

## 4. CV - BRANDS.mov

**Speaker1:** [00:00:08] The third point we **wanna** look at is brands. So where have they worked? Are they working for some of the biggest companies in the world? Are they working for the Fortune 100, the **ftse top 50**? Are they working for the **Microsoft**, the Amazons, the Goldman Sachs, the Nike's, the P&G, the Unilever's. And why is this? It's not just because. Oh, **you know**, you're working for a big company that we care about. No. The reason is, is that, **you know**, in early development, when your early career, you're **gonna** be exposed to international best practices, best approaches, and you're **gonna** get to work with the biggest budgets. A chief marketing officer who's running a \$500 million marketing budget is **gonna** have a much deeper set of consumer insights, a richer data set. I'll be working with a lot larger tool kit than, say, a chief marketing officer who has a 50,000\$ budget or 100,000\$ budget. From an intellectual horsepower perspective, maybe the candidate who has 100,000\$ marketing budget is smarter. But the fact is, over a period of 5 to 10 years in development, the candidates who are in the richer environment are **gonna** develop faster. So we **wanna** have a preference for those candidates who have been developed in the larger companies. I think the best is somebody who has worked in a very large organization and then has also maybe had a more entrepreneurial experience in an SME. This is a great mix and I'm not discounting people who work in smaller companies. There's a lot of great people, but the preference will always be for someone who has had experience with both or has been developed in one of the leading companies. So have a preference for that branding when you're looking at the CVs and you're bringing in your candidates.