

# Agency Revenue Radar

Evidencing - the 17% Revenue Opportunity

# Contents

- 1. Executive summary ..... 4
- 2. Purpose and scope ..... 5
  - What this paper lets you decide ..... 5
- 3. Why this matters now ..... 6
- 4. The commercial problem: post-launch silence ..... 7
- 5. The market technology context: others already monetise the gap ..... 8
- 6. How the 17% is calculated..... 9
- 7. The basis of the per-website figure..... 10
- 8. Existing-client revenue is the highest-probability revenue..... 11
  - The compound effect..... 11
  - Ongoing value delivery ..... 11
  - A recovered client: \$40,000 and a \$765,000 lifetime value..... 12
  - The investment-protection argument..... 12
- 9. The behavioural science of ongoing value ..... 13
- 10. The true cost of going quiet ..... 14
  - Why relationships go silent, and what it costs ..... 14
- 11. A separate matter: competitive displacement..... 15
- 12. A capability matched to routine commercial use ..... 16
  - Monthly cadence value beyond the 17%..... 16
- 13. From value and risk to AI readiness ..... 17
- 14. Conclusion ..... 18
- 15. Evidence summary ..... 19
- 16. References and sources..... 20

# The 17% Revenue Opportunity

*The revenue available from existing clients (present, lapsed) how it is calculated, and why it holds.*

## PURPOSE

This paper sets out the calculation, the market evidence, and the commercial mechanism behind the 17% revenue opportunity that Agency Revenue Radar puts within reach.

It highlights how post-launch silence creates measurable revenue leakage, why agencies are already prioritising growth from existing clients, and how evidence-led oversight turns a client issue into a relevant, agency-owned conversation.

It is written to be read on its own, by the person who quite rightly, wants the evidence: founders, managing and commercial directors, business development leads, and the account teams who carry the client relationship. It is a basis for a decision, this is not to be considered a sales deck or a product brochure.

## 1. Executive summary

The 17% is a calculated revenue opportunity, set against an agency's own revenue base.

For a model agency holding \$3,375,000 (£2,500,000) of revenue across 10 retained clients and 31 websites, it equals \$573,841 (£425,068) of addressable work across a year, reconciled from the top down against revenue and from the bottom up against the work each website needs.

The figure rests on recorded demand: 15 years of work estimates received by Sitemorse, part of the group behind the platform, and a review of 247 Kentico reference clients conducted between Oct. - Dec. 2025.

Existing-client revenue is the highest-probability revenue an agency holds. Independent research records a 60 to 70% probability of selling to an existing client, against 5 to 20% for a new prospect, and a 5% improvement in retention raising profit by between 25 and 95%. Most agencies leave this revenue uncaptured: of 104 agencies, 76% had no defined process for engaging clients after launch.

The work still needs doing, and the budget for it moves to third-party diagnostic vendors whose combined revenue inside agency client accounts is \$213m (£158m).

The recurring report carries value of its own. Clients pay an average of \$591 (£438) a month for the diagnostic tools they use now, revenue that leaves the agency today. Held and resold, the licence adds 4.5% to net bottom line. The monthly report gives the agency a justified reason to make contact and to be first in line for new work.

### **A separate risk sits alongside the opportunity.**

An agency with no capability of its own introduces a competitor's, and one documented displacement records a loss of \$400,000 (£296,296) and growing. AI readiness is the capability that places the revenue, and the client relationship, with the agency rather than the vendor.

## 2. Purpose and scope

This paper sets out the basis of the 17% revenue opportunity available to agencies from their existing clients, and the evidence that supports it. It is written for anyone inside an agency who needs to understand not just the figure but why it holds, from sources they can verify: founders, MD, CMO, CEO and commercial directors, business development, and account and client-services teams.

The 17% is a calculated figure, reconciled from the top down against agency revenue and from the bottom up against the work each website needs. It is grounded in deployment data, a 2025 review of 247 Kentico reference clients, and 15 years of work estimates received by Sitemorse. Internal AAAnow data is identified as internal, and external evidence is cited to its source in the references.

The evidence base draws on research published between 2013 and early 2026, including findings from Gartner, 6sense, Edelman-LinkedIn, Corporate Visions, the Harvard Business Review, Marketreach by way of GYDA's Jan. to Feb. 2026 analysis, and Sitemorse's analysis of 119m websites over 26 months to Jan. 2026.

Section 16 of this document provides a comprehensive list of references, the detail of the reference, and suitable links so that you can verify the evidence yourself.

Each amount is stated in US dollars, with the sterling equivalent beside it at £1 = \$1.35.

The 58% being-heard outcome and the 21% pitch-win outcome are separate matters and sit outside this paper, as do operational implementation, pricing and onboarding.

### What this paper lets you decide

The evidence here is set out so that the reader can settle five questions before committing time or budget.

- a) Whether post-launch silence is a real commercial weakness inside agency-client relationships.
- b) Whether the 17% revenue opportunity has a clear calculation and an auditable basis.
- c) Whether growth from existing clients is aligned with where the agency market is already focused.
- d) Whether monthly evidence-led reporting creates a stronger client conversation than a general update email.
- e) Whether Agency Revenue Radar helps the agency keep control of client confidence, client value, and relevant new work after launch.

### 3. Why this matters now

The agency market is already focused on growth from existing clients. BenchPress 2026 records that 86% of £1m+ agencies are pursuing growth by selling more to the clients they hold. That makes the post-launch gap commercially material, because the area agencies most want to grow is also where many have no structured engagement process after launch.

The same report shows that 43% of fee income comes from pre-agreed retainers and 41% from ad-hoc projects for existing clients. Existing clients are not a marginal opportunity. They already carry a large part of agency income and a major route to profitable growth.

Agencies with structured account management generate 10% more gross profit than those without it, and longer client relationships improve operating profit because less sales and marketing resource is needed to hold the same fee income.

The financial pressure behind that priority is documented. BenchPress 2025, drawing on 677 UK agencies, found 46% citing new business as their leading challenge, the highest in 13 years of benchmarking and up from 27% two years earlier. Average gross profit fell to a new low below 40%, 1 in 3 agencies made redundancies in 2024, and 58% of owners said selling the business was their primary goal, up from 44%.

The market has reset rather than dipped. The question is not whether existing-client revenue matters. It is whether the agency has a factual, repeatable way to stay close enough to identify relevant work, protect confidence, and remain first placed when the client needs support.

## 4. The commercial problem: post-launch silence

Trust is high while a project is live. The work is visible, and the client can see progress. After launch the cadence changes. The project closes, the agency waits to be asked, and the client starts asking a different question: what am I paying for now?

Of 104 agencies asked about post-launch engagement, 76% had no defined approach (AAAnow 2025). 62% of the same sample cited client discussions that had undermined their credibility and damaged confidence in the relationship. The silence reflects the absence of a system rather than a choice.

That silence has a practical cause. Turning website diagnostics into commercial insight has needed a mix of home-grown tools, third-party products and free tools. Running them was not the difficulty. Making the results usable was, and that work spanned disciplines: SEO, UX, development, compliance, AI, marketing and project management. It came to 11 days of interpretation for each client, at a cost above \$7,425 (£5,500) including licence. At that level of cost and time, routine use across a full client base was out of reach.

The client still needs assurance after launch, and if the agency does not provide the evidence, another supplier becomes the party explaining the issues and shaping the next conversation.

## 5. The market technology context: others already monetise the gap

The gap does not stay empty. Diagnostic, audit and quality-management vendors identified it years ago. Combined, the named vendors operating inside agency client accounts, Sitemorse, Siteimprove, Monsido, Silktide and Crownpeak, hold revenue of \$213m (£158m) (market estimate, 2026). That revenue came from client budgets agencies were managing.

The \$213m (£158m) is not part of the 17% calculation. Its role is to show that post-launch oversight is already a paid market: client budgets are already being spent to understand whether websites remain accurate, performant, accessible and trustworthy. The commercial question is whether the agency remains the party leading that conversation.

Sitemorse gives this point unusual provenance. Sitemorse is one of the named vendors in this market, so the account is first-hand rather than inferred from outside the industry.

The risk for agencies is not that clients want oversight. **That need is real, very much legitimate.** The risk is that the agency keeps the relationship in name while another vendor becomes the trusted party explaining performance, risk and digital confidence to the client.

## 6. How the 17% is calculated

The 17% is derived from a defined model agency and a measured value of addressable work for each website. The model holds a revenue baseline of \$3,375,000 (£2,500,000) across 10 major retained clients. Those clients run between 2 and 11 websites each, 31 across the model, with a new major project or significant website assumed at 9-week intervals.

Each main client website carries between 27 and 41 days of addressable work across a year, a range that already includes a 10% allowance for management and oversight. That work has an annualised value of \$18,511 (£13,712) for each website. Across the model, 31 websites at \$18,511 (£13,712) total \$573,841 (£425,068), set against a baseline of \$3,375,000 (£2,500,000), which is 17%.

The same result holds from the top down, and that reconciliation is what fixes the 17% against the agency's own revenue.

Calculation step	Working	Result
1. Midpoint work estimate	27 days + 41 days = 68 days, divided by 2	34 days
2. Annualised work value per website	From the Kentico-supported 27 to 41 day estimate	\$18,511 (£13,712)
3. Implied blended day rate	\$18,511 (£13,712) divided by 34 days	\$544.44 (£403.29)
4. Total days across applicable websites	31 websites multiplied by 34 days	1,054 days
5. Total calculated work value	31 websites multiplied by \$18,511 (£13,712)	\$573,841 (£425,068)
6. Percentage against agency baseline	\$573,841 (£425,068) divided by \$3,375,000 (£2,500,000)	17.0027%, expressed as 17%

The licence contribution is excluded from the 17% calculation. Licence resale could add a further 4.5% net bottom-line contribution, which against the baseline is \$151,875 (£112,500). Keeping it separate protects the integrity of the 17% revenue calculation.

## 7. The basis of the per-website figure

The value for each website is grounded in recorded client experience. Sitemorse, part of the group behind the platform, has received these work estimates and client needs for 15 years, which gives the figure a basis in observed demand over time.

An independent review, we carried out on the reference client base of the CMS vendor Kentico, conducted between October and December 2025, supports the value.

It covered:

1. 247 reference clients and identified work that was directly or indirectly addressable
2. Set that work at 27 to 41 days for each main client website, the midpoint of 34 days
3. Basis of the \$18,511 (£13,712) annual value.

The figure should be described as a calculated agency revenue opportunity supported by a named CMS vendor reference-client review, not a loose estimate, a universal benchmark, or an automatic outcome.

### NOTE

*Not commissioned by, and this data is not in any way endorsed by, Kentico as a vendor. It was carried out for analytical purposes only and for proof of value. The detail by client has been shared in summary format and is only available to Kentico clients who were audited during this time.*

## 8. Existing-client revenue is the highest-probability revenue

Existing clients are the highest-probability revenue an agency holds, and the economics are settled rather than new. A 5% improvement in retention produces a profit uplift of between 25 and 95% (Reichheld, Bain and Company, reported in the Harvard Business Review).

The probability of selling to an existing client is 60 to 70%, against 5 to 20% for a new prospect (Marketing Metrics, Farris and others; IndustrySelect, 2024).

Acquiring a new client costs 5 to 25 times as much as retaining one (Harvard Business School; Totango, 2025). Existing clients spend 67% more in months 31 to 36 of a relationship than in months 0 to 6 (Bain and Company).

The harder and more expensive problem, acquisition, takes the attention, while the easier and more profitable one takes what budget is left.

### The compound effect

The 17% is not one thing. Three movements run at the same time: retainer renewal, upsell from performance gaps the monitoring makes visible, and referral from clients who are actively engaged. None of these requires the agency to invent work. Each requires the agency to see, evidence and discuss client problems that would otherwise stay invisible until another supplier raised them.

Each is worth having on its own, and together they compound. The 17% is what is left on the table and available to others, and it does not reflect the further value of being able to grow the account.

### Ongoing value delivery

Winning a client is where the quieter challenge starts. After delivery, contact tends to go reactive, the agency waits to be asked, and the client begins to ask what the fee is producing. Continuous, independently generated insight into how a client's site is performing gives the agency something substantive to raise without waiting for a problem. Each time it arrives, it reinforces that the retainer is earning its place.

The recurring report carries commercial value of its own. Clients pay an average of \$591 (£438) a month for the data quality, audit and diagnostic tools they use now, revenue that leaves the agency for third-party vendors today. Where the agency holds and resells that licence, the contribution adds 4.5% to its net bottom line, separate from and additional to the 17%.

The report turns a routine update into a reason to call, to ask what is happening across the client's organisation, and to be first in line for new work.

### **A recovered client: \$40,000 and a \$765,000 lifetime value**

A worked example shows the recovery in practice. A high-street retailer left after 3 years. When the replacement work faltered, page load times reached 9 seconds and bounce rates climbed to 61%.

The original agency returned with waterfall data, a fixed-price remedy plan, and a 50% performance improvement guarantee within 90 days. The engagement was \$40,000 (£29,630), bounce rates fell to 11%, and the estimated lifetime value of the recovered relationship was \$765,000 (£566,667).

The agency did not make a sales call. The monitoring made the introduction, and the evidence closed the engagement.

### **The investment-protection argument**

Investment protection is a framing that lands with clients. Analysis of 119m websites over 26 months, to Jan. 2026, shows that performance, SEO position and standards deteriorate without active monitoring. Content decays as competitors update and search intent shifts, technical issues accumulate, and accessibility expectations change.

A site that performed at launch can be materially underperforming within 12 to 18 months, because no one is watching.

Consumer trust compounds the risk. Ponemon Institute research for Neustar, across 750 consumers, found that 91% distrust websites with errors, 88% distrust sites that go down frequently, and 67% lose trust when pages load slowly. A site built well and then left unmonitored damages the client's brand with its own customers.

The framing that works is not what an agency can sell next. It is what the agency found while looking after what the client has already built. To put a figure on it, analysis across a sample of 10 major agency clients identified \$540,000 (£400,000) in billable work left unaddressed after launch, representing \$3,375,000 (£2,500,000) in potential revenue where proactive oversight could have opened the discussion.

These figures are illustrative, drawn from a specific client set, and indicate the order of magnitude that post-launch silence leaves on the table (Our analysis, 2024-25).

## 9. The behavioural science of ongoing value

Several established mechanisms explain why proactive value holds a client. Sunk cost and switching inertia: a client who has invested time and money bringing an agency up to speed does not move easily, and continued evidence of value makes the calculation less attractive still.

Reciprocity, the ongoing gift: when an agency provides insight the client did not ask for, it builds a durable sense of obligation, which lowers price sensitivity and opens the client to further recommendations (Cialdini, 1984).

Confirmation bias and value anchoring: once a client judges an agency valuable, later interactions are read through that lens, and proactive contact keeps the positive anchor active.

Loss aversion sits alongside these. Kahneman and Tversky show that losses weigh more heavily than equivalent gains, so a client is moved more by evidence that website value, trust, accessibility, privacy or AI readiness is deteriorating than by a broad promise of improvement.

Value visibility matters as much as delivery. Clients who cannot articulate what the agency has done for them, to their own stakeholders in a budget review, are the ones most at risk of leaving, whatever the quality of the work (AgencyAnalytics, 2025).

Independent reports record 7 points higher net revenue retention where value realisation is structured (McKinsey, 2025) and 33% higher expansion revenue from regular structured reviews (Benchmarkit, 2025).

Translating technical output into business language, SEO trajectory, performance trends and risk exposure, is the work that makes the value visible to a finance dir. or a chief executive.

## 10. The true cost of going quiet

Craven's trust work sits alongside the retention data, and it frames silence as a trust problem rather than only a missed-sales problem. When trust breaks in an agency relationship, several factors are usually at work. 60% of people stop buying after a single broken-trust experience, and 37% cite poor customer service as the main reason for losing trust in a supplier (Marketreach, cited by Craven, GYDA, Feb. 2026).

In an agency relationship, poor service shows up as silence: the client cannot see what is being done or what the fee is producing, and the only contact is an invoice or a problem. Agencies tend to assume they lost on price. In many cases it was a trust objection that was never voiced. A retainer that is not delivering visible, evidence-led value has already begun to erode, whether or not the agency knows it.

### **Why relationships go silent, and what it costs**

Churn carries a cost beyond the lost fee. Losing a client and replacing that revenue leaves a 2-to-4-month gap during which fixed costs continue (Swydo, 2025).

An agency running churn above 20% needs constant acquisition simply to hold revenue, against a healthy benchmark below 5% a year (Swydo, 2025). Lapsed clients, the ones who have not ended anything formally but have gone quiet, are among the most undervalued revenue an agency holds.

The relationship exists, the trust was established, and the client would have to start again elsewhere.

## 11. A separate matter: competitive displacement

This point is distinct from the 17% and is treated separately. It is not revenue on the table. It is what happens when an agency has no capability of its own to address a client's need and to keep a site both AI ready and human ready.

34% of agencies are introducing competition into their own client accounts without intending to, through the diagnostic tools they bring in (AAAnow 2025). The intent is to add value. The outcome can be a competitor with a direct client relationship, a separate budget, and a reason to keep returning.

### **One documented case shows where it leads.**

An agency with no monitoring answer of its own introduced Monsido when a client asked about content performance. Monsido is owned by Acquia, a competing CMS platform, and Acquia used the benchmarking data as sales leverage, positioning its own platform as the stronger option and taking a major global account.

The initial loss was \$400,000 (£296,296), and it continues to grow. The greater value to the competitor was the sales advantage the data gave it.

The agency acted on the best option available at the time, and the loss followed from the absence of a capability of its own. Independent evidence the agency holds, covering both the human and the AI picture, is what removes that exposure.

Monsido

<https://www.acquia.com/products/acquia-web-governance>

Silktide

<https://silktide.com>

SiteImprove

<https://www.siteimprove.com>

Crownpeak

<https://www.crownpeak.com/digital-assurance/>

Sitemorse

<https://sitemorse.com/>

## 12. A capability matched to routine commercial use

Most agencies recognise what good preparation does to a client conversation. Going in with something specific, current and independently generated about the client's position changes the dynamic. The question was never whether it works. It was whether it was viable for routine use rather than reserved for the opportunities that justified the resource.

Assembling the equivalent capability needed six disciplines and 11 days of interpretation for each client, at a cost above \$7,425 (£5,500). For routine use across a client base, that was impractical. The capability now sits with commercial teams at a cost and speed that make it routine.

What required 11 days and \$7,425 (£5,500) now takes 10 minutes, at ~\$300 (£225) a month across a client base, in the hands of business development, account management and client services at each stage of the relationship.

### **Monthly cadence value beyond the 17%**

The 17% calculation captures the revenue opportunity from solving client problems identified through factual audit evidence. It does not capture the full relationship value of a regular evidence-led cadence, and that distinction matters.

A monthly report gives the agency a justified reason to ask what has changed across the client organisation. It turns a general update email into a call with purpose: a reason to discuss internal changes, wider digital estate changes, new risks, AI readiness, accessibility, privacy, search visibility, performance and the client's own stakeholder needs.

The cadence also helps the agency remain first placed for relevant new work, not because each report creates work, but because the agency is present, informed and evidence-led when something does need attention. That is the relationship value that sits beyond the 17%.

## 13. From value and risk to AI readiness

The diagnostic vendors served the human picture of value and risk. AI readiness is the larger executive need that now sits above it: how an organisation is found, read and judged by AI across the full footprint of information it has made available. 3% (May 2026) of organisations know what they look like to AI, which is the context for why clients need a factual assessment of their current state.

The group that built the value and risk diagnostics is the one setting out AI readiness as the priority.

An agency that leaves a client unable to see its AI readiness position carries exposure beyond the measured 17%, because the stakes rise as AI mediates how the client is found and judged.

The companion paper sets out what AI readiness measures and why it matters: [AI Readiness](#).

## 14. Conclusion

The market has reset, structurally rather than cyclically. Buyers are harder to reach, quicker to drift after delivery, and less moved by generic positioning.

The financial pressure is documented in falling gross profit and in new business named as the leading challenge. The 17% is a calculated opportunity, grounded in recorded demand and independent research, and the capability to capture it now sits with commercial teams at a cost that makes routine use viable. The evidence sets out what is available and why it holds.

## 15. Evidence summary

Evidence area	Key figure or finding	Primary source	How it supports the paper
<b>17% revenue opportunity</b>	\$573,841 (£425,068) divided by \$3,375,000 (£2,500,000) equals 17%	Kentico review; calculation model	Shows the figure is calculated, not loose marketing language.
<b>Kentico reference-client review</b>	247 reference clients; 27 to 41 days of applicable work per main client website	AAAnow Kentico review, 2025	Supports the work-volume input behind the calculation.
<b>Recorded demand over time</b>	15 years of work estimates received by Sitemorse	Sitemorse provenance	Grounds the per-website value in observed demand.
<b>Agency priority</b>	86% of £1m+ agencies pursuing growth from existing clients	BenchPress 2026	Aligns the opportunity with where agencies already want growth.
<b>Existing-client income share</b>	43% of fee income from retainers; 41% from ad-hoc existing-client projects	BenchPress 2026	Existing clients already carry substantial agency value.
<b>Structured account management</b>	10% higher gross profit with structured account management	BenchPress 2026	Supports a regular review cadence and account planning.
<b>Post-launch engagement gap</b>	76% of 104 agencies had no defined post-launch process	AAAnow internal, 2025	Explains why the opportunity stays unaddressed after launch.
<b>Interpretation barrier</b>	11 days and \$7,425 (£5,500) per client across six disciplines	AAAnow source paper	Explains why routine commercial use was out of reach.
<b>Diagnostic vendor market</b>	\$213m (£158m) across named vendors inside agency client accounts	AAAnow estimate, 2026	Shows post-launch oversight is already a paid market.
<b>Brand trust risk</b>	91% distrust websites with errors or inaccurate content	Ponemon / Neustar, 2015	Connects website condition to client reputation.
<b>Retention economics</b>	5% retention increase linked to 25 to 95% profit uplift	Reichheld, Bain / HBR	Supports protecting existing relationships.
<b>Existing-client sale probability</b>	60 to 70% versus 5 to 20% for a new prospect	Marketing Metrics	Supports focusing commercial attention on existing clients.
<b>AI readiness context</b>	3% (May 2026) of organisations know what they look like to AI	AAAnow, 2026	Supports factual current-state assessment, outside the 17% calculation.

## 16. References and sources

Where a source is internal, this is stated. Where a named source has no direct public URL, the access note says so rather than inventing a link.

**[1] AAAnow Limited. How the agency commercial model is being disrupted. Version 1.3 / 87621AB04, client release, 9 March 2026.**

Use: Primary AAAnow evidence paper: post-launch silence, 104-agency observation, \$213m market context, Sitemorse provenance, 119m website analysis, retention and behavioural framing. [AAAnow source paper \(PDF\)](#)

**[2] AAAnow Limited. Master Evidence and Calculation Lock, 2026.** Use: Control source for the 17% calculation, Kentico review basis, \$213m figure, licence separation, and the 3% AI readiness wording. *Internal working document, supplied for this project.*

**[3] The WOW Company. BenchPress 2026: Driving Agency Growth. Benchmarks for £1m+ agencies, Edition #15.** Use: 86% existing-client growth priority, retainer and ad-hoc fee income, structured account management, relationship length. [thewowcompany.com/benchpress](https://thewowcompany.com/benchpress)

**[4] AAAnow Limited. Kentico reference-client review, 2025 to 2026.** Use: Named CMS vendor reference-client review supporting the 27 to 41 day estimate across 247 reference clients. *Internal analysis, source details held by AAAnow.*

**[5] AAAnow Limited. Diagnostic Tool Vendor Market Analysis, 2026.** Use: Combined revenue estimate for Sitemorse, Siteimprove, Monsido, Silktide and Crownpeak inside agency client accounts. *Internal analysis, referenced in the AAAnow evidence paper.*

**[6] Craven, Robert / GYDA. If You're Not on the Day One List, You're Already Out, Jan. 2026.** Use: Agency buyer behaviour and shortlist research, drawing on HBR research of 1,200 buyers. [gyda.co](https://gyda.co)

**[7] Craven, Robert / GYDA. Trust: Your Agency's Untapped Superpower, February 2026.** Use: Trust framework drawing on Marketreach Trust Factor research, including the 60% and 37% trust findings. [gyda.co](https://gyda.co)

**[8] Craven, Robert / GYDA. The State of Digital Agencies in 2025, Jan. 2026.** Use: Agency market context, drawing on Rand Fishkin and SparkToro 2025 research. [gyda.co/insights](https://gyda.co/insights)

**[9] 6sense. 2025 B2B Buyer Experience Report.** Use: Buyer shortlist and buyer journey evidence. [6sense.com](https://6sense.com)

**[10] Corporate Visions. Science-Backed Selling Techniques, 2023.** Use: Unconsidered needs research and B2B executive pitch evidence. [corporatevisions.com](https://corporatevisions.com)

**[11] Edelman and LinkedIn. 2025 B2B Thought Leadership Impact Report.** Use: Decision-maker research on trust and willingness to pay for useful insight. Survey of 3,500 decision-makers. [edelman.com](https://edelman.com)

**[12] Gartner. Gartner Sales Survey, 2025.** Use: B2B buyer evidence on outreach and complex purchase experiences. Survey of 632 buyers. [gartner.com](https://gartner.com)

**[13] Reichheld, Frederick / Bain & Company / HBR. Zero Defections: Quality Comes to Services, 1990.** Use: Retention economics: 5% retention increase, 25 to 95% profit uplift. [hbr.org](https://hbr.org)

**[14] Farris, Bendle, Pfeifer and Reibstein. Marketing Metrics.** Use: Existing-client sale probability 60 to 70% versus 5 to 20% for a new prospect. [pearson.com](https://pearson.com)

**[15] IndustrySelect. 41 B2B Customer Retention Statistics, 2024.** Use: B2B customer-retention statistics referenced in the source paper. [industryselect.com](https://industryselect.com)

**[16] Totango. Cost of Customer Retention Versus Customer Acquisition, 2025.** Use: Retention versus acquisition cost multiplier of 5 to 25 times. [totango.com](https://totango.com)

- [17] **Bain & Company. Customer loyalty and customer spend research.** Use: Loyal customers spend 67% more in months 31 to 36 than in months 0 to 6. [bain.com](https://www.bain.com)
- [18] **AgencyAnalytics. Agency Benchmarks Report, 2024; Master Client Retention, 2025.** Use: Agency benchmark and client value-visibility evidence. [agencyanalytics.com](https://agencyanalytics.com)
- [19] **Swydo. Client Retention Strategies for Marketing Agencies, 2025.** Use: Churn cost, 2 to 4 month replacement gap, and churn benchmark evidence. [swydo.com](https://swydo.com)
- [20] **McKinsey & Company. The Net Revenue Retention Advantage, 2025.** Use: 7 points higher net revenue retention where value realisation is structured. [mckinsey.com](https://mckinsey.com)
- [21] **Benchmarkit / Maxio. SaaS Performance Metrics Benchmarks, 2025.** Use: 33% higher expansion revenue from regular structured reviews. [maxio.com](https://maxio.com)
- [22] **Cialdini, Robert B. Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion, 1984.** Use: Reciprocity evidence on why unsolicited useful insight changes engagement quality. [harpercollins.com](https://www.harpercollins.com)
- [23] **Kahneman, Daniel and Tversky, Amos. Prospect Theory, Econometrica, 1979.** Use: Loss aversion: avoiding deterioration motivates action more than a promise of gain. [jstor.org](https://www.jstor.org)
- [24] **Ponemon Institute / Neustar. What Erodes Trust in Digital Brands? 2015.** Use: Consumer trust: 91% errors, 88% downtime, 67% slow loading, across 750 consumers. *Source named in the AAAnow paper; no direct public URL supplied.*
- [25] **AAAnow / Sitemorse. Internal research and website analysis, 2024 to 2026.** Use: Survey of 104 agency executives and analysis of 119m websites over 26 months to Jan. 2026. *Internal analysis, referenced in the AAAnow evidence paper.*
- [26] **AAAnow.ai. Internal Observational Research, May to December 2025.** Use: Agency discussions and analysis across 104 agencies; directional position only. *Internal research, referenced in the AAAnow evidence paper.*
- [27] **The WOW Company. BenchPress 2025: State of the Agency Nation. Benchmarks for £1m+ agencies, Edition #14, 677 respondents.** Use: 46% new business challenge, gross profit below 40%, redundancies, owners citing sale of the business. [thewowcompany.com/benchpress](https://thewowcompany.com/benchpress)
- [28] **Acquia. Acquia completes acquisition of Monsido, 2024.** Use: Provenance for the displacement case: Monsido ownership by a competing CMS platform. [businesswire.com](https://www.businesswire.com)
- [29] **AAAnow.ai. AI Readiness Maturity Scale, independent measurement, 2026.** Use: Basis for the AI readiness position and the 3% (May 2026) current-state context. *Internal measurement, referenced in the AAAnow evidence paper.*
- [30] **AAAnow.ai. Companion paper, AI Readiness.** Use: What AI readiness measures and why it matters for the client conversation. [aaanow.aflip.in](https://aaanow.aflip.in)