

How we measured, and where the facts came from.

This companion to the Brand Size-Up deck does two things: it defines the six dimensions we scored, and it sources every external claim we made. Nothing in the audit is asserted without proof.

Anonymized sample. This is a real audit with the client's identity withheld. Scope: the public, retail-facing brand. Reads dated to the audit window.

WHY ANONYMIZED This sample pairs with Slant's public sample deck, which withholds the client's name and describes it only as a better-for-you snack brand. Brand-specific sources here are described generically so the identity stays private. Category-level market figures keep their real, public sources.

The six dimensions

Each dimension is scored as the share of its potential the brand is leveraging today, not out of ten. The overall figure (68%) is the average of the six.

Clarity

78%

Can someone tell what you are and why it matters, fast?

WHAT WE LOOK AT

The homepage value proposition, the five-second test, whether copy leads with benefit or feeling, and whether the portfolio still reads as one thing.

Product-level clarity is excellent: clean, organic, no seed oils, simple ingredients read in five seconds.

What a stranger never learns is why this brand over a cheaper clean-label rival, because the homepage sells simple snacking while the story page sells a life philosophy, and the two never meet.

A clear product, a blurring brand.

Consistency

58%

Does the brand hold together across every touchpoint?

WHAT WE LOOK AT

Tone and visual system across box, website, and social; whether the register holds; and whether the coherence is used as structure or as styling.

The deepest fracture in the audit. One rounded typeface and a warm palette hold across site and pack, but the founding register (mindful living, simple acts) and the new register (cartoon mascots, pun names) read as two different companies sharing one website. **Two registers, one site.**

Differentiation

60%

Do you own a position, or share generic territory?

WHAT WE LOOK AT

Positioning against named competitors, and whether the brand claims an asset or territory no rival can credibly take.

The copy leans on clean, organic, no seed oils. True, but every elevated rival says a version of it, so swapping the logo leaves the homepage still reading. The un-swappable assets, a lived worldview and a factory the brand owns, are the one thing the positioning never claims. **The un-swappable asset, framed as packaging.**

Resonance

65%

Does it connect, or does it read functional and distant?

WHAT WE LOOK AT

The emotional job the brand is hired for, the presence of real stories, and sentiment across reviews and social.

The original promise, small choices that add up, connected on a feeling no rival had, and people bought the meaning. The new fun-and-craveable surface trades that owned feeling for one the whole aisle already shares. **Connected on meaning, marketing the fun.**

Availability

80%

Is the brand easy to remember at the moment of choice, and easy to find and buy?

WHAT WE LOOK AT

Distinctive-asset salience and category-entry-point ownership (mental availability), plus distribution, findability, and searchable discovery (physical availability).

Physical availability is excellent: tens of thousands of doors across club, mass, and natural, plus a strong, ownable name and halo. The gap is mental, where a second cartoon-character system splits attribution instead of compounding one memory. **Best-in-class reach, two banks for one memory.**

Credibility

70%

Has the brand earned trust, and does the promise match the product record?

WHAT WE LOOK AT

Proof of claims, third-party validation, owned reviews, and whether the open-marketplace record agrees with the headline promise.

A deep, ownable proof stack: a factory the brand owns, organic certification, no seed oils, simple ingredients, a dietitian network, and a founder who actually lives the philosophy. The exposure is that the most human, least-copyable proof is being pushed to the background exactly when "is this brand for real?" is the category's central question. **Earned, then under-shown.**

Reading the colours: red marks a dimension at or under roughly 40% (structurally weak), amber 41–59% (partial), teal 60%+ (working). The colour is the same scale used on the scorecard.

Sources

Every external figure or market claim in the deck, with its source and what it means in real terms. Brand-specific observations are described generically to keep the identity withheld; category-level market figures keep their real, public sources.

Positioning, clean-label claims, and product macros: organic, no seed oils, simple ingredients VERIFIED

The brand's own homepage, product pages, and FAQ carry the clean-label positioning (organic, no seed oils, simple ingredients) and the shelf-facing snacking claims read in the audit. Read directly off the brand's public site.

Source: the brand's own homepage, product, and FAQ pages (identity withheld)

Owned factory: the brand makes its own food VERIFIED

The brand owns its means of production rather than co-packing, a structural moat most of the aisle cannot claim: quality control, speed to shelf, and the right to prove every claim with footage. Stated on the brand's own story page and echoed in a trade release.

Source: the brand's own story page + a dated trade release (identity withheld)

National distribution at nine-figure scale, across club, mass, and natural VERIFIED

From natural-channel origins to nationwide club and mass at nine-figure scale, tens of thousands of doors. Real, national trial machinery. Sourced from a dated trade release and the brand's own retail-locator and site copy.

Source: a dated trade release + the brand's own site (identity withheld)

The two-register brand fracture: a mindful founding voice vs. a new cartoon-mascot surface INFERRED

A read of the public surface: the founding register (mindful living, simple acts, philosophy-led) and the newer register (cartoon mascots, pun names, snack-for-the-win) read as two different companies sharing one website. This is an interpretation of the brand's own live site and packaging, not a stated fact.

Source: Slant's read of the brand's public homepage, story page, packaging, and social (identity withheld)

Owned five-star reviews vs. open-marketplace taste and texture friction DIRECTIONAL

The brand's owned storefront carries strong social proof, while open-marketplace review aggregators surface the recurring taste-and-texture note that the headline promise contests. A live read that splits owned sentiment from open sentiment; confirm the current figures at debrief.

Source: open-marketplace review aggregators + a live read (read during the audit window)

Competitor positions: mass light-popcorn leader, fun family-popcorn brand, heirloom craft brand, conscience-niche brand VERIFIED

Each competitor's owned position was read off its own public pages: the mass light-popcorn leader (light, simple, guilt-free everyday), the fun family-popcorn brand (bright, playful, whole-grain), the heirloom craft brand (small-batch, artisanal, premium-natural), and the conscience-niche brand (sustainability and conscience, cult). Every elevated rival now says a version of "clean," which is why the open lane (meaning at a mainstream price) sits empty.

Source: each competitor's own public homepage and product pages (named generically to keep the client anonymous)

28% of US consumers now actively avoid seed oils DIRECTIONAL

Roughly 28% of US consumers now actively avoid seed oils (Seed Oil Free Alliance, 2025). Category-level demand data, safe to cite by name because it does not identify the brand. The seed-oil reckoning is the movement this brand is uniquely equipped to prove, not just claim.

[Seed Oil Free Alliance · consumer avoidance data \(2025\)](#)

\$11.5B seed-oil-free snack market by 2033, up from ~\$5.9B in 2024, ~7.6% CAGR DIRECTIONAL

The seed-oil-free snack market is projected to reach about \$11.5B by 2033, up from roughly \$5.9B in 2024, a ~7.6% CAGR (Growth Market Reports). Category-level market sizing, safe to cite by name. The tailwind is real and accelerating, which is why a factory that can film the proof is a durable edge.

[Growth Market Reports · Seed Oil-Free Snacks Market Research Report 2033](#)

Positioning-theory anchors: Neumeier, Romaniuk, Dunford, diagnosis-as-strategy VERIFIED

The competitive and positioning slides cite Marty Neumeier ("your brand isn't what you say it is, it's what they say it is"), Jenni Romaniuk of the Ehrenberg-Bass Institute on distinctive brand assets, and April Dunford on changing the frame of reference, plus Slant's diagnosis-as-strategy lens. Used as interpretive frames, not market data.

Sources: Marty Neumeier, *The Brand Gap / Zag*; Jenni Romaniuk (Ehrenberg-Bass Institute), *Building Distinctive Brand Assets*; April Dunford, *Obviously Awesome*. Cited as published frameworks, not market data.