Section	Question	Enterprise Ltd.
Company Profile	**Industry & Business Model**	Services, B2B
Company Profile	**Scale (Revenue & Headcount)**	Medium ($10-50M), 117 emp.
Org Structure	**Who manages finance & accounting?**	Full in-house finance dept. & accounting
IT Landscape	**Core Systems (Accounting, CRM, Task Trackers)**	1C (ERP/Accounting), Bitrix24, Jira
IT Landscape	**How is data exchange configured between systems?**	Partially manual, partially 1C exports
Budgeting	**Where/How is the budget managed (Plan/Fact)?**	1C, Detailed budget, monthly control
Treasury	**Incoming Invoices Volume per month & Format**	70-100 pcs (PDF/EDI)
Treasury	**Approval & Payment Process**	Requests in 1C -> Payment Registry -> Bank Export
Treasury	**Effort: Data entry from invoice to system**	Manual by operator, ~15 min/invoice
Sales	**Outgoing Invoices/Acts Volume per month**	~20-40 pcs
Sales	**Client Invoicing Process**	Semi-automated (from 1C)
Contracts	**New Contracts Volume per month**	70-100
Contracts	**Where are contracts stored & approved?**	1C, Electronic Archive, strict workflow
HR	**Monthly Hiring & Onboarding**	3-5, standardized process
HR	**Time Tracking (Timesheets)**	Tracked in specialized SW/Excel, analyzed
Pains & Risks	**Key "Manual" Operations (Copy-Paste)**	Inputting primary docs, bank statement allocation, intercompany reconciliation
Pains & Risks	**Dependency on specific people (Bus Factor)**	Low (Deputies/SOPs in place)
Pains & Risks	**Satisfaction with current automation (1-10)**	6 (Core blocks covered, but lack connectivity)

Intelligent Automation Potential Report

Date: December 10, 2025

1. Executive Summary

Company Overview: The Company is Enterprise Ltd., operating in the Services, B2B industry. It is classified as a medium-sized enterprise with revenues between $10-50M and 117 employees. Operations are supported by a full in-house finance department.

Current State Assessment: The current automation maturity exhibits a reliance on core enterprise systems (1C) for structured processes like budgeting and contract management. However, significant manual intervention persists in transaction processing (Treasury) and data movement, resulting in moderate overall satisfaction with automation (Score 6/10). The process landscape demonstrates standardization in some areas (e.g., HR onboarding, Contracts), but data exchange between systems remains sub-optimal.

Key Conclusion: The primary opportunity for efficiency gains lies in automating high-volume, repetitive data entry tasks within the Treasury function and improving data integration between transactional systems.

2. Maturity Assessment

Model Overview: The Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) framework assesses process maturity across five levels: Level 1 (Initial – chaotic, heroic effort), Level 2 (Managed – repeatable, documented tasks), Level 3 (Defined – standardized across the organization), Level 4 (Quantitatively Managed – measurable performance), and Level 5 (Optimizing – continuous process improvement).

Company Assessment: Level 2 (Managed).

Justification: Evidence suggests processes are largely repeatable (e.g., monthly budget control in 1C, standardized HR onboarding), indicating movement beyond Level 1. However, the significant identified manual operations, manual data entry for 70-100 invoices monthly, and partially manual data exchange between systems suggest processes are not yet universally defined or standardized across the enterprise (Level 3). The low dependency on specific people indicates successful implementation of some documentation, supporting a Managed state.

Data Readiness Index: Mixed. Highly structured data exists within the 1C ERP for budgeting and core accounting. However, invoice processing relies on unstructured or semi-structured formats (PDFs), requiring manual operator intervention, which decreases overall data readiness for seamless integration.

3. Process Deep Dive

Treasury (Incoming Invoices)

Current Status: Processes 70-100 PDF/EDI invoices monthly. Approval flows are managed via 1C, leading to a Payment Registry and Bank Export. Data entry from invoice to system is performed manually by an operator, consuming approximately 15 minutes per invoice.

Pain Points / Bottlenecks: High volume (70-100/month) combined with a 15-minute manual entry time results in significant non-value-added time expenditure. This is explicitly cited as a key manual operation.

Recommendation: Implement Optical Character Recognition (OCR) combined with Robotic Process Automation (RPA) to capture key data from PDF invoices and automatically populate the corresponding records within 1C prior to routing for approval.

- Solution Type: AI

Data Exchange and Integration

Current Status: Data exchange between core systems (1C, Bitrix24, Jira) is partially manual, involving manual exports from 1C.

Pain Points / Bottlenecks: Manual data transfers create latency, increase the risk of transposition errors, and necessitate operator time spent on copy-paste operations, which is identified as a major pain point.

Recommendation: Develop standardized, controlled interfaces or utilize integration middleware to automate the transfer of transactional data between the primary ERP (1C) and other specified operational systems (Bitrix24, Jira).

- Solution Type: Process Optimization / Standardization

Treasury (Bank Statement Allocation)

Current Status: Bank statement allocation is listed as a key manual operation requiring "copy-paste."

Pain Points / Bottlenecks: Manual reconciliation and allocation of bank statement data against internal ledgers consume valuable operator time and introduce reconciliation risk.

Recommendation: Automate the ingestion and matching of bank statements within the 1C ERP environment, leveraging existing system capabilities or implementing rules-based automation for common matching criteria.

- Solution Type: RPA

Intercompany Reconciliation

Current Status: Intercompany reconciliation is listed as a key manual operation.

Pain Points / Bottlenecks: Manual reconciliation processes are inherently time-consuming and prone to errors when dealing with multiple related entities.

Recommendation: Standardize the format and frequency of intercompany data exchange, followed by implementing standardized reconciliation protocols within the 1C environment.

- Solution Type: Process Optimization / Standardization

4. Prioritization Matrix

The following matrix groups the recommended initiatives based on estimated impact and effort, derived from the analysis of manual effort and system dependency.

First, list all Quick Wins (High Impact / Low Effort).

- Manual Invoice Data Entry Elimination
- Solution Type: AI
- Rationale: High volume (70-100 invoices/month) and high individual time cost (15 min/invoice) make this task a prime candidate for immediate efficiency gains via OCR/AI implementation.
- Bank Statement Allocation
- Solution Type: RPA
- Rationale: Explicitly listed as a key manual operation; standard RPA implementation for rule-based matching offers fast return on investment.

Second, list all Strategic Initiatives (High Impact / High Effort).

- System Data Exchange Standardization
- Solution Type: Process Optimization / Standardization
- Rationale: Addressing the "partially manual" data exchange between 1C, Jira, and Bitrix24 requires formal definition of data flows and potential integration layer investment, classifying it as strategic.

Third, list all Low Priority items.

- Intercompany Reconciliation Standardization
- Solution Type: Process Optimization / Standardization
- Rationale: While manual, the specific volume is not provided, suggesting lower immediate throughput impact compared to the 70-100 incoming invoices.

5. Technology Landscape & Risks

Current Stack:
- Core ERP/Accounting: 1C
- Task Trackers/Collaboration: Bitrix24, Jira
- Specialized Software: Timesheets tracking software
- Documents: PDFs (for invoices)
- Spreadsheets: Excel (for timesheet analysis)

Risks:
- Data Integrity Risk: Partially manual data exchange between systems increases the susceptibility to data corruption or transposition errors during manual export/import activities.
- Operational Bottleneck Risk: High dependence on manual operator effort for processing 70-100 invoices monthly creates a significant bottleneck that impacts downstream payment cycles.
- System Disconnect Risk: Reliance on manual exports from the core 1C system to update

satellite systems (Jira, Bitrix24) creates functional disconnects and process latency.

6. Implementation Roadmap

The following phased approach prioritizes addressing immediate manual transactional volume before tackling systemic integration challenges.

Phase 1: Foundation and High-Volume Transactional Automation (0-6 Months)
- Objective: Eliminate the most time-consuming, volume-heavy manual data entry and allocation tasks.
- Action 1: Implement OCR solution integrated with 1C for automated processing of 70-100 incoming PDF invoices. (Addresses Invoice Data Entry Elimination)
- Action 2: Deploy RPA to automate the bank statement allocation process within 1C. (Addresses Bank Statement Allocation)

Phase 2: Process Definition and Stabilization (6-12 Months)
- Objective: Standardize identified manual reconciliation processes and formally define data flows.
- Action 1: Formalize intercompany reconciliation procedures and establish a standardized data exchange protocol for these transactions. (Addresses Intercompany Reconciliation Standardization)
- Action 2: Audit and define the exact data synchronization requirements (fields, triggers, direction) between 1C, Jira, and Bitrix24. (Foundation for Strategic Initiative)

Phase 3: Scaling and System Integration (12+ Months)
- Objective: Execute the strategic integration to eliminate residual manual data movement.
- Action 1: Implement integration architecture (middleware or direct APIs) to automate the data exchange flows defined in Phase 2 between 1C and satellite operational systems. (Addresses System Data Exchange Standardization)