



THE TRUST SIGNAL DIAGNOSTIC

CASE FILE A003

The Zilliant Audit

SIGNAL UNDER REVIEW

Credibility Signal

SUBJECT:

Zilliant — zilliant.com
Price optimization software

AUDIT TYPE:

Free Signal Audit —
Credibility Signal

CONDUCTED BY:

Esme —
The Trust Signal Diagnostic

DATE: JUNE 2026



A Note Before The Findings

This audit examines publicly observable signals only. It is not a comprehensive diagnostic that requires access to internal analytics, response data, and a direct conversation about what the brand is trying to achieve. What follows is what Esme can read from the outside. It is offered without malice and without inside knowledge.

Zilliant is a serious, well-established B2B software company. Founded in 1999, it has served major manufacturers and distributors for over 25 years and counts real, substantial organizations among its customers.

The Credibility signal problem identified here is not a reflection of the product's quality or the company's operational standing. It is a reflection of a pattern that is common among B2B software companies at a certain stage and one that has specific, observable consequences for AI recommendation and first-impression trust.

The findings are what the evidence shows. The repair direction is what the evidence suggests.

EXHIBIT 01

The Crime Scene — What the Evidence Showed First

The investigation began with a claims audit.

Zilliant's homepage meta description, the line that appears in every search result and that AI systems read before the page itself states:

See what the industry's leading cloud-native pricing, CPQ, and revenue optimization software can do for your business.

The Why Zilliant page goes further:

Zilliant's data science, cloud-native software and passion for customer success deliver the highest ROI, fastest time to value and highest customer satisfaction.

And press releases distributed via BusinessWire, used consistently as the company's standard boilerplate, carry the same language:

Zilliant, the leader in pricing lifecycle management...

EVIDENCE CONTINUED

The Crime Scene — What the Evidence Showed First

Three claims. Each one asserting market leadership or superiority.

None of them with a source attached.

The investigation then asked the question AI systems ask when they encounter claims like these:

can any of this be independently verified by a stranger who does not already trust the brand?

The answer, across all three claims was, not easily.

Zilliant doesn't lack confidence. It lacks corroboration.

EXHIBIT 02

The Evidence — The Claims Audit

The Credibility signal measures one thing: can what this brand claims be independently verified by someone who does not already trust it? The investigation examined each primary claim against publicly observable independent evidence. The evidence produced a clear pattern.

CLAIM EVIDENCE		
OBSERVABLE CLAIM	INDEPENDENT EVIDENCE VISIBLE	SIGNAL
01 "The industry's leading..." <i>(meta description)</i>	No cited source. Independent analyst coverage at time of audit does not support a leadership position in the primary industry framework.	GUILTY
02 "Highest ROI, fastest time to value, highest customer satisfaction"	No benchmark study, survey, or independent comparison cited. No methodology or comparison group named.	GUILTY
03 "The leader in pricing lifecycle management"	No independently verifiable source. The category named does not correspond to a recognized analyst category at time of audit.	GUILTY
04 Named case studies with measurable outcomes	The Arvedi case study is published and named. Results are described qualitatively only. No percentages, time-reduction figures, or margin impact numbers present.	GUILTY
05 Review volume supports leadership claim	91 reviews on G2 after 25+ years in operation. Comparable platforms in the same category have significantly higher review volumes.	RISK
06 Third-party analyst validation	Gartner Magic Quadrant recognition exists and is verifiable. This is the strongest independently observable signal in the audit and the one the repair should build from. It does not, however, support the leadership positioning used in the homepage meta description and press release boilerplate. The foundation exists. The claims have outrun it.	CLEAN - WITH LIMITS
CLEAN Claim is supported by independently verifiable evidence.	RISK Some supporting evidence exists, but it is insufficient to fully substantiate the claim.	GUILTY No independently verifiable evidence supports the claim at the time of the audit.

The pattern across five of six dimensions is consistent: the brand asserts. The independently observable evidence does not yet confirm what it asserts. The sixth dimension - third-party analyst validation, is the exception that proves the rule: independent validation exists, but it does not support the leadership claims being made in the same period. That gap is where the repair starts.

EXHIBIT 03

The Pattern — Where It Comes From

This pattern is not unusual for a B2B software company at Zilliant's stage. The company has built its reputation through direct sales, referral networks, and the quality of its product. Its customers know the product delivers. The trust, in most cases, was established before anyone evaluated the public-facing claims.

The problem is not the audience the brand built itself for. It is the audience it has not yet considered.

“Zilliant hasn’t failed to build credibility. It has failed to make that credibility independently observable. Existing customers know the product delivers. Strangers can only evaluate the evidence that exists outside the brand’s own voice.”

AI recommendation systems do not have the benefit of prior relationship. They read what is independently verifiable. A B2B buyer asking an AI system to recommend pricing lifecycle management software encounters Zilliant as a brand whose primary claims, market leadership, highest ROI, best-in-class satisfaction cannot be corroborated by sources outside Zilliant’s own platforms. When corroboration is absent, confidence in recommendation drops.

EVIDENCE CONTINUED

The Pattern — Where It Comes From

The claims have been repeated for so long, across press releases, homepages, and product pages that the evidence infrastructure to support them has not been built with the same care. That gap compounds as AI-mediated discovery becomes a more significant part of how B2B buyers research vendors.



Within the Trust Signal framework, this is the **Taker Friend Pattern**. The claims are completely sincere. The problem is that when a stranger asks why they should believe them, there is nothing outside the brand's own voice to point to.



A001

THE VERDICT

GUILTY.

The Credibility signal is broken across the brand's primary claims. The investigation did not find a shortage of credibility. It found a shortage of independently verifiable credibility. Zil-liant has built evidence inside the business. The investigation found significantly less evidence outside it.

The Verdict

The cost of this pattern is not visible in the existing customer base. Zilliant's customers know what they bought. The cost is visible in first-impression AI recommendation confidence, specifically when a buyer who does not already know the brand asks an AI system to recommend pricing software, and the system evaluates whether Zilliant's claims can be corroborated by sources outside Zilliant's own website.

*Claims create attention. Evidence creates belief.
AI recommends the brands it can verify, not the
brands it recognizes.*

The Repair Direction

The repair for a broken Credibility signal is not a messaging overhaul. The problem is not how Zilliant describes itself. The problem is that what it describes cannot be independently confirmed. Three directions address this.

DIRECTION		WHAT NEEDS TO CHANGE AND WHY
01	Restore independently verifiable positioning	The investigation identified a gap between the market position the brand claims and the position that can be independently confirmed. The repair is not removing confidence it is grounding confidence in sources that exist outside the brand's own voice. Claims that can be checked carry more weight than claims that cannot, precisely because they invite verification rather than asking for belief.
02	Make existing credibility observable	The credibility Zilliant has built exists inside customer relationships, inside completed implementations, inside a 25-year track record. The investigation found significantly less of it in a form observable to a stranger evaluating the brand for the first time. The repair is closing the gap between what existing customers know and what prospective customers can independently verify.
03	Close the gap between claimed leadership and observable evidence	The investigation identified a significant gap between the leadership position the brand claims and the volume and specificity of independently observable evidence available to support it. The repair is accumulating evidence that exists outside the brand's own platforms not because the underlying credibility is absent, but because it is not yet visible to the systems and strangers evaluating it.

What This Audit Cannot Tell You

This audit examined the Credibility signal only. It is one of four signals The Trust Signal Diagnostic investigates. The other three signals were not investigated here.

The signals always interact. A brand that appears to have a single broken signal from the outside is rarely carrying just one problem on the inside. The Credibility failure visible here may be the most observable symptom or it may be the consequence of a different signal that broke first.

What this audit does not tell you: which signal broke first, how the Credibility failure is interacting with Zilliant's other signals, what that interaction is costing in pipeline and recommendation terms, and what the correct repair sequence is for this specific brand.

A stylized, aged card with a dark green header and footer. The header reads 'INVESTIGATION STATUS'. Below it, under 'SIGNALS INVESTIGATED', are four items: Consistency, Clarity, Credibility (checked), and Connection. Under 'EVIDENCE REVIEWED' is a list of six items. Under 'EVIDENCE NOT REVIEWED' is a list of five items. The footer reads 'CASE STATUS' above a large red 'OPEN' stamp.

INVESTIGATION STATUS	
SIGNALS INVESTIGATED	
☐	Consistency
☐	Clarity
☒	Credibility
☐	Connection
EVIDENCE REVIEWED	
• Homepage and product messaging • Public leadership claims • Third-party analyst recognition • Customer evidence and case studies • Independent review platforms • Press releases and media coverage	
EVIDENCE NOT REVIEWED	
• Internal customer satisfaction data • Sales performance metrics • Proprietary implementation results • Internal benchmarking studies • Confidential customer references	
CASE STATUS	
OPEN	



The investigation is open. The evidence is already there.
The question is only whether you're reading it before the algorithm does.

Why This Requires a Full Diagnostic

This audit identifies one broken signal. It cannot determine whether that signal is the cause of the problem or merely the symptom.

The full Trust Signal Diagnostic maps how all four signals interact, identifies which signal broke first, and sequences the repair accordingly. That sequencing is not a checklist. It is built around questions this audit cannot answer

- *Which signal broke first and is Credibility the cause or the consequence?*
- *How are the other three signals interacting with what is visible here?*
- *What commercial cost is being created by the gap between claimed and verifiable positioning?*
- *What happens if visibility improves before credibility is established?*
- *Which repair would create the greatest commercial impact first?*

These are the questions the full diagnostic exists to answer.

The Trust Signal Diagnostic investigates all four signals together, traces the origin of each broken pattern, and builds a repair roadmap sequenced for the brand specifically. Not a checklist. An investigation.

ABOUT THIS AUDIT

This is a free **Trust Signal Audit** — a snapshot of one signal based on publicly observable evidence.

It is not a full Trust Signal Diagnostic.

If this audit produced a moment of recognition, that moment is the beginning of the investigation. The full diagnostic is where it goes next.

The diagnostic investigates all four signals directly with the brand and produces a sequenced repair roadmap.

If you'd like to understand what your trust signals are currently saying to both your audience and the AI systems they use for recommendations, contact:

 hello@thetrustsignal.com

 thetrustsignal.com



INVESTIGATION STATUS:
COMPLETE



THE TRUST SIGNAL DIAGNOSTIC

STRATEGY. EXECUTION. INTEL.