

EBOOK / PRACTICAL RESOURCE

# Conversion copy and messaging: the B2B website workbook

Develop messages from evidence and help people make informed website decisions.



CONTENT MARKETING

## HOW TO USE THIS RESOURCE

# Conversion copy and messaging: the B2B website workbook

B2B SaaS marketing, product marketing, UX and website owners

## Your practical outputs

- A prioritized messaging hierarchy
- A claim and proof register
- A reviewed page and CTA structure
- A test plan with diagnostics and ownership

## Read, choose, apply

Start with the overview and decision rules. Choose a concrete constraint in your business. Work through the relevant templates using your own evidence, record open assumptions and agree a review with the accountable people. The complete online edition provides linked sources and contextual navigation.

## Editorial context

Explicitly fictional cases and example figures are working aids, not client results or universal benchmarks. Frameworks structure decisions; they are not scientifically validated scores. Platform capabilities may change. Sources and review context are disclosed.

Read online: [Conversion copy and messaging: the B2B website workbook](#)

## CONTENTS

|                                                      |    |
|------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1. Define the decision the page supports             | 4  |
| 2. Collect customer language without copying motives | 5  |
| 3. Use the PROOF message record                      | 6  |
| 4. Build a message hierarchy                         | 7  |
| 5. Interview for alternatives and trade-offs         | 8  |
| 6. Write the hero as a compact decision aid          | 9  |
| 7. Place proof where the claim occurs                | 10 |
| 8. Make the page and forms understandable            | 11 |
| 9. Connect pages through reader questions            | 12 |
| 10. Measure completed actions and fit                | 13 |
| 11. Choose the right test for the uncertainty        | 15 |
| 12. Hand over messaging as a maintained system       | 16 |
| 13. Work through a fictional website rewrite         | 17 |
| 14. Review, correct and retire messaging             | 18 |
| Turn this resource into a team brief                 | 20 |
| Sources & further documentation                      | 21 |

This workbook is designed for practical team use. Its named models are original editorial aids, not scientifically validated scoring systems. Complete the working fields with actual material and replace blanks with inspectable records. Editorial evidence supports a statement within a defined scope. A hypothesis describes an expectation that still needs testing. A measured result identifies an observation, period, definition and limitations. Keep these categories separate throughout the workflow. Fictional examples illustrate decisions and capacity planning; they do not claim customer outcomes. Linked primary sources were checked on 24 October 2026.

## 1. Define the decision the page supports

Conversion copy helps the right visitor decide whether an appropriate next step is worthwhile. It cannot repair an unsuitable product or create evidence the company does not possess. Start with the page's job: understanding the offer, assessing fit, comparing an approach or requesting a conversation. Define the visitor situation, alternatives and necessary information. A homepage may route several situations, while a focused solution page may answer one. Avoid assigning every page every job. A clear conversion goal must also be a reasonable reader goal, otherwise the page becomes a series of demands without adequate help.

### Team fieldwork

Use a page decision brief before opening a design file. State the visitor's starting knowledge, the choice they face and the information this page can reasonably provide. For a technical evaluator, the next step may be reading integration requirements; for an operational sponsor, it may be seeing how ownership works. Do not force both into an identical request. List the questions that belong on another page and define the transition to them. Ask the page owner to explain how the visitor benefits from the intended action even if they never become a customer. This keeps the conversion goal grounded in a useful task rather than a dashboard target.

## Copyable decision worksheet

| Working field | Specific entry                                                                                | Ownership                 | Status                                   |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Next work     | Write a page contract: visitor situation, decision, evidence needed and reasonable next step. | [Name the owner]          | [open / complete]                        |
| Decision rule | Stop drafting if the intended action asks for more commitment than the page can justify.      | [Name the decision maker] | [proceed / stop]                         |
| Evidence      | [Add source location, version and permitted use]                                              | [Verify the source]       | [observation / hypothesis / measurement] |
| Handover      | [Add working file, unresolved question and next date]                                         | [Recipient and backup]    | [accepted / blocked]                     |

## 2. Collect customer language without copying motives

Gather appropriate research notes, support questions, sales objections and usability observations. Preserve the situation and source for each phrase. Customer language is evidence of how a particular person described a problem, not automatic permission to publish a quote or proof that the market shares the problem. Separate observed wording, editorial interpretation and messaging hypotheses. Look for tasks, alternatives, constraints and consequences rather than a collection of emotional adjectives. Include non-buyers and poor-fit cases where accessible. Their language can reveal boundaries that positive customer stories obscure. Do not infer a buyer's private motivation from a job title alone.

### Team fieldwork

Annotate each language sample with the speaker's role, situation, date and collection method. Keep quotations and paraphrases visually distinct in the working file. A phrase from a frustrated support conversation may describe a failure condition rather than the normal purchase trigger. A phrase from a successful customer may reflect knowledge acquired after onboarding. Preserve these differences instead of mixing them into a single voice-of-customer list. Group samples by decision question and identify missing perspectives. When publishing an attributed quote, check permission separately. Use unapproved source language to understand the problem only within the appropriate research context, not as ready-to-publish testimonial material.

## Copyable decision worksheet

| Working field | Specific entry                                                                                        | Ownership                 | Status            |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Next work     | Build a language bank with original wording, situation, source and interpretation in separate fields. | [Name the owner]          | [open / complete] |
| Decision rule | Do not present an internal interpretation as a verbatim customer statement.                           | [Name the decision maker] | [proceed / stop]  |

## 3. Use the PROOF message record

The original PROOF record connects Problem, Relevant capability, Observable evidence, Operating conditions and Fit boundary. A message is complete when the reader can understand both why the capability matters and when it may not help. Observable evidence can be a reproducible product demonstration, documented process or approved case record, depending on the claim. An outcome claim needs outcome evidence; a screenshot is not enough. This record is a planning aid rather than a scoring model. It helps the team replace unsupported superlatives with specific, testable statements while preserving necessary nuance about implementation dependencies and limitations.

### Team fieldwork

Inspect each PROOF record with a skeptical reviewer. If the problem is repeated handoffs, identify the capability that changes the handoff rather than claiming general efficiency. Show what can actually be observed: an owner field, an escalation rule or a review log. Write the conditions required for it to work, such as configured roles or imported data. Then name a poor-fit condition. These details may not all belong in the hero, but they must guide the hero's scope. If proof is missing, put a research task in the backlog and use a narrower accurate statement. Never fill the proof column with the proposed claim itself.

## PROOF example record

| Field                | Fictional entry                           | Boundary                                  |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| Problem              | Invoice exceptions lack an assigned owner | Not every invoice process has this issue  |
| Relevant capability  | Route exceptions to configured roles      | Requires configured roles                 |
| Observable evidence  | Reproducible product walkthrough          | Does not prove cost reduction             |
| Operating conditions | Data and ownership model available        | Implementation work remains               |
| Fit boundary         | Teams needing visible exception handoffs  | Not a promise to remove every manual task |

## Copyable decision worksheet

| Working field | Specific entry                                                                    | Ownership                 | Status            |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Next work     | Complete PROOF for the three most prominent proposed website claims.              | [Name the owner]          | [open / complete] |
| Decision rule | Remove or qualify a claim when its proof type does not match its promised result. | [Name the decision maker] | [proceed / stop]  |

## 4. Build a message hierarchy

Order messages by what the visitor needs to understand next. Start with what the product helps a relevant team do, then explain the meaningful mechanism, proof and fit conditions. Distinguish the category explanation from a reason to prefer your approach. A differentiator must matter to a decision and be supportable; being unusual is insufficient. Compare the strongest credible alternative, including keeping an existing process. Do not invent a weak competitor to make the page persuasive. Keep a primary message and a limited set of supporting arguments so each section has a distinct job rather than repeating the headline in different words.

## Team fieldwork

Build a message map with one primary proposition and distinct supporting arguments. For each supporting argument, record the reader question it answers and its evidence. Test whether removing the argument would leave a real information gap. If not, it may be repetition. Compare the page with the strongest existing alternative, including doing nothing for now. Explain the trade-off fairly and avoid implying that every manual step is inherently wasteful. Some teams may prefer a manual review because the volume is small or the risk needs human judgment. A fit boundary can improve clarity without weakening the legitimate case for the product in the right situation.

## Copyable decision worksheet

| Working field | Specific entry                                                                      | Ownership                 | Status            |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Next work     | Rank five messages by reader decision need and assign each a distinct page section. | [Name the owner]          | [open / complete] |
| Decision rule | Rework a hierarchy in which every section asserts the same broad benefit.           | [Name the decision maker] | [proceed / stop]  |

# 5. Interview for alternatives and trade-offs

Ask a buyer or practitioner to reconstruct the last relevant decision. What triggered it, what options were considered, what evidence mattered and what remained unresolved? Ask what would have made the product a poor fit. This yields more useful material than asking which marketing headline they prefer. Avoid turning a research interview into a sales demonstration. If showing concepts, reveal alternatives in a consistent manner and ask participants to explain their interpretation before giving guidance. Keep observed confusion separate from a preference for different language. A phrase can be appealing and still communicate the wrong capability.

## Team fieldwork

Run concept research in a way that reveals interpretation before preference. Show a concept and ask what the person believes the product does, who would use it and what would happen after clicking. Ask them to point to the wording that created that belief. Only then ask whether it seems relevant to their situation. A preference rating without interpretation can reward appealing ambiguity. Use consistent context across concepts and record the order shown. Do not coach participants toward the intended answer while treating their later explanation as independent understanding. Keep research notes detailed enough that the next editor can distinguish a genuine insight from the interviewer's leading prompt.

## Copyable decision worksheet

| Working field | Specific entry                                                                            | Ownership                 | Status            |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Next work     | Collect three decision reconstructions and at least one explicit poor-fit condition.      | [Name the owner]          | [open / complete] |
| Decision rule | Discard a favored phrase when readers consistently expect a capability the product lacks. | [Name the decision maker] | [proceed / stop]  |

## 6. Write the hero as a compact decision aid

The hero needs enough specificity to orient a suitable visitor without compressing the entire product into one sentence. Name the task or outcome category, identify who it serves when needed and explain the mechanism or relevant constraint. The supporting line can carry nuance the headline cannot. Use a CTA label that describes the next action and nearby copy that explains what follows. Avoid claims such as effortless transformation unless the actual experience supports them. A product image should demonstrate something relevant, with a textual explanation. Treat the hero as a testable hypothesis about comprehension, not an isolated slogan competition.

### Team fieldwork

Create a hero comparison sheet with headline, supporting explanation, proof cue and CTA expectation. Check the factual promise in each row before discussing style. If one version says review exceptions and another says eliminate exceptions, they are different product claims, not merely creative options. Reject the unsupported version before preference testing. Ask readers to explain the offer using their own words. Do not count a verbatim repetition of the headline as comprehension. Test whether they can name a plausible use and one limitation. Choose a version based on accurate understanding and relevance, then refine rhythm and voice within that supported boundary rather than returning to an exaggerated slogan.

## Hero interpretation test

| Question                     | Useful response                          | Warning sign                                  |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| What is offered?             | Concrete task and capability             | Only repeats a slogan                         |
| Who would use it?            | Relevant role and situation              | Assumes universal fit                         |
| What happens after clicking? | Actual next-step format                  | Expects an unavailable trial                  |
| What remains uncertain?      | Names an appropriate evaluation question | Believes an unsupported outcome is guaranteed |

## Copyable decision worksheet

| Working field | Specific entry                                                                             | Ownership                 | Status            |
|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Next work     | Draft three heroes with task, mechanism, fit condition and explicit next-step expectation. | [Name the owner]          | [open / complete] |
| Decision rule | Pause selection when variants differ in factual promise rather than merely framing.        | [Name the decision maker] | [proceed / stop]  |

## 7. Place proof where the claim occurs

Proof should answer the specific doubt created by a claim. A security certification, if applicable and current, does not prove easy adoption. A testimonial about service does not prove quantified cost reduction. Match each evidence element to its supported statement and show relevant scope. Include the period and conditions for measured outcomes where available. If confidential evidence cannot be published, narrow the public claim or describe the verification route honestly. Do not invent anonymized customer results. Review customer logos and quotations for permission and contextual accuracy. An attractive proof bar can mislead when it implies relationships or results that the underlying material does not establish.

## Team fieldwork

Make a proof-placement map linking each prominent statement to the evidence a reader can inspect. A demonstration can show a capability; an approved case can describe a bounded experience; a documented measurement can support a particular outcome under stated conditions. Do not let visual proximity imply that one supports another. For a testimonial, preserve the actual meaning and identify what the speaker experienced. For a numeric claim, record period, population, denominator and calculation where available. If these details cannot be recovered, remove the number or use a narrower qualitative statement. Proof should reduce a specific uncertainty, not serve as decorative reassurance around an otherwise unsupported promise.

## Copyable decision worksheet

| Working field | Specific entry                                                                                      | Ownership                 | Status            |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Next work     | Match every proof element to one claim and record what the proof does not establish.                | [Name the owner]          | [open / complete] |
| Decision rule | Hold publication if a prominent number lacks a recoverable source, denominator or relevant context. | [Name the decision maker] | [proceed / stop]  |

## 8. Make the page and forms understandable

Copy continues into navigation, forms, errors and confirmation states. Use descriptive headings, explain necessary terms and ensure links make sense in context. W3C WAI guidance covers [accessible writing](#), [page structure](#), labels and [form instructions](#). A placeholder should not be the only way to understand a field. Explain required information and what happens after submission. Use errors that identify the problem and how to fix it without blaming the visitor. Essential qualifications should remain readable near the claim, not disappear into inaccessible fine print. Content review must include the implemented interface, because correct source copy can be lost during design or development.

## Team fieldwork

Walk the implemented page as a task rather than reading the copy document alone. Navigate headings, follow links, complete required fields incorrectly once and then correct them. Check that error messages name the relevant field and give a usable repair. Confirm that labels remain visible and the confirmation explains the actual next step. Inspect whether design moved a necessary qualification away from its claim or hid it on a narrow screen. Content and interface owners should repair these issues together. A writer cannot establish accessibility by reviewing words in isolation, and a designer cannot preserve meaning by treating all supporting text as optional visual density.

## Copyable decision worksheet

| Working field | Specific entry                                                                               | Ownership                 | Status            |
|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Next work     | Test headings, labels, required-field instructions, error messages and confirmation content. | [Name the owner]          | [open / complete] |
| Decision rule | Block launch if a user cannot complete the intended task with understandable instructions.   | [Name the decision maker] | [proceed / stop]  |

## 9. Connect pages through reader questions

Build transitions around the next unresolved question. A solution page may lead to implementation details, a comparison may lead to a fit checklist and a security page may lead to documented review material. Do not add a demo CTA after every section merely to create more clickable objects. A secondary action can support a lower-commitment task when it is useful and clearly different. Keep the authoritative explanation findable and avoid contradictory capability language across pages. Distribution excerpts and sales snippets should use the same approved claim boundaries. A coherent website helps readers compare information without having to reconcile internal naming conventions themselves.

## Team fieldwork

Create a question-to-page map for one real evaluation path. Note what is answered on each page and what remains unresolved. Replace generic links such as learn more with a clear destination description where possible. Keep CTA labels consistent when they lead to the same action, and distinguish genuinely different actions. Check whether a visitor can move from a broad explanation to technical detail without losing the context of the original question. Review repeated capability statements across the path for conflicts. If a phrase has several meanings inside the organization, settle the public definition before allowing each page owner to improvise. Coherence is part of the useful content, not just a brand preference.

## Copyable decision worksheet

| Working field | Specific entry                                                                                   | Ownership                 | Status            |
|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Next work     | Map a path from one reader question to the next, noting the appropriate commitment at each step. | [Name the owner]          | [open / complete] |
| Decision rule | Merge or clarify pages that give conflicting answers about the same capability.                  | [Name the decision maker] | [proceed / stop]  |

# 10. Measure completed actions and fit

Define success with an action dictionary. A click, submitted request, accepted meeting and qualified opportunity are different events with different owners. [Google Analytics key events](#) designate important actions in the measurement system; they do not validate lead quality. Check that a form completion reflects successful submission rather than only a click or reload. Report appropriate counts and denominators, plus known collection gaps. Pair quantitative behavior with comprehension tests and conversation feedback. A higher request rate can coexist with poorer fit if the copy attracts the wrong expectation. Avoid optimizing a top-line conversion rate without checking what happened after the action.

## Team fieldwork

Agree on an action dictionary with analytics and sales operations. Define which system records successful submission, which records an accepted meeting and which records qualification. Document deduplication and time windows so a resubmitted form is not silently treated as another person. Test the recording path and compare it with the visible confirmation. In the report, show request volume alongside fit observations rather than combining them into a single success score. Add a note when collection is incomplete. A website experiment can change who responds as well as how many respond, so review examples of actual expectations created by the copy before celebrating a higher rate.

## Action dictionary

| Observation           | System owner              | Interpretation limit                               |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| CTA click             | Web analytics             | Interest in a link, not completed request          |
| Successful request    | Form or application owner | Submission, not qualification                      |
| Accepted meeting      | Sales operations          | A scheduled conversation, not an opportunity       |
| Qualified opportunity | CRM process owner         | Depends on the documented qualification definition |

## Copyable decision worksheet

| Working field | Specific entry                                                                              | Ownership                 | Status            |
|---------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Next work     | Define click, successful request and fit review separately, with an owner and data source.  | [Name the owner]          | [open / complete] |
| Decision rule | Do not call a lift successful when fit or fulfillment deteriorates beyond the agreed limit. | [Name the decision maker] | [proceed / stop]  |

## 11. Choose the right test for the uncertainty

A comprehension uncertainty needs a comprehension test. A missing proof uncertainty needs research. A technical failure needs repair. An A/B test is useful only when the comparison, allocation, outcome and sample support the intended inference. Do not announce a winning message from a handful of requests or repeated peeking at noisy results. For low-traffic B2B pages, structured reader sessions and careful before-and-after diagnostics may answer more immediate questions, while still lacking causal certainty. Predefine the decision you will make under each plausible result. If neither result changes a decision, the test is not yet worth running.

### Team fieldwork

Write a test charter containing uncertainty, comparison, method, outcome and decision rule. If readers do not understand the category, start with a comprehension session. If they doubt a claim, find or improve evidence. If a form fails, repair it before testing persuasion. For a quantitative comparison, ask an analyst whether the available traffic and outcome frequency can support the desired inference. Predefine how the test will end and what invalidates it. Avoid changing the hypothesis after seeing a favorable segment. When the result is inconclusive, preserve that conclusion. A small B2B team can still make a practical decision using multiple imperfect evidence sources, provided it labels the uncertainty honestly.

### Uncertainty-to-method decision table

| Uncertainty            | Appropriate first method                         | What it cannot establish                   |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| Offer misunderstood    | Structured comprehension session                 | Population-wide conversion lift            |
| Claim doubted          | Source verification and proof review             | Preference for a wording variant           |
| Form incomplete        | Task test and technical inspection               | Weak buyer motivation                      |
| Two supported framings | A planned comparison suitable for available data | Causation from an uncontrolled tiny sample |

## Copyable decision worksheet

| Working field | Specific entry                                                                                         | Ownership                 | Status            |
|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Next work     | Write uncertainty, method, outcome definition, stopping rule and decision before collecting results.   | [Name the owner]          | [open / complete] |
| Decision rule | Stop interpreting the test if tracking or allocation fails; repair and restart the defined comparison. | [Name the decision maker] | [proceed / stop]  |

## 12. Hand over messaging as a maintained system

Maintain an approved message library with claim IDs, evidence, fit boundaries, page locations and review owners. Distinguish voice guidance from factual promises so writers know what they can change freely. Product marketing owns positioning decisions, product experts verify capabilities, UX owns task clarity and the web owner coordinates implementation. Assign a decision maker for disputes rather than expecting consensus to appear. Give sales and distribution teams current excerpts and retire old ones. A change to pricing, availability or onboarding can require coordinated updates across the site. Test one such change during handover to reveal hidden dependencies before the original author leaves.

### Team fieldwork

Prepare a change-control note for every high-impact message. Include the fact owner, evidence source, live locations, derivative users and conditions that trigger re-review. A change in implementation requirements may affect a landing page, sales deck and onboarding email simultaneously. Ask the backup to update one controlled example and verify every location. Keep voice principles separate from approved factual claims so routine editing does not require unnecessary escalation. Conversely, a small wording change that expands scope must return to fact review. The handover should let a new owner make safe routine changes while recognizing the few decisions that need specialist input, rather than freezing the entire site behind a vague approval rule.

## Copyable decision worksheet

| Working field | Specific entry                                                                            | Ownership                 | Status            |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Next work     | Trace one capability change through page copy, proof, CTA expectation and sales excerpts. | [Name the owner]          | [open / complete] |
| Decision rule | Freeze outdated claims if the owning expert cannot confirm the current product condition. | [Name the decision maker] | [proceed / stop]  |

## 13. Work through a fictional website rewrite

FICTIONAL B2B SaaS EXAMPLE: Ledgerpath helps finance teams review invoice exceptions. All numbers are assumptions for planning; there are no invented client results. Assume six research sessions, two page concepts and thirty-two available team hours. Replace an unsupported hero promising to eliminate all manual work with a bounded capability statement: route invoice exceptions to named owners with a visible review history. Verify that capability in the product before using it. The CTA offers a workflow walkthrough and explains its format. Evaluate whether participants can describe the task, limitation and next step. No conversion lift, time saving or revenue outcome is assumed.

### Team fieldwork

For the fictional Ledgerpath rewrite, assign explicit hours to research, evidence checks, writing, implementation and task testing. The thirty-two-hour envelope is a planning constraint, not an estimate that applies to every SaaS team. If participants reveal a major misunderstanding, reduce the number of pages instead of skipping the second comprehension pass. Verify the owner-routing and history capabilities directly before using the proposed headline. Test the walkthrough request so its actual format matches the CTA explanation. Record the six sessions as qualitative input, not a conversion experiment. The pilot's first output is a better-supported message and a usable page; any commercial result requires separate observation and cannot be assumed.

## Copyable decision worksheet

| Working field | Specific entry                                                                                        | Ownership                 | Status            |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Next work     | Allocate research, verification, writing, implementation and task testing inside the available hours. | [Name the owner]          | [open / complete] |
| Decision rule | Cut page scope before cutting the verification of the central product promise.                        | [Name the decision maker] | [proceed / stop]  |

## 14. Review, correct and retire messaging

Schedule reviews based on how quickly the underlying facts change. A stable task explanation may remain useful while an integration claim needs immediate correction after a product change. Preserve a record of meaningful revisions and coordinate derivatives. [Google's helpful-content guidance](#) is relevant to reader usefulness; it is not a promise that a rewritten page will rank or convert better. Keep a correction path and allow the page to state fit limits clearly. Retire messages that cannot be supported rather than replacing proof with more confident adjectives. The workbook is complete when every important promise has an owner, evidence and a realistic path to correction.

### Team fieldwork

Run a claim retirement review alongside normal site maintenance. For each important promise, ask whether the underlying capability, evidence and fit conditions remain current. Keep accurate evergreen explanations without refreshing dates cosmetically. If a claim is unsupported, remove or narrow it before commissioning a prettier layout. Check derivative excerpts and sales material when wording changes materially. Invite factual correction through a clear route and assign the response to an owner. Record why a message was retired so future teams do not reintroduce it because it sounds compelling. A maintained website can contain fewer promises and still offer stronger decision support because the remaining promises are easier to verify and fulfill.

## Copyable decision worksheet

| Working field | Specific entry                                                                                | Ownership                 | Status            |
|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Next work     | Review every major promise as current, needs evidence, narrowed or retired, with a next date. | [Name the owner]          | [open / complete] |
| Decision rule | Archive a promise when no owner can establish its current scope or supporting evidence.       | [Name the decision maker] | [proceed / stop]  |

## Primary sources and application limits

- [Google: Creating helpful, reliable, people-first content](#) — checked 24 October 2026.
- [Google: Guidance on generative AI content](#) — checked 24 October 2026.
- [Google: Publication dates](#) — checked 24 October 2026.
- [W3C WAI: Writing for web accessibility](#) — checked 24 October 2026.
- [W3C WAI: Page structure](#) — checked 24 October 2026.
- [Google Analytics: Campaign URL parameters](#) — checked 24 October 2026.
- [Google Analytics: About key events](#) — checked 24 October 2026.
- [W3C WAI: Form instructions](#) — checked 24 October 2026.

## YOUR TRANSFER CANVAS

## Turn this resource into a team brief

Use this page for a joint review. Agree one practical output, observable evidence and an accountable owner. Add the specific methods and templates from the relevant chapters.

| Working field               | Your agreement                    |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Priority output             | A prioritized messaging hierarchy |
| Your starting point         | Finding / source / date: _____    |
| Smallest useful test        | _____<br>_____                    |
| Evidence & counter-evidence | _____<br>_____                    |
| Ownership & review          | Owner / reviewer / date: _____    |
| Stop or change when ...     | _____<br>_____                    |
| Decision & next action      | _____<br>_____                    |

Keep unresolved assumptions explicitly open. A completed worksheet is not a substitute for evidence or accountable judgement.

## Sources & further documentation

Primary sources checked 24 October 2026. Sources support the linked technical or factual statements; the working models and fictional cases are original editorial decision aids. Recheck changing platform details before implementation.

1. [Google: Creating helpful, reliable, people-first content](#)
2. [Google: Guidance on generative AI content](#)
3. [Google: Publication dates](#)
4. [W3C WAI: Writing for web accessibility](#)
5. [W3C WAI: Page structure](#)
6. [Google Analytics: Campaign URL parameters](#)
7. [Google Analytics: About key events](#)
8. [W3C WAI: Form instructions](#)

### Next step

If you want help adapting the working plan to your product, evidence and team capacity, request a non-binding strategy conversation.

[patrickwings.com](https://patrickwings.com)