URL Ledger

Case Study Template & Proof Pack

A reusable evidence-backed template for turning every URL Portfolio Repricing Audit into a public case study, private board memo, sales proof asset, and benchmark contribution.

Before -> Proof -> Ledger	URL / Cluster	No unsupported lift
Core story	**Unit of account**	**Evidence rule**
Make the recovery visible	Every claim ties to an asset	Model vs measured is labeled

Positioning note

This template keeps URL Ledger channel-agnostic. AI Search, organic search, paid traffic, social, email, referral, direct, CRM attribution, and future AI-agent consumption are treated as discovery and value surfaces inside the same URL asset ledger.

Prepared for: internal use, pilot partners, and future public proof assets

ASSET PURPOSE

How to use this case study template

This document is built to turn audit work into reusable market proof. It gives the team one structure for private client readouts, anonymized public case studies, founder-led LinkedIn posts, investor proof points, and sales enablement snippets.

The template is designed around the URL Ledger thesis: every URL is an asset with identity, yield, durability, risk, history, governance requirements, and evidence. The case study should never read like a generic SEO win. It should read like a portfolio repricing story.

Output	Audience	Purpose	Proof standard
Public case study	Prospects, partners, market	Create external trust without over-disclosing client data	Only measured outcomes or clearly labeled modeled results
Private board memo	Client leadership, CFO, CMO, RevOps	Show value-at-risk, actions, recovery, and governance path	Full evidence pack, data sources, assumptions, confidence notes
Sales proof card	Outbound and discovery calls	Show the pain, offer, and outcome in one page	Concise, defensible numbers and clean before/after framing
Investor proof point	VCs, strategic partners	Show repeatability of the audit-to-ledger wedge	Repeatable process, not one-off heroics

Case study rule

Do not claim lift that was not measured. Separate baseline, modeled value-at-risk, implemented actions, observed movement, and expected follow-on value. The credibility of URL Ledger depends on evidence discipline.

TEMPLATE SECTION 1

Case study snapshot

Use this as the first page of a public or private case study. It should answer: what changed, what was at risk, what was fixed, and why the client now needs the ledger as an ongoing system of record.

Field	Working copy
Client / anonymized name	[ClientCo] or [Category-leading B2B SaaS company]
Industry / model	[B2B SaaS / ecommerce / marketplace / multi-location / publisher / services]
Portfolio size	[X] total URLs; [Y] indexable; [Z] priority clusters
Audit window	[45 days] from [date] to [date]
Primary trigger	[Core update volatility / traffic decay / conversion drift / migration risk / content waste / board pressure]
Value-at-risk	[$X] estimated annualized exposure across priority clusters
Proof sprint actions	[3-5] changes shipped or validated
Observed movement	[X%] improvement in [impressions / clicks / conversions / revenue proxy / crawl efficiency]
Next step	Install URL Ledger for always-on monitoring, governance, and quarterly portfolio repricing

Headline formula

[Client] was not losing value because it needed more content. It was losing value because existing URL assets were decaying, overlapping, misclassified, or invisible across key discovery and attribution surfaces.

TEMPLATE SECTION 2

Before state: what the client thought was happening vs what the ledger found

This section reframes the client pain from surface-level symptoms to structural portfolio causes.

What the client saw	What the ledger investigated	What the case study should prove
Traffic down after volatility	Which URLs, clusters, and channels lost visibility or eligibility?	The loss was not random; it had asset-level causes.
Conversions down despite stable sessions	Which landing pages, CTAs, proof assets, or journey mismatches created conversion decay?	Traffic alone was not the asset value. Yield changed.
Too much content, unclear ROI	Which URLs were waste, dilution, overlap, or protected assets?	The portfolio needed governance, not more output.
AI/search changes creating uncertainty	Which pages were citation-ready, machine-readable, or structurally invisible?	AI and agent surfaces were additional discovery layers, not the whole category.
Leadership asking for proof	Which actions could be tied to value-at-risk, recovery, and evidence?	The audit translated content decisions into capital allocation language.

Recommended wording

The client did not need another dashboard. They needed a ledger: a canonical asset record that showed which URLs were healthy, which were decaying, which were waste, which deserved protection, and which actions could recover value fastest.

TRIGGER EVENT OPTIONS

Pick the dominant trigger

Trigger	Use when	Suggested opening line
Core update repricing	Search volatility exposed fragility	A market shock repriced the portfolio faster than the team could diagnose it.
Revenue leakage	Revenue or pipeline declined from existing traffic	The website was still receiving traffic, but the yield of key URL assets had degraded.
Portfolio bloat	Large content library with unclear ROI	The client had more content than truth.
Migration or redesign risk	Technical changes created visibility or conversion risk	A site change created asset lineage problems that dashboards could not reconcile.
Agent/readiness pressure	Client is exploring AI agents or automation	The team needed an asset registry agents could query before acting.

TEMPLATE SECTION 3

Baseline evidence and value-at-risk

This page should make the financial case. Keep it simple: inventory, yield, risk, and recoverable value. Use confidence bands and label assumptions.

[X]	[Y]	[$Z]	[$A-$B]
URLs in scope	**Priority clusters**	**Estimated value-at-risk**	**90-day recovery case**
total crawled or imported	selected for repricing	annualized exposure	base / upside case

Metric	Baseline	Source	Notes / caveats
Total URLs crawled	[128,450]	Crawl / sitemap / CMS export	Deduplicate canonical and parameter variants.
Indexable URLs	[72,300]	Crawler + index rules	Exclude intentionally noindexed pages.
Priority revenue clusters	[8]	GA4 / CRM / payments / GSC	Clusters selected by exposure and actionability.
Annualized traffic value	[$X]	Traffic x RPM / lead value / revenue proxy	Use conservative and upside cases.
Modeled value-at-risk	[$Y]	Decay velocity x yield x risk score	Modeled unless proven by implementation.
Observed proof sprint movement	[X%]	GSC / GA4 / CRM / crawl evidence	Only cite after sufficient measurement window.

Evidence standard

Public case studies should use conservative ranges unless exact client approval is granted. Example: "$500K-$750K in annualized value-at-risk identified" is safer than unsupported precision.

TEMPLATE SECTION 4

The 13-variable diagnosis

Use this table to show that the audit is structural and portfolio-level, not a generic SEO review.

#	Variable	What it tested	Finding severity	Case study note
1	Content Health	Accuracy, usefulness, completeness, freshness, and relevance	[High / Medium / Low]	[1-2 sentence finding]
2	Content Decay	Performance deterioration, freshness risk, and asset half-life	[High / Medium / Low]	[1-2 sentence finding]
3	Content Dilution	Authority spread across low-value or unnecessary inventory	[High / Medium / Low]	[1-2 sentence finding]
4	Cannibalization	URLs competing against each other for the same intent	[High / Medium / Low]	[1-2 sentence finding]
5	Content Waste	Pages consuming crawl, budget, or attention without enough return	[High / Medium / Low]	[1-2 sentence finding]
6	Content Investment	Cost, effort, expertise, proof, and embedded asset value	[High / Medium / Low]	[1-2 sentence finding]
7	Content ROI	Pipeline, revenue, lead value, conversion, or assisted value	[High / Medium / Low]	[1-2 sentence finding]
8	Content Performance	Impressions, clicks, CTR, sessions, engagement, conversion behavior	[High / Medium / Low]	[1-2 sentence finding]
9	Intent / Journey Alignment	Fit to TOFU, MOFU, BOFU, branded, commercial, support, local	[High / Medium / Low]	[1-2 sentence finding]
10	Psychographic / Messaging Fit	Match to trust state, objections, emotional drivers, decision readiness	[High / Medium / Low]	[1-2 sentence finding]
11	Authority / Entity Strength	Brand, author, topical, proof, reference, and entity signals	[High / Medium / Low]	[1-2 sentence finding]
12	Technical / Indexation Structure	Crawlability, canonicals, redirects, render, schema, speed, index rules	[High / Medium / Low]	[1-2 sentence finding]
13	AI Citation / Agent Readiness	Extractability, citation clarity, machine readability, action safety	[High / Medium / Low]	[1-2 sentence finding]

TEMPLATE SECTION 5

Root cause walkthrough

Use one or two walkthroughs to make the audit tangible. Each walkthrough should include the observed pattern, why it mattered, the recommended fix, the expected impact, and the evidence used to validate the action.

Root cause element	Working copy
Observed pattern	[Example: high-value comparison pages were buried 4-5 clicks deep after navigation changes.]
Affected assets	[URL patterns, clusters, templates, or page types.]
Why it mattered	[The affected URLs had commercial intent and historical conversion contribution.]
Structural variable(s)	[Technical / Indexation Structure, Intent Alignment, Content Decay, Authority Strength.]
Fix spec	[Internal links, canonical rules, schema repair, consolidation, refreshed proof, CTA revision.]
Measurement plan	[GSC impressions/clicks, crawl depth, indexation status, GA4 landing-page conversions.]
Claim status	[Modeled / shipped / measured / pending validation.]

EXAMPLE WALKTHROUGH PROMPTS

Common walkthrough patterns

Pattern	What to show	Proof artifact
Internal link dilution	Before/after hub paths and authority flow to money pages	Crawl graph, link counts, priority URL list
Cannibalization	Cluster overlap and competing pages	Query overlap, rank split, merge map
Template regression	Titles, H1s, schema, or rendering drift from template changes	Before/after template diff, schema validator, crawl sample
Conversion decay	Traffic stable while outcomes fell	Landing page funnel, CTA/offer evidence, conversion trend
AI/agent readiness gap	Pages not extractable, citable, or action-safe	Structured evidence checklist, machine-readable fields, policy note

TEMPLATE SECTION 6

Proof sprint action log

The proof sprint is the heart of the case study. It shows URL Ledger does not stop at diagnosis. It produces a governed backlog and measures what happens after action.

Action	Asset / cluster	Variable addressed	Owner	Status	Expected signal	Measured result
1. Rewire internal links	[Cluster]	Technical / Authority / Journey	[SEO lead]	[Shipped]	[Crawl depth down, clicks up]	[Pending / X%]
2. Merge overlap pages	[Cluster]	Cannibalization / Waste	[Content lead]	[Approved]	[Rank consolidation]	[Pending / X%]
3. Refresh proof and claims	[URL]	Health / Authority / Messaging	[Editorial]	[Shipped]	[CTR, conversion assist]	[Pending / X%]
4. Repair schema/template	[Template]	Technical / Agent readiness	[Dev]	[Shipped]	[Eligibility restored]	[Pending / X%]
5. Protect strategic asset	[URL]	Governance / Investment	[RevOps]	[Policy installed]	[No unauthorized edits]	[Confirmed]

Proof sprint language

We did not try to rewrite the whole site. We selected a small number of high-value assets where structural risk, revenue exposure, and fix feasibility overlapped.

TEMPLATE SECTION 7

URL asset ledger excerpt

This table is the artifact that makes the case study feel different from a marketing story. It proves the platform sees each URL as an asset with state, risk, value, and recommended action.

URL / cluster	Role	Baseline value	Risk	Primary issue	Action	Governance note
/pricing-guide	BOFU trust asset	[$X annualized]	High	Freshness + proof decay	Refresh + protect	Owner approval required
/comparison/[competitor]	Commercial comparison	[$X annualized]	High	Orphaning + outdated claims	Rehub + refresh	Legal review required
/blog/[topic-hub]	TOFU/MOFU hub	[$X traffic value]	Medium	Cannibalization	Merge supporting pages	Redirect map required
/templates	Product-led asset	[$X assisted value]	Medium	Diluted internal links	Restore hub architecture	No-touch policy after update
/legacy/[page]	Low-fit legacy page	[$0-$X]	Low/High waste	Low strategic fit	Retire / redirect	Document reason code

Ledger excerpt rule

Do not publish full URLs for clients without approval. Use anonymized slugs, cluster names, or redacted patterns when needed.

TEMPLATE SECTION 8

Outcome measurement and claim hierarchy

A good case study protects credibility by separating what was identified, what was shipped, what moved, and what remains modeled.

Claim type	Allowed wording	Evidence required	Do not say
Identified risk	We identified [$X] in annualized value-at-risk.	Model, assumptions, risk formula, baseline data	We recovered [$X] unless action was measured.
Implemented action	The team shipped [X] approved recovery actions.	Ticket, change log, screenshot, crawl evidence	The action caused revenue lift without measurement.
Observed movement	Within [N] days, [metric] moved by [X%].	Before/after data, time window, caveat	Guaranteed permanent recovery.
Assisted value	The affected URLs contributed to [pipeline/revenue/lead value].	Attribution source, CRM/payment/source notes	Full credit unless attribution model supports it.
Governance impact	The client installed no-touch rules and review thresholds.	Policy record, approval matrix, change log	All future decay is prevented.

BEFORE / AFTER SCORECARD

Outcome table

Metric	Before	After	Delta	Status
Priority cluster impressions	[X]	[Y]	[+/- Z%]	[Measured]
Priority cluster clicks	[X]	[Y]	[+/- Z%]	[Measured]
Landing-page conversions	[X]	[Y]	[+/- Z%]	[Measured / pending]
Indexable duplicate count	[X]	[Y]	[-Z%]	[Measured]
Average crawl depth for money URLs	[X]	[Y]	[-Z clicks]	[Measured]
Protected strategic assets	[0]	[X]	[Policy installed]	[Confirmed]

TEMPLATE SECTION 9

Narrative versions to generate from one case study

One audit should produce multiple proof assets. Use the same evidence pack but change the framing by audience.

Version	Angle	Opening line
CFO version	Recovered value, risk, durability, payback	The issue was not content volume. It was unmeasured asset impairment across high-value URLs.
CMO version	Pipeline, visibility, content governance, trust	The team had enough content. It lacked a system to know which pages still deserved investment.
SEO/Growth version	Technical causes, clusters, discovery surfaces	The drop was not a mystery. It was a cluster-level decay pattern hiding inside the URL graph.
AI/Agent version	Machine-readable truth, policy, agent-safe actions	Before agents can act on a site, they need a ledger they can trust.
Investor version	Repeatable wedge, system of record, benchmark moat	The audit is the wedge; the ledger is the compounding asset.

Master story arc

Before: unmanaged URL portfolio. Diagnosis: 13-variable asset audit. Action: proof sprint. Result: measured movement and repriced assets. Expansion: always-on URL Ledger as system of record.

Public case study copy template

Headline: [Client category] uncovered [$X] in URL portfolio value-at-risk and installed a governed recovery backlog in 45 days.

Subhead: URL Ledger helped the team move from fragmented dashboards to a URL-level asset record that showed which pages were decaying, which were waste, which deserved protection, and which fixes had the fastest path to proof.

Situation: [Client] had a mature website with [X] URLs across [Y] priority clusters. Performance volatility, content bloat, and unclear ownership made it difficult to know which pages were still creating value.

Problem: The team did not have a single asset-level view of URL identity, performance history, risk, conversion contribution, technical state, and governance requirements.

What URL Ledger did: URL Ledger normalized the URL inventory, scored assets across 13 structural variables, mapped value-at-risk, selected priority clusters, and created a proof sprint backlog.

Actions: The team prioritized [internal linking / canonical cleanup / consolidation / content refresh / schema repair / conversion updates / protected asset policies].

Results: Within [measurement window], the client observed [measured movement]. The audit also identified [$X] in modeled annualized value-at-risk and [Y] protected strategic assets.

Expansion: The client moved from one-time audit to ongoing URL Ledger governance, with recurring portfolio reviews, protected asset rules, and an evidence-backed action log.

TEMPLATE SECTION 11

One-page sales proof card

Use this as a fast sales insert or follow-up after discovery.

Section	Copy
Problem	[Client category] had a large URL portfolio but no reliable way to know which assets were healthy, decaying, duplicative, invisible, or overvalued.
Audit	URL Ledger ingested [sitemap/crawl/GSC/GA4/CRM], normalized the URL inventory, scored the portfolio across 13 variables, and ranked recovery actions by value-at-risk.
Finding	[X%] of priority assets showed meaningful decay, overlap, waste, or governance risk. [Y] strategic assets needed protection.
Action	A proof sprint focused on [3-5 actions] across [priority clusters].
Outcome	[Observed result] plus [modeled value-at-risk] and a governed backlog for the next 90 days.
Why it matters	The client did not need more content first. It needed a system of record for the content assets it already owned.

CTA

Want to see which URLs are compounding value, leaking value, or creating waste? Start with a 45-Day URL Portfolio Repricing Audit.

TEMPLATE SECTION 12

Interview guide for case study approval

Use these questions to capture client voice after the audit and proof sprint.

Question	Target answer
What problem were you trying to solve before URL Ledger?	Pain in the client language, not our jargon.
What made the existing dashboards insufficient?	Fragmentation, lack of actionability, no asset-level truth.
What surprised you most in the audit?	A decay, waste, or governance finding they did not expect.
Which recommended action felt most valuable?	Specific action tied to a cluster or URL class.
How did the audit change internal conversations?	Finance, marketing, SEO, content, RevOps alignment.
What changed after the proof sprint?	Measured movement, clarity, confidence, or operating cadence.
Why does this need to become ongoing?	Portfolio keeps changing; one-time report is not enough.

QUOTE BANK

Reusable quote placeholders

Theme	Quote draft
Portfolio truth	"For the first time, we could see our website as an asset base instead of a pile of pages."
Finance alignment	"The audit gave us a way to discuss content in terms of risk, yield, and recovery - not just traffic."
Actionability	"The value was not just what URL Ledger found. It was knowing what to fix first and what not to touch."
Governance	"We needed guardrails before scaling more automation across the site."

TEMPLATE SECTION 13

Evidence pack checklist

Every case study should be backed by an internal evidence folder. This protects credibility and makes future benchmark intelligence stronger.

Evidence item	Required?	Location / owner	Notes
Final URL inventory / crawl export	Yes	[folder/link]	Versioned with date and crawl settings.
GSC baseline export	Yes	[folder/link]	Page/query data for agreed window.
GA4 landing-page export	Yes	[folder/link]	Sessions and conversions by page.
CRM/payment source or value proxy	If claiming revenue	[folder/link]	Document attribution model.
Scoring workbook or system export	Yes	[folder/link]	13-variable scores and confidence notes.
Proof sprint tickets/change log	Yes	[folder/link]	Who changed what and when.
Before/after screenshots or exports	Recommended	[folder/link]	Helpful for visual proof.
Client approval for public claims	Yes if publishing	[folder/link]	Record approved language.
Caveats and exclusions	Yes	[folder/link]	Protect against overclaiming.

Benchmark contribution

After redaction and consent, each case study should add normalized learning to the benchmark layer: decay patterns, action types, time-to-lift, recovery confidence, governance requirements, and recurring review triggers.

TEMPLATE SECTION 14

Claim standards and redaction rules

Rule	Use this standard
Client identity	Use named client only with written approval. Otherwise use anonymized category descriptor.
Revenue numbers	Use ranges or indexes unless exact numbers are approved.
Causality	Use "associated with," "observed after," or "contributed to" unless causal proof is strong.
Modeled vs measured	Label modeled value-at-risk separately from observed performance movement.
Time window	Always state the measurement window. Short windows should be caveated.
External shocks	Note core updates, launches, seasonality, migrations, paid campaigns, or product changes that could affect results.
AI Search claims	Do not overstate AI-specific causality unless AI citation, answer visibility, or agent-readiness data was actually collected.
Confidential URLs	Redact slugs, query data, and revenue values when needed.

Credibility position

URL Ledger should win trust by being more conservative than a typical marketing case study. The platform is positioned as an evidence layer. The proof assets must behave like evidence.

REUSABLE CLOSING

Case study close and expansion path

Close every case study by showing that the audit is the wedge and the ledger is the long-term operating system.

Phase	What happened	What it proved
Audit	Inventory normalized, URLs scored, value-at-risk mapped	The client had hidden asset impairment and no canonical record.
Proof sprint	3-5 high-confidence actions shipped or validated	The backlog could move measurable indicators.
Ledger install	Ownership, policies, ratings, evidence, and review cadence configured	The site moved from one-time analysis to ongoing governance.
Expansion	More domains, channels, benchmarks, and agent-ingress policies added	URL Ledger became the system of record for website asset value.

Final case study line

The audit showed what was leaking. The proof sprint showed what could move. The ledger made the asset base governable.

URL Ledger - Every URL is an asset. The ledger tells you what it is worth, what risk it carries, and what should happen next.