
Northline Outdoor Co.

As of September 21, 2026

BUSINESS PROFILE

Specialty outdoor retailer selling camping, hiking, and ski equipment through an e-commerce site and two flagship stores. Catalog of 2,400 SKUs with seasonal assortment changes. Customer support handles sizing questions, warranty claims, and order status via email and chat.

BUSINESS TYPE

Private Company

INDUSTRY

Retail & E-Commerce

LOCATION

United States

OPERATING REGIONS

North America

COMPANY SIZE

Small (11–50 employees)

CUSTOMER TYPES

Consumer

BUSINESS MODEL

B2C

REGULATORY CONTEXT

Other

STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

Revenue Growth, Operational Efficiency, Innovation, Cost Reduction

KEY SYSTEMS

Custom / Proprietary, CRM, Accounting

DATA SENSITIVITY

Personally Identifiable Information (PII), Financial Records

CURRENT BUSINESS AI POSTURE

MARKETING

Experimenting

Marketing team uses ChatGPT for campaign copy and subject line variants. Brand voice guide is informal.

SALES

Avoiding

No AI in merchandising or promotional planning workflows.

DELIVERY

Experimenting

Support lead trials AI reply suggestions in helpdesk. Agents edit every message before send.

CUSTOMER SUCCESS

Avoiding

Loyalty outreach and win-back emails are manually written.

OPERATIONS

Experimenting

Ops manager uses ChatGPT for vendor email drafts. No integration with ERP.

GROWTH

Avoiding

Product training for seasonal staff uses printed cheat sheets.

IT / TECHNOLOGY

LOGISTICS

Avoiding

E-commerce platform and ERP are managed by vendors. No AI in IT operations or security.

Experimenting

Ops manager uses ChatGPT informally for inbound shipment follow-up emails. No integration with inventory system.

CURRENT AI USE

Email campaign and subject line drafts	
BUSINESS FUNCTION	TOOL / VENDOR
Marketing	ChatGPT
WHO IS USING	WORK SUPPORTED
Marketing coordinator	Seasonal promotion copy for email and social posts
PROCESS DOCUMENTED	IS IT HELPING?
Informal / primarily in one person's head	Yes
CREATING REWORK / PROBLEMS?	
No	
INFORMATION SHARED	
No customer data — product and promo details only.	
APPROVED?	
Yes	
NOTES	
Brand manager approves before campaigns launch.	

Support reply suggestions	
BUSINESS FUNCTION	TOOL / VENDOR
Delivery	Helpdesk AI assist (trial)
WHO IS USING	WORK SUPPORTED
Customer support agents	Drafting replies to sizing and warranty questions
PROCESS DOCUMENTED	IS IT HELPING?
Documented and repeatable	Yes
CREATING REWORK / PROBLEMS?	
Partly	
INFORMATION SHARED	
Order numbers and product SKUs; customer PII minimized in trial config.	
APPROVED?	
Yes	

NOTES
Agents must edit before send; trial limited to tier-1 questions.

Vendor correspondence templates

BUSINESS FUNCTION	TOOL / VENDOR
Operations	ChatGPT
WHO IS USING	WORK SUPPORTED
Operations manager	Drafting PO follow-up and inbound shipment inquiry emails
PROCESS DOCUMENTED	IS IT HELPING?
Informal / primarily in one person's head	Yes
CREATING REWORK / PROBLEMS?	
No	
INFORMATION SHARED	
Vendor and SKU data only; no customer PII.	
APPROVED?	
Yes	
NOTES	
Used for internal/vendor communication only.	

Inventory Exception Summaries

Operations · In Progress

OPPORTUNITY BEING ASSESSED

TITLE

Inventory Exception Summaries

BUSINESS FUNCTION

Operations

OWNER

Sam Rivera, E-commerce Operations Manager

STATUS

Deferred

VALUE PROPOSITION

Reduce cycle time

CURRENT FRICTION

Stockouts and oversells require manual Slack threads between support, ops, and merchandising.

DESIRED CHANGE

Summarize exception queues with cited source systems so teams can prioritize customer messaging, PO follow-up, and restock actions.

SUCCESS INDICATOR

Daily exception triage time reduced by 25%; every summary cites source records; no customer notification is sent from an unverified summary.

AI'S ROLE

AI summarizes stockout, oversell, PO, and promotion exceptions from daily exports. Ops owners verify facts before action or customer messaging.

ASSESSMENT

STATUS

In Progress

VERSION

LIGHTNING_1.0

STARTED

9/21/2026

READINESS PROFILE

Dimension	Status	Key Observation
Process	NEEDS ATTENTION	Inventory exceptions are handled through Slack threads and manual triage. The team needs a standard exception workflow before AI summaries can reliably speed action.
Data & Information	NEEDS ATTENTION	Stockout, oversell, PO, and promotion data live across e-commerce, warehouse, and merchandising systems. Summaries should cite source systems so teams can validate facts quickly.
People & Training	READY TO INVESTIGATE	Ops and merchandising teams already collaborate on exceptions, but they need ownership rules for who acts on an AI summary and when support should message customers.
Risk & Security	NEEDS ATTENTION	Incorrect exception summaries could cause unnecessary customer notifications or missed restock actions. The risk is operational, so start with internal triage summaries only.
Technology & Vendor	NEEDS ATTENTION	No single system owns the full exception queue. Begin with daily exports from commerce, warehouse, and PO systems before considering live integrations.

OVERALL INTERPRETATION

Inventory exception summaries are useful but secondary. Focus merchandising and support pilots first.

QUESTION RESPONSES

PROCESS

We can explain how the current work is performed from beginning to end.	YES
The people involved generally perform the work in a consistent way.	YES
We understand what a good result looks like.	YES
We know where judgment, exceptions, or escalation are required.	YES
The process is documented well enough to support testing or improvement.	YES
We know who owns the process and who can approve changes to it.	YES

DATA & INFORMATION

We know what information the AI would need to perform this work.	PARTLY
We know where that information comes from and who owns it.	PARTLY
The information is accurate, complete, and usable enough for the intended purpose.	NO
We know what information would be shared with the AI and understand whether it is appropriate and permitted to share that information with the specific tool being considered.	NO
We understand whether customer, employee, financial, confidential, proprietary, regulated, or restricted information is involved.	PARTLY
We know what information should not be provided to the AI.	PARTLY

PEOPLE & TRAINING

The people involved are willing to try AI for this use case.	YES
They can learn how to provide useful instructions and context.	YES
The proposed AI use fits reasonably into how the work is performed.	YES
Someone involved has enough subject-matter expertise to evaluate the AI output.	PARTLY
We know what quality or accuracy is acceptable for this use case.	PARTLY
People understand that AI output may need to be challenged, corrected, or rejected.	PARTLY
It is clear who remains responsible for the final work or decision.	PARTLY
People understand when human review is required.	PARTLY

RISK & SECURITY

We know whether this use is internal, employee-facing, customer-facing, vendor-facing, or public.	YES
We know who will see, use, or rely on the AI output.	YES
We understand what could happen if the AI is wrong.	YES
We know when human review is required before the output is used.	PARTLY
We have or can establish acceptable-use boundaries for this use case.	PARTLY
We can document, when appropriate, what the AI did, what information it used, who reviewed it, and what action was taken.	PARTLY

We know who is responsible for identifying and responding to security or privacy concerns.	PARTLY
--	--------

TECHNOLOGY & VENDOR

We know which technology platforms and vendors touch this process or its information.	PARTLY
We know whether those vendors use AI in relevant features or services.	PARTLY
We understand what information may be sent to or processed by the AI service.	NO
We understand how information is stored, retained, or shared.	NO
We know whether information may be used to train or improve models or services.	NO
We know what controls are available, including whether AI features can be disabled or configured.	NO
We understand who has access to the data and what happens to it if we stop using the vendor.	NO
The proposed technology is a reasonable fit for the intended business use.	NO

OPEN QUESTIONS

Which system is authoritative for stockout, oversell, purchase-order, and promotion exceptions?	MEDIUM	OPEN
Who owns each exception type after a summary is produced?	MEDIUM	OPEN
When should support message customers versus waiting for ops or merchandising verification?	MEDIUM	OPEN

ASSUMPTIONS

Initial pilot uses internal summaries only, not customer-facing messages.	UNVERIFIED
Each summary includes source-system citations for validation.	UNVERIFIED
Ops and merchandising owners agree on action ownership by exception type.	UNVERIFIED

RISKS

Incorrect summary triggers unnecessary customer notifications	OPEN
LIKELIHOOD	DECISION
Medium	Reduce
Missed restock action extends a stockout during promotion	OPEN
LIKELIHOOD	DECISION
Medium	Reduce
Conflicting source systems cause teams to act on the wrong inventory number	OPEN

LIKELIHOOD	DECISION
High	Reduce

CONSTRAINTS

Commerce, warehouse, PO, and merchandising systems do not share one exception queue.	OTHER	IDENTIFIED
Action ownership must be defined before summary recommendations can be trusted.	OTHER	IDENTIFIED

ACTION ITEMS

Define standard inventory exception workflow and owners	GOVERNANCE	OPEN
Build daily exports from commerce, warehouse, and PO systems	PILOT PREPARATION	OPEN
Create source-citation format for every AI summary	GOVERNANCE	OPEN
Run internal-only exception summaries for two promotion cycles	PILOT PREPARATION	OPEN

BUSINESS OBJECTIVES

Reduce daily inventory exception triage time by 25% during pilot
EXPECTED VALUE
Time Savings
Ensure 100% of pilot summaries cite source records before action
EXPECTED VALUE
Quality Improvement

TEAM READINESS

Name	Role	AI Familiarity	Business Knowledge	Process Knowledge	Review Capability	Risk Awareness	Notes
Sam Rivera	E-commerce Operations Manager	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alex Morgan	Head of Merchandising	—	—	—	—	—	—

Name	Role	AI Familiarity	Business Knowledge	Process Knowledge	Review Capability	Risk Awareness	Notes
Jordan Lee	Customer Support Lead	—	—	—	—	—	—

AI ROLE ASSIGNMENTS

Role	Person	Notes
AI Sponsor	Sam Rivera	—
AI Champion	Alex Morgan	—
AI Reviewer	Jordan Lee	—

OPERATING GUARDRAILS

Inventory exception summaries are internal-only until source records are verified.	HUMAN REVIEW	PROPOSED
Every summary must cite source systems and export timestamps.	OTHER	PROPOSED
Customer notifications require support lead approval after ops verification.	OTHER	PROPOSED

PILOT CHARTERS

Stockouts and oversells trigger manual Slack triage across teams, slowing restock decisions and customer communication. USERS Ops manager, merchandising lead, and support lead for daily exception review IN SCOPE Daily internal summaries for stockout, oversell, PO delay, and promotion exceptions OUT OF SCOPE Automated customer messaging, inventory adjustments, purchase-order changes	DRAFT
---	-------

INFORMATION

Commerce export, warehouse inventory export, purchase-order status, promotion calendar

WORKFLOW

1. Daily exports are collected. 2. AI summarizes exceptions with citations. 3. Ops verifies facts. 4. Owner acts or routes. 5. Support messages customers only after approval.

HUMAN REVIEW APPROACH

Ops verification before action; support lead approval before any customer message.

SUCCESS MEASURES

Triage time -25%; 100% source-cited summaries; no unverified customer notifications

RISKS SUMMARY

Wrong inventory facts, missed restock action, premature customer communication

CONTROLS

Internal-only phase; source citation; ownership rules; approval before customer messaging

OWNER

Sam Rivera

DURATION

45 days

STOP CONDITIONS

Unverified customer notification; repeated source mismatch; missed high-priority stockout action

DECISION POINT

Day 21: adjust exports or owners. Day 45: expand, integrate systems, or stop.

Support Reply Drafts for Tier-1 Questions

Delivery · In Progress

OPPORTUNITY BEING ASSESSED

TITLE

Support Reply Drafts for Tier-1 Questions

BUSINESS FUNCTION

Delivery

OWNER

Jordan Lee, Customer Support Lead

STATUS

Assessing

VALUE PROPOSITION

Improve consistency

CURRENT FRICTION

Agents retype similar answers for sizing, care instructions, and order tracking. Average handle time is 8 minutes on chat.

DESIRED CHANGE

Suggest replies from approved knowledge-base content while agents edit every message before send.

SUCCESS INDICATOR

Average tier-1 handle time reduced by 15%; escalation rate does not increase; zero auto-sent replies.

AI'S ROLE

AI suggests support replies from approved macros and knowledge-base articles. Agents edit and approve every customer message.

ASSESSMENT

STATUS

In Progress

VERSION

LIGHTNING_1.0

STARTED

9/21/2026

READINESS PROFILE

Dimension	Status	Key Observation
Process	READY TO INVESTIGATE	Tier-1 support questions already follow recognizable patterns: sizing, care instructions, order status, and warranty policy. AI can suggest replies from approved knowledge-base content while agents keep final send authority.
Data & Information	NEEDS ATTENTION	Support drafts may reference order numbers, customer names, and warranty history. The pilot needs retention rules with the helpdesk vendor and a policy for when customer PII can be used.
People & Training	READY TO INVESTIGATE	Agents are already trialing suggestions, so the main training need is edit discipline: check policy language, remove overpromises, and escalate edge cases instead of trusting the first draft.
Risk & Security	NEEDS ATTENTION	The major risks are warranty over-promises, inaccurate care advice, and off-brand tone. Weekly transcript sampling should verify that AI suggestions reduce handle time without increasing escalations.
Technology & Vendor	READY TO INVESTIGATE	A helpdesk AI trial is active and can support a measured pilot. Connect it to approved macros and knowledge-base articles before expanding to broader customer messaging.

OVERALL INTERPRETATION

Support reply drafts show early promise in the helpdesk trial. Expand metrics collection before rolling to peak holiday chat volume.

QUESTION RESPONSES

PROCESS

We can explain how the current work is performed from beginning to end.	YES
The people involved generally perform the work in a consistent way.	YES
We understand what a good result looks like.	YES
We know where judgment, exceptions, or escalation are required.	YES
The process is documented well enough to support testing or improvement.	YES
We know who owns the process and who can approve changes to it.	YES

DATA & INFORMATION

We know what information the AI would need to perform this work.	PARTLY
We know where that information comes from and who owns it.	PARTLY
The information is accurate, complete, and usable enough for the intended purpose.	NO
We know what information would be shared with the AI and understand whether it is appropriate and permitted to share that information with the specific tool being considered.	NO
We understand whether customer, employee, financial, confidential, proprietary, regulated, or restricted information is involved.	PARTLY
We know what information should not be provided to the AI.	PARTLY

PEOPLE & TRAINING

The people involved are willing to try AI for this use case.	YES
They can learn how to provide useful instructions and context.	YES
The proposed AI use fits reasonably into how the work is performed.	YES
Someone involved has enough subject-matter expertise to evaluate the AI output.	PARTLY
We know what quality or accuracy is acceptable for this use case.	PARTLY
People understand that AI output may need to be challenged, corrected, or rejected.	PARTLY
It is clear who remains responsible for the final work or decision.	PARTLY
People understand when human review is required.	PARTLY

RISK & SECURITY

We know whether this use is internal, employee-facing, customer-facing, vendor-facing, or public.	YES
We know who will see, use, or rely on the AI output.	YES
We understand what could happen if the AI is wrong.	YES
We know when human review is required before the output is used.	PARTLY
We have or can establish acceptable-use boundaries for this use case.	PARTLY
We can document, when appropriate, what the AI did, what information it used, who reviewed it, and what action was taken.	PARTLY

We know who is responsible for identifying and responding to security or privacy concerns.	PARTLY
--	--------

TECHNOLOGY & VENDOR

We know which technology platforms and vendors touch this process or its information.	PARTLY
We know whether those vendors use AI in relevant features or services.	PARTLY
We understand what information may be sent to or processed by the AI service.	NO
We understand how information is stored, retained, or shared.	NO
We know whether information may be used to train or improve models or services.	NO
We know what controls are available, including whether AI features can be disabled or configured.	NO
We understand who has access to the data and what happens to it if we stop using the vendor.	NO
The proposed technology is a reasonable fit for the intended business use.	NO

OPEN QUESTIONS

Which helpdesk fields and customer identifiers are retained by the vendor during AI suggestion generation?	MEDIUM	OPEN
Which tier-1 categories are safe for suggestion-only handling without escalation risk?	MEDIUM	OPEN
What transcript sampling rate will detect warranty over-promises or off-brand language?	MEDIUM	OPEN

ASSUMPTIONS

Agents edit every suggested reply before sending.	UNVERIFIED
The pilot is limited to tier-1 sizing, care, order status, and warranty-policy questions.	UNVERIFIED
Approved macros and knowledge-base articles are current enough for reply suggestions.	UNVERIFIED

RISKS

Suggested reply over-promises warranty coverage or return eligibility	OPEN
LIKELIHOOD	DECISION
Medium	Reduce
Care advice is inaccurate for a specific product material	OPEN
LIKELIHOOD	DECISION
Medium	Reduce
Customer PII is retained by the helpdesk AI vendor beyond approved policy	OPEN

LIKELIHOOD	DECISION
Medium	Reduce

CONSTRAINTS

Helpdesk vendor retention and training terms must be confirmed before expanding the trial.	CONTRACTUAL	IDENTIFIED
Agents must keep final send authority; auto-send is out of scope.	OTHER	IDENTIFIED

ACTION ITEMS

Map safe tier-1 categories and required escalation triggers	GOVERNANCE	OPEN
Connect helpdesk suggestions to approved macros and knowledge-base articles	PILOT PREPARATION	OPEN
Define transcript sampling plan for warranty and tone issues	GOVERNANCE	OPEN
Review helpdesk vendor retention and AI training terms	INVESTIGATION	OPEN

BUSINESS OBJECTIVES

Reduce average tier-1 handle time by 15% without increasing escalations
EXPECTED VALUE
Time Savings
Maintain zero sampled replies with unapproved warranty promises
EXPECTED VALUE
Quality Improvement

TEAM READINESS

Name	Role	AI Familiarity	Business Knowledge	Process Knowledge	Review Capability	Risk Awareness	Notes
Jordan Lee	Customer Support Lead	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alex Morgan	Head of Merchandising	—	—	—	—	—	—

Name	Role	AI Familiarity	Business Knowledge	Process Knowledge	Review Capability	Risk Awareness	Notes
Sam Rivera	E-commerce Operations Manager	—	—	—	—	—	—

AI ROLE ASSIGNMENTS

Role	Person	Notes
AI Sponsor	Jordan Lee	—
AI Champion	Sam Rivera	—
AI Reviewer	Alex Morgan	—

OPERATING GUARDRAILS

Support agents must edit every AI-suggested reply before sending.	HUMAN REVIEW	PROPOSED
AI suggestions may use only approved macros and knowledge-base articles for warranty language.	OTHER	PROPOSED
Customer PII use must follow approved helpdesk vendor retention settings.	DATA HANDLING	PROPOSED

PILOT CHARTERS

Agents repeatedly type similar tier-1 responses, keeping chat handle time high during seasonal support peaks.	DRAFT
USERS 4 support agents and the support lead for tier-1 chat/email categories	
IN SCOPE Suggestion-only replies for sizing, care, order status, and warranty-policy questions	
OUT OF SCOPE	

Auto-send, pricing decisions, exception approvals, complex warranty disputes

INFORMATION

Approved macros, knowledge-base articles, order status, SKU data, minimized customer identifiers

WORKFLOW

1. Customer asks tier-1 question. 2. Helpdesk suggests reply from approved content. 3. Agent edits for accuracy and tone. 4. Agent sends. 5. Weekly transcript sample is audited.

HUMAN REVIEW APPROACH

Agent edit and approval required for every customer message.

SUCCESS MEASURES

Handle time -15%; escalation rate stable; zero sampled warranty over-promises

RISKS SUMMARY

Warranty over-promises, inaccurate care advice, off-brand tone, PII retention

CONTROLS

Approved macros; agent edit gate; transcript sampling; vendor retention review

OWNER

Jordan Lee

DURATION

60 days

STOP CONDITIONS

Any auto-send incident; escalation spike; repeated warranty or care-advice errors

DECISION POINT

Day 30: expand categories or narrow. Day 60: adopt, pause for vendor controls, or stop.

AI-Assisted Product Descriptions

Sales · Completed

OPPORTUNITY BEING ASSESSED

TITLE

AI-Assisted Product Descriptions

BUSINESS FUNCTION

Sales

OWNER

Alex Morgan, Head of Merchandising

STATUS

Ready for Pilot

VALUE PROPOSITION

Speed time to market

CURRENT FRICTION

Each new SKU description takes 45–60 minutes to write. Merchandising queue backs up before spring and fall drops.

DESIRED CHANGE

Generate first-draft descriptions from PIM spec fields in ≤20 minutes total merchandiser time including review.

SUCCESS INDICATOR

Average description turnaround ≤20 minutes; catalog launch dates met; return rate stable vs baseline.

AI'S ROLE

AI drafts SEO-friendly descriptions from structured product attributes. Merchandisers edit for brand voice and accuracy before publish.

ASSESSMENT

STATUS

Completed

VERSION

LIGHTNING_1.0

STARTED

9/21/2026

COMPLETED

9/21/2026

READINESS PROFILE

Dimension	Status	Key Observation
Process	READY TO INVESTIGATE	Product description workflow is repeatable: spec sheet → web copy → marketplace variants. Merchandising team understands review checkpoints.
Data & Information	NEEDS ATTENTION	Product specs and vendor terms are lower sensitivity than customer records, but marketplace claims still need accurate source fields and vendor-approved product attributes.
People & Training	READY TO INVESTIGATE	Merchandising is already experimenting with campaign copy. Brand voice guidelines and merchandiser publish discipline are the main training needs.
Risk & Security	NEEDS ATTENTION	Incorrect product claims create return liability and marketplace policy violations. Drafts must not invent safety, sizing, or warranty claims outside approved attributes.
Technology & Vendor	NEEDS ATTENTION	PIM fields are the right source for catalog drafts, but the workflow is not integrated with an approved content-generation tool. Enterprise catalog content evaluation should precede peak season rollout.

OVERALL INTERPRETATION

Product description generation is a high-ROI, lower-risk starting point compared to autonomous customer messaging. Merchandising already edits AI output — formalizing review gates and PIM integration is the main work. A 60-day pilot across 20 spring SKUs fits the seasonal calendar.

QUESTION RESPONSES

PROCESS

We can explain how the current work is performed from beginning to end.	YES
The people involved generally perform the work in a consistent way.	YES
We understand what a good result looks like.	YES
We know where judgment, exceptions, or escalation are required.	YES
The process is documented well enough to support testing or improvement.	YES
We know who owns the process and who can approve changes to it.	YES

DATA & INFORMATION

We know what information the AI would need to perform this work.	PARTLY
We know where that information comes from and who owns it.	PARTLY
The information is accurate, complete, and usable enough for the intended purpose.	NO
We know what information would be shared with the AI and understand whether it is appropriate and permitted to share that information with the specific tool being considered.	NO
We understand whether customer, employee, financial, confidential, proprietary, regulated, or restricted information is involved.	PARTLY
We know what information should not be provided to the AI.	PARTLY

PEOPLE & TRAINING

The people involved are willing to try AI for this use case.	YES
They can learn how to provide useful instructions and context.	YES
The proposed AI use fits reasonably into how the work is performed.	YES
Someone involved has enough subject-matter expertise to evaluate the AI output.	PARTLY
We know what quality or accuracy is acceptable for this use case.	PARTLY
People understand that AI output may need to be challenged, corrected, or rejected.	PARTLY
It is clear who remains responsible for the final work or decision.	PARTLY
People understand when human review is required.	PARTLY

RISK & SECURITY

We know whether this use is internal, employee-facing, customer-facing, vendor-facing, or public.	YES
We know who will see, use, or rely on the AI output.	YES
We understand what could happen if the AI is wrong.	YES
We know when human review is required before the output is used.	PARTLY
We have or can establish acceptable-use boundaries for this use case.	PARTLY
We can document, when appropriate, what the AI did, what information it used, who reviewed it, and what action was taken.	PARTLY

We know who is responsible for identifying and responding to security or privacy concerns.	PARTLY
--	--------

TECHNOLOGY & VENDOR

We know which technology platforms and vendors touch this process or its information.	PARTLY
We know whether those vendors use AI in relevant features or services.	PARTLY
We understand what information may be sent to or processed by the AI service.	NO
We understand how information is stored, retained, or shared.	NO
We know whether information may be used to train or improve models or services.	NO
We know what controls are available, including whether AI features can be disabled or configured.	NO
We understand who has access to the data and what happens to it if we stop using the vendor.	NO
The proposed technology is a reasonable fit for the intended business use.	NO

OPEN QUESTIONS

Can product descriptions be generated from PIM fields without sending vendor-confidential terms externally?	MEDIUM	OPEN
What brand voice checklist must merchandisers complete before publishing AI drafts?	MEDIUM	OPEN
Which marketplace channels require additional claim or attribute review before publishing AI-assisted copy?	MEDIUM	OPEN

ASSUMPTIONS

Merchandisers review all product copy for accuracy and brand voice before publish.	UNVERIFIED
Marketplace variants require the same merchandiser review as web descriptions.	UNVERIFIED
PIM integration is available for spec-sheet-driven description drafts.	UNVERIFIED

RISKS

Published description includes incorrect weight limit or safety claim	OPEN
LIKELIHOOD	DECISION
Medium	Reduce
Draft product copy includes unapproved warranty, safety, or performance claims	OPEN
LIKELIHOOD	DECISION
Medium	Reduce

Marketplace listing violates channel policy due to AI-generated claims		OPEN
LIKELIHOOD	DECISION	
Low	Reduce	

CONSTRAINTS

Marketplace terms require accurate product attributes — AI output cannot skip merchandiser verification.	CONTRACTUAL	IDENTIFIED
Children's product categories require additional safety review beyond standard copy workflow.	REGULATORY	IDENTIFIED

ACTION ITEMS

Define brand voice checklist for AI-generated product copy	GOVERNANCE	OPEN
Integrate PIM spec export with description draft pilot	PILOT PREPARATION	OPEN
Define marketplace-specific claim review checklist	GOVERNANCE	OPEN
Pilot 20 SKU descriptions for spring catalog drop	PILOT PREPARATION	OPEN

BUSINESS OBJECTIVES

Reduce average SKU description time from 50 minutes to ≤20 minutes for pilot assortment
EXPECTED VALUE
Time Savings
Maintain return rate within 2% of baseline during pilot period
EXPECTED VALUE
Quality Improvement

TEAM READINESS

Name	Role	AI Familiarity	Business Knowledge	Process Knowledge	Review Capability	Risk Awareness	Notes
Alex Morgan	Head of Merchandising	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jordan Lee	Customer Support Lead	—	—	—	—	—	—

Name	Role	AI Familiarity	Business Knowledge	Process Knowledge	Review Capability	Risk Awareness	Notes
Sam Rivera	E-commerce Operations Manager	—	—	—	—	—	—

AI ROLE ASSIGNMENTS

Role	Person	Notes
AI Sponsor	Alex Morgan	—
AI Champion	Jordan Lee	—
Process Owner	Sam Rivera	—

OPERATING GUARDRAILS

All product descriptions require merchandiser approval before publish to web or marketplaces.	HUMAN REVIEW	PROPOSED
AI drafts must use approved PIM attributes and may not invent safety, sizing, or warranty claims.	DATA HANDLING	PROPOSED
Children's product SKUs excluded from AI copy pilot until safety review workflow is defined.	VENDOR USE	PROPOSED

PILOT CHARTERS

New SKU descriptions take 45–60 minutes each, creating a merchandising backlog before seasonal catalog drops. USERS 2 merchandisers for 60-day spring catalog pilot IN SCOPE	DRAFT
--	-------

First-draft web and marketplace descriptions from PIM spec fields

OUT OF SCOPE

Auto-publish to marketplaces, customer support replies, pricing or inventory decisions

INFORMATION

Product specs, materials, and sizing charts from PIM — no customer PII in description workflow

WORKFLOW

1. Merchandiser selects SKU. 2. AI drafts description from PIM fields. 3. Merchandiser edits for accuracy and brand voice. 4. Marketplace-specific checklist is completed. 5. Copy is published.

HUMAN REVIEW APPROACH

Merchandiser sign-off on all web and marketplace copy before publish.

SUCCESS MEASURES

Description time ≤20 min; catalog launch dates met; zero policy violations in audit sample

RISKS SUMMARY

Incorrect product claims; off-brand tone; marketplace policy violations

CONTROLS

Brand voice checklist; merchandiser publish gate; marketplace claim checklist; weekly copy audit

OWNER

Alex Morgan

DURATION

60 days (pre-spring catalog)

STOP CONDITIONS

Return rate spike >2% vs baseline; marketplace listing rejection; customer complaint re incorrect specs

DECISION POINT

Day 30: expand SKU count or narrow scope. Day 60: adopt, seasonal repeat, or stop.