: A person decides whether to commission research or retain a provisional message.

4. People obtain the real responses

Proposed live handover

The research owner agrees method, sample, privacy and cost. A research supplier recruits buyers and collects responses. This case does not claim that study was commissioned or completed.

Handed over: Authorised respondent data and a method report, if commissioned.

Next: Research checks the study; analytics receives the usable records.

5. Compare responses without inventing certainty

Proposed live handover

Analyse needs and message responses by the agreed segments. Check sample coverage, missing answers and uncertainty before ranking options. Small differences may be inconclusive.

Handed over: A comparison of messages, who preferred them and the strength of the evidence.

Next: Send findings to strategy and creative/partnerships.

6. Turn the finding into a proposition

Proposed live handover

Match a supported customer need to a product benefit the client can prove. Use that proposition to assess creator and partner ideas; do not choose a creator on follower count alone.

Handed over: A message, its product proof and a relevant collaboration idea.

Next: Review challenges the evidence. People approve the claims and commercial arrangement.

Calculate channel spend

How do inputs become a channel allocation?

1. Keep the budget rules fixed

In this case

The brief supplies \$8.5m and the 45% / 30% / 25% phase split. These rules do not determine the share for outdoor, social or another channel.

Handed over: Fixed total and phase budgets, separate from channel weighting.

Next: Research looks for comparable channel-performance evidence.

2. Find the buying inputs

Illustrative inputs in this case

Ask suppliers for eligible placements, dates, audience coverage and prices. This case has no confirmed quotes, so the schedules use clearly labelled illustrative quantities and prices.

Handed over: A priced schedule with its coverage and availability still to confirm.

Next: Planning selects activity that fits the launch-stage job and store areas.

3. Check units and scope

Calculation preparation

Keep net media separate from production and fees. Record whether each price buys a package, one click or one thousand ad views. Do not count the same campaign under social and app acquisition.

Handed over: Quantities and unit prices ready for calculation.

Next: The fixed calculation multiplies quantity by unit price.

4. Calculate cost, then percentage

Calculated from illustrative inputs

Sydney has \$765,000 for introducing the brand. Nine Outdoor packages at \$20,000 each cost \$180,000. Divide \$180,000 by \$765,000, then multiply by 100: 23.53%.

Handed over: Channel cost and its share of the available stage budget.

Next: Add costs across channels and keep the unassigned money visible.

5. Keep the full budget accounted for

Illustrative schedules

The national schedules cost \$7.92 million. Another \$580,000 remains unassigned within the \$8.5 million budget. Confirm suitable supplier options before committing it.

Handed over: Costed schedules, unassigned balances and linked assumptions.

Next: Review checks arithmetic and whether each proposed activity can be bought.

6. Challenge before presenting or buying

Required review

Check costs plus unassigned money equal each market and stage budget. Check dates, units, duplicate counting and visible price assumptions. A human approves real supplier choices and commitments.

Handed over: Checked calculations and unresolved buying inputs.

Next: Assemble all five deliverables using the same version.

7. Bring the five outputs back together

In this case

The channel rationale, local schedule and budget use the same inputs. Measurement defines how results would be collected. Partnerships explains the proposed outside contribution. The coordinator packages these as one response, with unresolved evidence visible.

Handed over: Five connected deliverables, the reading PDF and the calculation workbook.

Next: The client and agency review the proposal; release of a planning response does not authorise media spend.

8. Approve the actual commitment separately

Proposed live handover

Before any live campaign commitment, the client and agency must accept the direction and budget, obtain the real buying inputs and record the required approvals. A simulated channel mix is a method demonstration, not buying authority.

Handed over: A recorded decision to proceed, revise or request stronger evidence.

Next: If inputs change, the coordinator returns the affected work to planning and recalculation.

Resolve a supplier gap

What happens when an agent cannot finish its work?

1. Check where the radio advertising will reach

Proposed live handover

Planning needs to know whether a station reaches people within the permitted early store area. A national radio study is not a local coverage map or a supplier quote.

Handed over: A request for the station's coverage, adult audience, inventory and price.

Next: The coordinator assigns the request to the investment owner.

2. Investment obtains the supplier evidence

Proposed live handover

The investment owner asks the station for current coverage and commercial terms. If the station cannot supply enough evidence, the placement remains unconfirmed.

Handed over: Dated supplier proposal and coverage information, or an explicit unresolved gap.

Next: Research checks the source; analytics compares usable reach and cost.

3. Check whether the information answers the question

Proposed live handover

Check geography, audience definition, measurement period and exclusions. Return a mismatch to investment instead of presenting the proposal as verified.

Handed over: An evidence assessment attached to the proposed placement.

Next: Planning checks the brief's first-eight-week proximity restriction.

4. Revise a placement that does not fit

Proposed live handover

If coverage cannot meet the early targeting restriction, propose another placement or a later flight. Pass changed costs back to the calculation tool, then return the revised plan to review.

Handed over: A revised placement with the reason and its budget effect.

Next: Review tests the change; the Regional Growth lead approves regional flighting.

5. An authorised person approves and books

Proposed live handover

The relevant owners approve the placement, costs and timing. Only an authorised buyer commits the spend. This example describes the intended handover; no station exchange or booking is claimed.

Handed over: Recorded approval and booking confirmation, if completed.

Next: Store the decision with the plan so future updates use the agreed version.

Work stages

1. Agree the assignment

Strategy AI agent / AI + human

Starts with: Client brief, five requested outputs, target definitions and approval rules.

AI preparation: Extract requirements and flag contradictions. Assign each task a question, source list, expected output and completion test.

Returns: Requirements register and assignments for research, analytics, planning, creative and partnerships.

People's responsibility: Client marketing director confirms scope. Head of AI configures access, tools, review rules and responsibility.

If information is missing: Unclear objective or conflicting instruction returns to the client before dependent work proceeds.

2. Collect useful evidence

Research AI agent / AI + human

Starts with: Audience definitions, product statements, store questions and channel-performance requirements.

AI preparation: Find public research, compare methods and record the exact claim each source supports. Request client records and supplier evidence that cannot be obtained publicly.

Returns: Source-linked findings, structured input tables and specific missing-data requests.

People's responsibility: Operations supplies addresses and dates. Product/legal supplies claim proof. Research partner recruits and interviews real buyers. Investment obtains quotes.

If information is missing: No local price or reach evidence? Route a request to investment. No customer evidence? Commission research or mark the decision provisional.

3. Analyse and compare

Data Analytics AI agent / AI-led preparation

Starts with: Source tables, definitions, research responses and comparable campaign outcomes.

AI preparation: Check missing records and duplicates, apply consistent definitions, code qualitative themes, calculate rates and compare options. Label any simulation separately.

Returns: Audience findings, costed schedules, budget balances and measurement calculations.

People's responsibility: Analytics owner approves definitions and test design. Research owner checks coding and sample interpretation.

If information is missing: Unmatched dates, unclear denominator or unrepresentative sample goes back to the data owner. The affected result stays unresolved.

4. Build the recommendation

Strategy, Media Planning, Creative and Partnerships AI functions / AI + human

Starts with: Audience needs, product proof, verified stores, advertising quantities and supplier prices.

AI preparation: Connect need to message and media. Assemble local schedules and budgets. Define candidate collaboration and evaluate alternatives against the brief.

Returns: Five connected draft deliverables with rationale, formulas, conditions and source links.

People's responsibility: Strategy owner selects the direction. Investment tests buyability. Creative owner evaluates the work. Legal checks claims and rights.

If information is missing: An unaffordable or geographically unsuitable placement returns to planning. An unsupported product promise returns to the product owner.

5. Challenge and correct

Review AI agent / AI + human

Starts with: Draft outputs, controlling brief, sources, formulas and explicit acceptance tests.

AI preparation: Check whether claims follow from evidence, totals reconcile and every requirement is answered. Return a specific defect, affected output and required retest.

Returns: Review findings and verified corrections. The coordinator sends each correction to its original owner.

People's responsibility: Agency reviewer tests commercial sense and judgement. A second reviewer must be assigned for a genuinely independent live review.

If information is missing: A failed check loops back to the responsible stage; no self-declared completion bypasses it.

6. Approve and deliver

Strategy AI agent assembles the files / Human approval

Starts with: Corrected deliverables, completed checks and remaining decision requests.

AI preparation: Package the site, reading PDF and calculation workbook from the same data version. Record approval evidence and release status.

Returns: Channel strategy, local media plan, channel/market budget, measurement framework and partnership point of view.

People's responsibility: Client approves strategy and budget; legal clears claims; Regional Growth lead approves regional flighting; authorised people contract and book media.

If information is missing: Missing approval holds the affected external action. AI can prepare the request but cannot approve it for the person.

How to build and operate the system

Agent runtime

Assign and resume

A harness is the software that runs the agents. It gives each task its instructions and permitted tools, saves progress and pauses work that needs a person.

Cluckin' Good example: Save "awaiting local coverage evidence" against the radio placement. Resume that task when the investment owner supplies the answer.

Model + task instructions

Read, reason and draft

Use an approved language model with a separate task definition for each role. Specify the question, permitted sources, output fields and conditions for escalation.

Cluckin' Good example: Research returns the finding, source, study population, date, limitation and planning implication. It does not return an unsupported recommendation as fact.

Evidence + task store

Retrieve and remember

Keep the controlling brief and dated evidence in an access-controlled library. Store task status and versioned outputs in structured records so agents do not overwrite one another.

Cluckin' Good example: Each channel cost links to its quantity and price. Replacing an illustrative price with a supplier quote marks the affected costs and remaining budget for recalculation.

Calculation + export tools

Repeat exactly

Run arithmetic, validation and file generation in code. The agent chooses which approved tool to call; the tool applies a fixed formula and returns its result or error.

Cluckin' Good example: Nine Outdoor packages at \$20,000 each cost \$180,000. Check that all channel costs fit within the available stage budget. Reject a negative price or an over-budget schedule.

Human decision queue

Pause before commitment

Show the question, owner, affected decision, evidence and proposed action. Record the person's answer. Enforce permissions in the application, not just in the prompt.

Cluckin' Good example: Research commissioning waits for cost and method approval. A planning agent can draft a booking request but has no media-buying permission.

Evaluation + release record

Check and recover

Test sources, formulas, content and file consistency. Save failed checks, corrections and approved output versions. Retry a failed read safely; verify an uncertain external action before repeating it.

Cluckin' Good example: Review sends an unsupported claim back for correction. Only reviewed output versions enter the release; missing approvals continue to hold the affected action.

A complete handover record

Record the question, input and evidence status, next owner and action, returned evidence, acceptance rule and route for a failed check. For radio coverage, investment obtains the dated supplier evidence; planning checks the brief's early targeting rule and keeps the placement unconfirmed until coverage, cost and approvals are established.

Before live use

Test missing inputs, contradictory sources, invalid numbers, interrupted tasks, duplicate actions and attempts by retrieved text to change the agent's instructions. Check both the automated response and the person's recovery path.

Method, checks and live requirements

A connected operating model

Inputs: The five deliverables and required human decisions

Preparation: Designed the connected map, defined each specialist's inputs and returns, and worked through audience research, channel calculation and supplier-request examples.

Check applied: Every stage has an input, output, responsible function and route for missing information.

Required human action: Head of AI: configure permissions, evaluations and logs.
Client approver: accept consequential strategy, budget and claim decisions.

Does each AI agent need its own trained model?

No. Different instructions and tool permissions can give separate sessions different jobs while using the same underlying model. Training a new model is not required for this design.

Does the human review every sentence before another AI agent can work?

No. Routine research and calculations can continue within agreed permissions. Human decisions are required for missing private information, disputed business choices, legal approval and spending authority.

AI production method: additional case-study scope, not a client campaign objective

Source notes: [OpenAI: Agents SDK and workflow orchestration](#); [OpenAI: File search](#); [OpenAI: Guardrails and human review](#)

03 / THE EVIDENCE

All the evidence, before the recommendations.

See what each deliverable needs, where the information comes from, what it tells us and what is still missing.

Purpose: Show what can legitimately support the recommendations.

Deliverable: Inputs to all five deliverables.

Decision explained

The brief tells us what success means. Client records establish where and what we can sell. Research explains buyers and the market. Supplier evidence tells us what advertising can reach those buyers and at what cost. Measurement and partner records complete the picture.

Each data topic below keeps its questions and findings together. An article becomes useful evidence only when we extract a specific observation, number or theme, record who it describes and explain what decision it supports. A missing answer stays missing; it is not replaced by confident wording.

This case includes real public research and a labelled simulation for unavailable campaign and store data. The simulation makes the planning calculations inspectable. It does not prove actual channel performance, local demand or supplier availability.

One register for all five deliverables

The same question connects the required information to the finding and decision. Missing evidence is recorded honestly. A published article contributes only the observation that its method supports.

Audience

Who we need to reach, what matters to them and which evidence supports the choices.

Used in deliverables 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

Who qualifies, and how many buyers are there?

Information to collect: Age, takeaway purchase frequency, household meal decision role and membership of either or both target groups. Estimate unique eligible buyers by market; do not add overlapping groups together. Preserve the brief's student, share-house and young-professional context for the primary group and family-treat context for the secondary group. Agree screening rules with the client; descriptive traits are not automatically mandatory qualifications.

Where it comes from: The brief defines the starting groups. A research supplier screens survey participants and estimates local audience size using suitable population data and buyer research.

Decision it supports: Who we target, the audience size used in planning and how we compare the groups.

Finding: The brief defines the two groups and their ages, purchase context and frequency. It does not supply unique buyer counts or the size of the overlap.

Choice: Use the client groups. Do not invent market sizes or add overlapping groups.

Evidence status: Brief supplied; sizing missing

Client brief, target-audience section. No local audience-size study supplied.

Where can they realistically buy?

Information to collect: Home or relevant work area, usual collection or delivery choice, acceptable travel time and access to a launch store. Use area-level data where possible, not unnecessary personal addresses.

Where it comes from: Business inputs: client store addresses, opening dates and delivery areas. Audience evidence: local buying areas and acceptable travel times, checked against journey or catchment estimates.

Decision it supports: Which areas receive advertising, especially the brief's first-eight-week proximity restriction. Match placements to local opening dates and phases. The early targeting boundary does not automatically define the awareness-survey population.

Finding: No real addresses, delivery areas or buyer travel limits have been supplied. The case uses an illustrative footprint.

Choice: The plan can illustrate local timing, but cannot confirm where a real advert may run.

Evidence status: Missing client and buyer evidence

Client brief, store-access requirements. No actual store or buyer-travel records supplied.

Which media, formats and times reach them?

Information to collect: Platform and service use, frequency, ad-supported access, preferred food-content formats, meal occasions, ordering times and duplicated reach across channels. Compare metro and regional buyers. Include commuter routes for outdoor, deal or catalogue use, and search and delivery-app discovery.

Where it comes from: Published media studies; a survey of qualifying buyers where those studies are too broad; local reach estimates from media suppliers.

Decision it supports: Placement, format, daypart, local channel mix and useful reach. General media use is not the same as paid advertising reach.

Finding: ACMA's June 2025 survey reports weekly user-generated/short-form viewing of 62%, 64% and 60% for ages 18 to 24, 25 to 34 and 35 to 44. Radio listening is 36% for ages 18 to 24. These are age groups, not screened takeaway buyers.

Choice: Consider short-form for both groups. Keep radio conditional on local reach and price; do not derive budget shares from usage.

Evidence status: Public research; local detail missing

ACMA, How we watch and listen to content: June 2025 weekly-use findings. Age bands differ from the brief's buyer groups.

[ACMA \(2026\): Viewing and listening findings](#)

Whose content or interests could connect with them?

Information to collect: Food creators they follow or trust and relevant sport, gaming or entertainment interests, with audience age and location fit. Check qualifying-buyer fit and additional reach beyond the planned media, not only age or follower count.

Where it comes from: Buyer research and creators' or partners' verified audience reports. A human checks that the claimed audience matches the campaign.

Decision it supports: Which partnership audiences are worth pursuing. Commercial availability, fees and rights are checked separately.

Finding: The candidate research confirms food-production experience for Andy Cooks and Daen's Kitchen. It does not establish which creators the target buyers trust or the extra local reach a partnership would add.

Choice: Compare food production on a common brief; buy audience distribution only after checking its actual composition.

Evidence status: Capability evidence; buyer fit missing

Official creator and organiser records linked below. No buyer-following or local audience study supplied.

[Andy Cooks: About](#)

[Andy Cooks shares BOSS Coffee announcement](#)

[Daen's Kitchen: Official biography](#)

[Melbourne Food & Wine: 2024 festival record](#)

What meal problem are we solving?

Information to collect: Recent meal occasions, who the meal is for, time pressure, frustrations with alternatives, motivations and reasons to reject an order. Include usual competing brands, existing competitor rewards membership and reasons to switch.

Where it comes from: Interviews about recent purchases with qualifying buyers, followed by a suitable survey to measure which needs are common.

Decision it supports: The problem the message should address and the benefit worth leading with.

Finding: Public studies describe convenience, cost and meal appeal. They do not report how common each concern is among Cluckin' Good's exact target buyers. Competitor switching and rewards membership are unmeasured.

Choice: Test these themes; do not claim a majority or a winning message.

Evidence status: Qualitative themes; prevalence missing

Qualitative studies linked below. Their participants' themes are not national percentages.

[Gupta et al. \(2025\): Australian delivery-food choices](#)

[Allman-Farinelli et al. \(2019\): Young adults eating out](#)

[Middleton et al. \(2023\): How families manage meals](#)

What offer feels worth the price?

Information to collect: Usual meal spending, response to the actual full price including fees, portion needs, relevant menu or dietary requirements, and trade-offs between price, flavour, quality and convenience.

Where it comes from: Business inputs: client menu, portions and full prices. Audience evidence: priced-choice research with buyers. Ask income only if it explains a decision beyond spending and affordability.

Decision it supports: A credible value proposition and offer. Do not promise a portion, price or dietary option that the client cannot supply.

Finding: The brief positions the meal above bargain value on quality and flavour. Actual prices, portions, fees and buyer willingness to pay are absent.

Choice: Propose a clear full-price meal offer; final value claims depend on the real menu and test.

Evidence status: Brief positioning; priced test missing

Client positioning in the brief; no complete priced menu or local willingness-to-pay test supplied.

What message and content persuade them?

Information to collect: Understanding, credibility and preference for alternative messages shown with the same product and price; reactions to tone, format, creator endorsement and ingredient claims.

Where it comes from: Client product evidence plus a controlled message comparison. A researcher checks responses; the client's legal reviewer approves claims.

Decision it supports: Which message and execution to recommend, with the evidence behind that choice.

Finding: No controlled comparison of Cluckin' Good messages has been conducted. Food-first, cheeky language and ingredient-led positioning are client directions.

Choice: Use the brief's tone and compare treatments at the same price before naming a winner.

Evidence status: Proposal, not a test result

Message proposals developed from brief positioning and qualitative themes. No comparative message-test results.

What stops a first order or rewards sign-up?

Information to collect: Order or delivery friction, app usefulness, sign-up effort, privacy concerns and the benefits buyers would actually use.

Where it comes from: Buyer interviews, observed ordering or sign-up tests and authorised client journey data if available.

Decision it supports: The call to action and acquisition message, and problems people must fix before advertising sends buyers there.

Finding: No live ordering or rewards journey has been tested in this case.

Choice: Treat an easy ordering route and useful rewards benefit as design requirements, not proven conversion drivers.

Evidence status: Missing journey evidence

Operational research requirement. No observed ordering or sign-up journey study supplied.

What do buyers know and do before the campaign?

Information to collect: Prompted and unprompted brand awareness, category choices, previous brand visits and rewards status, using the same buyer qualifications and metro/regional definitions throughout. Agree whether each target is evaluated separately by audience and market; record the survey denominator and overlap treatment.

Where it comes from: A pre-launch tracker and authorised client records. A research supplier repeats the tracker after launch using comparable samples.

Decision it supports: A baseline for measuring change, rather than treating every post-launch result as an advertising effect.

Finding: The brief supplies awareness and trial targets, not a measured pre-launch baseline.

Choice: Use a consistent target-buyer definition for baseline and follow-up; do not assume a new brand has exactly zero awareness.

Evidence status: Targets supplied; baseline missing

Client brief, campaign objectives. Targets are supplied; measured starting values are not.

What does each channel add for its cost?

Information to collect: Spend, extra awareness, extra first visits and qualified rewards joins; study period, comparison group, sample size and uncertainty. Break down by audience and market only where the sample supports it.

Where it comes from: Comparable client or agency campaign tests, transferable effectiveness studies, or commissioned experiments.

Decision it supports: Check whether advertising creates additional results and inform later changes. No comparable outcome evidence has been supplied for this launch.

Finding: No controlled launch results for these audiences have been supplied.

Choice: Use the measurement framework to design a suitable comparison; do not claim the proposed channel costs come from measured campaign results.

Evidence status: Comparable outcome evidence missing

Measurement framework: proposed controlled comparisons and limitations.

How much useful reach remains as spending grows?

Information to collect: Unduplicated eligible reach, exposure frequency, likely repeated reach and changes in cost or response at higher spend.

Where it comes from: Planning inputs: supplier reach plans, local inventory and prices. Performance evidence: comparable campaign response studies or controlled tests.

Decision it supports: Channel spending limits and when additional money should go elsewhere.

Finding: No local supplier forecast establishes how many different buyers the proposed schedules would reach.

Choice: Compare local coverage and repeat exposure before booking. Combine overlapping store areas rather than assuming every area needs a separate purchase.

Evidence status: Supplier forecasts missing

Required supplier proposals; cost schedule assumptions in the workbook.

Can we measure the brief's outcomes consistently?

Information to collect: Agree the awareness survey population and when awareness is measured relative to the first visit. For trial, link first-visit evidence to the local opening's 90-day window. For rewards, retain all first-time visitors in the denominator, including non-returners; define completed registration, the observation window and treatment of unlinked or missing visitors. Record first/second visit timing. Keep app downloads, rewards joins, cost per trial and cost per app acquisition separate; define social engagement denominators and sentiment coverage.

Where it comes from: Research inputs: agreed tracker and outcome definitions. Operational inputs: authorised sales/app records, local opening dates, consented identifiers where available and platform reports. People approve privacy and check missing/duplicate records.

Decision it supports: Measure 60% metro and 40% regional awareness, trial among aware consumers and rewards joins within the first two visits, using the brief's time windows. Missing records must not become false success. Observed target attainment and the extra effect caused by advertising are separate measures.

Finding: The measurement framework specifies denominators and missing-data rules. No real buyer tracker, sales-to-app linkage or launch reporting extract has been supplied.

Choice: Present the measurement design. Never report the demonstration numbers as achieved targets.

Evidence status: Definitions proposed; records missing

Client brief, objectives and reporting requirements; measurement framework in this response. No live outcomes.

Product and offer

What we can credibly promise and sell.

Used in deliverables 1, 2, 5

What makes this brand worth choosing?

Information to collect: Positioning, menu, portions, full prices, sourcing proof and approved wording.

Where it comes from: Client product and legal teams supply and approve product records.

Decision it supports: Message, value proposition and creator brief.

Finding: The brief says free-range chicken, small-batch marinades, no artificial fillers and chef-developed flavours. The proposition is indulgence without compromising quality, transparency or flavour.

Choice: Lead with actual food and flavour. Legal must substantiate sourcing; do not imply healthy or diet food.

Evidence status: Brief supplied; proof missing

Brief sections 1, 5, 6 and 10

Can the advertised meal actually be ordered?

Information to collect: Menu availability by store, prices, fees, opening hours, stock/capacity, ordering links and app readiness.

Where it comes from: Client product, operations and digital owners supply records and run a real order test.

Decision it supports: Offer, local creative and route from advert to purchase.

Finding: There are no confirmed meal prices, live links or product-availability records in the case.

Choice: Do not invent an offer price or send paid traffic to an untested route.

Evidence status: Not supplied

Operational dependency identified from the required purchase and rewards journeys. No readiness audit supplied.

Stores and timing

Where advertising can run and when each market starts.

Used in deliverables 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

Where are the 45 launch stores?

Information to collect: Store ID, address, region, opening date, drive/delivery area and operational capacity.

Where it comes from: Client operations supplies the approved store register; the planner checks coverage with media suppliers.

Decision it supports: Local reach, market spending and delivery feasibility.

Finding: The brief requires all eight states and territories, with 45 first-wave stores. The model distributes 45 invented store IDs across 12 markets; actual addresses are absent.

Choice: Use the example for planning arithmetic. Obtain real addresses and realistic purchase areas before booking.

Evidence status: Brief plus illustrative example

Brief sections 1, 4 and 10

When does each store need advertising?

Information to collect: Opening date, local phase dates, final campaign end date, creative deadlines and date-lock status.

Where it comes from: Client operations confirms dates; the planner calculates local weeks and lock dates.

Decision it supports: Market schedule, phase budgets and approvals.

Finding: Early November is the brief's opening window. The model uses illustrative 2, 9 and 16 November dates and a proposed common year-end of 1 November 2027.

Choice: Start each local launch phase on its opening date. Confirm the common end date; later openings have less time for sustain.

Evidence status: Brief plus illustrative dates

Brief sections 7, 10 and 11

What prevents a local booking?

Information to collect: Address/date confirmation, placement coverage, legal sign-off and Regional Growth approval.

Where it comes from: People approve records and supplier plans; AI checks the presence and consistency of approvals.

Decision it supports: Permission to release local advertising.

Finding: The brief requires addresses and dates locked three weeks before local media, regional approval before booking and sourcing claims cleared before airing.

Choice: Hold any placement without those checks. First-eight-week proximity is a hard constraint, not an optional efficiency adjustment.

Evidence status: Requirements supplied; approvals absent

Brief sections 4 and 10

Category and competitors

Understand alternatives, relevant occasions and the advertising comparison.

Used in deliverables 1, 2, 4, 5

What are we competing against?

Information to collect: Competing offers, price positioning, customer alternatives, advertising messages and competitor rewards.

Where it comes from: Client category knowledge; dated official menus and campaigns; licensed competitor monitoring where required.

Decision it supports: Distinctive positioning, switching proposition and competitor universe.

Finding: The client describes a crowded chicken category with two established leaders. The case does not contain a complete current competitor-price or campaign audit.

Choice: Position around the brief's quality/flavour difference. Do not claim it is unique in the market without a like-for-like audit.

Evidence status: Client context; full audit missing

Brief sections 1 and 5

Which occasions and advertising benchmarks matter?

Information to collect: Relevant meal occasions, seasonal dates, local events, comparable monitored competitor spend/exposure and coverage limits.

Where it comes from: Client calendar, event organisers and authorised monitoring provider.

Decision it supports: Sustain timing, partnership relevance and share-of-voice tracking.

Finding: The brief names seasonal activations such as Christmas and sport finals. No licensed competitor time series or agreed credibility threshold is supplied.

Choice: Use occasions as provisional planning windows; agree comparable monitoring and the third-player criterion before reporting success.

Evidence status: Brief occasions; monitoring missing

Brief sections 2, 7 and 9

Media and money

What can be bought, what it might achieve and how the model divides the money.

Used in deliverables 1, 2, 3, 4, 5

How much money is available, and when?

Information to collect: Net media envelope, local phase shares, scope exclusions, contingency and approval authority.

Where it comes from: Client brief and written finance scope.

Decision it supports: Total and phase allocations.

Finding: \$8.5 million net media: 45% in local weeks 1 to 4, 30% in weeks 5 to 12 and 25% for sustain. Production, research, fees, rights and GST have no assigned funding in the case.

Choice: Preserve the three envelopes. Ask finance to fund non-media work separately rather than pretending it is free.

Evidence status: From the brief

Brief section 7

What placements can reach local buyers at a workable price?

Information to collect: Placement, dates, units, target-buyer reach, overlap, frequency, net price, minimum buy, geography, booking/cancellation terms and creative specifications.

Where it comes from: Agency investment requests dated supplier proposals and checks platform planning exports.

Decision it supports: Feasible media plan, delivery estimates and cost forecast.

Finding: No current local inventory quotes or reach forecasts have been obtained. Google's August 2026 documentation confirms that search adverts can reach people looking for relevant products and services. It does not establish local search demand, prices or extra sales.

Choice: Keep price, units and forecast reach unconfirmed. Test relevant meal and nearby-store searches; assess brand-name searches separately. Use a suitable controlled comparison before claiming sales happened because of the advertising.

Evidence status: Supplier proposals missing

Required supplier proposals. No priced, available local media package has been supplied.

[Google Ads: Search campaigns](#)

What does the proposed advertising cost?

Information to collect: Market and stage; planned packages, ad views or estimated clicks; unit price; calculated cost; stage budget; percentage; unassigned balance.

Where it comes from: Supplier proposals and platform estimates in practice. This case uses explicitly illustrative quantities and unit prices.

Decision it supports: Cost the proposed schedules and check that they fit the available money.

Finding: Sydney's opening-stage Outdoor example plans nine four-week packages at \$20,000 each: \$180,000. Divide by the \$765,000 stage budget to get 23.53%.

Choice: Compare eligible schedules, calculate their costs and retain any unassigned balance. The cost calculation is not proof of the best media mix.

Evidence status: Illustrative inputs; calculated costs

Evidence & calculations workbook: Cost inputs, Cost schedules and Budget.

How are market budgets derived?

Information to collect: Verified store counts, demand/capacity, useful local reach and prices; agreed market allocation rule.

Where it comes from: Client operations and audience/supplier evidence. Case uses an equal-per-store rule and illustrative counts.

Decision it supports: Market weights before dividing each phase across channels.

Finding: Sydney has nine of the model's 45 stores, so receives nine forty-fifths of \$8.5 million: \$1.7 million. The store count is invented; the division is calculated.

Choice: Use as a transparent starting example. Replace equal-per-store weighting if verified demand, capacity or cost evidence supports another allocation.

Evidence status: Assumption and calculation

Evidence & calculations workbook: illustrative store counts and calculated Market Plan. Equal spending per store is a planning assumption.

Measurement records

Define what success means and the records needed to test it.

Used in deliverables 4

What exactly counts as success?

Information to collect: Prompted/unprompted awareness, aware-buyer trial, first/second visits, rewards registration, app downloads, cost measures, share of voice, social engagement and sentiment definitions.

Where it comes from: Brief targets plus the research and analytics owners' measurement specification.

Decision it supports: The complete KPI framework.

Finding: Targets are 60% metro and 40% regional awareness at six months; trial from 25% of aware buyers within 90 local days; rewards registration from 15% of first-time visitors within two visits.

Choice: Keep the populations and clocks distinct. All first-time visitors remain in the rewards base; unknown identity is reported, not silently excluded.

Evidence status: Targets supplied; definitions proposed

Brief sections 2 and 9

Can the required outcomes be collected reliably?

Information to collect: Tracker responses/sample, sales/visit records, app events, lawful identifiers, duplicates, missingness, platform spend/exposure and licensed competitor data.

Where it comes from: Research supplier collects responses; client implements sales/app collection; agency supplies delivery/monitoring exports; analytics validates.

Decision it supports: Quality checks, reporting and decisions.

Finding: The case provides a framework and illustrative examples, not live results. A platform purchase attribution is not proof of extra sales caused by advertising.

Choice: Specify collection before launch, report coverage, and use controlled studies for causal claims. Do not declare success from incomplete samples.

Evidence status: Collection not performed; examples available

Proposed collection design in the measurement framework, with the methods linked below. No live data collection has occurred.

[Nielsen Ad Intel 2024 advertising spend report](#)

[Google Analytics: Automatically collected events](#)

[AMSI: Calculating confidence intervals](#)

Creators and partners

Choose a specific collaboration that can actually work.

Used in deliverables 5

What can each candidate credibly do?

Information to collect: Relevant official work, proposed task, creative treatment, product fit and exchange of value.

Where it comes from: Research AI reviews official portfolios; a human checks the actual product brief with representatives.

Decision it supports: Candidate shortlist and collaboration scope.

Finding: Andy Cooks and Daen's Kitchen have documented food/brand content experience. That supports comparing production, not assuming local sales impact.

Choice: Request the same food-filming brief and limited usage rights. Do not imply either has accepted.

Evidence status: Public capability evidence

Official creator biographies, Andy's BOSS Coffee announcement and the 2024 Melbourne Food & Wine organiser record.

[Andy Cooks: About](#)

[Andy Cooks shares BOSS Coffee announcement](#)

[Daen's Kitchen: Official biography](#)

[Melbourne Food & Wine: 2024 festival record](#)

Are there conflicts or operating restrictions?

Information to collect: Food policy, location, adult audience, restaurant exclusivity, safety and operational capacity.

Where it comes from: Official policies plus written representative/client confirmation.

Decision it supports: Proceed, defer or reject a proposed scope.

Finding: Fortress's published policy prohibits outside food except celebration cake, so its venue-sampling idea is rejected. PWR documents McDonald's work; current conflict status is unconfirmed.

Choice: Do not force an incompatible venue activation. Defer PWR unless conflict and suitable local audience evidence clear the gate.

Evidence status: Specific restrictions found

Fortress venue policy and PWR's official partnership case studies.

[PWR: Official partnership case studies](#)

[Fortress: Venue food and age policies](#)

[Fortress Experiences: Tabletop Tavern](#)

What would we buy, pay and measure?

Information to collect: Named deliverables, shoot/edit scope, fee, rights, territory, platforms, paid use, exclusivity, availability, disclosure, revisions, cancellation and measurement access.

Where it comes from: Agency requests itemised proposals; client/legal signs the contract and disclosure/claim requirements.

Decision it supports: Commercial comparison, test design and approval.

Finding: The proposed comparison is one filming session, two short vertical edits and four weeks of specified paid use. No talent fee or organic distribution is assumed.

Choice: Judge total production/rights cost and like-for-like creative performance. Paid promotion fits the media budget only without double counting; content costs need separate funding.

Evidence status: Proposed scope; no quotes or agreements

Proposed scope, to be priced and agreed with representatives; commercial disclosure guidance below.

[AANA Food and Beverages Advertising Code](#)

Working audience profiles

Frequent takeaway buyers / 18 to 34

Given: Time-poor students, share-house renters and young professionals buying takeaway at least twice weekly. Value-driven, with an interest in quality and new flavours; active on short-form and food-focused social content.

Need: An enjoyable meal that feels worth its full price and is easy to obtain.

Proof: GIVEN in brief: chef-developed flavour, free-range chicken, small-batch marinades and no artificial fillers. CLIENT REQUIRED: legal substantiation, current meal prices and store availability.

Shared: Enjoy a flavour-led takeaway without guessing whether it is worth the price. Proposed value proposition: distinctive food, clear value and an easy local order.

Message: Proposed direction: show the flavour and preparation, state the meal price and make ordering nearby easy.

Test: Do the actual flavour and quality benefits justify the price among qualifying frequent buyers?

Limit: The need is a planning interpretation supported by qualitative evidence, not a validated quotation or a national segment estimate.

Household meal decision-makers / 30 to 45

Given: Takeaway as a treat or Friday-night household ritual. The client describes greater price sensitivity, influence from deals and potential reach through broadcast and outdoor.

Need: A meal that suits the household without difficult coordination or an unclear total cost.

Proof: GIVEN in brief: everyday indulgence, quality and flavour. CLIENT REQUIRED: household meal portions, options, full price, delivery fees and availability.

Shared: Give the household a treat with clear portions and total cost. Proposed value proposition: an enjoyable shared meal that is easy to choose and obtain.

Message: Proposed direction: show what the household gets, for how much, and how easy it is to order.

Test: Which portions, menu choices and price make the offer feel suitable for the household?

Limit: Public studies support household coordination as a consideration. They do not prove stronger deal sensitivity than younger buyers or a national Friday-night pattern.

These are working profiles, not measured local personas. Income, spending, platform preference, population size and message rankings remain unknown where no suitable evidence has been collected. Do not add overlapping audience groups.

Method, checks and live requirements

Research and evidence

Inputs: Original brief, existing source register, model and measurement definitions

Preparation: Mapped inputs to their normal source, current availability, required fields and affected decision.

Check applied: Brief completeness, source classifications and data-to-deliverable coverage.

Required human action: Client operations supplies stores; product/legal supplies claim evidence; investment obtains quotes; research owner commissions missing audience data.

Why do some client inputs still need to be requested?

The brief defines the assignment. Operational records such as addresses, prices and customer history normally arrive separately. Their source remains the client; their current availability is recorded beside each item.

Original brief plus the source and data registers

04 / FIVE DELIVERABLES

One national idea. A practical local route to trial.

Introduce the food and its point of difference nationally, while placing early paid media only where people can realistically buy.

Purpose: Answer how advertising should help this new brand launch.

Deliverable: Delivers the central recommendation in output 1

Decision explained

This choice follows two instructions in the brief: launch across Australia and avoid early spending outside store buying areas. We therefore keep the brand idea consistent while adapting placements, store information and opening dates locally. A broad national burst without those controls could create interest where no store can serve it.

Food-led video and visible local placements introduce the offer. Search and delivery advertising help people who are already looking for a meal. Acquisition campaigns invite first visitors into the rewards app, while ongoing retention remains mainly with the client. These roles overlap, so we compare each channel across awareness, trial and rewards rather than assuming it does only one job.

The channel mix is calculated from a transparent simulation because comparable client or agency performance records were not supplied. Public research informs the shortlist and model design. It does not establish the exact spend percentages. The budget page walks through the calculation. The workbook contains every input and alternative scenarios.

The recommendation

Make the brand recognisable, then make the next step a nearby meal.

A new national name needs introduction, but the brief restricts early advertising to places where people can realistically buy. Use one food-led brand idea, adapted to local stores, prices and ordering routes.

The evidence, applied

Keep short video open to both audiences

Public research; local detail missing

What we found

ACMA's June 2025 survey reports weekly user-generated/short-form viewing of 62%, 64% and 60% for ages 18 to 24, 25 to 34 and 35 to 44. Radio listening is 36% for ages 18 to 24. These are age groups, not screened takeaway buyers.

What we do differently

Include short-form creative in both audience plans. Use supplier reach and controlled results to decide placements and spending; do not turn media-use percentages into budget shares.

ACMA, How we watch and listen to content: June 2025 weekly-use findings. Age bands differ from the brief's buyer groups.

[ACMA \(2026\): Viewing and listening findings](#)

Sell the meal, with proof behind the promise

Brief supplied; proof missing

What we found

The brief says free-range chicken, small-batch marinades, no artificial fillers and chef-developed flavours. The proposition is indulgence without compromising quality, transparency or flavour.

What we do differently

Use real food and flavour as the creative starting point. Verify sourcing claims before release; avoid an unsupported health proposition. This changes the message and creator brief, not the budget formula.

Brief sections 1, 5, 6 and 10

National brand, local paid reach

Requirements supplied; approvals absent

What we found

The brief requires addresses and dates locked three weeks before local media, regional approval before booking and sourcing claims cleared before airing.

What we do differently

Use one brand idea across Australia, but exclude early placements that cannot satisfy store buying areas. This is a pass/fail condition from the brief, not a preference score.

Brief sections 4 and 10

Compete on a credible difference

Client context; full audit missing

What we found

The client describes a crowded chicken category with two established leaders. The case does not contain a complete current competitor-price or campaign audit.

What we do differently

Present the client's quality/flavour proposition rather than inventing a lowest-price promise. Treat uniqueness against competitors as unproven until a like-for-like audit is available.

Brief sections 1 and 5

Compare channels instead of dividing money equally

Illustrative inputs; calculated costs

What we found

Sydney's opening-stage Outdoor example plans nine four-week packages at \$20,000 each: \$180,000. Divide by the \$765,000 stage budget to get 23.53%.

What we do differently

Use the same spending and outcome definitions to compare channels. The current demonstration uses artificial experiments and declared adjustments; it explains an allocation, not a proven best mix.

Evidence & calculations workbook: Cost inputs, Cost schedules and Budget.

What success would look like

These are the client's targets, not results predicted by this spending model.

Recognition: introduce the brand, then measure prompted awareness against 60% among the target audience in all major metro markets and 40% in regional markets within six months of launch.

First visits: make ordering practical, then measure whether 25% of people who know the brand try it within 90 days of their local store opening.

Rewards: give first-time visitors a clear reason to join, then measure the 15% registration target by their second visit.

Advertising presence: assess the client's credible third-player ambition over 12 months using an agreed, comparable share-of-voice measure. The measurement deliverable defines the evidence and reporting rules.

How the channels work together

Outdoor, social, video and radio introduce the meal and the name. Search and delivery listings help people who are already choosing food find an available store.

App-acquisition advertising asks first-time buyers to join a useful rewards programme; retention remains primarily with the client. Use distinct campaign accounting so the same social spend is not counted twice.

Make the opening and the food locally relevant

Propose suburb- or store-specific outdoor versions showing the nearest available meal and location, where the supplier's format allows. Confirm the actual address and opening before production.

Pursue a factual local opening story for publicity, supported by the client's spokesperson and an operationally ready store. Coverage is not guaranteed. Any PR work needs an owner and funding outside the net-media budget; do not count hoped-for coverage as paid reach.

Test licensed food-creator edits within eligible paid-social activity, compared with brand-made content. The partnership deliverable sets the candidate and rights checks. Defer broad sponsorship until local audience fit and commercial terms justify it.

Why not a broad national blast?

It risks paying to reach people who cannot buy during the first eight weeks. Why not search alone? It helps active food shoppers but cannot be assumed to create enough wider recognition. The recommendation combines introduction and purchase access; no channel is exempt from the local-coverage rule.

Linear television and small markets

Do not reserve a separate linear-TV line at this stage. Local broadcast packages may be considered where coverage and cost meet the brief, funded by an explicit reallocation rather than extra spending. Broadcaster video is a distinct option, not a claim that all broadcast television has been bought. In smaller markets, use fewer viable channels if minimum buys or available reach make a seven-channel spread impractical.

What would change this recommendation?

A supplier showing useful local reach at a better cost may replace a weaker placement. Buyer research may change the message or format. If no proposed early placement can satisfy store-access requirements, hold that line and ask the client to resolve the conflict. Do not quietly relax the brief's geographic restriction.

Deliverable contents

Objectives and audiences

Positioning and message

Channel roles and executions

Geography and phasing

Options and exclusions

Evaluation and dependencies

Different jobs as the launch develops

Introduce the brand / Local weeks 1 to 4

Build recognition near an available meal.

Lead with this: Use food-led social/video and visible local placements to introduce the name and its difference.

Make the next step work: Keep search and delivery ready to catch people who want to order. Invite eligible first visitors to rewards; do not make an app download the main launch story.

Why not the alternative?: An unrestricted national burst risks reaching people who cannot buy. Search alone depends too heavily on people already looking for a meal.

Basis and limits: The brief asks for recognition and restricts the first eight weeks to store buying areas. We propose local placements that introduce the brand, then price their quantities within the stage budget.

Encourage a first visit / Local weeks 5 to 12

Turn recognition into a practical first order.

Lead with this: Put more emphasis on meal-search, delivery and offer-led social activity, while retaining useful local recognition.

Make the next step work: Connect each advert to a confirmed meal, full price and working order route. Keep rewards invitations tied to first visits.

Why not the alternative?: Extra awareness is not enough if people cannot find a store, judge the meal's value or complete an order. Check those barriers before simply adding media.

Basis and limits: The brief asks for trial among aware buyers within 90 local days. We propose meal-search, delivery and offer-led activity to help people make a first order. The geographic restriction continues through week eight.

Keep the brand in consideration / Local week 13 to year end

Give people useful reasons to return.

Lead with this: Keep productive local discovery and order routes, with fresh menu, meal-occasion and rewards messages.

Make the next step work: Refresh creative around relevant trading moments. Use paid acquisition for eligible new visitors; the client continues to own ongoing customer retention.

Why not the alternative?: Repeating the same launch advert is not a retention plan. A seasonal message needs an available product, relevant timing and a working purchase route.

Basis and limits: The brief assigns 25% of media to sustain and keeps most retention in-house. We propose ongoing local discovery, meal messages and eligible rewards

invitations, then price the activity within that budget. Week 13 and the common campaign end date are modelling conventions requiring client agreement.

Metro

Compare eligible local outdoor and digital/video placements.

More channels are not automatically better. Select placements that fit the buying area, add useful buyers and can be bought at a workable cost. Local supply and prices remain unconfirmed.

Regional

Give local outdoor and radio explicit consideration.

The brief asks for greater local outdoor and radio emphasis in regional markets. Check that suitable placements reach people who can use a store. Concentrate on fewer channels where dividing the money too thinly would leave each with too little useful activity.

How a channel earns its place

First, can it reach people who can buy from an available store? Second, can it do the job needed at this launch stage? Third, does its expected contribution justify its cost compared with the alternatives? Research informs these checks; supplier proposals and comparable campaign results are needed before booking.

This strategy sets the jobs and selection criteria. The media plan turns them into dates and placement requirements. The budget chapter shows spending shares, dollar amounts and the complete calculations, including all six market-type and phase comparisons.

Frequent takeaway buyers · 18 to 34

Make quality and flavour easy to try.

Message to test: Show the actual food, its full price and a nearby way to order. Test flavour and convenience together, rather than assuming novelty alone will persuade people.

What supports the choice: The brief identifies frequent takeaway buyers. A 2019 young-adult study described food appeal, reviews and discounts. Delivery interviews conducted in 2023, published in 2025, identified time, cost and ordering effort.

Limits: These older qualitative studies identify themes, not current national preferences or the percentage of this target audience persuaded by each message. The message is a proposal to test, not a tested winner.

Next test: Compare food-led short video and offer-led versions with eligible local buyers. Check actual paid reach before selecting a platform.

[Allman-Farinelli et al. \(2019\): Young adults eating out](#)

[Gupta et al. \(2025\): Australian delivery-food choices](#)

Family meal decision-makers · 30 to 45

Make tonight's meal decision easier.

Message to test: Show what the household gets, the total price and how to collect or order. Test a clear meal occasion, not an unsupported claim that every family wants the cheapest option.

What supports the choice: The brief identifies family meal decision-makers. Parent interviews found time, cost and differing food preferences affected family meals.

Limits: The studies do not measure this exact age group nationally or establish a winning family message.

Next test: Compare complete-meal and food-appeal versions. Keep short video in consideration for this group too; do not assume social media is only for younger buyers.

[Middleton et al. \(2023\): How families manage meals](#)

[Gupta et al. \(2025\): Australian delivery-food choices](#)

Why short video stays in consideration for both groups

ACMA reports weekly short-form or user-generated viewing of 62% for ages 18 to 24, 64% for 25 to 34 and 60% for 35 to 44.

Do not reserve short video for young buyers or exclude it from the family plan.

These are overlapping media-use estimates from June 2025, not paid-ad reach, takeaway-buyer data or a spending formula. The age bands do not exactly match either client segment.

[ACMA \(2026\): Viewing and listening findings](#)

Why paid search stays in the plan

Google's documentation, updated in August 2026, confirms that search adverts can appear when people look for relevant products and services. Someone searching for a nearby meal does not have to know Cluckin' Good already.

Test meal, category and nearby-store searches in areas that an open store can serve. Report searches for the brand's name separately from other searches.

This explains the channel's job, not its likely return. Check local demand, cost and completed orders. A recorded order after an advert is not proof the advert caused it: use a suitable comparison with people or areas not receiving the advertising before claiming extra sales. The budget shares remain simulated.

[Google Ads: Search campaigns](#)

Channel roles and execution reference

Outdoor

Execution: Roadside or retail-area panels

Job: Make the name and nearby meal easy to notice

Where and when: Local opening and meal occasions; approved store buying areas

How we judge it: Brand recognition; eligible local reach

Paid social

Execution: Short vertical food films and offer cards

Job: Show the food, price and route to order

Where and when: Both audiences; compare messages rather than assume preferences

How we judge it: Qualified visits and controlled creative tests

Broadcaster video

Execution: Short video on ad-supported broadcaster services

Job: Introduce the brand through sight and sound

Where and when: Local audience packages only when geographic controls qualify

How we judge it: Completed views as delivery checks; survey recognition as outcome

Radio

Execution: Short spots with clear local store or ordering cue

Job: Build repeated local recognition

Where and when: Especially regional options; select stations and times from audience evidence

How we judge it: Local reach and frequency; recognition survey

Search

Execution: Meal, category and nearby-store adverts; assess brand-name searches separately

Job: Help people already looking for a meal choose and order

Where and when: Only open-store service areas, with correct hours and destination

How we judge it: Qualified orders and cost, reported separately for brand-name and other searches; compare with a suitable control before claiming extra sales

Delivery media

Execution: Sponsored restaurant listings or meal placements

Job: Turn an active meal search into a first order

Where and when: Only locations with confirmed service, stock and capacity

How we judge it: First orders if the platform can identify them; separate repeat orders

App acquisition

Execution: A clearly identified rewards sign-up campaign

Job: Explain the benefit and help first visitors join

Where and when: Eligible first visitors; consent and customer matching required

How we judge it: Registration by the second visit, not downloads alone

Basis and limits

This recommendation answers the channel-strategy request. It does not replace the other four deliverables. The following market plan, budget, measurement framework and partnership recommendations turn it into a workable response.

A national message does not require indiscriminate national paid coverage. During the first eight weeks, the agency must check each proposed placement against approved store drive or delivery areas. A platform's location setting is a starting control, not proof that every exposure is inside the required area.

The proposed message follows the supplied positioning: enjoyable food with a credible quality story, not a bargain-bucket or diet-food claim. Research and creative testing should establish how to express that promise convincingly.

The client's proposition is 'Fried chicken you don't have to feel weird about loving.' Campaign creative should make the food the hero, sound confident and cheeky, and avoid appearing cheap. Explain ingredient quality without suggesting the meal is healthy. All free-range and sourcing claims need legal clearance before airing.

If a placement fails the first-eight-week store-access requirement, hold its allocation or seek an approved alternative within the market and phase budget. Do not book an exception because coverage has merely been checked.

Location settings cannot guarantee that every viewer can buy. Before committing the front-loaded budget, the human investment owner must obtain placement-level coverage, likely exposure outside the buying area, dates and net costs. Hold placements that fail the brief. If no feasible combination meets it, the client must resolve the conflict; no allowance for wasted coverage is assumed. [TikTok: About location targeting](#) [Google Ads: Advanced location options](#) [Google Ads: Target geographic locations](#)

Method, checks and live requirements

Channel strategy

Inputs: Brief proximity rule, audience evidence and channel roles

Preparation: Compared broad launch, local activation and intent-only options, then linked the recommendation to all three funnel outcomes.

Check applied: Recommendation against the simultaneous launch, first-eight-week proximity and in-house retention requirements.

Required human action: Client marketing director agrees the direction. Investment owner rejects placements that cannot satisfy approved store buying areas.

Why not use only search and delivery advertising?

Search and delivery can introduce the brand to active meal shoppers and help them order. We propose other media for wider recognition, subject to comparable audience, access and cost evidence. No channel reaches everyone, and this comparison does not prove one approach will cause more sales.

Scenario brief: sections 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8

Source notes: [TikTok: About location targeting](#); [Google Ads: Advanced location options](#); [Google Ads: Target geographic locations](#)

05 / FIVE DELIVERABLES

Where will the advertising run, and when?

Select a market to see its illustrative store count, shared opening date, phases and channel allocation.

Purpose: Turn the strategy into a local timetable.

Deliverable: Delivers output 2: indicative media plan with market-by-market phasing

Decision explained

The brief gives 45 stores and names priority markets, but supplies no actual store list. The workbook groups these illustrative stores into 12 markets across all eight states and territories, with one shared opening date per market.

Each market group begins its launch phase at its shared opening date. This workbook does not independently schedule every store. The first local start requires confirmed addresses and dates at least three weeks beforehand. Regional bookings also require the Regional Growth lead's approval.

The recommendation

Launch nationally, but start each store's media clock when it opens.

The case schedule covers all eight jurisdictions. Dates and store counts are illustrative examples; the real register must replace them before buying. Each local market keeps the brief's 45%, 30% and 25% spending phases.

The evidence, applied

Give each opening its own media clock

Brief plus illustrative dates

What we found

Early November is the brief's opening window. The model uses illustrative 2, 9 and 16 November dates and a proposed common year-end of 1 November 2027.

What we do differently

Calculate introduction and trial from the local opening. The current example groups stores by market opening date. Different store dates require separate opening groups and rebuilt schedules. Lock addresses 21 days before local media starts. These dates remain illustrative until operations replaces them.

Brief sections 7, 10 and 11

Buy access to customers who can actually visit

Missing client and buyer evidence

What we found

No real addresses, delivery areas or buyer travel limits have been supplied. The case uses an illustrative footprint.

What we do differently

Match placements to practical drive or delivery areas, especially in the first eight weeks. Do not substitute a city-wide age-group estimate for a verified local buying area.

Client brief, store-access requirements. No actual store or buyer-travel records supplied.

Do not confuse an allocation with a booking

Supplier proposals missing

What we found

No current local inventory quotes or reach forecasts have been obtained. Google's August 2026 documentation confirms that search adverts can reach people looking for relevant products and services. It does not establish local search demand, prices or extra sales.

What we do differently

The schedule proposes channels and dates, but does not claim purchased units or forecast reach. Obtain a local supplier offer; reject or combine lines that fail minimum buys within the same budget envelope.

Required supplier proposals. No priced, available local media package has been supplied.

Google Ads: Search campaigns

Match advertising to what is available

Not supplied

What we found

There are no confirmed meal prices, live links or product-availability records in the case.

What we do differently

Release offer-led activity only when the meal, price, stock and ordering route work in that market. A delayed opening or unavailable meal changes the schedule and creative.

Operational dependency identified from the required purchase and rewards journeys. No readiness audit supplied.

Place seasonal messages on the actual calendar

Brief occasions; monitoring missing

What we found

The brief names seasonal activations such as Christmas and sport finals. No licensed competitor time series or agreed credibility threshold is supplied.

What we do differently

Use the brief's occasions as planning windows. Check whether each falls in introduction, trial or sustain for that market; do not put every seasonal activity into sustain by default.

Brief sections 2, 7 and 9

How to handle a late opening

Shift that store's launch and trial dates, recalculate the address-lock deadline and check supplier changes. The example uses one national end date, so later stores have less sustain time. Extending their year needs explicit funding and approval; the model does not create extra money.

Before any placement goes live

The media buying owner checks location coverage, availability, minimum purchase, price and format. Client operations confirms addresses and dates at least 21 days beforehand. Legal approves sourcing claims. The Regional Growth lead approves regional schedules before booking. A supplier setting labelled 'local' is not proof that everyone reached can use a store.

Keep the first-eight-week buying-area restriction in place. After that, expand only where useful audience reach and store capacity justify it. Check how often people see the advertising and investigate excessive repetition. Review advertising and spending monthly. Never advertise a store that is not ready.

Deliverable contents

All markets and store coverage

Local opening dates and phase dates

Channel and format schedule

Seasonal and menu activity

Placement eligibility

Approval and change rules

Agree the geographic boundary before booking

Presence targeting aims to reach people in or regularly in the selected area, but it cannot guarantee that nobody outside it sees an advert. If the brief requires zero exposure outside the store buying area, ask the client to clarify the acceptable boundary before booking. A location setting alone does not prove compliance.

[Google Ads: Advanced location options](#)

Activity calendar

Before opening

Advertising activity: Confirm addresses, media availability and opening dates

Creative and ordering task: Approve product facts, meal prices and working order pages

Control: Lock addresses 21 days before local media; legal and regional approvals

Weeks 1 to 4 · Introduction

Advertising activity: Launch local outdoor, radio, video and social; search and delivery catch active demand

Creative and ordering task: Show the brand and its food with a clear nearby purchase route

Control: 45% of local annual media; first-eight-week purchase-area restriction applies

Weeks 5 to 12 · First visits

Advertising activity: Continue useful recognition activity; increase meal-search, delivery and offer-led execution

Creative and ordering task: Use confirmed meal and price information; test order journeys

Control: 30% of local annual media; restriction continues through week 8

Week 13 to the national year end · Keep people coming back

Advertising activity: Maintain effective local reach and order routes; rotate menu and rewards messages

Creative and ordering task: Plan monthly menu or offer changes and refreshed creative

Control: 25% of local annual media; later openings have a shorter final phase

Seasonal dates wherever they fall

Advertising activity: Schedule Christmas, Australia Day, State of Origin and AFL finals activity against the approved opening calendar

Creative and ordering task: Client supplies the menu, offer, stock and trading-hour plan

Control: A seasonal date may fall in the first-visit phase, not only the final phase

Store opening and information deadlines

Market	Stores	Example opening	Store details due
Sydney	9	2026-11-02	2026-10-12
Melbourne	9	2026-11-02	2026-10-12
Brisbane	5	2026-11-02	2026-10-12
Perth	4	2026-11-02	2026-10-12
Adelaide	3	2026-11-02	2026-10-12
Gold Coast	4	2026-11-09	2026-10-19
Newcastle	3	2026-11-16	2026-10-26
Geelong	2	2026-11-09	2026-10-19
Sunshine Coast	2	2026-11-16	2026-10-26
Hobart	2	2026-11-02	2026-10-12
Canberra	1	2026-11-02	2026-10-12
Darwin	1	2026-11-02	2026-10-12

Store counts and dates are illustrative. The deadline for confirmed addresses and opening dates is 21 days before local media starts. The workbook lists local dates and each channel's phase allocation. The first-eight-week buying-area restriction cannot be verified without real addresses, delivery areas and supplier coverage. The budget chapter owns the spending amounts.

Basis and limits

The illustrative budget gives each store an equal starting weight. A market with nine of the 45 stores receives nine forty-fifths of the total. This is a transparent demonstration rule, not evidence that every store has equal commercial potential.

In live work, replace the store counts, opening dates and catchments with client records. Compare customer opportunity, expected capacity, competition and media costs before adjusting the weights. Any changed allocation must still reconcile to the national budget.

The brief names weeks 1 to 4, weeks 5 to 12 and months 4 to 12. The example translates these into local days 1 to 28, 29 to 84 and 85 onward, with a common annual end date. The client needs to agree that day-85 transition and treatment of late openings.

If stores open on different dates, split them into explicit opening groups. Dates in the current workbook are fixed example values. A real date change requires rebuilding the affected phase dates and lock deadline, then checking the whole schedule.

Method, checks and live requirements

Market planning

Inputs: 45-store illustrative footprint; opening dates; brief phase and lead-time rules

Preparation: Calculated local start/end dates, 21-day lock deadlines and market/phase/channel budget lines.

Check applied: Eight jurisdictions covered; 45 stores; valid dates; no phase past the national year end.

Required human action: Client operations verifies every address, opening and buying area. Regional Growth lead approves each regional schedule before booking.

Can this schedule be used to book media?

No. The dates and store counts are illustrative. Client confirmation, quotes, coverage checks and the brief's approvals are still required.

Does changing the national start date move all stores?

No. It is reference information. Market dates are entered separately, and stores with different dates within a market need separate opening groups before live use.

Scenario brief: sections 4 and 7

How is the \$8.5 million divided?

Start with \$8.5 million. Divide it between example markets, set aside each launch stage's share, then calculate what each channel receives.

Purpose: Make the proposed spending inspectable.

Deliverable: Delivers output 3: budget allocation by channel and market

Decision explained

The brief sets the \$8.5 million and the 45% / 30% / 25% launch-stage split. Illustrative store counts divide the money between markets. We then price the proposed advertising for each channel.

Sydney has nine of the 45 illustrative stores, giving it \$1.7 million for the year. The first stage gets 45%, or \$765,000. Nine Outdoor packages at an illustrative \$20,000 each cost \$180,000. Divide \$180,000 by \$765,000 and multiply by 100: Outdoor uses 23.53% of this stage's available money.

The national schedules total \$7.92 million. Another \$580,000 is unassigned within the \$8.5 million budget. This pays for net media only. Production, research, fees and creator rights need separate funding. Confirm coverage, availability and prices before booking.

The recommendation

Keep spending within \$8.5 million. Show where every amount comes from.

The brief sets the total and stage percentages. Illustrative store counts divide the money between markets. Proposed advertising quantities and illustrative unit prices set each channel's cost; its percentage follows from that cost.

The evidence, applied

Price the advertising we propose to buy

Illustrative inputs; calculated costs

What we found

Sydney's opening-stage Outdoor example plans nine four-week packages at \$20,000 each: \$180,000. Divide by the \$765,000 stage budget to get 23.53%.

What we do differently

Multiply the planned quantity by its unit price. Divide the channel cost by the market's stage budget to show its percentage. Every amount opens four steps.

Evidence & calculations workbook: Cost inputs, Cost schedules and Budget.

Make the market allocation rule explicit

Brief plus illustrative example

What we found

The brief requires all eight states and territories, with 45 first-wave stores. The model distributes 45 invented store IDs across 12 markets; actual addresses are absent.

What we do differently

Use each illustrative market's share of the 45 stores as the starting share of \$8.5 million. This equal-per-store rule is a transparent assumption, not a finding that every store has equal demand.

Brief sections 1, 4 and 10

Compare supplier options before committing

Supplier proposals missing

What we found

No current local inventory quotes or reach forecasts have been obtained. Google's August 2026 documentation confirms that search adverts can reach people looking for relevant products and services. It does not establish local search demand, prices or extra sales.

What we do differently

Use local audience coverage, dates and prices to choose suitable activity. Keep unassigned money visible. Illustrative prices do not prove that a schedule is available or best.

Required supplier proposals. No priced, available local media package has been supplied.

[Google Ads: Search campaigns](#)

What the \$8.5 million includes

The \$8.5 million is available for net media placement. Proposed schedules cost \$7.92 million; \$580,000 remains unassigned, not spent. Production, research, agency fees, talent, usage rights and GST need separate funding. Paid promotion of creator assets can use social spend only if counted there once.

Why the market weights are provisional

The example allocates the same starting amount per store. Nine of 45 stores gives Sydney one fifth of the budget, or \$1.7 million. Real demand, useful reach, capacity and supplier costs may justify different weights. None of those missing values is disguised as a measured market advantage.

Check that the allocation can actually be bought

None of these placements is booked. Obtain minimum purchase amounts, current prices, availability and local audience coverage before approving spending. If an amount is too small to buy useful advertising, concentrate it in fewer suitable channels within the same market and stage budget. Recalculate and seek approval.

When to move money

Review delivery and qualifying results weekly, using comparable periods and enough evidence. First check tracking, store readiness and the adverts. If a channel remains weak or cannot reach suitable buyers, propose moving money within the approved budget. Record the amount, reason, evidence and approving person. A low cost reported by a platform is not enough on its own.

What the model cannot promise

The quantities and prices are illustrative planning inputs, not a delivery forecast or evidence that the targets will be achieved. Compare real supplier proposals before booking. The calculation explains the cost and leaves unassigned money visible.

Deliverable contents

Net media scope and exclusions

Channel totals

Market totals

Phase reconciliation

Worked allocation method

Sensitivity and buying conditions

Follow one calculation: outdoor in Sydney's introduction phase

Illustrative quantities and prices. No supplier booking or outcome forecast is implied.

1. Divide the money by market

Sydney has nine of the 45 illustrative stores. Use equal money per store as the starting assumption.

$$\$8,500,000 \div 45 \times 9 = \$1,700,000.$$

2. Set the stage budget

The brief assigns 45% to introducing the brand.

$$\$1,700,000 \times 45 \div 100 = \$765,000.$$

3. Price the Outdoor schedule

Plan nine four-week local packages at an illustrative \$20,000 each. Confirm actual placements and coverage before booking.

$$9 \times \$20,000 = \$180,000.$$

4. Show its budget percentage

Divide the Outdoor cost by all the money available for this market and stage.

$$\$180,000 \div \$765,000 \times 100 = 23.53\%.$$

Choosing the schedule

Compare eligible suppliers by intended audience, local coverage, dates, expected repetition and price. The arithmetic costs a proposed schedule; it does not establish that it is the best schedule.

What the price means

Illustrative round prices for this exercise. Not sourced market rates. Real supplier quotes or platform planning estimates must replace them before booking.

What the quantities mean

Planned order sizes for supplier comparison, not quantities derived from an audience forecast. The case has no local eligible-audience count to establish suitable frequency. Confirm local reach and repeat exposure, then reduce or revise quantities where needed. No guarantee of delivery or optimal mix is implied.

Digital advertising

Ad views include repeat views by the same person. Divide views by 1,000 before multiplying by a cost per thousand. A click estimate multiplied by average click price is a planning cost, not a guarantee of delivery.

The whole budget

Scheduled media totals \$7,920,000. Another \$580,000 remains unassigned. Together they account for the \$8.5 million available. Confirm supplier proposals before committing the remainder.

Sydney / Ignition: costed schedule

Channel	Quantity	Unit price	Cost
Outdoor	9 packages	\$20,000 / package	\$180,000
Paid social	16,200,000 ad views	\$10 / 1,000 views	\$162,000
Broadcaster video	4,500,000 ad views	\$40 / 1,000 views	\$180,000
Radio	9 packages	\$12,000 / package	\$108,000
Search	18,000 estimated clicks	\$2 / click	\$36,000
Delivery media	18,000 estimated clicks	\$2 / click	\$36,000
App acquisition	1,800,000 ad views	\$10 / 1,000 views	\$18,000

Scheduled: \$720,000. Unassigned: \$45,000. Available: \$765,000.

What the packages contain

Outdoor: Four local Outdoor panels for the stated burst. Illustrative package contents, subject to supplier coverage. Radio: 60 thirty-second radio spots across the stated burst. Illustrative package contents and \$200 per spot.

Timing: one four-week burst in local weeks 1 to 4. Spread digital quantities across the stage, adjusting daily delivery to store hours and available audience.

Sydney / Trial-drive: costed schedule

Channel	Quantity	Unit price	Cost
Outdoor	9 packages	\$10,000 / package	\$90,000
Paid social	10,800,000 ad views	\$10 / 1,000 views	\$108,000
Broadcaster video	1,800,000 ad views	\$40 / 1,000 views	\$72,000
Radio	9 packages	\$6,000 / package	\$54,000
Search	31,500 estimated clicks	\$2 / click	\$63,000
Delivery media	27,000 estimated clicks	\$2 / click	\$54,000
App acquisition	2,700,000 ad views	\$10 / 1,000 views	\$27,000

Scheduled: \$468,000. Unassigned: \$42,000. Available: \$510,000.

What the packages contain

Outdoor: Four local Outdoor panels for the stated burst. Illustrative package contents, subject to supplier coverage. Radio: 30 thirty-second radio spots across the stated burst. Illustrative package contents and \$200 per spot.

Timing: one two-week burst during local weeks 5 to 12. Spread digital quantities across the stage, adjusting daily delivery to store hours and available audience.

Sydney / Sustain: costed schedule

Channel	Quantity	Unit price	Cost
Outdoor	9 packages	\$8,000 / package	\$72,000
Paid social	9,000,000 ad views	\$10 / 1,000 views	\$90,000
Broadcaster video	1,350,000 ad views	\$40 / 1,000 views	\$54,000
Radio	9 packages	\$6,000 / package	\$54,000
Search	27,000 estimated clicks	\$2 / click	\$54,000
Delivery media	22,500 estimated clicks	\$2 / click	\$45,000
App acquisition	2,700,000 ad views	\$10 / 1,000 views	\$27,000

Scheduled: \$396,000. Unassigned: \$29,000. Available: \$425,000.

What the packages contain

Outdoor: Four local Outdoor panels for the stated burst. Illustrative package contents, subject to supplier coverage. Radio: 30 thirty-second radio spots across the stated burst. Illustrative package contents and \$200 per spot.

Timing: one two-week burst at a confirmed trading moment from local week 13 to year end. Keep search, social and delivery active throughout the stage, spreading their planned quantities across its days. Use frequency limits where available. App activity is limited to eligible buyers; video may run in shorter flights.

Gold Coast / Ignition: costed schedule

Channel	Quantity	Unit price	Cost
Outdoor	4 packages	\$24,000 / package	\$96,000
Paid social	6,400,000 ad views	\$10 / 1,000 views	\$64,000
Broadcaster video	1,000,000 ad views	\$40 / 1,000 views	\$40,000
Radio	4 packages	\$18,000 / package	\$72,000
Search	8,000 estimated clicks	\$2 / click	\$16,000
Delivery media	10,000 estimated clicks	\$2 / click	\$20,000
App acquisition	1,200,000 ad views	\$10 / 1,000 views	\$12,000

Scheduled: \$320,000. Unassigned: \$20,000. Available: \$340,000.

What the packages contain

Outdoor: Four local Outdoor panels for the stated burst. Illustrative package contents, subject to supplier coverage. Radio: 90 thirty-second radio spots across the stated burst. Illustrative package contents and \$200 per spot.

Timing: one four-week burst in local weeks 1 to 4. Spread digital quantities across the stage, adjusting daily delivery to store hours and available audience.

Gold Coast / Trial-drive: costed schedule

Channel	Quantity	Unit price	Cost
Outdoor	4 packages	\$14,000 / package	\$56,000
Paid social	4,000,000 ad views	\$10 / 1,000 views	\$40,000
Broadcaster video	400,000 ad views	\$40 / 1,000 views	\$16,000
Radio	4 packages	\$8,000 / package	\$32,000
Search	14,000 estimated clicks	\$2 / click	\$28,000
Delivery media	12,000 estimated clicks	\$2 / click	\$24,000
App acquisition	1,200,000 ad views	\$10 / 1,000 views	\$12,000

Scheduled: \$208,000. Unassigned: \$18,667. Available: \$226,667.

What the packages contain

Outdoor: Four local Outdoor panels for the stated burst. Illustrative package contents, subject to supplier coverage. Radio: 40 thirty-second radio spots across the stated burst. Illustrative package contents and \$200 per spot.

Timing: one two-week burst during local weeks 5 to 12. Spread digital quantities across the stage, adjusting daily delivery to store hours and available audience.

Gold Coast / Sustain: costed schedule

Channel	Quantity	Unit price	Cost
Outdoor	4 packages	\$12,000 / package	\$48,000
Paid social	3,200,000 ad views	\$10 / 1,000 views	\$32,000
Broadcaster video	200,000 ad views	\$40 / 1,000 views	\$8,000
Radio	4 packages	\$8,000 / package	\$32,000
Search	12,000 estimated clicks	\$2 / click	\$24,000
Delivery media	10,000 estimated clicks	\$2 / click	\$20,000
App acquisition	1,200,000 ad views	\$10 / 1,000 views	\$12,000

Scheduled: \$176,000. Unassigned: \$12,889. Available: \$188,889.

What the packages contain

Outdoor: Four local Outdoor panels for the stated burst. Illustrative package contents, subject to supplier coverage. Radio: 40 thirty-second radio spots across the stated burst. Illustrative package contents and \$200 per spot.

Timing: one two-week burst at a confirmed trading moment from local week 13 to year end. Keep search, social and delivery active throughout the stage, spreading their planned quantities across its days. Use frequency limits where available. App activity is limited to eligible buyers; video may run in shorter flights.

[Nielsen: media schedules, units and costs](#)

[Nielsen: audience reach efficiency](#)

Scheduled channel costs by phase and year

Channel	Ignition	Trial-drive	Sustain	Year
Outdoor	\$944,000	\$494,000	\$404,000	\$1,842,000
Paid social	\$788,000	\$518,000	\$428,000	\$1,734,000
Broadcaster video	\$790,000	\$316,000	\$226,000	\$1,332,000
Radio	\$606,000	\$292,000	\$292,000	\$1,190,000
Search	\$180,000	\$315,000	\$270,000	\$765,000
Delivery media	\$191,000	\$270,000	\$225,000	\$686,000
App acquisition	\$101,000	\$135,000	\$135,000	\$371,000

Brief-fixed phase budget

Phase	Share fixed by brief	Net media
Ignition	45.0%	\$3,825,000
Trial-drive	30.0%	\$2,550,000
Sustain	25.0%	\$2,125,000

Scheduled channel costs total \$7,920,000. Another \$580,000 remains unassigned. Totals use full-precision calculations; displayed dollars are rounded. Production, creator fees, research, technology and agency remuneration require a separate agreed commercial scope; this is the net media envelope.

Basis and limits

The workbook shows planned quantities, unit prices, cost formulas and unassigned balances. Editing workbook inputs requires regenerating this presentation and its PDF so all outputs use the same version.

Method, checks and live requirements

Budget and cost checks

Inputs: Brief budget, illustrative store areas, planned quantities and illustrative unit prices

Preparation: Recalculated all 252 market, phase and channel amounts and their totals.

Check applied: Check that scheduled costs plus unassigned money equal the available budget, and that every market retains the brief's stage percentages.

Required human action: Investment owner obtains actual media costs and availability; finance confirms excluded costs; client approves the buying budget.

If the totals add up, does that prove the spending choices are right?

No. It proves the amounts add up. The right allocation also depends on real audience opportunity, store access, costs and expected outcomes.

Scenario brief: section 7

07 / FIVE DELIVERABLES

Count the right result. Know when the evidence is incomplete.

One framework covers every objective: what we count, where it comes from, when we report it and what action follows.

Purpose: Bring the individual measures into one usable reporting process.

Deliverable: Completes output 4: measurement framework aligned to the brief

Decision explained

Awareness, first visits and rewards membership answer different questions. Each needs its own population, dates and records. We compare observed results with the brief's targets and show missing data separately.

A campaign report does not, by itself, prove advertising caused a sale. A comparable control or other suitable causal study is needed to estimate that extra effect. Platform-attributed purchases and incremental purchases must stay distinct.

The framework below includes collection owners, calculations, timing, quality checks and decisions. It also explains how to handle unlinked records, customers who do not return and incomplete research, so a neat percentage cannot falsely declare success.

The recommendation

Measure recognition, first visits and rewards separately, with honest treatment of missing data.

One report can contain all the measures, but each has a different source and denominator: the group we divide by. The framework below covers every metric requested in the brief, including efficiency, share of voice, engagement and sentiment.

The evidence, applied

Keep the three targets on their own denominators

Targets supplied; definitions proposed

What we found

Targets are 60% metro and 40% regional awareness at six months; trial from 25% of aware buyers within 90 local days; rewards registration from 15% of first-time visitors within two visits.

What we do differently

Recognition divides by the survey's eligible audience; trial divides by aware buyers; rewards divides by first-time visitors. Keep their different time windows and populations separate rather than multiplying unrelated percentages.

Brief sections 2 and 9

Missing answers cannot become success

Definitions proposed; records missing

What we found

The measurement framework specifies denominators and missing-data rules. No real buyer tracker, sales-to-app linkage or launch reporting extract has been supplied.

What we do differently

Report unknown identity and missing outcomes separately. Show how unresolved records could change the result and withhold attainment where the gap could reverse the decision.

Client brief, objectives and reporting requirements; measurement framework in this response. No live outcomes.

Measure trial against the relevant local opening

Brief plus illustrative dates

What we found

Early November is the brief's opening window. The model uses illustrative 2, 9 and 16 November dates and a proposed common year-end of 1 November 2027.

What we do differently

Assign a person to an agreed local opening/reporting group and assess the 90-day trial window there. Do not use the national advertising date as every person's start date.

Brief sections 7, 10 and 11

Define who we compare the brand with

Brief occasions; monitoring missing

What we found

The brief names seasonal activations such as Christmas and sport finals. No licensed competitor time series or agreed credibility threshold is supplied.

What we do differently

Agree the competitor list, channels, reporting period and comparable monitoring basis before judging advertising presence. A net budget is not directly comparable with published rate-card spend.

Brief sections 2, 7 and 9

Separate delivery checks from business results

Supplier proposals missing

What we found

No current local inventory quotes or reach forecasts have been obtained. Google's August 2026 documentation confirms that search adverts can reach people looking for relevant products and services. It does not establish local search demand, prices or extra sales.

What we do differently

Track spend, reach and frequency to check what was bought. Use surveys and appropriate customer records for recognition, trial and rewards. A delivered impression is not a new customer.

Required supplier proposals. No priced, available local media package has been supplied.

[Google Ads: Search campaigns](#)

Before launch

Agree audience/market definitions and survey sample; collect baseline awareness; test sales, visit and app records; define first-time status and linking coverage; obtain delivery and competitor monitoring access. The client approves privacy and research funding. No baseline or fieldwork has been collected in this case.

During the campaign

Check spend, delivery, ordering links and tracking daily. Investigate performance weekly and reconcile costs monthly. Review qualified visits, app acquisition and creative response with their reporting lag. Compare awareness at the agreed tracker points and six-month deadline; assess trial against each local 90-day window. Review monitored share of voice monthly and at 12 months. Report sample size and uncertainty alongside rates.

When records are incomplete

Keep all eligible people in the definition of the metric. Report unknown identity, missing outcomes and pending follow-up separately. A rewards result based only on easily identified customers cannot establish the result for all first-time visitors. Customers who never return do not disappear from that base.

A result versus an advertising effect

A purchase after an ad is not automatically a purchase caused by that ad. Compare suitable exposed and control groups when estimating extra results. A creator-versus-brand creative test answers which advert works better under that test; it does not by itself show how many sales all advertising caused.

What the review changes

If delivery is wrong, fix targeting or the placement. If awareness is weak with valid measurement, revisit reach and creative. If aware people do not try, inspect availability, offer and ordering friction. If visitors do not register, inspect the reward value and sign-up journey. Do not interpret every failure as a need for more media spend.

Deliverable contents

All brief metrics and targets

Definitions and denominators

Sources and collection owners

Reporting timing

Quality and missing-data rules

Decisions and causal limits

Set up before reporting success

Awareness and first-visit surveys

Responsible person: Client insights owner and research supplier

When: Before launch; agree local day-90 and six-month waves

Required output: Approved audience boundaries, overlap rules, sample design, questionnaire, dates and price

First-visitor and rewards records

Responsible person: Client data owner and agency measurement owner

When: Before first orders and sign-ups

Required output: Tested customer matching, visit dates, consent and incomplete-record reporting

Competitor advertising monitoring

Responsible person: Client marketing owner and monitoring supplier

When: Before the first reporting period

Required output: Same brands, channels, geography, period and valuation method; agreed meaning of credible third player

Campaign delivery and experiments

Responsible person: Agency media and analytics owners

When: Before media starts, then weekly checks

Required output: Verified spend and delivery, agreed comparison groups, sufficient test size and a reporting schedule

Research and implementation costs

Responsible person: Client budget owner

When: Before commissioning each item

Required output: Separate approved funding; these costs are not silently included in the \$8.5m net-media allocation

Prompted brand awareness

Definition: The percentage of the intended audience who recognise Cluckin Good when shown its name in a list of brands.

Numerator: Survey respondents who recognise the brand, after any agreed survey weights are applied.

Denominator: Everyone eligible for that same survey question, in the same audience, market and survey wave, including people who do not recognise the brand. Use the same weighting rules.

Target: 60% in each agreed major metro market and 40% in the agreed regional markets within six months. Agree how regional areas are grouped before collecting answers.

Collection owner: Human research supplier collects responses. The human client insights owner approves the method; the human agency measurement owner checks the results.

Collection source: Commission an independent survey before paid advertising and at the required six-month check. A month-three check is optional. Ask people to name brands before showing a list and vary the list order fairly. 400 is an illustrative starting sample for requesting quotes, not a statistically validated requirement. The supplier must determine the sample needed for the agreed precision and market comparisons. Illustrative quote size: 12 reporting markets $\times$ 2 waves $\times$ 400 completed interviews = 9,600 responses. A more cautious example allows 1.5 times as many interviews because clustered or weighted answers can contain less independent information: $400 \times 1.5 = 600$ per market and wave; $12 \times 2 \times 600 = 14,400$. That 1.5 allowance is an assumption for quoting, not a measured design effect. The supplier must agree reporting groups, recruitment, sample design and price. Both totals exclude local-day-90 trial interviews and an optional month-three check. Agree full-market boundaries separately from advertising buying areas.

Source replacement: No client tracker was supplied. Commission real responses. Followers, website traffic and advertising displays cannot replace this survey. A convenience sample can suggest questions to investigate but cannot establish target achievement.

Biases

Some types of people may be more likely to join or answer the survey

People may guess recognition from the brand list

Different survey samples can create apparent changes

A national average can hide individual market shortfalls

The two audience age groups overlap

Worked example: Illustrative worked example AWARE: 236 of 400 equally weighted eligible metro respondents recognise the brand: $236/400 = 59\%$. No real sample was collected. Real fieldwork needs its own weighting, quality and uncertainty assessment.

Non example: 60% of ad viewers recall an ad. That denominator excludes people the campaign did not reach.

Rule: Report the market, survey wave, sample size, weighting and uncertainty. A point estimate close to the target is not a precise population pass or fail. Missing recognition answers stay separate from confirmed non-recognition. Report their weighted share and how they could affect the conclusion. Sample size for a single proportion does not establish power to detect change between waves.

Decision use: If recognition is low, investigate who the advertising reaches, how often they see it and whether the creative makes the brand memorable.

Unprompted brand awareness

Definition: The percentage of the intended audience who name Cluckin Good before they see any brand names.

Numerator: Eligible respondents who name the brand without help, using agreed spelling rules and survey weights.

Denominator: All eligible respondents asked the same open category question, with the same survey weights.

Target: No numeric target in brief.

Collection owner: Human research supplier collects answers; the human client insights owner agrees the question and coding rules.

Collection source: Use the same survey as the brand-recognition measure. Ask people to name chicken brands before showing them a list. Record any mention separately from the first brand named.

Source replacement: Commission a survey. Search activity and social mentions measure other behaviours and cannot substitute for unaided recall.

Biases

The category wording changes which brands people consider

Misspellings need consistent coding

Earlier questions can influence answers

Small samples produce uncertain estimates

Worked example: Illustrative aggregate worked example, not raw customer records: 32 of 400 name the brand without help = 8%; if 12 name it first, top-of-mind is 3%, a separate diagnostic.

Non example: Recognising the name from a list.

Rule: Ask before showing brand names. Keep any mention separate from the first brand mentioned.

Decision use: Check whether people can bring the brand to mind without help, rather than only recognising its name.

First-visit trial among people aware of the brand

Definition: The percentage of people who know the brand who report their first visit within 90 days of their local store opening.

Numerator: Aware survey respondents who report a first visit in that local 90-day window, with agreed survey weights.

Denominator: All known unique aware respondents in the same agreed reporting group and day-90 survey, including those with a missing trial answer; apply the same survey weights. Awareness measured at day 90 is a proposed rule for client agreement. People whose awareness itself is unknown are reported separately, not assumed aware or unaware.

Target: 25% within 90 days of the local opening. The client must agree the awareness timing and whether delivery purchases count as visits. Keep physical visits and delivery purchases separate until then.

Collection owner: Human research supplier collects answers. Human client insights and operations owners confirm local opening dates. A human agency analyst checks any supporting purchase records.

Collection source: At the agreed local day-90 point, survey the defined target population and identify aware respondents, then ask separately about first physical visits and delivery purchases. Assign each person to one residence/opening-date reporting group using a rule agreed before collection; do not count the person twice across overlapping store areas. Actual staggered stores require appropriate opening groups even though the planning workbook currently has one shared date per market. Compare with available authorised purchase records. Quote trial screening and interviews separately from awareness waves.

Source replacement: When customer identities are missing, a representative survey may estimate trial with uncertainty. Receipts cannot count aware people who never visited, so receipts cannot provide the whole denominator.

Biases

A visit may itself make someone aware of the brand

People may recall the wrong visit date

Physical visits and delivery orders differ

People may use more than one store

Later openings need their full local observation period

Worked example: Illustrative worked example TRIAL: 46 of 200 aware respondents report a first visit during local days 1 to 90: $46/200 = 23\%$. This is a separate tracking group from the awareness example. Purchase including delivery is only a proposed interpretation, pending client agreement.

Non example: Dividing total orders by ad impressions or by all residents.

Rule: Use the same people, reporting group, weights and local window. Keep confirmed trial, confirmed no trial, waiting follow-up and missing answers separate. Among known aware people, lower possible rate = confirmed trials / all known aware people; upper possible rate = (confirmed trials + unresolved outcomes) / that same base. Show the answered-only rate separately. These are missing-outcome bounds, not confidence intervals. Withhold attainment if missingness or uncertainty could change the decision. Never multiply unrelated month-six awareness and day-90 trial samples.

Decision use: If recognition is strong but first visits are weak, check store access, meal value, availability and experience as well as advertising.

Source ids

S25

Store visitation

Definition: The number of visits to a store in a stated period, using a clearly described counting method.

Numerator: Visit events that meet the agreed rules. Remove staff, couriers, passers-by and duplicate location signals where the method allows.

Denominator: No denominator is needed for a count. To report visits per open day, divide by actual open store-days. Unique visitors are a separate count.

Target: No numeric target in brief.

Collection owner: Human client operations owner supplies store details and counter data. A contracted human-managed provider supplies location estimates. The human measurement owner checks the method and coverage.

Collection source: Use store entrance counters or an approved location-data provider. Agree the store boundary, opening hours, how long someone must remain to count as a visit, and how to remove repeated signals, staff and couriers. Show how many people the provider actually measures and how it estimates a wider total. Compare the pattern with till transactions, which count purchases rather than people.

Source replacement: Use scheduled manual entrance counts if suitable. Sales transactions can be labelled as a purchase-count proxy, but must not be renamed visits or people.

Biases

The measured devices may not represent all visitors

Nearby shops and building levels can confuse location signals

Staff and couriers may enter the area

Repeat trips and multiple devices can duplicate people

Estimates expanded from a sample have uncertainty

Opening hours and days can differ

Worked example: Illustrative aggregate worked example, not raw customer records: 1,200 qualifying visits over 30 open store-days = 40 visits per open day. If 900 distinct measured visitors made those visits, visits and visitors remain separate.

Non example: 1,200 location pings or 1,200 receipts automatically equal 1,200 customers.

Rule: Report the counting method and coverage for each store. Leave unreliable estimates unavailable instead of assuming they represent the whole country.

Decision use: Find local access or trading problems and decide where a controlled visitation test could help.

App downloads

Definition: First-time downloads reported by each app store, with repeat downloads reported separately.

Numerator: First-time downloads reported for the chosen period and geography, using each app store's definition.

Denominator: None for a download count. Downloads across devices or operating systems are not necessarily different people.

Target: No numeric target in brief.

Collection owner: Human client app product owner obtains reports from App Store Connect and Google Play Console.

Collection source: Get app-store acquisition reports with their definitions. Compare downloads, first app launches and completed registrations, explaining why the counts differ.

Source replacement: If app-store download reports are unavailable, report first launches under that name. Launching the app after reinstalling it can trigger this event again, so it is not a count of new members or downloads.

Biases

Repeat downloads and reinstalls

One person may use several devices

A download may never be opened

App stores use different reporting definitions

Reports may arrive late

Worked example: Illustrative aggregate worked example, not raw customer records: 1,000 first-time store downloads, 800 first opens and 120 registrations are three different funnel counts; $120/800 = 15\%$ open-to-registration, not the brief's visitor-to-loyalty rate.

Non example: Counting first app launches as downloads or rewards registrations.

Rule: Keep operating-system definitions visible and report downloads, first launches and registrations separately.

Decision use: Distinguish difficulty attracting app users from difficulty getting them through registration.

Source ids

S10

Technical event name: first_open

Rewards sign-up within the first two visits

Definition: The percentage of first-time visitors who complete a new rewards registration by the end of their second visit.

Numerator: Different first-time visitors with a confirmed registration no later than visit two. Agree how to handle people who joined before their first visit.

Denominator: All known unique first-time visitors in the same agreed tracking group, including people who do not return, with success, failure, waiting and missing outcomes reported separately. The number of people behind unresolved identities is unknown, so those records remain outside this known-person calculation and prevent a claim about all first-time visitors.

Target: 15%. The client must agree follow-up timing, non-returner treatment and how to handle people already registered before their first visit.

Collection owner: Human client rewards-data owner supplies registrations. The human sales-data owner links visit order across stores. A human research supplier can study visitors missing from those records if commissioned.

Collection source: The client links purchase records to rewards accounts using an approved customer identifier and permission to use the records. Record the first visit, later visits, registration time and whether the person was already a member. Give the agency grouped results rather than customer identities.

Source replacement: If records cannot be linked fully, report the identifiable group's result with its limits and consider a visitor follow-up study. Registrations divided by receipts are not this measure. Unresolved records are not automatically different first-time people.

Biases

Customers who can be identified may be more loyal already

Cash and anonymous visitors may be missing

Shared or duplicate accounts

Some customers have not yet reached visit two

Dropping non-returners can inflate the rate

Some people registered before launch

Worked example: Illustrative worked example REWARDS: 15 of 100 identified customers assumed evaluable after second visit registered by visit two = 15%. Another 20 records have unknown identity. No pending group is modelled; this is not the rate for all first-time visitors.

Non example: 15% of installers register, or 15% of second-visit customers register.

Rule: Count a verified registration by visit one as success immediately. Confirm failure only after visit two without an in-time registration and with complete records. Otherwise label known eligible people waiting or missing outcome, without overlap. Calendar closure alone is not failure. Lower possible rate = successes / all known eligible people; upper = (successes + waiting + missing outcomes) / that same base. Show resolved-only results separately. These bounds do not cover unidentified people or sampling uncertainty. Withhold attainment if gaps could change it. Agree non-returner and pre-existing-member rules. The original teaching group contains no waiting customers.

Decision use: Separate problems with advertising acquisition from problems with store sign-up prompts or app registration.

Advertising share of voice and credible third-player objective

Definition: The brand's share of category advertising measured on one agreed basis. The brief asks for a "credible third player" in advertising share of voice. Proposed test: third by comparable monitored advertising value across the full agreed category over the agreed reporting period within year one, plus any separate credibility criterion the client agrees. This proposal is not a supplied definition or a sales ranking.

Numerator: Cluckin Good's monitored advertising value, measured by the same provider and rules as every competitor. The proposed method uses gross published advertising values, before negotiated discounts.

Denominator: The sum of comparable advertising values for all brands in the agreed takeaway-chicken category, including Cluckin Good, with the same media, geography and period.

Target: Become a credible third player in advertising share of voice within 12 months. The brief sets no percentage or automatic rank-based pass. The human client must agree competitors, media, period and what counts as credible.

Collection owner: Human agency research or media-investment owner obtains the monitoring data. The human client marketing director approves the comparison and success rule.

Collection source: Obtain a licensed brand-level advertising report, such as Nielsen Ad Intel, with a coverage guide. Agree brand names, included channels, exclusions and the year-one reporting period. Review on the agreed schedule.

Source replacement: Without comparable advertising-value data, report this measure as unavailable. A consistent ad-count sample can be labelled share of observed advertisements, but not share of advertising expenditure. Sales share, search share and social discussion are different measures.

Biases

Comparing discounted client spend with undiscounted competitor values

Some advertising channels may be missing

The provider's category may differ from the agreed category

National totals can hide local differences

Third place is automatic if only three brands are counted

A short burst may distort one month's rank

Worked example: Illustrative worked example SOV: six anonymous monitored values are 52, 20, 12, 9, 7 and 4 million, total 104 million. The example brand's $12/104 = 11.538\%$. Third by value in this illustrative set does not establish the client's undefined credible-third objective.

Non example: Dividing the \$8.5M net media budget by competitors' gross rate-card values, or treating sales share as SOV.

Rule: Use a consistent provider, value basis, competitor list and time period. Agree the success rule before judging it. The illustrative third-place example proves neither real advertising presence nor sales performance.

Decision use: Once real category data is available, assess the brand's advertising presence against the client's agreed ambition.

Source ids

S02

Cost per first-time trial

Definition: Advertising spend divided by first-time trials, with a label explaining whether trials were observed, credited to ads or estimated to have been caused by ads.

Numerator: Checked net media spend for the same markets, channels and time period as the trial count.

Denominator: Different first-time triers under the agreed visit definition. State whether the count covers all observed trials, ad-attributed trials or additional trials estimated by a credible comparison.

Target: No cost target in brief.

Collection owner: Human agency finance and media owners confirm spend. The human client data owner supplies first-time counts. The human measurement owner checks that their definitions and periods match.

Collection source: Match invoices and platform costs to the chosen time and area. Remove duplicate customer counts in sales records or use a labelled survey estimate. Record delays and how shared advertising spend is assigned.

Source replacement: If first-time identities are missing, use a survey estimate with uncertainty. If only orders are known, report cost per order instead of cost per trial.

Biases

Some trials would happen without advertising

More than one platform may claim the same trial

Anonymous customers may be missing

Survey-based totals have uncertainty

Trials may occur after the reporting period

Assigning only selected costs can make a result appear cheap

Worked example: Illustrative aggregate worked example, not raw customer records: \$100,000 net media / 2,000 observed first-time triers = \$50 per observed trial. If a credible control estimates only 400 additional triers, incremental cost per trial is \$250.

Non example: Cheap attributed trials prove media caused those purchases.

Rule: Always label the result observed, attributed or incremental. Incremental means additional trials caused by advertising; it requires a credible comparison, not a platform claim. If results are missing, report a provisional cost using only the named verified result count and disclose incomplete coverage; do not treat it as a final performance comparison. Do not convert unidentified records into people, combine overlapping platform claims or silently change the denominator. Zero or unavailable results mean cost is unavailable, not zero. The human measurement owner resolves missing data before recommending scale. If an estimated additional-trial effect is non-positive or its uncertainty includes no effect, do not present a positive incremental cost as established.

Decision use: Compare tactics only after checking whether the costs and trial definitions are comparable.

Cost per app acquisition

Definition: App-acquisition advertising spend divided by a named new app result. Report downloads separately from confirmed new rewards registrations.

Numerator: Net app-acquisition advertising spend for the same people, time period and ad-crediting window.

Denominator: New registrations counted once and credited to advertising using one agreed method. For cost per download, use first-time downloads instead.

Target: No cost target is supplied. The client must agree which app result counts as acquisition.

Collection owner: Human agency performance owner checks cost and ad-crediting rules. Human client app and rewards-data owners confirm events and registrations.

Collection source: Compare platform or app-measurement reports with registration records. Agree how long after an ad click or view a result can be credited. Remove overlapping claims across platforms.

Source replacement: If only platform-attributed installs are available, call the result cost per platform-attributed install. Do not call it confirmed registration cost or add overlapping platform claims.

Biases

Some ad links cannot be observed because of privacy limits

Reinstalls may look new

View-based credit can overstate influence

Several platforms can claim one person

Some registrations happen without advertising

Fake or duplicate accounts

Worked example: Illustrative aggregate worked example, not raw customer records: \$12,000 spend produces 1,000 attributed first-time downloads and 200 verified attributed registrations. Cost per download = \$12; cost per registration = \$60.

Non example: A \$12 install cost is a \$12 loyal-customer acquisition cost.

Rule: Name the app event and crediting window beside the cost. Check the result against client records. If results are missing, report a provisional cost using only the named verified result count and disclose incomplete coverage; do not treat it as a final performance comparison. Do not convert unidentified records into people, combine overlapping platform claims or silently change the denominator. Zero or unavailable results mean cost is unavailable, not zero. The human measurement owner resolves missing data before recommending scale.

Source ids

S10

Decision use: Avoid optimising for cheap downloads that do not lead to completed membership registrations.

Social sentiment

Definition: The tone of relevant public comments or mentions collected from stated sources, classified using consistent rules.

Numerator: Positive, negative, neutral and mixed mentions, counted separately. For an optional net score, subtract negative from positive.

Denominator: All relevant collected mentions that can be classified, including neutral and mixed. Report unclassifiable material and gaps in collection separately.

Target: No numeric target.

Collection owner: Human social analyst collects the material. A human coder checks classifications. The human client customer-care owner reviews issues needing action.

Collection source: Use an authorised listening-service export or accessible comments on owned posts. Fix search terms, platforms, languages, dates, spam and duplicate rules. Human checks of sarcasm and sensitive content remain necessary.

Source replacement: If a listening service is unavailable, label a sample of owned comments as owned-comment sentiment. It does not represent all public discussion or the Australian population.

Biases

Vocal commenters may not represent other customers

Private and deleted posts may be absent

Sarcasm and slang can be misread

Bots and repeated posters can distort counts

Moderation can remove negative material

Worked example: Illustrative aggregate worked example, not raw customer records: 40 positive, 20 negative, 30 neutral and 10 mixed = 100 classifiable mentions. Positive share 40%; negative 20%; optional net score $(40-20)/100 = +20$ percentage points.

Non example: 40% of Australians like the brand because 40% of captured comments are positive.

Rule: Show counts, collection limits and uncertain classifications. Refer serious complaints to the human client team regardless of the average score.

Decision use: Identify questions about the food, sourcing, advertising or service that need investigation.

Engagement rate on launch content

Definition: Selected interactions divided by the number of times the same content was displayed, reported separately by platform and paid or unpaid distribution.

Numerator: Likes or reactions, comments, shares and saves where available. This proposed common definition excludes clicks and video views.

Denominator: Advertising or post impressions for the same content, platform and period. An impression is one display, not a unique person. Do not combine rates based on reach or video views with this rate.

Target: No numeric target.

Collection owner: Human agency social owner obtains post reports. Creators supply authorised reports from their own accounts.

Collection source: Get post-level reports with dates, paid-promotion flags and available interaction counts. Divide total interactions by total impressions; do not average individual post percentages.

Source replacement: If impressions are missing, a public-view-based rate may be a labelled alternative. It is a different measure and cannot replace the impression-based rate without disclosure.

Biases

One person can take several actions

Paid and unpaid distribution can overlap

Platforms define displays differently

Some interaction types may be unavailable

Bots and giveaways may boost counts

Negative reactions can produce high engagement

Worked example: Illustrative aggregate worked example, not raw customer records: 600 likes + 100 comments + 200 shares + 100 saves = 1,000 actions; 50,000 impressions gives 2%. This does not mean 2% of unique people engaged.

Non example: Average a tiny post's 20% rate and a large post's 1% rate to claim 10.5% overall.

Rule: Keep the actions counted, the denominator and paid status visible. Compare like with like.

Decision use: Choose content for further testing alongside sentiment and business outcomes, rather than treating all engagement as positive.

Shared controls

Human client and agency owners must agree audiences, reporting areas, opening dates, tracking groups and ad-crediting periods before collection. Named roles are proposed responsibilities, not confirmed supplier appointments.

The age groups overlap at 30 to 34. Measure their needs separately; remove duplicate people before combining counts.

A first-ever brand visit differs from a first visit to one branch. Use a reliable customer identifier across stores where permission allows and report missing identities.

The client retains personal customer records. The agency receives grouped results. Collection, linking and retention require human privacy approval.

When the denominator is zero or missing, report the measure as unavailable. Explain missing records, reporting dates and later corrections.

Keep one client-approved store list with dates, addresses and realistic drive or delivery areas. Do not silently substitute a platform reporting area.

Use net media costs consistently and explain separate treatment of tax, fees, incentives, research and content rights.

Use daily operational checks where data exists, weekly investigation and monthly reconciled reporting. Surveys follow the separate awareness and trial schedules.

Choose a real survey sample size for the required precision and market decisions. The 400-person worked example is not an approved sample plan or quote.

Assign known eligible people once to confirmed success, confirmed failure, follow-up still open or missing outcome. Unresolved identity records are a separate category because their unique-person count and eligibility cannot be assumed. Registration at the first visit takes precedence over waiting for visit two.

For a known eligible group, report confirmed-success and possible-success bounds using the full group, alongside any answered-only diagnostic. Apply survey weights consistently. Do not present missing-outcome bounds as sampling confidence intervals or extend them to unidentified people.

When incomplete outcomes could alter a target decision, report attainment as unresolved. The human measurement owner records the affected population, missing counts, requested collection, responsible person and next review date. Do not fill gaps with assumed failures or successes.

Separate advertising buying areas, awareness reporting markets and supplier reporting zones. Agree population coverage and the treatment of overlapping opening groups before fieldwork. A channel-mix label does not assign the awareness target.

Incomplete outcome rules

Known person statuses

Rule: Known unique eligible person meets the agreed outcome. For rewards, registration by visit one counts immediately.

Rule: Known unique eligible person has complete evidence of failure after the outcome window. For rewards this means visit two occurred without registration in time.

Rule: Known unique eligible person has not completed the relevant observation. A calendar checkpoint does not turn a rewards non-returner into a failure.

Rule: Known unique eligible person has an outcome that cannot be determined from the available records, rather than simply needing more time.

Outside known person base: Unresolved identity records cannot establish unique eligible people; do not insert their record count into person-based bounds. Unknown eligibility is also reported separately.

Calculation: $N = \text{successes} + \text{failures} + \text{follow-up open} + \text{missing outcome}$. Lower = $\text{successes} / N$. Upper = $(\text{successes} + \text{follow-up open} + \text{missing outcome}) / N$. Complete-case diagnostic = $\text{successes} / (\text{successes} + \text{failures})$. For surveys use weighted totals and report unweighted counts. Zero denominators yield unavailable.

Decision: If bounds cross the target, attainment is unresolved. If bounds do not cross it, still consider sampling uncertainty, unknown identities, eligibility coverage and the agreed decision rule; bounds alone do not certify the population result.

Trial stress

Successes: 46

Failures: 134

Missing outcomes: 20

Known aware people: 200

Lower rate: 23.0%

Upper rate: 33.0%

Complete case rate: 25.6%

Purpose: Shows how dropping missing answers changes the result. Separate from the original 46/200 trial example.

Rewards stress

Successes: 15

Failures: 65

Follow up open: 20

Known eligible people: 100

Lower rate: 15.0%

Upper rate: 35.0%

Complete case rate: 18.8%

Purpose: Separate stress case only. The original 100 identified customers all reached visit two, with 15 successes, 85 failures and no pending group. Its 20 unidentified records remain separate.

Owner action: Human measurement owner records the affected group, missing counts, next collection action, accountable human owner and review date. Client agrees non-returner, prior-member and physical-versus-delivery rules.

Experiment design

Definition: Additional results caused by advertising, compared with what would otherwise have happened.

Proposal: If feasible, randomly give comparable open-store areas different amounts of extra advertising while meeting the national launch requirement. This tests the extra advertising, not the whole campaign. Agree measures, duration and exclusions first; account for people crossing areas. If random assignment is impossible, describe the assumptions behind a matched comparison.

Worked example: Illustrative equal-size groups: treatment trial rate rises from 4% to 7%; control rises from 4% to 5%. Difference in changes = $(7-4)-(5-4) = 2$ percentage points. Across 20,000 eligible treatment people, estimated additional trials = 400. $\$100,000$ incremental spend / 400 = \$250 per incremental trial.

Limitations: Different opening dates, promotions, stock availability and advertising crossing areas can make comparisons misleading. Check prior trends where meaningful and report uncertainty. New stores have no prior store sales; do not invent them. If the estimate could include no effect, report an inconclusive result instead of a precise cost.

Basis and limits

Location-based visit estimates are not confirmed purchases. Define the store area, opening hours and rules for staff or repeat visits, then check the provider's coverage.

Engagement rate means selected actions divided by a stated base such as impressions. Keep that base consistent. Social sentiment means the tone of comments in the sample; public comments are not a representative survey, and people should review sarcasm and sensitive issues.

Cost per trial and cost per app acquisition need a clear definition of the result being counted. A platform may credit an order to an advertisement without proving that the advertisement created an additional purchase. Revenue divided by advertising spend is also different from profit-based return on investment.

The Research AI agent can flag unusual results and prepare an explanation. A human performance owner reviews it; investment and client owners approve changes to committed spending.

Report mutually exclusive groups: confirmed success, confirmed failure, still waiting, missing outcome and unresolved identity. Bounds on possible results apply only to a known number of unique eligible people, not an unknown number of people behind unidentified records. The measurement owner records the next collection action and keeps target decisions open when missingness or sampling uncertainty could change them.

Method, checks and live requirements

Measurement design

Inputs: All brief KPIs and existing measurement framework

Preparation: Specified collection owners, numerator/denominator rules, reporting windows and actions for incomplete data.

Check applied: Each required measure has an owner, source, calculation and missing-data rule.

Required human action: Analytics implements events before launch; research establishes baselines; client agrees reporting cadence and action thresholds.

Who handles a serious complaint found in social comments?

The client's responsible human team. AI can flag and organise the issue, but it should not independently decide or publish a sensitive response.

Scenario brief: section 9

Source notes: [MOVE: Outdoor audience measurement](#); [DoorDash: Self-Serve Sponsored Listings](#); [Google Analytics: Automatically collected events](#); [AMSI: Calculating confidence intervals](#)

Compare paid food content before committing to sponsorship.

Compare Andy Cooks and Daen's Kitchen for a defined production brief. Reject Fortress venue sampling and defer PWR; no candidate is booked.

Purpose: Recommend how outside voices or organisations could help the launch.

Deliverable: Delivers output 5: creator and partnership point of view

Decision explained

The recommendation is to test food-led content linked to a ready store or ordering route before committing to a large sponsorship. This supports the brief's flavour and quality positioning and keeps the activity useful to people who can buy.

Andy Cooks and Daen's Kitchen have relevant food-content experience, but their home-cooking identities mean takeaway work must be a genuine fit. Fortress prohibits the proposed outside-food sampling. PWR documents an October 2024 McDonald's campaign, so defer it pending current conflict clearance and audience evidence. [Andy Cooks: About Andy Cooks shares BOSS Coffee announcement](#) [Daen's Kitchen: Official biography](#) [Melbourne Food & Wine: 2024 festival record](#) [Fortress: Venue food and age policies](#) [PWR: Official partnership case studies](#)

The recommendation

Compare food-content production first. Do not buy a large sponsorship without a clear local benefit.

The shortlist separates a person's ability to make good food content from evidence that their followers are suitable local buyers. Andy Cooks and Daen's Kitchen are comparison candidates, not agreed partners. Other scopes are rejected or deferred where the evidence does not fit.

The evidence, applied

Buy a defined production skill, not assumed influence

[Public capability evidence](#)

What we found

Andy Cooks and Daen's Kitchen have documented food/brand content experience. That supports comparing production, not assuming local sales impact.

What we do differently

Compare Andy Cooks and Daen's Kitchen on the same food-filming brief. Their documented work supports a production shortlist, not an assumption that their followers will buy locally.

Official creator biographies, Andy's BOSS Coffee announcement and the 2024 Melbourne Food & Wine organiser record.

[Andy Cooks: About](#)

[Andy Cooks shares BOSS Coffee announcement](#)

[Daen's Kitchen: Official biography](#)

[Melbourne Food & Wine: 2024 festival record](#)

Keep audience fit separate from production ability

[Capability evidence; buyer fit missing](#)

What we found

The candidate research confirms food-production experience for Andy Cooks and Daen's Kitchen. It does not establish which creators the target buyers trust or the extra local reach a partnership would add.

What we do differently

Buy local distribution through the brand's advertising where appropriate. Pay separately for a creator's audience only after its relevant local adult buyers and overlap are evidenced.

Official creator and organiser records linked below. No buyer-following or local audience study supplied.

[Andy Cooks: About](#)

[Andy Cooks shares BOSS Coffee announcement](#)

[Daen's Kitchen: Official biography](#)

[Melbourne Food & Wine: 2024 festival record](#)

Ask creators to show the actual product

[Brief supplied; proof missing](#)

What we found

The brief says free-range chicken, small-batch marinades, no artificial fillers and chef-developed flavours. The proposition is indulgence without compromising quality, transparency or flavour.

What we do differently

Commission a truthful demonstration of the client's meal and approved claims. Do not replace the takeaway product with a recipe concept or an unsubstantiated health story.

Brief sections 1, 5, 6 and 10

Local activation must have a place people can buy

[Requirements supplied; approvals absent](#)

What we found

The brief requires addresses and dates locked three weeks before local media, regional approval before booking and sourcing claims cleared before airing.

What we do differently

Confirm the stores, eligible area and opening before paid distribution. Any off-site event needs suitable premises and operational approval; a creator does not remove those requirements.

Brief sections 4 and 10

Check commercial conflicts before appointment

[Specific restrictions found](#)

What we found

Fortress's published policy prohibits outside food except celebration cake, so its venue-sampling idea is rejected. PWR documents McDonald's work; current conflict status is unconfirmed.

What we do differently

Require competitor clearance and a credible reason for the association. PWR's documented McDonald's work creates a concrete conflict question, so appointment is deferred rather than assumed available.

Fortress venue policy and PWR's official partnership case studies.

[PWR: Official partnership case studies](#)

[Fortress: Venue food and age policies](#)

[Fortress Experiences: Tabletop Tavern](#)

Do not hide creator costs in a media-only budget

[From the brief](#)

What we found

\$8.5 million net media: 45% in local weeks 1 to 4, 30% in weeks 5 to 12 and 25% for sustain. Production, research, fees, rights and GST have no assigned funding in the case.

What we do differently

Count paid promotion once within the approved media line. Obtain separate funding for talent, production and usage rights. The proposed pilot cap is a risk limit, not a supplier quote.

Brief section 7

The common brief

Request one filming session and two 15 to 30 second vertical food edits, with four weeks of paid use on named platforms and approved local areas. Include captions, an approved ordering route and one factual/legal revision. Do not assume organic posts, recipe development or ambassador rights are included.

Production is different from distribution

A creator can make advertising that the brand distributes to its own chosen audience. Paying for an organic post additionally buys access to that creator's followers. The second purchase needs dated adult Australian and local audience evidence, overlap checks and a clear fee; follower totals alone are not enough.

Sport, gaming and entertainment

Defer broad rights packages at launch: local buyer reach, fit and full costs have not been established. Consider a specific adult food occasion only when it supports the meal and store access. PWR remains deferred pending conflict/audience checks. Fortress venue sampling is rejected; an off-site hosted event would be separate, optional work requiring suitable client premises.

Test, stop or scale

Compare licensed creator edits against brand-made edits with the same offer, audience and reporting window. Include production and rights costs in the assessment. Set the observation period and sufficient sample with the analyst before starting. Stop for claim, safety or commercial breaches; scale only where observed performance and total cost justify it. No invented numeric success threshold is presented.

Before commissioning

Confirm willingness, availability, named deliverables, fees, rights, territory, duration, platforms, exclusivity, revisions, cancellation, disclosure and reporting access. Paid advertising must be identifiable, and product claims need legal clearance. The client and agency commercial owner must identify funding for talent and rights outside the media-only envelope.

Deliverable contents

Strategic role and audience fit

Named candidate comparison

Specific collaboration and mutual value

Rights costs and conflicts

Test and decision rules

Alternatives and approval gates

Common selection criteria

Select someone who can make truthful food advertising that can reach eligible local buyers at an acceptable total cost.

Production capability earns a place on the comparison shortlist. Appointment requires all applicable checks to pass. Unknown terms are not a pass, and follower count is not a substitute for local buyer evidence.

Andy Cooks: food filming

Relevant capability: Official biography and BOSS Coffee announcement support professional food and commercial production experience.

Product and local fit: Must accept the real takeaway product. Brand-bought local advertising is the proposed distribution. His followers' local buyer fit is unverified.

Rights, conflicts and total cost: Availability, itemised fee, paid-use rights and competitor clearance remain unconfirmed.

Decision: Compare the production proposal. Do not appoint or rank as best yet.

Daen's Kitchen: food filming

Relevant capability: Official biography and festival organiser record support branded food work and a sponsored food activation.

Product and local fit: Must demonstrate the actual meal without inventing a Mediterranean recipe or health claim. Local organic audience fit is unverified.

Rights, conflicts and total cost: Obtain the same fee, rights, availability and conflict evidence as Andy so the offers are comparable.

Decision: Compare on the same production brief. No performance superiority established.

Fortress: venue sampling

Relevant capability: Official venue policy prohibits outside food. Its off-site hosted-game service is a separate capability.

Product and local fit: Bringing the client's chicken into Fortress fails the proposed venue scope. A later off-site event also needs suitable client premises and buyer fit.

Rights, conflicts and total cost: No exception, one-off service quote or event agreement is confirmed.

Decision: Reject venue sampling. Do not book an alternative merely to keep the name.

PWR: creator content

Relevant capability: Published McDonald's Grimace work supports commercial experience and creates a concrete competitor question.

Product and local fit: A named adult creator must demonstrate a credible meal occasion and relevant local buyers. Global gaming reach does not answer this.

Rights, conflicts and total cost: Written organisation and creator conflict clearance, local audience evidence, rights and price are missing.

Decision: Defer. Reconsider only when these conditions are met.

A bounded, fair comparison

Choose two eligible local markets. A market is the budget group; advertising stays within its confirmed store buying areas. Cap paid distribution at the smaller of \$40,000 or 10% of their combined first-visit phase paid-social budget. Split equally between creator and brand-led advertising during the same four-week local window.

1. For example, Sydney and Melbourne each have \$108,000 for first-visit paid social.
2. Add them to get \$216,000, then take 10% to get \$21,600.
3. That is smaller than \$40,000, so the test limit is \$21,600:
4. \$10,800 for each treatment.

The \$40,000 ceiling does not bind any pair in this illustrative schedule.

The \$40,000 and 10% limits contain spending on an unproven test; they are proposed risk limits, not market prices or a sample-size calculation.

Confirm sufficient sample before starting; an inconclusive result does not justify automatic expansion.

This comes from existing media. Talent, filming and permission to use the content require separate approved funding.

How the comparison works

Randomly assign eligible people to non-overlapping creator and brand groups, with the same offer, dates and campaign settings. Agree one primary outcome, the smallest improvement worth paying for and the required sample before launch. If random assignment is unavailable, label the comparison observational. This compares creative treatments, not advertising versus no advertising. Two creators, two edits and four weeks are proposed scope choices to make a small, comparable production test; they are not researched optimum quantities.

Andy Cooks

Capacity: Paid kitchen visit and short-form food videos

Decision: A credible production candidate, not an appointed ambassador.

Reason: Chef experience and an actual BOSS Coffee relationship support his capability. His strong home-cooking philosophy means takeaway work must be a genuine fit, not a forced endorsement.

Scope: Ask for one filmed session with the actual kitchen team and two 15 to 30 second vertical edits. Show preparation, the finished meal and the approved ordering route. Request four weeks of paid use on named platforms in approved local areas, captioned exports and one factual/legal revision round. No organic post, recipe development or ambassador rights are assumed.

Exchange: Cluckin' Good receives food-focused advertising assets. Andy's business receives an agreed production and licensing fee for work he can honestly support. He would not certify sourcing or pretend to have developed the menu.

Conditions

Confirm he accepts the takeaway brief; assess his proposed treatment against comparable creators.

Obtain an itemised quote, availability, paid-use rights and written competitor/product-placement conflict clearance.

Verify the meal, price and store access. If buying organic distribution, also obtain dated adult Australian audience and city-level evidence.

Measurement: Compare the licensed edits with brand-made advertising using the same offer and eligible local audience. Report the actual observable purchase measure and total costs. This comparison tests creative performance, not whether all advertising caused extra sales.

Verdict: Keep on the comparison shortlist. Do not pay a celebrity premium without a defensible production or distribution benefit.

His biography records professional kitchen and hospitality experience and a clear commitment to home cooking. It supports food expertise, but does not establish willingness to endorse a takeaway chain.

[Andy Cooks: official biography](#)

His own post shares Suntory Oceania's announcement of his BOSS Coffee ambassadorship in Australia and New Zealand. This is concrete beverage-brand experience, not evidence of Cluckin' Good results or current restaurant availability.

[Andy Cooks shares the BOSS Coffee announcement](#)

Daen's Kitchen

Capacity: Paid flavour and meal demonstration

Decision: A second food-production option to compare on the same brief.

Reason: Documented branded food work supports considering her. Mediterranean home cooking is her speciality, so the actual Cluckin' Good meal must fit her treatment without inventing ingredients or health benefits.

Scope: Request the same one-session, two-short-edit, four-week paid-use package. Her treatment could explain the actual flavour, texture or household serving occasion after reviewing the real product. Do not invent olive-oil preparation, a new recipe or a menu collaboration to manufacture a fit.

Exchange: Cluckin' Good receives an alternative food-led creative treatment. Her business receives a paid production and licensing assignment. The content must suit her standards and clearly disclose the commercial relationship.

Conditions

Confirm willingness to demonstrate takeaway rather than create a home recipe, current travel base and availability.

Compare recent commercial food work, an itemised fee, named-platform paid rights and a written conflict declaration.

Verify food claims and serving information with the client. Any separately purchased organic reach needs dated age and location evidence.

Measurement: Use the same paid-creative comparison and reporting basis as Andy. Do not compare raw views from different platforms or claim she is a better performer

before a fair test. Include the production and rights fee when judging commercial value.

Verdict: Include as a comparison candidate, not an automatic replacement or a confirmed participant in the two-creator pilot.

Daen Lia's official biography lists branded work with Westgold Butter, WeberBBQ, Country Road and Melbourne Food & Wine. Her signature is Mediterranean home cooking. These facts establish relevant content experience, not better local reach or lower fees than Andy.

[Daen's Kitchen: official biography](#)

Melbourne Food & Wine's 2024 festival record lists Daen Lia in Celebrity Sausage, presented by Bakers Delight. That is an organiser-confirmed sponsored food activation, not proof of a current exclusive bakery contract or a successful takeaway campaign.

[Melbourne Food & Wine: 2024 festival record](#)

Fortress

Capacity: Possible off-site event supplier, only if needed later

Decision: The proposed sampling event conflicts with the venue's food policy.

Reason: Fortress prohibits outside food and drink, except celebration cake. We should not recommend serving Cluckin' Good there on the assumption that ordinary venue hire makes it possible.

Scope: No initial event booking. If a later store has suitable seating and the client wants to test a social meal occasion, request a bespoke adult board-game evening at that store: Fortress supplies a host, games and run sheet; Cluckin' Good serves its own food. No permanent game-library purchase or ongoing programme is proposed.

Exchange: Fortress earns an off-site service fee without replacing food sales in its own venue. Cluckin' Good could test an occasion at the point of purchase. A takeaway-only shop without suitable space is not a fit.

Conditions

Client operations must first confirm seating, queues, quiet trading time and that an event will not disrupt service.

Obtain written one-off availability, game provision, insurance, age checks, capacity and total costs.

Treat this as optional later work. Do not redirect launch funds merely to keep a gaming name in the plan.

Measurement: If commissioned later, count registrations, actual attendees and linked purchases separately. Divide full event cost by tracked purchasers with identity limits stated. Attendees choose to attend, so their purchases alone do not prove the event caused additional sales.

Verdict: Reject the original on-site sampling scope. An off-site service is a conditional alternative, not a launch recommendation.

Fortress's FAQ prohibits outside food and drink except celebration cake. It also permits accompanied minors before its evening cutoff, so normal venue hire does not itself establish an adult-only audience.

[Fortress: published venue policies](#)

Its separate Tabletop Tavern offer supplies hosted game formats to other venues, with hosts, run sheets and reports; the host venue supplies food and space. This is a different service from bringing chicken into Fortress. A one-off commission and its exact terms still require confirmation.

[Fortress Experiences: Tabletop Tavern](#)

PWR

Capacity: Potential licensed creator content, not team sponsorship

Decision: Relevant experience, but a real competitor check comes first.

Reason: PWR documents a McDonald's Grimace campaign in October 2024. A past campaign does not prove current exclusivity, but it is a concrete conflict and brand-distinctiveness question that the recommendation must address.

Scope: Only reconsider after clearance: one suitable adult creator visits an actual store and delivers two disclosed meal-break edits with a local ordering link and limited paid-use rights. No organisation-wide sponsorship, branded game, tournament, youth-oriented giveaway or unrestricted livestream is recommended.

Exchange: PWR earns production and licensing revenue. Cluckin' Good tests a relevant meal occasion, rather than buying global gaming attention with no proven connection to nearby purchases.

Conditions

Obtain written restaurant and delivery conflict clearance at organisation and named-creator level. Do not assume the McDonald's relationship has ended or remains exclusive.

Require dated adult Australian/local audience evidence and a creative treatment that makes food, not the game, the point.

Clear platform rules, food-marketing suitability, claims, paid rights and total quote before reconsidering.

Measurement: If later approved, compare the licensed content with brand-made advertising on the same local basis. Global followers, game plays and giveaway entries would not count as trial. No spend or return is forecast for PWR.

Verdict: Keep out of the initial launch recommendation. Reopen only if conflict, audience and commercial evidence justify it.

PWR's own portfolio describes the McDonald's Grimace introduction video, creator livestreams and giveaway. It also lists GeoGuessr, Nacon/RIG and Australian Open work. This supports commercial content capability, not suitable local adult buyers or current permission to work with a competing restaurant.

[PWR: official partnership case studies](#)

Basis and limits

Compare food creators on the same paid production brief: one kitchen/store session, two 15 to 30 second vertical videos per creator, captions, approved ordering link, clean exports and one factual/legal revision round. Seek four weeks of paid use on named platforms in approved local areas. No organic post, positive review, recipe development or ambassador appointment is assumed.

For paid-production-only work, compare food demonstration, truthful product fit, reliability and the full production/licensing cost. The agency buys local adult distribution separately and must verify it. If purchasing organic creator distribution, also require dated audience age and location evidence. The human partnerships owner confirms current conflicts, willingness, availability, fees and paid-use rights before commissioning.

KFC's announced BBL partnership is a reason to investigate category conflicts rather than assume that property is available. Food claims, audience age and advertising requirements need appropriate legal review. [Cricket Australia: KFC partnership extension AANA Food and Beverages Advertising Code](#)

Fortress's separate off-site hosted-games service is only a possible later option at a suitably equipped store. It requires seating, capacity, operating approval and a bespoke quote; it is not an initial launch recommendation or permission to bring chicken into Fortress. [Fortress: Venue food and age policies Fortress Experiences: Tabletop Tavern](#)

Method, checks and live requirements

Partnership evaluation

Inputs: Official candidate records and existing partnership review

Preparation: Connected content capability to proposed collaboration, commercial conditions and alternatives.

Check applied: Recommendation against published capability and known conflicts; unverified reach, rights and availability remain open.

Required human action: Partnership owner requests audience geography, fees, rights and conflict declarations; legal and client approve the contract and claims.

What would make a candidate unsuitable?

The wrong audience, poor local access, a category conflict, unacceptable content, unaffordable rights or inability to support the product claims.

Scenario brief: sections 5, 6 and 8

Source notes: [Andy Cooks: About](#); [Andy Cooks shares BOSS Coffee announcement](#); [Daen's Kitchen: Official biography](#); [Melbourne Food & Wine: 2024 festival record](#); [Fortress: Venue food and age policies](#); [Fortress Experiences: Tabletop Tavern](#); [PWR: Official partnership case studies](#); [Cricket Australia: KFC partnership extension](#); [AANA Food and Beverages Advertising Code](#)

Make the brand known. Make the first visit easy.

Discuss the direction, resolve the inputs that affect spending and claims, and assign owners and dates.

Purpose: Close the presentation and agree the next actions.

Deliverable: Handover of all five planning outputs

Decision explained

The five outputs now connect: audience and category evidence explain the strategy; the local schedule shows where and when; the budget shows the calculation; measurement defines success; partnership recommendations show how outside content could help.

The next decision is whether to proceed with this direction and obtain the information needed for buying: verified stores and opening dates, local media proposals, priced product offers, comparable performance evidence and agreed measurement collection. Client operations, investment, research and legal owners each have a defined role.

Use the reading PDF to review the complete explanation, and Decision Evidence and Calculations to inspect the data and formulas. The remaining work concerns real inputs and approvals; an illustrative calculation alone cannot certify campaign performance.

Legal

Approve evidence for free-range and ingredient-sourcing claims before any advertising appears.

Responsible: Human client legal owner

Store lock

Confirm store opening dates and addresses at least 21 days before local advertising starts.

Responsible: Human client operations owner

Regional booking

Approve each regional advertising schedule before booking it.

Responsible: Human client Regional Growth owner

Store access

For the first eight weeks, proposed placements must reach approved areas people can realistically drive or order from. If the supplier cannot demonstrate suitable coverage, keep the placement unbooked and seek approved alternatives within the market and phase budget.

Responsible: Human agency media-buying owner

Commercial

Approve prices, available placements, all costs and any phase changes. Assign app campaigns to one budget category so they are not counted twice.

Responsible: Human client marketing and finance owners

Basis and limits

The AI contribution is the preparation and checking of this planning response. It is not evidence of a deployed agency automation service, completed customer fieldwork, signed partner contracts or a successful advertising campaign.

Before live use, replace the illustrative market opening groups with approved store records, splitting groups where dates differ. Agree definitions, obtain quotes and coverage, commission missing research and seek the required approvals. Recalculate and review the affected outputs when those inputs change.

Method, checks and live requirements

Delivery and handover

Inputs: The completed response and outstanding input requests

Preparation: Connected the five outputs, downloads and next actions into one handover.

Check applied: Cross-file agreement, required output coverage and unresolved inputs visible at the handover.

Required human action: Client and agency agree direction, name action owners and dates, and authorise live work only after the relevant checks and approvals.

What should the client do first?

Review the strategic direction, confirm the actual store schedule and access areas, and agree the measurement and research questions that must be resolved before commitments.

Scenario brief: section 12

All information from the original brief

Client-supplied information, grouped by its original section. This is the complete input register, rather than selected examples. Product and legal claims retain the brief's approval requirements.

Background

Original brief, section 1 / Defines launch scale, expansion context and product positioning.

Cluckin' Good is a new fast-casual takeaway chicken brand launching simultaneously across every state and territory in Australia. Backed by a private equity-funded challenger group with deep experience in QSR (quick service restaurant) rollouts, the brand will open 45 stores in its first wave, spanning capital cities and key regional centres, with a further 60 stores planned within 18 months.

The Australian takeaway chicken category is large, crowded, and dominated by a small number of entrenched players with high brand recall and deep loyalty program penetration. Cluckin' Good's point of difference is a "no shortcuts" positioning: free-range chicken, small-batch marinades, no artificial fillers, and a menu built around bold, chef-developed flavour profiles not typically found in mainstream fried chicken. The brand is affordable but positions itself just above the mainstream value tier: "everyday indulgence," not bargain-bucket.

This is a full national launch, not a market-by-market rollout, meaning media needs to build awareness and trial in parallel across markets of very different scale, media consumption habits, and store density.

Campaign Objectives

Original brief, section 2 / Sets the four success objectives and their measurement windows.

Awareness: Achieve 60% prompted brand awareness among the target audience within 6 months of launch across all major metro markets, and 40% in regional markets.

Trial: Drive first-visit trial from 25% of aware consumers within the first 90 days of their local store opening.

Loyalty sign-up: Convert 15% of first-time visitors into the Cluckin' Good rewards app within their first two visits.

Category disruption: Establish Cluckin' Good as a credible "third player" in share-of-voice against the two category leaders within 12 months.

Target Audience

Original brief, section 3 / Defines the two target audiences and client-stated behaviour.

Primary: "Convenience-conscious indulgers," 18 to 34, metro and regional, time-poor students, share-house renters, and young working professionals who order takeaway 2+ times per week. Value-driven but willing to pay a premium for perceived quality and flavour novelty. Highly active on short-form video and food-focused social content.

Secondary: Family decision-makers, 30 to 45, ordering takeaway as a treat or Friday-night ritual for the household. More price-sensitive, more influenced by catalogue/deal-driven media, and more likely to be reached through broadcast and out-of-home.

Key Markets and Considerations

Original brief, section 4 / Controls geography, proximity and regional media choices.

National simultaneous launch across NSW, VIC, QLD, WA, SA, TAS, ACT, and NT.

Store footprint is metro-weighted in the first wave (Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Perth, Adelaide) with regional stores in high-growth corridors (Gold Coast, Newcastle, Geelong, Sunshine Coast).

Media weight should flex to store proximity: no media dollars wasted reaching audiences more than a realistic delivery/drive radius from a launch store in the first 8 weeks.

Regional markets will require a channel mix less reliant on premium digital inventory and more reliant on broadcast, radio, and local out-of-home given lower digital ad load efficiency in those areas.

Single-Minded Proposition

Original brief, section 5 / Sets the value proposition that messages must support.

"Fried chicken you don't have to feel weird about loving."

Cluckin' Good is the takeaway chicken brand for people who want to indulge without compromising on quality, transparency, or flavour.

Tone and Creative Direction

Original brief, section 6 / Constrains tone, product presentation and permitted claims.

Confident, cheeky, a little irreverent: but never at the expense of appearing cheap.

Food-forward: the product (glistening, steaming, dripping with sauce) should be the hero in every asset.

Avoid overt “healthy” claims: this is about better ingredients, not diet food.

Voice should feel like a mate who knows a good feed, not a corporate QSR brand.

Budget and Flighting

Original brief, section 7 / Fixes spend, phase envelopes and local timing.

Total media investment: \$8.5M net media spend, first 12 months.

Phasing:

Weeks 1 to 4 (Ignition): 45% of budget: maximum reach and frequency in launch markets, store-opening moments as press-worthy events.

Weeks 5 to 12 (Trial-drive): 30% of budget: performance and social-heavy, geo-targeted to drive store visitation and app downloads.

Months 4 to 12 (Sustain): 25% of budget: always-on presence, new product/menu moments, seasonal activations (e.g. Australia Day, Origin/AFL finals, Christmas).

Flighting must accommodate staggered store openings within the national window: later-opening markets shift into their own “Ignition” phase on their local opening date.

Channel Considerations

Original brief, section 8 / Sets channel considerations and the in-house retention boundary.

Agency to develop full channel strategy and recommendation, but the following should be factored into planning:

Out-of-home: High-impact placements near launch stores and high-traffic commuter routes; opportunity for locally dynamic creative by suburb/store.

Social & short-form video: Core channel for primary audience; strong opportunity for creator partnerships and UGC-style food content.

Search & delivery platform media: Critical for capturing intent at the point of hunger; presence on major delivery apps from day one.

Broadcast/BVOD & radio: Efficient reach vehicle for secondary audience and regional markets.

Sponsorship/partnerships: Open to agency recommendations around sport, gaming, or entertainment partnerships that fit the “everyday indulgence” positioning.

CRM/App: Retention and loyalty media sit primarily in-house, but agency input welcome on acquisition media for app downloads.

Measurement and Success Metrics

Original brief, section 9 / Defines the required measurement coverage.

Prompted and unprompted brand awareness (pre/post tracking)

Store visitation (footfall/geo data by store and market)

App downloads and loyalty sign-up rate

Share of voice vs. category leaders

Media efficiency: cost per trial, cost per app acquisition

Social sentiment and engagement rate on launch content

Mandatories

Original brief, section 10 / Sets legal, operational and regional booking gates.

All creative must clear legal review for free-range/sourcing claims before airing.

Store-opening dates and addresses must be locked with Client 3 weeks before any locally targeted media goes live.

All regional flighting must be signed off by the Regional Growth lead prior to booking.

Timing

Original brief, section 11 / Sets delivery deadlines and launch milestones.

Milestone	Date
Brief issued	28 August 2026
Agency response/strategy due	18 September 2026
Creative concepts due	9 October 2026
First stores open	Early November 2026
National campaign go-live	Aligned to first store openings

Deliverables Requested from Agency

Original brief, section 12 / Defines all five requested outputs and the clarification route.

Channel strategy and recommendation deck

Indicative media plan with market-by-market phasing

Budget allocation by channel and market

Measurement framework aligned to objectives above

Point of view on creator/partnership opportunities

This brief is a working document. Agency questions and clarifications should be directed to the Client Contact above ahead of the strategy response date.

Evidence definitions and source register

GIVEN

Already supplied in the original brief. Product statements still need the legal substantiation the brief requires.

RESEARCHED

Observed or reported by the linked research source, within its sample and method.

CLIENT REQUIRED

Normally supplied by the client, agency or commissioned provider; absent from this case so far.

ILLUSTRATIVE

Artificial inputs used to demonstrate a calculation. These are not observed customers or campaign results.

ASSUMPTION

An explicit provisional choice with a rationale and replacement input.

DERIVED

Calculated from the labelled inputs; inherits their limitations.

UNKNOWN

No reliable value is available yet.

Roy Morgan: Australian eating habits, June 2026

[Open source](#)

The 18 August 2026 release reports 19.2 million Australians aged 14+ ate takeaway in an average six months and 10.3 million were KFC customers. These are reported customers, not advertising reach.

Method: Roy Morgan Single Source, July 2025 to June 2026; 59,959 respondents aged 14+.

Period: Release 18 August 2026; fieldwork July 2025 to June 2026

Claim locator: Opening paragraph, chart base and CEO commentary

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: Public survey summary, not chicken-category spend, SOV, or the brief's 18 to 34 frequent-buyer audience.

Nielsen Ad Intel 2024 advertising spend report

[Open source](#)

Australian monitored expenditure uses published gross rate-card values; discounts are not openly available and classifications are Nielsen's.

Period: March 2025 publication about 2024 monitoring

Claim locator: About Nielsen Ad Intel: methodology note

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: Methodology disclosure from March 2025, not a purchased current category extract. Confirm current coverage before commissioning.

TikTok: About location targeting

[Open source](#)

Location delivery and accuracy are not guaranteed; small areas can restrict delivery; geography options vary by availability.

Period: Updated August 2025

Claim locator: Opening notes and location options

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: Public product documentation, not an Australian account test or validated store catchment.

Google Ads: Advanced location options

[Open source](#)

Presence targeting narrows delivery to people likely in or regularly in the selected locations; default options can include location interest.

Period: Undated help page

Claim locator: Compare location options; Keep in mind

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: Presence is inferred, not proof of exact physical location or delivery access; configuration varies by campaign.

Google Ads: Target geographic locations

[Open source](#)

Google offers radius targeting, subject to a minimum 1 km radius and minimum area/user privacy thresholds.

Period: Undated help page

Claim locator: Radius targeting table; privacy-threshold note

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: A circle is not a delivery polygon or measured drive time; no live account or inventory forecast accessed.

ACMA: Viewing and listening 2024 to 2025

[Open source](#)

ACMA's March 2026 report covers broadcast and digital viewing and listening, with public report and data links.

Period: Updated 5 March 2026; report period 2024 to 2025

Claim locator: Report description and download links

Verification scope: Report landing page only

Limitation: Landing-page summary verified; underlying tables not analysed. Does not establish regional cost efficiency or target-audience reach.

MOVE: Outdoor audience measurement

[Open source](#)

MOVE describes coverage across five major metropolitan and 21 regional areas using a modelled illustrative population.

Period: Undated provider page

Claim locator: Data richness and FAQs

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: Provider description, not site-level licensed data; exposure estimates do not establish store visits.

Uber Eats Australia: Advertisements

[Open source](#)

Uber Eats offers merchants in-app placements and advertising tools in Uber Eats Manager. Its FAQ describes weekly budgets and campaigns that restart after a weekly limit; assign explicit end-date control.

Period: Undated Australian merchant page

Claim locator: Manager tools and campaign-budget FAQs

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: No Cluckin' Good merchant onboarding, coverage, costs, eligibility or results verified.

DoorDash: Self-Serve Sponsored Listings

[Open source](#)

DoorDash states Sponsored Listings are available in Australia and charge for orders within seven days of an ad click. Average daily budgets permit daily variation up to twice that average; promotions can create separate charges.

Period: Undated Australian merchant page

Claim locator: Availability note; budgeting, bidding and charging sections

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: Attributed orders are not automatically incremental or first-ever brand purchases. No account tested.

Google Analytics: Automatically collected events

[Open source](#)

first_open fires when an app is first launched after installation or reinstallation, not when it is downloaded.

Period: Undated documentation

Claim locator: Automatically collected events: first_open row

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: App events require implementation and collection coverage; event counts are not unique new loyalty members.

Andy Cooks: About

[Open source](#)

Andy Hearnden describes chef training, restaurant experience and an emphasis on home cooking and ingredients.

Period: Undated biography

Claim locator: About and Get to know Andy Hearnden

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: Self-description verifies positioning, not independent audience composition, endorsement, fee or availability.

PWR: Official partnership case studies

[Open source](#)

PWR describes an October 2024 McDonald's Grimace campaign with creator videos, livestreams and a giveaway. This supports commercial content capability and requires a specific current restaurant-conflict check.

Period: October 2024 campaign; portfolio page undated

Claim locator: McDonald's Grimace campaign section

Verification scope: Official replacement campaign checked; previous homepage-specific detail unverified

Limitation: The partnership claim is supported by the official portfolio. The earlier homepage maps/documentary statement could not be rechecked and is not relied on. Current exclusivity, adult local audience, available rights, fees and willingness remain unknown.

Fortress: Venue food and age policies

[Open source](#)

Fortress prohibits outside food and drink except a celebration cake. Reject the proposed Cluckin' Good sampling inside its venue. Its age rules also permit accompanied minors before an evening cutoff.

Period: Undated policy

Claim locator: Outside Food and minors/age questions

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: Venue hire is not permission to serve another restaurant's food. A separate off-site service would need a new scope and agreement. No initial booking, exception or adult-only event is established.

Cricket Australia: KFC partnership extension

[Open source](#)

April 2025 announcement extends KFC partnership for at least three years including BBL naming rights.

Period: Announcement 2 April 2025; at least three-year extension

Claim locator: 2 April 2025 partnership announcement

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: Strong conflict signal; does not disclose every exclusivity term or establish that all cricket inventory is unavailable.

AANA Food and Beverages Advertising Code

[Open source](#)

Published code says occasional food advertising, including sponsorship advertising, must not target children.

Period: PDF effective November 2021

Claim locator: Definitions; sections 3.1 to 3.4

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: The published code defines children as under 15 and assesses targeting in context. Adult-only distribution is our proposed safeguard, not that legal definition. Product classification, sponsorship/prize rules and application require human legal review; no clearance is claimed.

7plus: Advertising enquiries

[Open source](#)

7plus provides an advertising sales route.

Period: Undated enquiry page

Claim locator: Advertising enquiry answer

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: Does not establish postcode availability, costs, inventory, audience reach or a booked placement.

Gupta et al. (2025): Australian delivery-food choices

[Open source](#)

Interviews with 30 Victorian delivery users aged 18 to 45 found comfort, time, cost, family preferences, images and delivery fees influenced reported choices.

Method: 30 qualitative interviews; 25 participants used delivery two to five times weekly.

Period: Published 9 May 2025; interviews July to September 2023

Claim locator: Methods: sampling/recruitment; Results: participant characteristics

Verification scope: Primary methods and relevant findings checked

Limitation: Interviews in July to September 2023; convenience sample, mostly women, graduates and metropolitan residents. Qualitative findings, not national percentages or proof of ad effectiveness.

Allman-Farinelli et al. (2019): Young adults eating out

[Open source](#)

Four focus groups with 31 Sydney adults aged 18 to 30 who ate out at least twice weekly described indulgence, images, reviews and discounts as influences.

Method: Four recorded focus groups in February and March 2019.

Period: Published 2019; groups February and March 2019

Claim locator: Methods and Results, printed pages 2 to 6

Verification scope: Primary methods and relevant findings checked

Limitation: 2019 qualitative convenience sample, mostly women and students. Eating out is broader than takeaway; not evidence of current platform preferences or regional behaviour.

Middleton et al. (2023): How families manage meals

[Open source](#)

South Australian parent interviews identified recurring time, cost, food-preference and responsibility considerations in family meals; takeaway was one way of managing preparation.

Method: 32 parents in the earlier study and 22 in 2020; purposive samples. Separate samples, not the same families followed over time; 2020 interviews took place during the pandemic. Full paper checked via the authors' Flinders University repository.

Period: Published 2023; separate 1993/94 and 2020 interviews

Claim locator: Methods/Participants and takeaway discussion, printed pages 3 and 6

Verification scope: Full primary paper via authors' university

Limitation: Qualitative comparison of 16 families in 1993/94 and 12 in 2020. Not a national survey or a test of family-versus-young-adult price sensitivity.

ACMA (2026): Viewing and listening findings

[Open source](#)

June 2025 previous-week short-form/user-generated viewing: 62% ages 18 to 24, 64% ages 25 to 34, 60% ages 35 to 44. Traditional free-to-air: 58% regional versus 50% metro. Free-to-air catch-up viewing is separately 49% regional versus 43% metro.

Method: Survey 1, 16 to 30 June 2025: 5,990 Australian adults in a probability-based online/phone panel; weighted estimates. Metropolitan means all eight capital-city ABS areas, not a store buying area. Methodology:

<https://www.acma.gov.au/communications-and-media-australia-methodology>

Period: Published March 2026; survey 16 to 30 June 2025

Claim locator: Key findings, printed page 4; Listening behaviours, printed page 8; Survey 1 methodology/Table 1 note

Verification scope: Primary methods and relevant findings checked

Limitation: Overlapping media usage, not ad reach, food-content engagement, family-specific behaviour or media-buying efficiency. Age bands differ from the brief's groups. Traditional television is not the proposed streaming buy. Catch-up includes services that are not equivalent commercial inventory. Actual local ad supply and efficiency remain unknown.

Livingstone et al. (2021): Australian young-adult meal preferences

[Open source](#)

Publisher-indexed abstract/excerpts describe 577 Australian adults aged 18 to 30 choosing among hypothetical weekday meals; nutrition ranked highest within the tested options alongside cost, quality, taste and preparation time.

Method: Online hypothetical choice study with social-media recruitment, as described in indexed primary material. August 2021 journal issue; not a complete full-method review.

Period: August 2021 journal issue; fieldwork date unverified

Claim locator: Publisher abstract and search-index excerpts only

Verification scope: Partial primary-source verification; full methods unavailable

Limitation: Partially verified: full publisher and university pages could not be retrieved in the audit. Full recruitment/exclusion details, fieldwork date and complete limitations remain unverified. Abstract-level findings do not establish takeaway-chicken purchases or justify health claims.

OpenAI: Agents SDK and workflow orchestration

[Open source](#)

Agents SDK supports specialist instructions, tools, managed tool loops, state, tracing and resumable approval flows.

Period: Undated documentation

Claim locator: Choose the Agents SDK and comparison table

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: Technical implementation reference. The connected agency application described here is proposed, not deployed by this case study.

OpenAI: File search

[Open source](#)

File search retrieves information from uploaded documents using semantic and keyword search.

Period: Undated documentation

Claim locator: Opening File search description

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: A searchable knowledge base requires authorised uploads and governance. No client database was connected in this case study.

OpenAI: Guardrails and human review

[Open source](#)

Automatic validation and human approval are separate controls; a workflow can pause before sensitive actions.

Period: Undated documentation

Claim locator: Pause for human review; Approval lifecycle; Workflow boundaries

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: Controls reduce risk but do not guarantee correctness. Approval authority must be implemented by the application and organisation.

AMSI: Calculating confidence intervals

[Open source](#)

For sufficiently large binomial samples, approximate 95% precision for a proportion uses 1.96 times the square root of $p(1-p)/n$.

Period: Undated educational reference

Claim locator: Large-binomial approximation and confidence-interval derivation

Verification scope: Narrow official-page statement checked; no campaign outcome or commercial availability established

Limitation: This statistical approximation does not validate sampling coverage, an opt-in panel, weighting, nonresponse or the proposed research budget. New sample sizes are planning assumptions.

Andy Cooks shares BOSS Coffee announcement

[Open source](#)

His own post shares Suntory Oceania's announcement of his BOSS Coffee ambassadorship in Australia and New Zealand. This is concrete beverage-brand experience, not evidence of Cluckin' Good results or current restaurant availability.

Period: Undated page; checked 6 September 2026

Claim locator: BOSS Coffee announcement shared by Andy

Verification scope: Public source checked on 6 September 2026 for the stated past work or service. Current availability, fees, audience and contractual rights are not established.

Limitation: Creator-shared announcement; publication date not established here. No restaurant availability, fees, exclusivity or local audience established.

Daen's Kitchen: Official biography

[Open source](#)

Daen Lia's official biography lists branded work with Westgold Butter, WeberBBQ, Country Road and Melbourne Food & Wine. Her signature is Mediterranean home cooking. These facts establish relevant content experience, not better local reach or lower fees than Andy.

Period: Undated page; checked 6 September 2026

Claim locator: About: home-cooking focus and brand work

Verification scope: Public source checked on 6 September 2026 for the stated past work or service. Current availability, fees, audience and contractual rights are not established.

Limitation: Self-description of food content and past brand work. No current fee, audience advantage, willingness or availability established.

Melbourne Food & Wine: 2024 festival record

[Open source](#)

Melbourne Food & Wine's 2024 festival record lists Daen Lia in Celebrity Sausage, presented by Bakers Delight. That is an organiser-confirmed sponsored food activation, not proof of a current exclusive bakery contract or a successful takeaway campaign.

Period: 2024 festival

Claim locator: 2024 Celebrity Sausage, presented by Bakers Delight

Verification scope: Public source checked on 6 September 2026 for the stated past work or service. Current availability, fees, audience and contractual rights are not established.

Limitation: Past organiser record, not a current agreement, exclusivity finding or performance result.

Fortress Experiences: Tabletop Tavern

[Open source](#)

Its separate Tabletop Tavern offer supplies hosted game formats to other venues, with hosts, run sheets and reports; the host venue supplies food and space. This is a different service from bringing chicken into Fortress. A one-off commission and its exact terms still require confirmation.

Period: Undated page; checked 6 September 2026

Claim locator: Tabletop Tavern service description

Verification scope: Public source checked on 6 September 2026 for the stated past work or service. Current availability, fees, audience and contractual rights are not established.

Limitation: One-off hosted formats are publicly described; suitability, availability and terms for Cluckin' Good remain unconfirmed. Store space, age controls, games, insurance and a quote still need checking.

Thinkbox: Profit Ability 2 (2024)

[Open source](#)

The UK econometric programme considers media efficiency, scale and return over time. This supports checking diminishing returns and time horizons when comparing channels.

Method: TV-industry commissioned UK multi-advertiser econometric research. Publisher summary verified 7 September 2026; full econometric report not reviewed in this pass.

Period: 2024 UK research; report download page posted 4 November 2024.

Limitation: Not Australian launch-store performance. No UK ROI has been transferred into this allocation or treated as a local forecast.

Google Ads: Search campaigns

[Open source](#)

Search adverts can appear while people search for relevant products and services. This supports testing meal, category and nearby-store searches, including discovery by people unfamiliar with the brand.

Method: Official product documentation, updated 19 August 2026; checked 7 September 2026.

Period: Documentation updated 19 August 2026; checked 7 September 2026.

Limitation: A channel capability, not evidence of extra Cluckin' Good orders, local search demand, cost or an optimal spending share. Separate brand-name and non-brand searches when assessing results.