



Turn your firm's expertise into useful content.

One useful expert conversation can support several pieces of content when the source, reader and review are clear. This kit gives that work a practical sequence. Start with a genuine buyer question, then build an article brief and a manageable plan for sharing the answer.

Your working output.

An article brief, channel-appropriate social sequence and achievable editorial calendar.

Use the companion tool.

Agree the buyer decision before booking expert time

Use approved sources and record permission for the intended use

Separate expert fact review from publication approval

Keep the live URL and subsequent observations separate from planning

Version 1.0. Sources checked 2026-10-28. Open-access planning guidance. Verify your own inputs and professional requirements.

Make the decision with your team.

Start with a question that deserves an expert answer.

Choose a question your team actually hears before a suitable engagement. Give it a service, a buyer and a decision. A finance leader comparing integration support needs a different explanation from a homeowner checking whether an architect can handle an occupied-building project. An editorial theme becomes useful when it helps someone decide what to do.

Prepare an interview that protects the source.

Send the question and intended use ahead of the session, and ask the expert to bring public or approved source material and an explanation of the method. Agree whether notes or a recording may be retained, who may access them and which topics should stay outside the discussion. Availability of a recording does not establish permission to publish it.

Separate insight, fact and opinion in the brief.

A draft can mix several kinds of material. An original explanation of the firm's method needs an accountable source. A factual platform statement needs current primary documentation. An opinion should be recognizable as judgment and include the circumstances in which it applies.

Make the decision with your team.

Build a source article before a distribution sequence.

Draft the main explanation in the firm's established voice. Give the reader enough context to understand the recommendation, including the tradeoff and an example, and use meaningful headings and a clear route to relevant service information. Google recommends people-first, useful content. That supports answering the actual question rather than stretching the draft to a keyword quota.

Source: [Creating helpful, reliable, people-first content](#)

Give review a place in the calendar.

Name the draft owner, expert reviewer and person authorized to approve publication, and add a planned date only after allowing for their availability. A pending approval should prevent the item being marked ready even when a platform slot is open. The calendar distinguishes draft, professional review and approval rather than treating them as one task.

Review the conversation without claiming a sale.

Record what people asked, which explanation required clarification and whether the post led to a relevant conversation when you can verify that. Keep those observations separate from paid advertising reports. Organic LinkedIn activity and LinkedIn Ads have different inputs and evidence.

Work through an example.

Illustrative example: a consultancy turns one interview into a sequence.

A fictional consultancy selects a question about when an integration program needs clearer decision ownership. The expert explains the difference between a governance problem and a software problem, using an invented situation with no client details. The brief records that distinction as the article's purpose and names the principal as the proposed reviewer.

Adapt the brief for a legal practice.

A fictional practice wants to explain what a prospective client should prepare before an initial conversation, and the draft owner asks the authorized attorney to define the permitted scope and review the language. The content avoids individual advice, matter details and claims that contacting the firm guarantees acceptance.

Adapt the brief for an architecture studio.

A fictional studio plans a project story about decisions made during an occupied-building refurbishment. Its brief explains the studio's role, the project stage, collaborators and the client's constraints, and it asks which facts and images can be used, with photographer rights and client permission checked separately.

Define the decision.

Blank working page. Record only information approved for this planning file. Add a source or an unknown status where evidence is missing.

Buyer question

Intended reader

Service

Interview prompt

Source insight

Record the next action.

Blank working page. Record only information approved for this planning file. Add a source or an unknown status where evidence is missing.

Source version

Adaptation

Channel

Approval reference

Live URL

Use, review and keep the context.

Use the workbook to make production manageable.

Start with Expert interview and Sources and permissions. Put the approved editorial task into Calendar with its reader, service, source insight, format and intended next step, and use Distribution log for the actual live URL and subsequent observation. Leave unavailable evidence blank or explicitly unknown.

The separate example sheet contains original fictional briefs for consulting, legal work and architecture. Use them to see how the task and dependencies change. Your real plan should identify the people and approvals actually available, with enough time to produce one useful source before expanding its distribution.

Sources.

[Creating helpful, reliable, people-first content](https://developers.google.com/search/docs/fundamentals/creating-helpful-content)

<https://developers.google.com/search/docs/fundamentals/creating-helpful-content>

Current HTML guide and related reading.

<https://www.growthfriday.com/resources/expert-content-planning-kit>

Recommendations are planning guidance. Platform documents describe their own surfaces. Fictional examples are not results, tests or benchmarks. Review source changes and professional requirements before use.