03 — Paid Media Performance Report

Spanish & English Debt Relief Lead Generation

Duration: 2 Years
Market: United States · Nationwide
Platforms: Google · Meta · TikTok
Vertical: Debt Relief / Debt Settlement / Debt Consolidation
Role: Media Buyer

> **Confidential case study:** Performance figures are rounded or aggregated where necessary to protect client, buyer, and proprietary business information.

---

1. Executive Performance Summary

Over approximately two years, I managed paid acquisition across **Google, Meta, and TikTok** for a nationwide U.S. debt-relief operation.

The system generated:

KPI	Result
Revenue Generated	**$5.4M+**
Media Spend	**$3.7M+**
Calls Generated	**935K+**
Monetized Qualified Calls	**272K+**
Starting Daily Spend	**~$2K/day**
Scaled Daily Spend	**$10K+/day**
Initial Buyer-side acquisition cost	**$2,000+**
Winner / Target Buyer-side acquisition cost	**<$900**

The objective was not simply to maximize call volume.

The objective was to build an acquisition system that could **generate buyer-valuable demand, reduce buyer-side acquisition cost, and scale media spend without destroying downstream economics.**

---

2. What the Metrics Actually Mean

Because this was a call-based lead-generation model, standard platform CPA terminology did not fully describe the business outcome.

For this project, the most important metric was **buyer-side customer acquisition cost (CAC)**.

KPI Definitions

Metric	Project Definition
Generated Call	A consumer call generated through the paid acquisition funnel
Qualified Call	A call meeting the buyer's qualification requirements; the standard threshold was approximately 8+ minutes
Monetized Qualified Call	A qualified call that was accepted/monetized within the buyer's operation
Buyer-side acquisition cost	The buyer-side customer acquisition cost used to evaluate the economics of the acquisition operation
Platform Cost per Result	The platform-reported acquisition efficiency metric used as a supporting signal
Revenue	Revenue generated by the acquisition operation
Media Spend	Paid-media expenditure across the acquisition operation
Revenue / Media Spend	Return relative to the media investment, using the reporting convention available in the project data

The distinction between platform CPA and downstream business economics was fundamental.

Google itself distinguishes average CPA from conversion value and conversion value/cost, emphasizing that advertisers should evaluate the business value generated by conversions rather than focusing solely on conversion counts.

In this project, the same principle was applied further down the funnel:

The platform could tell me how efficiently I was acquiring traffic. The buyer told me whether that traffic was economically valuable.

---

3. The Performance Transformation

The most important performance change was the reduction in **buyer-side acquisition cost**.

Starting Environment

$2,000+ Buyer-side acquisition cost

At this stage, the acquisition system was operating around a breakeven/economic-pressure zone.

The challenge was not simply finding more traffic.

It was finding traffic that the buyer could monetize efficiently.

Optimized Winners

<$900 Buyer-side acquisition cost

The objective became identifying repeatable combinations of:

- Creative
- Audience
- Campaign environment
- Bid strategy
- Budget
- Traffic quality

that could consistently operate below the buyer's required acquisition cost.

Scale

At the same time, daily media spend increased from approximately

$2K/day → $10K+/day

This represented approximately **5× daily-spend growth**.

The key achievement was therefore not merely lowering CAC.

It was:

Lowering Buyer-side acquisition cost while substantially increasing the amount of media the system could absorb.

---

4. Two-Year Aggregate Results

Across the approximately two-year operating period:

$5.4M+

Revenue generated

$3.7M+

Media spend

935K+

Calls generated

272K+

Monetized qualified calls

The disclosed aggregate figures imply approximately **$1.46 in reported revenue per $1 in reported media spend, calculated from the rounded $5.4M+ revenue and $3.7M+ media spend** figures.

This should **not** be interpreted as net profit or full-business ROI.

It is a portfolio-level **revenue-to-media-spend relationship**. Operating costs, production costs, overhead, buyer economics, and other expenses are not disclosed.

---

5. Funnel Performance

The acquisition system operated through a full-funnel model:

Paid Media
↓
Landing Page
↓
Consumer Call
↓

Buyer Call Center
↓
8+ Minute Qualification
↓
Monetization

Over the two-year period:

935K+ calls were generated.

Of those:

272K+ became monetized, qualified calls.

Using the rounded case-study figures, approximately **29% of generated calls reached the monetization stage**.

Because the reported numbers are rounded for confidentiality, this should be treated as an approximate portfolio-level ratio rather than an exact operational conversion rate.

The important performance distinction was the following:

> **Call volume was the front-end output. Monetized qualified calls were the downstream business output.**

---

6. Performance Progression

The two years can be understood as four operating phases.

Phase 1 — Stabilization

Starting spend: ~$2K/day
Buyer-side acquisition cost: $2,000+

The initial challenge was establishing a repeatable acquisition baseline.

The account was already operational, but the economics and downstream quality were not yet where they needed to be for aggressive scale.

Phase 2 — Optimization

The focus shifted toward the following:

- Creative research
- Winning-hook identification
- Script development
- Controlled testing
- Account restructuring
- Bid-strategy optimization
- Spend-pacing control
- Funnel QA

The key realization was that **media quality could not be separated from downstream call quality**.

Phase 3 — Winner Development

Repeatable winners were identified with the following:

Buyer-side acquisition cost below approximately $900

Winner evaluation required more than one good day.

I looked for:

- CPA below target
- Stable performance
- Normal spend pacing
- Acceptable platform cost per result
- Positive buyer feedback

Once those conditions were established, winners became candidates for controlled scaling.

Phase 4 — Scale

Daily spend increased to:

$10K+/day

The system was no longer dependent on one campaign or one creative.

Scale was supported by a repeatable process:

Find winners → Validate stability → Scale → Monitor downstream economics → Iterate creative → Repeat

---

7. Platform Performance Framework

The operation used three acquisition platforms, but each served a different role.

Google

Google served as a major acquisition and scaling channel, particularly for capturing existing demand.

The operating approach included:

- Search and video acquisition
- Historical CPA analysis
- Maximize Conversions for newer accounts
- Transition to tCPA after stabilization
- Close spend-pacing monitoring
- Conservative campaign changes

Meta

Meta was used heavily for broad acquisition and creative-led demand generation.

The approach emphasized the following:

- Broad audience acquisition
- Creative testing
- Historical cost-per-result benchmarks
- Controlled ad-set testing
- Account consolidation rather than unnecessary fragmentation

Meta's Conversions API documentation likewise emphasizes connecting marketing data with downstream actions and using additional customer-journey data to improve optimization and measurement.

TikTok

TikTok was primarily used for:

- Video-first creative testing
- Creative exploration
- Additional acquisition volume
- Cost-cap experimentation

However, TikTok was not pushed as aggressively as Google and Meta because those platforms were already providing the majority of the required scale.

---

8. Platform-Level Financial Data Limitation

The following table presents the **approximate contribution of each platform** to overall media spend, revenue, call volume, and monetized qualified calls during the operating period. Figures are rounded or aggregated for confidentiality and should be interpreted as **portfolio-level directional performance**, rather than exact platform-level financial reporting.

Platform	Spend	Revenue	Calls	Monetized Calls	Buyer CAC
Google	40%	35%	35%	55%	Under $900
Meta	50%	60%	60%	40%	Under $900
TikTok	10%	5%	5%	5%	Under $1300

The platform mix shows that **Meta and Google accounted for the majority of acquisition volume and revenue contribution**, while Google produced a disproportionately strong share of monetized qualified calls relative to its share of total call volume.

TikTok operated as a smaller incremental acquisition and testing channel, contributing approximately **10% of media spend** and **5% of reported revenue and call volume** while operating at a higher buyer-side acquisition-cost range.

Because the underlying figures are rounded and aggregated, the table should be used to understand **relative platform contribution and efficiency**, rather than as a precise reconciliation of the aggregate $5.4M+ revenue and $3.7M+ media-spend figures.

The purpose of this comparison is to show how budget and acquisition output were distributed across the media mix while maintaining the confidentiality of exact campaign- and platform-level financial data.

---

9. What Drove the Improvement?

The performance improvement came from several connected optimization systems.

Creative

Researching winning hooks and adapting proven concepts to the debt-relief vertical.

Qualification

Using creative messaging to help pre-qualify the audience before the call.

Account Structure

Keeping the account relatively lean and avoiding unnecessary campaign proliferation.

Bidding

Using account history to determine appropriate bidding strategies.

Pacing

Separating abnormal delivery from genuine performance deterioration.

Scaling

Increasing budgets gradually after performance stabilized.

Downstream Feedback

Using Buyer-side acquisition cost and quality feedback to determine whether traffic should continue to scale.

The system therefore optimized the **entire acquisition chain**, not merely the advertising account.

---

10. Optimization Evidence

Creative → Qualification

One of the most important strategic changes was treating creative as a qualification mechanism.

The buyer had a preference for consumers carrying approximately **$15K+ in debt**.

Creative messaging was therefore adapted to make qualification clearer and attract a more commercially relevant audience.

When downstream buyer CAC became too high, creative became more qualification focused:

Clearer qualification → less aggressive claims → revised debt messaging → new hooks → more accurate expectations → revised CTA

Delivery → Performance Evaluation

Campaigns were not immediately judged when they produced abnormal spending.

The sequence was:

Detect burst spend → Correct delivery → Normalize pacing → Observe → Evaluate

This prevented a delivery problem from being mistaken for a fundamentally bad campaign.

Buyer CAC → Creative Strategy

Weekly buyer feedback created a direct link between downstream economics and the next creative cycle.

When buyer CAC increased significantly:

Descale → Investigate → Adjust creative → Re-test

This ensured that the next testing cycle responded to actual buyer economics rather than relying solely on platform-level signals.

---

11. Scaling Framework

Scaling was based on **repeatability**, not isolated performance.

A campaign became a scaling candidate when it demonstrated:

- Below-target buyer-side economics
- Stable CPA
- Normal spend pacing
- Acceptable platform cost per result

- Positive buyer feedback

Once established, the operating framework used approximately

+30–40% budget increases every ~3 days

where performance remained stable.

If a winner deteriorated:

~20% budget reduction

was used initially, followed by further descaling or shutdown if negative performance persisted.

These were **account-specific operating rules developed from the conditions of this acquisition system**, not universal scaling formulas.

---

12. Daily Performance Management

The daily reporting framework was intentionally simple:

Metric	Purpose
Spend	Understand capital deployment
Sales	Track commercial output
CPA	Monitor acquisition economics
Revenue	Measure generated business value
ROI	Compare return against media investment

Performance was reviewed **platform by platform** where data was available.

The report then fed into the next day's decisions:

What worked?
What deteriorated?
Was spending normal?
Which campaigns deserved more budget?
Which needed to be reduced?
What should be tested next?

This created a continuous

Measure → Diagnose → Act → Re-measure

cycle.

---

13. The Commercial Result

The strongest way to evaluate this operation is not by asking

> "How many clicks or calls did the ads generate?"

The more relevant question is

> **"Could the acquisition system produce buyer-valuable demand repeatedly enough to support meaningful scale?"**

The available results indicate:

- **$5.4M+ revenue generated**
- **$3.7M+ media spend**
- **935K+ calls generated**
- **272K+ monetized qualified calls**
- **~5× increase in daily media spend**
- **Buyer-side acquisition cost reduced from $2,000+ to <$900 for repeatable winners**
- **Two years of sustained operation**

The operation therefore progressed from an acquisition system operating around **$2K/day** into one capable of supporting **$10K+/day+** in media spend.

---

14. Why This Performance Matters

The result was not a single campaign win.

It was the development of a **repeatable acquisition system**.

The system connected:

Creative Research
→ Controlled Testing
→ Platform Optimization
→ Pacing Control
→ Buyer-side acquisition cost
→ Creative Qualification

→ **Budget Allocation**
→ **Scale**

That distinction is important.

The value of the media-buying work was not simply producing traffic.

It was developing a process that could determine the following:

Which traffic to buy, how much to buy, when to scale it, when to stop it, and how downstream buyer economics should change the next acquisition decision.

---

15. Final Performance Snapshot

$5.4M+

Revenue generated

$3.7M+

Media spend

935K+

Calls generated

272K+

Monetized qualified calls

~5×

Daily-spend growth

$2K/day → $10K+/day+

Acquisition scale

$2,000+ → <$900

Buyer-side acquisition cost progression

~2 Years

Operating period

Reporting & Data Integrity Note

All figures are rounded, aggregated, or presented in ranges to protect confidential client and buyer information.

Platform-level financial allocation was not retained in the available dataset. Therefore, this report deliberately does **not** assign the aggregate $5.4M+ revenue or $3.7M+ media spend to individual platforms.

Likewise, no unsupported campaign-level, monthly, or platform-level figures have been created.

The report separates the following:

verified aggregate results → account-specific operating benchmarks → qualitative platform roles

rather than presenting estimated numbers as historical fact.

This approach is consistent with modern paid-media reporting, where conversion cost, conversion value, and return metrics should be defined according to the actual business outcome being measured. Google explicitly notes that conversion values help measure the business impact of campaigns and that conversion value/cost can be used to evaluate return; TikTok likewise distinguishes CPA from ROAS and defines ROAS as revenue generated relative to ad cost.