

MOROCCAN CLOTHING BRAND

Meta Ads scaling in a Cash on Delivery model

Confidentiality: Brand name and campaign/ad-set names are withheld for privacy and commercial confidentiality. The brand is a Moroccan clothing e-commerce business operating primarily on Cash on Delivery (COD). Spend is shown in USD, as reported by Meta Ads Manager.

Objective. Scale website purchase volume without allowing acquisition cost to deteriorate. My approach was to test multiple ad sets at controlled budgets, stop weak tests quickly, and concentrate spend on combinations that proved they could hold CPA as volume increased.

COD MEASUREMENT NOTE

In a COD business, a Meta "purchase" is an attributed website order, not necessarily a delivered, cash-collected sale. I therefore separate media-buying efficiency from confirmation and delivery performance.

TOTAL SPEND \$746.81 Meta Ads spend	WEBSITE PURCHASES 202 Attributed orders	BLENDED CPA \$3.70 Per website purchase	LINK CLICKS 7,944 Traffic generated
IMPRESSIONS 164,940 Account total	REACH 71,373 Unique people	LINK CTR 4.82% Derived from clicks / impression	FREQUENCY 2.31x Impressions / reach

From controlled testing to concentrated scale

The account shows a clear testing-to-scaling pattern: most experiments were run on small daily budgets, weak tests were contained, and spend concentrated into a small group of purchase-producing winners.

01 TEST

Most test ad sets used a \$5.76/day budget, creating a controlled environment to compare conversion efficiency before committing meaningful spend.

02 STOP WASTE EARLY

14 zero-purchase tests used only \$36.99 in total - 5.0% of account spend. This kept failed experiments from absorbing scale budget.

03 CONCENTRATE

The top three ad sets generated 161 of 202 purchases (79.7%) while using 67.1% of spend. Their blended CPA was \$3.11 versus \$5.99 for the rest of the account.

04 SCALE VALIDATED WINNERS

The highest-volume winner delivered 67 purchases at \$2.88 CPA on \$192.76 spend. Its \$22.16/day budget was about 3.8x the recurring \$5.76/day test budget.

WHERE THE SCALE CAME FROM

Top 3 ad sets

Share of spend



Share of purchases



BLENDED CPA

Top 3: \$3.11

Rest: \$5.99

Top-three CPA was 48.1% lower than the remaining ad sets.

Ad-set performance across the account

All original ad-set names are removed. IDs below are portfolio labels only (Ad Set 1-24) and preserve the metric order visible in Ads Manager.

AD SET	SPEND	PURCH.	CPA	IMPR.	CLICKS	READ
1	\$38.52	6	\$6.42	4,263	215	Small converting test
2	\$137.63	39	\$3.53	31,716	1,716	Core winner
3	\$170.74	55	\$3.10	39,016	1,715	Core winner
4	\$1.71	0	-	271	11	No purchase test
5	\$5.25	1	\$5.25	886	37	Small converting test
6	\$2.11	0	-	280	8	No purchase test
7	\$1.94	0	-	315	9	No purchase test
8	\$2.04	0	-	307	13	No purchase test
9	\$2.13	0	-	344	10	No purchase test
10	\$2.20	0	-	296	14	No purchase test
11	\$2.14	0	-	230	10	No purchase test
12	\$3.22	0	-	322	15	No purchase test

AD SET	SPEND	PURCH.	CPA	IMPR.	CLICKS	READ
13	\$2.41	0	-	249	8	No purchase test
14	\$2.94	0	-	305	10	No purchase test
15	\$2.22	0	-	392	13	No purchase test
16	\$2.11	0	-	307	15	No purchase test
17	\$5.05	1	\$5.05	936	35	Small converting test
18	\$82.79	15	\$5.52	17,461	816	Volume / higher CPA
19	\$4.64	0	-	1,089	63	No purchase test
20	\$12.50	3	\$4.17	2,899	120	Small converting test
21	\$5.18	0	-	1,243	59	No purchase test
22	\$50.85	13	\$3.91	7,815	357	Volume / higher CPA
23	\$13.73	2	\$6.87	2,971	148	Small converting test
24	\$192.76	67	\$2.88	51,027	2,527	Core winner

Interpretation: I did not treat every ad set as something to scale. Low/no-purchase tests were intentionally kept small, while budget was concentrated where purchase economics justified it. Historical pause status is not used here as a performance label because an ad set can also be paused after completing a successful testing/scaling cycle.

Why I did not optimize for CTR alone

Two high-volume ad sets generated almost the same number of link clicks, but very different purchase outcomes. This is why I evaluate the full funnel before scaling.

AD SET 2 VS AD SET 3		Ad Set 2	Ad Set 3	Change
Spend		\$137.63	\$170.74	+24.1%
Link clicks		1,716	1,715	-0.1%
Purchases		39	55	+41.0%
CPA		\$3.53	\$3.10	-12.2%
Purchase ROAS		8.16x	9.37x	+14.8%
Purchase CVR		2.44%	3.16%	+29.5%
Link CTR		5.41%	4.40%	-18.7%
CPM		\$4.34	\$4.38	+0.9%

WHAT THIS TELLS ME

- Nearly identical click volume**
1,716 vs 1,715 link clicks - traffic volume was essentially the same.
- More orders from the same traffic**
Ad Set 3 produced 55 purchases vs 39: +41.0% purchase volume.
- Better unit economics**
CPA improved 12.2% while purchase ROAS increased 14.8%.
- Post-click quality mattered more**
CTR was lower, but purchase CVR was 29.5% higher. I would favor the stronger business outcome over the vanity metric.
- More attributed value**
Meta-attributed purchase value was about \$1,600 vs \$1,123. In COD, this remains attributed order value, not confirmed collected cash.

Highest-volume winner: Ad Set 24 generated 67 purchases at \$2.88 CPA on \$192.76 spend, with 51,027 impressions, 32,110 reach and 2,527 link clicks. Its \$22.16/day budget is consistent with a scale-stage allocation rather than an exploratory test budget.

Meta Ads Manager performance evidence

ACCOUNT TOTAL

[illegible][illegible][illegible]

Key takeaways from the account

This account demonstrates not only a strong result, but the decision logic I used to protect efficiency while scaling.

- 1 I protect test capital.**
I use small budgets to collect enough signal without letting weak ad sets consume meaningful spend.
- 2 I stop weak patterns instead of averaging them into the account.**
Only about 5% of total spend went to zero-purchase tests, which kept the account focused on validated demand.
- 3 I scale on purchase economics.**
The top three ad sets generated almost 80% of purchases with 67% of spend and a \$3.11 blended CPA.
- 4 I look beyond CTR.**
One stronger ad set had lower CTR but materially better purchase conversion, CPA and ROAS. The final business outcome matters more than the surface engagement metric.
- 5 I understand the COD constraint.**
Meta-attributed purchases are only the acquisition layer. A complete Moroccan COD P&L; also requires confirmation rate, delivered-order rate, return/refusal rate and cash-collected margin.

Result: \$746.81 in Meta spend produced 202 attributed website purchases at a \$3.70 blended CPA, while the strongest scale-stage ad set reached 67 purchases at \$2.88 CPA.