

CREATIVE

Make room for the good idea

Alongside People / Advice and hands-on implementation

Practical AI adoption for Melbourne creative teams

If your studio is already trying AI but has no clear view of what good use looks like, we can help you work it out. We look at what supports the quality of the work, what adds burden and where to go next. You do not need to arrive with a production task already chosen.

A useful creative workflow leaves people enough attention to make and defend good decisions. It makes the brief clear, keeps feedback attached to the right version and carries an approved idea through production without losing its intent.

Our starting point is to look first at the repeated work surrounding the idea. AI can be trialled for organising a brief, preparing production variations or checking a delivery packet. The creative lead still decides what deserves to exist, what fits the audience and whether the final work is good enough to represent the client.

For Melbourne creative teams, we propose **Understand, Try, Repeat, Operate, Improve**. Protect judgement while reducing production friction. Generated options need to earn their place.

Locate the work that steals attention

A project can slow down before anyone opens a design tool. The brief contains several competing objectives. Feedback arrives in separate messages. A late amendment changes the product claim but reaches only some files. The approved concept is clear, yet turning it into a set of formats requires repeated copying and checking.

Brief clarification needs a conversation. Version confusion needs a reliable record. Repeated production may benefit from templates or automation. Assistance depends on clear purpose and sources.

Producing many directions can make review harder. Decide what an exploration needs to answer and how many alternatives the team can assess. Include creative-lead attention in the cost.

Begin by following one recent deliverable from briefing to acceptance. Record where people searched, repeated, waited or corrected. Ask which decisions required creative judgement and which steps simply carried an agreed decision forward.

A fictional workflow: one campaign, several formats

This fictional example reports no client results or achieved savings.

Imagine a Melbourne studio preparing a campaign for a local cultural event. The client has approved the audience, message, visual direction and a set of supplied photographs. The studio needs to prepare several digital formats and a presentation explaining the choices.

The producer creates an approved source packet: brief, required wording, factual event details, brand rules, permitted assets, output dimensions and the client's requirements for AI use. An assistant organises these into a production checklist. It flags missing information rather than inventing an admission price, partner endorsement or usage permission.

The creative lead reviews the checklist and chooses which tasks can be assisted. Layout exploration uses placeholders or assets cleared for that purpose. The designer determines composition, hierarchy and tone. Where generative imagery is proposed, its provenance and permitted use are checked before it becomes part of a client deliverable.

The assistant helps prepare draft text variations within the approved message. Each variation remains attached to its source wording and format. The producer checks dates, names, restrictions and file naming. The creative lead reviews whether each version preserves the idea, rather than merely filling the available space.

Client feedback is recorded against a specific version. An approved amendment becomes a change instruction for the affected outputs. A final packet contains editable files, exports, approval history and an asset register. A person signs off the actual delivered files.

The trial examines chasing, correction and creative quality. A folder of variants alone is insufficient evidence.

Rights belong in the workflow

Tool capability, permission to use an input, contractual commitments and rights in an output are separate questions. A client's supplied photograph may be cleared for a campaign without being cleared for every upload or transformation. Record the allowed use before sending material to a new service.

Adobe's Firefly FAQ describes commercial use of generated outputs subject to the actual feature and its terms. Check the feature, model, input permissions and account arrangement before production. A familiar application name does not settle the rights for every generation, especially where partner models are available. Keep the applicable terms with the asset record. [Firefly FAQ](#).

WIPO's current small-business guide explains that AI and intellectual-property questions are evolving and jurisdiction-dependent. We recommend a practical source and approval record, with specialist advice where the proposed use requires it. Do not promise exclusivity or legal clearance from the fact that a tool produced an image. [WIPO: Learning Machines](#).

What would make this worth continuing?

The following is a decision aid for the fictional trial, not an observed result. Agree the limits with the people responsible before testing.

- **Accepted result:** Accepted campaign files with the approved message, editable source and complete asset and approval records.
- **Who judges it:** The creative lead and producer, with the client's normal approval process.
- **Hold and return to the manual route when:** Asset permission is missing, a factual claim changes or an approved amendment is missed in an affected output.

- **Evidence for another step:** Compare accepted deliverables of similar scope, including unusable variants, creative review and correction rounds.

For a fictional amendment test, change the event date in the approved source packet. List every affected format and verify the actual exported files. An updated prompt or master file is insufficient if one delivered version still carries the old date.

Use the [one-workflow worksheet](#) to record the agreed question, evidence and next decision.

Understand: separate judgement from production

We map one deliverable with the producer, creative lead and people making the work. We identify the decisions that define quality and the repeated steps that can be made easier. We agree the source of truth for the brief, versions and approvals.

The aim is focused creative attention. Continue when there is an agreed workflow, a quality rubric, an asset-use record and a baseline. The rubric might cover message accuracy, brand fit, visual hierarchy and fidelity to the concept. It should be specific enough for reviewers to explain a rejection.

Try: carry one approved idea through a contained task

We select a task such as organising a source packet or preparing draft text variations for approved formats. The trial uses synthetic or authorised material. A designer and producer inspect the outputs and record the changes needed before acceptance.

The aim is evidence about useful assistance. Continue when there is a finished sample, editable source, review notes and full effort record. Record unusable outputs as well as accepted ones.

Repeat: test the method against real variation

We repeat with a second brief or a controlled amendment. Can the method preserve a changed date across every affected version? Does it retain the approved voice? Does another producer understand the record? Include a case with insufficient rights information so the workflow must stop and ask.

The aim is repeatable production. Continue when there is a reusable template, exception handling and comparable samples that preserve intent while allowing creative judgement.

Operate: make the approval trail easy to use

We establish where briefs, assets, versions and approvals live, who can access them and who can release work. Tool choices include their actual edition and model arrangements. The team can identify which files used assistance and recover editable work without relying on a chat history.

The aim is less uncertainty at handover. Continue when there is a working procedure, an asset register, a tested delivery packet and a manual fallback. Client confidentiality, permissions and publishing authority remain explicit. Automated production should not quietly become automated approval.

Improve: retain what helps the work

We review accepted quality, review burden and correction patterns. If output is faster but creative review becomes harder, narrow the task or reduce the number of options. If templates account for most of the improvement, keep that simpler method. If a tool changes, retest the parts that depend on it.

The aim is a production practice that earns its place. Continue when there is a dated decision and a focused next experiment.

A proposed 30-day trial

This proposed evaluation is not a commercial commitment or campaign-delivery promise.

During days 1-5, choose one deliverable, trace comparable recent work and agree quality and rights requirements. During days 6-12, complete a contained sample from a checked source packet. During days 13-21, repeat with another example and an amendment, inspecting every output. During days 22-30, review the evidence and decide whether to incorporate the method into normal production.

Keep existing client approvals. Fictional briefs can demonstrate the method but cannot establish client acceptance. Record the limits and next approved observation.

Measure accepted work, including the checking

Establish a baseline for comparable deliverables. Record elapsed brief-to-acceptance time, active production time, producer and creative-lead review time, correction rounds and missing or inconsistent requirements. Separate a change in client direction from a production mistake.

Assess quality with the agreed rubric and written reasons. A review of matched examples can be useful, provided reviewers know the intended audience and message. Small samples should inform a decision without being presented as statistical proof.

Count accepted deliverables with a complete approval and asset record. Track factual corrections, unapproved assets and missed amendments as quality guardrails. Pause the workflow if required provenance or permission cannot be established. Do not reward volume of imagery, prompts or variants.

Calculate cost per accepted deliverable from tool usage, production, review and rework. Show initial setup separately. Record whether producers can find the latest approved version and whether creative leads have more room for the decisions that matter. These observations explain a result better than a headline drafting-time saving.

How we help

Alongside People offers advice and implementation around the work. We can help clarify the production problem, design a usable source and approval packet, assess tools against the task, and build a repeatable method. We help your team measure the result and decide how far to take it.

Paul Volpato is our founder and CEO. Start with one deliverable where the team spent too much attention finding, resizing, updating or checking.

Sources and scope

Understand / Try / Repeat / Operate / Improve is Alongside People's original discussion framework. It is not a certification, validated maturity assessment or official standard.

The five stages and trial are our proposed approach. The workflow is fictional and makes no claim about client outcomes. Sources support specific product and intellectual-property context; they do not establish rights for a particular asset or project.

- [Adobe Firefly FAQ](#), Adobe; displayed update 25 May 2026, checked 3 October 2026.
- [Learning Machines: introduction](#), World Intellectual Property Organization; 2026 small-business guide, checked 3 October 2026.

If you are already trying AI and are unsure what deserves further investment, [tell us what you have tried and what you want to improve](#). We can help find the starting point together.

Read the structured HTML edition: alongsidepeople.com/resources/ai-for-creative