FULL SYNTHETIC SAMPLE

Ad Spend Decision Memo

One evidence-bounded verdict before a synthetic brand moves ad budget.

This document is entirely invented. The brand, evidence, assumptions, numbers, and conclusion demonstrate the memo structure. They are not an anonymized customer result, benchmark, or claim that another business should expect the same outcome.

Decision Brief snapshot

FIELD	AGREED SYNTHETIC SCOPE
Decision	Should Synthetic Brand X increase Meta spend by 30% next week?
Window	Invented last-30-day evidence; one US Shopify store; Meta decision only.
Evidence	Synthetic Shopify net revenue, platform-reported revenue and spend, promotion calendar, and stated margin assumptions.
Access	Redacted screenshots or exports only. No passwords, account access, or customer-level personal data.
Service target	Within three business days after the Decision Brief is accepted and agreed evidence is complete and usable.

1. Decision

The synthetic brand proposes increasing monthly Meta spend from about $45,000 to $58,500. The question is whether the supplied evidence supports committing the additional $13,500 now.

Bounded question: Is the agreed evidence strong enough to justify the proposed 30% Meta increase for this synthetic decision window?

2. Verdict

UNRESOLVED - SAFE INTERIM ACTION: HOLD THE FULL INCREASE

The supplied aggregates do not establish marginal return on new spend. They also do not show that the move is clearly wrong. Resolve the named uncertainty before committing the full increase.

Verdict definitions: Supported - the agreed evidence supports the move. Unsupported - it weighs against the move. Unresolved - a named uncertainty prevents a defensible yes or no. This sample selects Unresolved.

3. Evidence reviewed

All values below are invented. The memo distinguishes supplied facts, arithmetic, assumptions, and unresolved explanations.

SYSTEM	REPORTED REVENUE	SPEND	REPORTED ROAS
Meta Ads	$290,000	$45,000	6.4x
Google Ads	$95,000	$18,000	5.3x
Email / SMS	$120,000	-	-
Sum of channel claims	$505,000	$63,000	-
Shopify net revenue - sales anchor	$360,000	-	-

4. What the discrepancy does and does not show

Observed in the synthetic inputs: Channel-reported revenue totals about $505,000 while Shopify records $360,000 of net revenue. The claims equal about 140% of the store-recorded anchor, so they cannot be added as unique revenue.

Not established: The $145,000 gap does not prove which channel claims overlap, how much any channel overstates incrementality, or what caused the mismatch. Possible explanations include overlapping attribution, revenue-base differences, and window differences. The aggregates cannot isolate one.

Decision implication: Meta's reported 6.4x is a platform-attributed average on prior spend. It is not evidence of marginal return on the next dollar. Blended MER is about 5.7x ($360,000 / $63,000), but it is also an average and not attribution truth.

5. Confidence and unresolved facts

Illustrative confidence: Medium. The figures contain a material contradiction, but no order-level overlap, new-versus-returning mix, or measured marginal return was supplied. Cross-device effects are possible but not observed. The promotion calendar is supplied; the margin band is a synthetic customer assumption.

Evidence classification

CLASS	EXAMPLE IN THIS SAMPLE
Supplied	Synthetic revenue, spend, promotion calendar, and margin assumptions.
Calculated	140% claim-to-sales-anchor ratio and 5.7x blended MER.
Inferred	The platform average is insufficient to support a marginal scale decision.
Unresolved	Actual overlap, incremental return, customer mix, and cross-device effects.

6. Economics overlay

The synthetic customer supplies a contribution-margin range of 53% to 57% before ad spend. The midpoint, 55%, is used only to show sensitivity. It is not audited or presented as a finding.

Illustrative breakeven: At a 55% contribution margin, $1 of new spend needs about 1 / 0.55 = 1.8x marginal revenue to break even on contribution. The current evidence does not measure that marginal return.

Scenario view - assumptions, not forecasts

SCENARIO	ASSUMED MARGINAL ROAS	INCREMENTAL REVENUE	INCREMENTAL CONTRIBUTION
Upper illustration	4.0x	$54,000	+$16,200
Middle illustration	2.8x	$37,800	+$7,290
Breakeven illustration	1.8x	$24,300	About -$135

7. Recommendation

Do not commit the full synthetic 30% increase on the current evidence. Keep the safe interim action bounded: hold the full increase while collecting evidence that measures the next-dollar decision rather than relying on attributed averages.

Least-cost resolution step: Run a pre-agreed stepped-spend or holdout design only if the brand can monitor contribution consistently and stop at a defined loss boundary. Re-read a clean post-promotion window and add new-versus-returning context. The exact experiment belongs in the accepted Decision Brief; this sample does not prescribe one universally.

8. What would change the conclusion

The verdict could move to **Supported** if new evidence shows marginal contribution clearing the agreed threshold in a clean window and resolves the material revenue-base questions. It could move to **Unsupported** if measured marginal contribution remains at or below the agreed threshold or the supplied margins are materially weaker. No single aggregate platform metric changes the verdict by itself.

9. What to watch

Monitor contribution on the agreed scope, the difference between platform-attributed averages and measured marginal performance, promotion changes, and new-versus-returning mix. Treat each as evidence with provenance, not as automatic proof of causality.

10. Limits

This memo does not create perfect attribution, establish a true per-channel ROAS, replace MMM or incrementality testing, perform a finance close, or guarantee revenue, profit, or campaign performance. It is an evidence-bounded advisory opinion on one accepted decision. Customer-supplied evidence remains the customer's responsibility.

What a real Decision Brief asks for

REQUIRED ITEM	BOUNDARY
Decision and deadline	One scale, cut, hold, restart, or reallocate decision.
Scope	Period, geography, channels, order universe, exclusions, and new-scope boundary.
Store-recorded net revenue	Same period, after refunds and discounts.
Platform claims and spend	Same period and only the channels in scope.
Economic context	Approximate COGS, fulfillment, payment fees, and promotion context.

Evidence, privacy, and deletion

No passwords or account access. Use redacted screenshots or exports; never send credentials or customer-level personal data. The accepted Decision Brief records the transfer method, permitted evidence use, and deletion date. Evidence is not used to train models or create benchmarks. Testimonials, referrals, and public case studies require separate explicit consent.

Founding commercial terms

The total price is $199 flat. No tax, surcharge, or other customer charge is added. There is no upfront payment; you receive the complete memo before payment is due. The invoice becomes payable only when the delivered memo materially fulfills the accepted Decision Brief.

Delivery is within three business days after the Decision Brief is accepted and the agreed evidence is complete and usable. The complete memo receives a separate critical QA pass before delivery. The customer has two business days to identify a specific material mismatch. One bounded correction is included. Subjective disagreement with a conforming verdict does not cancel the invoice. The $199 invoice is due seven days after materially conforming delivery; a material correction resets delivery and the due date. Genuine incurable material nonconformance waives the fee.

Request path

Start with an email containing the brand, one live decision, and its deadline. Do not attach evidence yet. If the decision fits, SpendProof proposes the Decision Brief for explicit acceptance. No case, evidence upload, or payment is accepted through the website.