Stefano Ravegnani

Principal Project Manager (AI) — Execution Architect — Builder’s Mindset

- What this is: an interview-ready portfolio that makes execution quality visible.
- What you’ll find: a flagship venture-style case study (SaveMe) documented as an operating system: decisions, risks, metrics, governance, and leadership reflection.
- How to use it: skim the Executive Profile, then jump to Decision Log, Business Risks, and Metrics.

Location: Berlin, Germany | LinkedIn: linkedin.com/in/ravegnanistefano
Date: 2026-03-02

Executive Profile

I am a Principal Project Manager specialized in leading complex, cross-functional initiatives from concept to delivery in high-ambiguity environments. My core strength is building execution structures that align stakeholders, reduce delivery risk, and transform strategic ideas into operational systems.

I focus on creating clarity where uncertainty exists—defining roadmaps, governance models, and decision frameworks that allow teams to move fast without losing alignment.

I approach projects with a builder mindset: every initiative is a system that can be designed, optimized, and scaled. My leadership style emphasizes transparency, structured decision-making, and measurable outcomes.

Core Competency Map

Execution Architecture	Strategic Thinking
• Program structuring from concept to delivery • Roadmap design & milestone modeling • Risk identification and mitigation systems • Governance and escalation frameworks • Cross-functional delivery orchestration	• Opportunity evaluation & problem framing • Prioritization logic and trade-off analysis • Decision architecture design • Ambiguity navigation
Leadership & Influence	**Operational Excellence**
• Stakeholder alignment across functions • Executive communication • Conflict mediation & decision facilitation • Ownership culture building	• KPI architecture and measurement design • Process design and optimization • Quality structuring & release strategies • Scalable execution systems

Operating principle: Strong execution is not about pushing teams harder. It’s about designing systems where progress becomes inevitable.

Signature Case Study — SaveMe

SaveMe is a venture concept for an affordable hybrid personal safety solution combining a low-cost wearable panic device with a smartphone app. Selected implementation details are intentionally high-level for public sharing.

Problem

- Victims often cannot manually call for help during an incident.
- Many existing tools rely only on manual activation and/or are priced too high for mass adoption.
- Gap: proactive, affordable, intelligent solution that can trigger alerts reliably.

Solution Architecture

- Discreet panic device connected via Bluetooth to a smartphone app.
- App detects potential distress signals and triggers alerts to trusted contacts (and optionally authorities/partners).
- Hybrid design increases usability when the phone is inaccessible.

Go-to-Market and Business Model

- Pilot-first entry: NGO partnerships in Germany to build trust and validate real-world usage.
- Hardware for distribution + optional subscription for premium integrations/features.
- Institutional channels (NGOs, universities, governments) to enable volume adoption.

Roadmap Milestones

- 6 months: MVP app + prototype device
- 12 months: NGO pilot (500–1,000 users)
- 18 months: AI refinement + manufacturing readiness
- 24 months: Germany launch
- 36 months: EU expansion

Execution Architecture Blueprint

A risk-first execution model designed to reduce uncertainty before scaling cost.

Objective	Validate a scalable safety platform via affordability, trust, institutional pilots, and meas
Strategy	Risk-first execution: validate demand before scaling production; build trust channels be
Delivery System	Lean cross-functional core team; weekly execution reviews; explicit decision log; milest
Risk Control	Business risks prioritized: trust, adoption, compliance, distribution. Each risk assigned a
KPI System	Activation + reliability + trust signals + engagement metrics. Scale decisions gated by

Product Decision Log

Decision	Options	Trade-off	Why it mattered
Hybrid device + app vs app-only	App-only; wearable-only; hybrid	Higher complexity	Reliability when phone is inacc
Mass adoption pricing	Premium; mid-range; low cost	Lower unit margins	Scale + distribution unlock; su
AI-driven detection	Manual-only; check-ins; AI	False positive risk	Victims may not trigger manua
NGO pilot before public launch	D2C first; influencer rollout; partnerships	Slower early revenue	Trust is primary barrier; institu
Freemium + subscription	Hardware-only; ads; subscription	More product complexity	Recurring revenue funds reliab

Product insight: The highest-impact product decisions were architecture decisions, not feature decisions.

Business Risk Architecture

Focus: adoption, trust, compliance, and distribution—before scaling cost.

Top Business Risks and Mitigations

- Adoption risk: hesitation to trust safety tools → mitigate via NGO pilots and real-world validation.
- Trust & credibility risk: reliability perception → mitigate via staged rollout and transparent reliability metrics.
- Pricing sensitivity: affordability barrier → mitigate via low-cost hardware + freemium entry + partner subsidies.
- Regulatory & legal: AI + biometrics + GDPR → mitigate via compliance-first design and early legal review.
- Distribution risk: high CAC without partners → mitigate via institutional channels before broad D2C.

Product Metrics and Validation System

A hypothesis-driven measurement system to validate product behavior before scaling.

Activation	• Pairing rate • Onboarding completion • First-day activation • First test-alert success
Reliability	• Alert success rate • Response time • Connectivity stability • False alarm rate
Trust signals	• Permission enablement rate (camera/mic) • 7/30-day retention • Manual test frequency • Repeat engagement
Engagement	• DAU/MAU • Feature usage distribution • Background persistence • Ongoing interactions

Decision rule: Scale decisions occur only after validation thresholds are met (activation, reliability, false positives, retention).

Execution Leadership Reflection

SaveMe was not primarily a product exercise. It was a leadership exercise in structuring ambiguity, aligning stakeholders, and reducing execution risk across multiple dimensions simultaneously.

The project reinforced that initiatives rarely fail due to ideas—they fail due to coordination. Sustainable velocity comes from shared understanding, explicit trade-offs, and measurable progress.

Key realization: scaling a system before stabilizing it multiplies problems faster than progress.

Personal Leadership Creed

- Clarity is kindness: ambiguity is unavoidable; confusion is not.
- Systems outperform heroics: projects should not rely on individual over-effort.
- Trade-offs must be explicit: visible consequences create alignment and trust.
- Reliability earns influence: consistency builds credibility; credibility enables execution.
- Leadership is environmental design: I design conditions where execution becomes inevitable.

Leadership Under Uncertainty (selected examples)

- Ambiguity in scope: narrowed to one primary outcome (distress detection + alerting) to prevent feature creep.
- Innovation vs feasibility: prioritized reliability over sophistication for MVP to earn trust early.
- Overengineering risk: validation-first architecture; no scaling investments before thresholds.
- GTM alignment friction: structured decision session; selected NGO-first rollout to build credibility.
- Decision I would revisit: include advanced AI detection too early. Learning: validation speed often matters more than feature depth.