CRONAH

Backend Infrastructure & Automation Engineering

Systems Architecture Blueprint

Sample Document

Prepared for: John Doe

Date: 01.01.2026

Confidential

cronah.com

1. Executive Summary

This diagnostic analyzes the current backend infrastructure of a Meta Ads agency managing multiple active clients and identifies structural inefficiencies in reporting, onboarding, and internal workflows.

The current operational setup relies on manual data transfers, fragmented storage systems, and informal coordination processes. While functional at a small scale, this structure introduces compounding inefficiencies and scalability risks as client volume increases.

Primary Findings:

- ➔ Reporting processes are manually consolidated and formatted weekly.
- ➔ Client performance data exists across multiple disconnected sources.
- ➔ Onboarding workflows lack standardized automation.
- ➔ Operational dependency on specific team members is high.

Estimated Weekly Manual Time Loss: 15–25 hours.

2. Current Backend Infrastructure Overview

2.1 Tool Stack Analysis

The current operational environment consists of:

- ➔ Meta Ads Manager — Campaign execution and performance source
- ➔ Google Sheets — Performance consolidation and reporting
- ➔ Slack — Internal communication
- ➔ Stripe — Billing and invoicing
- ➔ Notion / ClickUp — Task coordination

While each tool serves its purpose independently, the system lacks structured integration across platforms.

3. Data Flow Breakdown

Performance data currently moves through multiple manual touchpoints before reaching the client.

Current Flow:

Identified Inefficiencies:

- ➔ Multiple manual data handling steps
- ➔ High risk of version control conflicts
- ➔ Repetitive formatting tasks
- ➔ Lack of automated validation
- ➔ Inconsistent report delivery timelines

Primary Breakpoints:

- ➔ Manual export errors
- ➔ Duplicate spreadsheet entries
- ➔ Inconsistent metric formatting
- ➔ Delayed client communication

This structure increases operational overhead and error probability as client volume grows.

4. Manual Workflow Analysis

The following recurring processes currently require manual intervention:

Weekly Reporting:

- ➔ Data export and consolidation
- ➔ Performance summary creation
- ➔ Formatting and distribution

Client Onboarding:

- ➔ Asset collection via email
- ➔ Manual CRM updates
- ➔ Task creation in project management tool

Internal Coordination:

- ➔ Slack-based performance updates
- ➔ Manual reminder follow-ups
- ➔ Cross-tool status verification

Operational Risk:

As the agency scales, manual coordination increases exponentially, leading to founder dependency and reduced execution efficiency.

5. Structural Risk Assessment

Key structural risks identified:

- ➔ Fragmented data storage across multiple tools
- ➔ No centralized performance database
- ➔ Reporting inconsistency due to manual formatting
- ➔ Onboarding variability between clients
- ➔ High operational reliance on specific team members

Without architectural restructuring, operational complexity will compound with scale.

6. Backend Architecture Redesign Proposal

6.1 Centralized Data Structure

Proposed:

- ➔ Unified performance data layer
- ➔ Standardized metric schema
- ➔ Structured client reporting database

Objective:

Establish a single source of truth to eliminate duplication and inconsistency.

6.2 Reporting System Architecture

Proposed:

- ➔ Automated performance data ingestion
- ➔ Structured dashboard layer
- ➔ Scheduled report generation
- ➔ Automated delivery triggers

Result:

Manual reporting replaced with systematic, repeatable processes.

6.3 Onboarding Workflow Architecture

Proposed:

- ➔ Automated intake forms
- ➔ Asset submission system
- ➔ Trigger-based task assignment
- ➔ CRM integration

Result:

Standardized onboarding pipeline reducing coordination overhead.

6.4 Automation Integration Strategy

Automation will be embedded within defined structural layers:

- ➔ Data synchronization logic
- ➔ Scheduled reporting workflows
- ➔ Slack notification automation
- ➔ Error detection and monitoring

Automation will support structured infrastructure rather than operate as isolated task triggers.

7. Optimization Impact Forecast

Projected Improvements:

- ➔ 15–25 hours weekly operational time savings
- ➔ Reduced reporting inconsistency
- ➔ Lower error probability
- ➔ Increased onboarding standardization
- ➔ Reduced founder dependency
- ➔ Improved scalability readiness

8. Implementation Roadmap

Infrastructure Setup

Establish centralized data structure and system architecture foundation.

Reporting Automation

Integrate automated data ingestion and reporting layer.

Onboarding Automation

Deploy standardized intake and trigger-based task workflows.

Workflow Optimization

Implement internal coordination automation and monitoring systems.

Estimated Timeline: 4–8 weeks depending on system complexity.

9. Engagement Model

Cronah operates through a structured three-stage engagement model designed to ensure clarity before execution.

Stage I — Backend Diagnostic Sprint

A focused 7–10 day backend assessment designed to identify structural inefficiencies, quantify operational time loss, and define a clear infrastructure improvement roadmap.

This stage provides:

- ➔ Tool stack and data flow mapping
- ➔ Manual time-loss quantification
- ➔ Reporting and spreadsheet friction analysis
- ➔ Scalability risk assessment
- ➔ Prioritized infrastructure optimization roadmap

Outcome:

Clear architectural direction before any implementation begins.

Stage II — Infrastructure Implementation

Execution of engineered backend systems based on validated architectural design.

This stage adapts to the agency's scale and operational complexity.

Core — Backend Stabilization System

A 3–4 week infrastructure upgrade eliminating manual reporting loops, spreadsheet dependency, and fragmented data workflows.

Scope Includes:

- ➔ Automated reporting pipeline
- ➔ Centralized data layer (single source of truth)
- ➔ Spreadsheet workload reduction or replacement
- ➔ Client onboarding automation
- ➔ Slack workflow routing
- ➔ Error handling and monitoring
- ➔ Documentation and internal team handoff

Outcome:

Operational stability and structured automation foundation.