

Sample AI Visibility Report: Northstar CRM

A fully fictional client report showing how audit observations can become a concise commercial deliverable.

Baseline · United States · 10 buyer questions × 5 engines · September 2026

Version 1.0 · September 2026

Operational template. Not a scientific ranking or a guarantee of AI exposure.

Executive Summary

Northstar CRM appears in 62% of tested buyer questions. The brand has meaningful baseline awareness, but its own sources are cited in only 34% of responses. The largest gap is in high-intent comparisons and verifiable evidence for pricing, integrations and customer outcomes.

62%

Mention rate

34%

Citation rate

28%

Top-three rate

46%

Visibility index

Strongest signal

Problem-led questions mention Northstar more often than direct provider comparisons.

Largest gap

Third-party sources dominate the evidence used to justify recommendations.

Measurement design

The fictional baseline uses one frozen prompt set and one observation per question and engine.

Dimension	Scope	Definition
Market	United States	English-language buyer questions
Audience	B2B agencies, 10–50 employees	Fictional example scope
Prompts	10	Awareness, consideration and evaluation
Engines	5	ChatGPT, Gemini, Perplexity, Google AI Mode, Claude
Observations	50	One question per engine
Measurement date	September 28, 2026	One-time baseline

Scoring logic

Mention, owned citation, top-three position and framing are captured for every observation. The visibility index is a transparent operating metric, not a universal AI rank.

Results by engine

Perplexity produces the strongest citation rate; Claude shows the weakest top-three presence in this fictional sample.

Engine	Tests	Mention	Citation	Top 3	Index
ChatGPT	10	70%	30%	30%	50%
Gemini	10	60%	20%	30%	42%
Perplexity	10	70%	70%	40%	56%
Google AI Mode	10	60%	30%	30%	44%
Claude	10	50%	20%	10%	32%

What stands out

- Perplexity mentions and cites Northstar most consistently.
- ChatGPT shows baseline awareness but often relies on third-party sources.
- Claude mentions the brand less frequently and rarely in the first three recommendations.
- Direct brand questions perform better than generic buying and comparison questions.

Source and competitor picture

Answers rely more heavily on directories and comparison pages than on Northstar's own product pages.

Source type	Observation	Meaning
Owned product pages	17 citations	A base exists, but high-intent proof is thin
Software directories	29 citations	Strong influence on comparisons and shortlists
Trade publications	11 citations	Support category understanding and trust
Customer and partner pages	6 citations	Too little verifiable outcome evidence

Recurring competitors

Fictional rivals HeliosCRM, PipelineWorks and FocusDesk appear in 41 of 50 responses.

Source gap

Northstar has feature pages but few dated case studies, integration details and direct comparisons.

Prioritized actions

The 30-day pilot should begin with verifiable evidence, not generic content volume.

1	Clarify pricing and scope	Publish packages, audience, exclusions and typical implementation time with a visible update date.
2	Structure three outcome case studies	Separate starting point, intervention, measurement period and quantified result.
3	Expand integration evidence	Create dedicated pages for the five most important integrations, including limitations.
4	Publish comparison pages	Differentiate Northstar factually from recurring alternatives, including non-fit scenarios.

30-day pilot

The pilot combines publishing work with a comparable repeat measurement.

Week	Work	Output
1	Evidence inventory and page scope	Approved facts, sources and priorities
2	Pricing, integration and case-study pages	Three publication-ready core pages
3	Comparison pages and external profiles	Two comparisons and updated directory profiles
4	Quality review and repeat measurement	Comparable second sample and follow-up actions

Success criteria

- All priority pages are published and internally linked.
- Every material claim has a verifiable source or customer evidence.
- The second measurement uses the same prompts and scoring rules.
- Changes are reported as observations, not guaranteed causality.

Limitations

This sample uses entirely fictional data and brands. Real audits must preserve actual answers, sources, timestamps and account conditions. Outputs can vary because of model changes, personalization and randomness.