REPORT BY ROLF STENBERG

MyLedgerBook.ie

Business, Search & Competitive Growth Investigation

Public sample edition · certain figures withheld

What's working. What's holding the business back. And what its competitors appear to have missed.

Client	MyLedgerBook — myledgerbook.ie
Market	Ireland — sole traders, freelancers, tradespeople and small limited companies
Reference	GWT-26-MLB
Investigation date	22 September 2026
Prepared by	Rolf Stenberg
Evidence base	Client-supplied Google Search Console Performance and Coverage exports (6–19 September 2026); full crawl of all 17 sitemap URLs rendered in a live browser; five competitor pricing pages read the same day.
Objective	Establish why a technically sound site with substantial content is producing almost no organic traffic, and identify the three changes most likely to fix it.

WHY THIS REPORT IS ABOUT MY OWN PRODUCT

MyLedgerBook is mine. Before selling the Growth Investigation to anyone else I ran it on my own business — including Section 7, where I conclude that my own pricing is wrong. A real investigation in which I come off badly seemed more use to you than a tidier example built on a business with nothing at stake. A small number of figures are withheld and marked WITHHELD; a client's report is delivered in full, and nothing is published without their agreement.

EXECUTIVE CONCLUSION

MyLedgerBook does not have a content problem. It has eleven genuinely substantial guides, clean canonicals, Article markup and authoritative citations to Revenue.ie. The problem is narrower than the traffic figures suggest. Two of the eleven guides — the two aimed at people actively shopping for an alternative — are not in Google's index at all. Of the impressions the rest earn, 42% are spent on generic "accounting software" searches where the site sits at position 81 and will not rank for years, while the compliance cluster where it already ranks on pages one and two is treated as supporting content. The strategy is not to make more; it is to get two pages indexed and concentrate on the ground already taken.

SECTION 1

Executive Brief

What I would do if this were my own business.

6,643	42%	Withheld	2
words of content not in Google's index	of impressions spent on unwinnable searches	the specific search opening identified	clicks in 14 days

The measurable history of this site is short. Google's first recorded impression is 8 September 2026 and the export ends on 19 September, so everything quantitative below rests on fourteen days. That is enough to see structure and direction. It is not enough to call a trend, and nothing in this report treats it as though it were.

Within those limits the picture is consistent and it is not the one the click count suggests. The site is being crawled, indexed and shown. It is being shown for the wrong things, and two of its best assets are not being shown at all.

THE THREE MOVES

1. Get the two unindexed guides into the index, and give the homepage a direct path to the guide library.

2. Concentrate on the narrow Irish compliance cluster where the site already ranks on pages one and two — SPECIFIC TERMS WITHHELD — and stop trying to win generic "accounting software".

3. Make the Irish-and-euro contrast concrete on the comparison pages, using what the competitors are actually publishing today — and revisit the entry price before anyone is anchored to it.

WHAT I AM NOT RECOMMENDING

Not more guides. Eleven is already more long-form content than the site has authority to rank, and the eleventh will not perform better than the two currently sitting unindexed. Not paid search either: at the current entry price, paid acquisition against Xero and Sage is a losing arithmetic problem, and the site is not yet converting the visitors it gets for free.

SECTION 2

The Index Gap

The two guides written for buyers are the two Google has not indexed.

The Coverage export reports 15 pages indexed and 4 not indexed, with the not-indexed group broken down as: *Discovered – currently not indexed* (2), *Crawled – currently not indexed* (1), and *Page with redirect* (1).

I cross-checked that against the Performance export. Fifteen URLs received at least one impression during the period. The sitemap contains seventeen. The two sitemap URLs that received no impressions at all are:

URL	Words	Impressions	Purpose
`/guides/xero-alternative-ireland`	3,177	0	Captures buyers already shopping for an alternative
`/guides/switch-accounting-software-ireland`	3,466	0	Answers the single biggest objection to switching

Sources: client-supplied Search Console Coverage and Performance exports, 6–19 September 2026; sitemap.xml read 22 September 2026.

Fifteen indexed pages, fifteen pages with impressions, and exactly two sitemap URLs missing from both lists. The match is clean enough that I am confident these are the two counted as "Discovered – currently not indexed". OBSERVED, CROSS-CHECKED ACROSS TWO EXPORTS

This matters more than the raw word count suggests. Of the eleven guides, nine are educational — they answer a compliance question and the reader may or may not be in the market. These two are the only ones written for somebody who has already decided they want different software. They are the bottom of the funnel, and they are invisible.

Why this is probably happening

Nothing is technically blocking them. Both return HTTP 200, both carry a self-referencing canonical, neither has a robots meta tag, both are in the sitemap, and both are linked from the guides index and from other guides. I checked each of those directly. OBSERVED

"Discovered – currently not indexed" on a site this young usually means Google has queued the URL but not judged it worth the crawl yet — a question of site-level authority and internal signals rather than of the page. Two things in the site's structure make that worse than it needs to be:

- **The homepage links to no guide at all.** Its only internal links are to `/pricing`, `/guides`, `/login`, `/register`, `/security`, `/privacy` and `/terms`. The strongest page on the domain passes nothing directly to any of the eleven assets that earn the traffic. OBSERVED
- **Both pages were published on 9 September**, in the same batch as `/guides/accounting-software-small-business-ireland`, which *is* indexed and is the site's highest-impression page. So the publication date alone does not explain it. OBSERVED

> **WHAT THIS COSTS**
>
> Every impression the site currently earns comes from somebody researching a compliance question. The two pages that would catch somebody comparing products or worrying about migration earn nothing. The funnel has a top and no middle. INFERRED

SECTION 3

Search Baseline

Fourteen days. What it can and cannot tell us.

The export is filtered to "Last 6 months", which means the fourteen days below are the site's entire recorded search history, not a slice of it.

Date	Clicks	Impressions	CTR	Avg position
8 Sep	0	17	0%	24.8
9 Sep	1	52	1.92%	36.3
10 Sep	0	70	0%	50.4
11 Sep	0	59	0%	50.8
12 Sep	0	63	0%	51.7
13 Sep	1	50	2%	46.0
14 Sep	0	55	0%	38.1
15 Sep	0	40	0%	50.4
16 Sep	0	43	0%	47.7
17 Sep	0	52	0%	16.1
18 Sep	0	61	0%	58.3
19 Sep	0	19	0%	76.1

Client-supplied Search Console Performance export, Chart tab. 6 and 7 September recorded zero impressions and are omitted.

HOW TO READ THE POSITION COLUMN

The swing from 24.8 on day one to 76.1 on the last day is not a collapse in rankings. It is Google widening the set of queries it tests the site against. As more low-ranking commercial terms enter the sample, the site-wide average gets worse even if no individual page has moved. Judging a young site on average position is close to meaningless; judge named queries on named pages instead.

A discrepancy I want to be straight about

The property totals 581 impressions and 2 clicks. The Queries tab lists 165 queries totalling 359 impressions and **zero** clicks. The gap is normal — Google withholds queries that are too rare to report without identifying the searcher — but it means the two clicks came from searches not shown in the export, and I cannot tell you what they were. Every query-level figure in the next section is drawn from the 359, and I have not quietly scaled it up to 581. OBSERVED

Where the impressions are coming from geographically

Country	Clicks	Impressions	Avg position
Ireland	2	470	**53.2**
United States	0	69	**9.3**
United Kingdom	0	17	16.9
Netherlands	0	5	31.0

The site ranks at position 9.3 in the United States and 53.2 in Ireland. For a product whose entire proposition is Irish compliance, that is worth understanding rather than enjoying. The most likely explanation is that Irish results for these queries are contested by Xero, Sage, QuickBooks and BrightBooks, all with years of authority, while the same queries in the US return a thinner field — so a well-written Irish page surfaces higher somewhere it can never convert. INFERRED It also means the 69 American impressions are noise in any site-wide average, and should be filtered out before judging progress.

SECTION 4

Where Google Already Shows Interest

Two distinct populations of query, and only one of them is worth pursuing.

I grouped all 165 reported queries into clusters and weighted each cluster's average position by its impressions, so that a single fluke ranking does not distort the picture.

Cluster	Queries	Impr.	Share	Avg pos.	Best
Generic "accounting software"	72	151	42%	**81.1**	32
Sole trader (registration / tax)	20	69	19%	**73.0**	53
Compliance cluster A	9	43	12%	WITHHELD	WITHHELD
Compliance cluster B	15	39	11%	WITHHELD	WITHHELD
Compliance cluster C	13	21	6%	WITHHELD	WITHHELD
Compliance cluster D	8	17	5%	WITHHELD	WITHHELD

Derived from the client-supplied Queries export (165 queries, 359 impressions). Cluster averages are impression-weighted.

The 42% that will never convert

Seventy-two of the 165 queries are variations on "accounting software", "bookkeeping software" and "accounts packages". They account for 151 impressions — 42% of everything the site is shown for. **Fifty-five of those 72 sit at position 70 or worse.** That is page eight and beyond. No click will ever come from them.

They are almost entirely generated by one page, `/guides/accounting-software-small-business-ireland`, which earned 199 impressions — the most of any page on the site — at an average position of **75.7**. It is the site's busiest page and its least productive one. It is also, single-handedly, what drags the Irish average position down towards 53.

> **THE UNCOMFORTABLE PART**
>
> "Accounting software Ireland" is a category term owned by companies with fifteen-year-old domains and national advertising budgets. A four-thousand-word guide does not change that, and writing a better one will not either. The page is not badly written — it is competing in the one place where being well-written is not the binding constraint.

The cluster that is actually working

Set the generic terms aside and a much sharper picture appears. There is a small group of specific, Ireland-only compliance queries on which this six-week-old site already appears on the first or second page of results — including a short acronym searched by effectively every VAT-registered business in the country. One guide alone holds a strong position on roughly a third of the impressions the site's busiest page attracts.

WITHHELD FROM THE PUBLIC EDITION

The ten queries, their positions and the page that earns them are the substance of this finding and the basis of Move 2. Publishing them would hand the opening to competitors who have not done the work. They appear in full in the client's own copy.

THE DECISION THIS POINTS TO

MyLedgerBook's route to search visibility is not "accounting software". It is the specific, annual, poorly-explained Revenue obligations that its product happens to automate — PRIORITY ORDER WITHHELD. Those are exactly the topics where the site is already close, exactly the topics the large competitors cover thinly, and exactly the topics whose readers have the problem the product solves.

SECTION 5

Product & Positioning

More differentiated than a generic "accounting software" label suggests.

The live homepage positions MyLedgerBook as "Accounting software built for Irish businesses — invoicing, expenses and Irish tax, without the accounting headache", aimed at sole traders, freelancers, tradespeople and small limited companies. The specific promise is that VAT3, RTD, VIES and income-tax figures are prepared automatically, "laid out the Revenue way".

Signal on the live site	Commercial meaning
VAT3 (T1/T2/T3), annual RTD, VIES / EC Sales	Concrete Irish localisation, not generic bookkeeping with a currency setting
Invoice basis or cash-receipts basis	A real Irish VAT distinction most international products bury
Form 11 and CT1 figures, with a set-aside estimate	Addresses the actual fear — an unexpected tax bill — not just the bookkeeping
Next Revenue deadline on the dashboard, with countdown	Turns a compliance calendar into a product feature
Deposit and staged invoices (50% on order, balance on delivery)	Speaks directly to tradespeople and commission work
EU hosting, tenant isolation, support-access logging	Unusually tangible privacy proof for financial records
Accountant export (Sage / Xero / BrightBooks), accountants free	Removes the accountant as a blocker to switching
30 days free, no card required	Lower friction than the competitors' discount-then-renew offers

Live pages reviewed 22 September 2026: myledgerbook.ie homepage, /pricing, /security.

POSITIONING OPPORTUNITY

Do not compete on "more features". Compete on this: the Irish returns are prepared for you, laid out the way Revenue wants them, and your accountant can see them for free. That is a narrower promise than any competitor makes, and it is the one the search data says people are actually looking for.

One structural weakness in the copy

The homepage is 552 words and the pricing page 702. Both read well. Neither mentions RTD or VAT3 in a way that would let them rank, and — more importantly — neither offers the reader a route into the guides that are earning all the impressions. A visitor who arrives on the RTD guide and wants to know whether the product is credible has a path. A visitor who lands on the homepage has no way to discover that eleven substantial guides exist beyond a single nav link marked "Guides". OBSERVED

SECTION 6

Competitor Set

Who matters in the buying decision — and two openings they have left.

Every figure below was read on the competitor's own live Irish pricing page on 22 September 2026. All prices are monthly and exclusive of VAT unless stated.

Product	Entry	Mid	Top	Notes
MyLedgerBook	WITHHELD	WITHHELD	WITHHELD	30 days free, no card
BrightBooks	€17.41	€23.03	€33.72	Billed annually (€208.86 / €276.35 / €404.61). Starter capped at 25 invoices
Sage Accounting IE	€19	€37	—	90% off for 3 months, then full price
QuickBooks IE	€21	€31	€45 / €75	Four tiers
Xero IE	**$29**	**$50**	**$75**	Quoted in dollars — see below

Sources read 22 September 2026: xero.com/ie/pricing-plans/, sage.com/en-ie/sage-business-cloud/accounting/pricing/, quickbooks.intuit.com/ie/pricing/, brightsg.com/en-ie/brightbooks-cloud-based-bookkeeping-software/.

Opening 1 — Xero's Irish pricing page is quoted in dollars

On 22 September 2026, `xero.com/ie/pricing-plans/` — a page whose HTML declares `lang="en-IE"` — displayed its three plans as **$29, $50 and $75 per month**. I counted the currency symbols on the rendered page: **six dollar signs and zero euro signs**. There was no currency selector on the page. OBSERVED

I want to be careful about how far that goes. Large sites sometimes vary currency by visitor location, and this was read from a browser in Dublin, which is the relevant case but not the only one. What I can state is that on this date, from Ireland, Xero's Irish pricing page quoted an Irish sole trader a price in dollars. Anyone repeating this claim should re-check it and record the date, because it may well be corrected.

Opening 2 — BrightBooks' Irish page is serving UK compliance content

The BrightBooks page at `brightsg.com/en-ie/` carries a resource feed beneath its pricing. On 22 September 2026 all four featured articles were about **Making Tax Digital** — a United Kingdom regime with no application in Ireland. Titles included "Making Tax Digital for Accountants: Your Complete MTD IT Compliance Guide" and "MTD IT Q2 Readiness Checklist". OBSERVED

> **WHAT THESE TWO HAVE IN COMMON**
>
> The two competitors positioned most explicitly as Irish are both, today, leaking non-Irish signals on their Irish pages — one in currency, one in tax regime. This is precisely the gap MyLedgerBook's positioning claims, and it can now be demonstrated rather than asserted. It is also fragile: both are one content update away from disappearing.

Where the competitors are genuinely strong

Competitor	Observed strength	Implication
Xero	Breadth, bank feeds, accountant ecosystem, brand recall	Do not compete on features. Compete on Irish returns and on switching being painless.
Sage	Established Irish brand and accountant familiarity; aggressive 90%-off entry	Trust and familiarity are formidable. Target owner-managed simplicity instead.
QuickBooks	Four tiers in euro, strong brand, heavy paid presence	Match clarity of pricing; differentiate on Irish return preparation.
BrightBooks	Irish-owned, accountant channel, RCT and multi-currency at top tier	Irish ownership alone is not unique. The clearer VAT/RTD workflow story is.

A NOTE ON FAIRNESS

A competitor can be strong overall and still leave a specific opening. The purpose of this section is not to declare winners; it is to identify where MyLedgerBook can make a narrower and more credible promise than any of them.

SECTION 7

The Price Question

Something better said now than discovered in eighteen months.

MyLedgerBook's entry tier undercuts BrightBooks, Sage and QuickBooks by a margin of roughly a third. It is the cheapest credible Irish option, and by a clear distance. FIGURES WITHHELD

Nothing in the evidence suggests price is what is stopping people signing up. The site recorded two clicks in fourteen days. Twelve impressions reached the pricing page in the entire period. The constraint is that almost nobody is arriving — not that they arrive and find the price too much.

THE RISK OF THE LOW ANCHOR

A launch price is the easiest thing in the world to set and among the hardest to raise. Every customer acquired at the launch price becomes a reason not to raise it, and the cheapest option in a compliance category invites a question the product should not have to answer: if the Revenue returns really are prepared for me, why is this the cheapest one? In a market where the alternative to getting it wrong is a Revenue penalty, being conspicuously cheap is not automatically an advantage. INFERRED — THIS IS JUDGEMENT, NOT DATA

I am not recommending a specific number; pricing is the client's decision and they know their cost base. What I would say is that the window to set it is now, while the customer base is small enough that a change costs nothing, and that the decision should be made deliberately rather than by default. A modest increase would sit level with BrightBooks and below Sage while still reading as the affordable Irish option, and would put meaningfully more revenue behind every acquisition — which is what eventually pays for the content and the support.
RECOMMENDED FIGURE WITHHELD

The one thing I would not do is discount further. Sage's 90%-off-for-three-months and Xero's 80%-off are the moves of companies who can absorb the loss and count on renewal inertia. A new product cannot win that fight, and entering it teaches early customers that the price is negotiable.

SECTION 8

Site & Technical Findings

The site is in better technical shape than most. Four things are worth correcting.

For context, this is a clean build. All 17 sitemap URLs return 200. Every page carries a self-referencing canonical, a written meta description within length, and a single H1. All eleven guides carry Article structured data and cite Revenue.ie directly. There is no duplicate content, no orphaned test page, no indexable staging URL. That is a better technical baseline than the majority of sites I look at, and it is worth saying so before listing what is wrong.

1. Duplicated brand name in six title tags

Six guide titles append the brand twice — once as "| MyLedgerBook" and again as "— MyLedgerBook":

Page	Title length
`/guides/switch-accounting-software-ireland`	76
`/guides/rtd-ireland`	73
`/guides/sole-trader-accounting-ireland`	72
`/guides/vat-registration-threshold-ireland`	69
`/guides/vat3-ireland`	69
`/guides/vat-invoice-requirements-ireland`	67

Titles read from the live pages, 22 September 2026.

Google truncates titles at roughly 60 characters, so what a searcher sees is the keywords pushed out by a brand name printed twice. The site's single best-performing page is one of the six. OBSERVED

2. No structured data outside the guides

The homepage, pricing, security, privacy and terms pages carry no JSON-LD at all. There is no `Organization` markup establishing the brand, and no `SoftwareApplication` or `Offer` markup on a pricing page that publishes three clear euro prices. There is no `BreadcrumbList` anywhere on the site. OBSERVED

3. The pricing page title says nothing

"Pricing — MyLedgerBook" is 22 characters and contains no term anybody searches for. The Queries export shows real demand for "how much does accounting software cost", "accounting software prices" and "accounting software cost" — all currently landing elsewhere on the site.

4. One guide is cut off from the others

`/guides/starting-as-a-sole-trader-in-ireland` (2,326 words) is the only guide with **no links to any other guide and no outbound citations to Revenue.ie**. Every other guide links to between two and six siblings and cites four or more Revenue pages. It is also the guide offering a "Free 2026 Starter Pack", which makes it the most commercially useful of the educational set. OBSERVED

> **ALSO NOTED, NOT YET A FINDING**

The site's own robots.txt records a concern about "the unrelated Google Play app of a similar name" competing for the brand identity. I have not investigated that collision and it is outside what the supplied data can answer, but it is worth a dedicated look — brand-term confusion is expensive and hard to undo once Google has settled on an interpretation.

SECTION 9

The Three Moves

In order. None of them requires writing anything new.

Move 1 — Get the two buyer-intent guides indexed

THIS WEEK

EVIDENCE

Coverage reports 2 pages "Discovered – currently not indexed". The two sitemap URLs with zero impressions are `/guides/xero-alternative-ireland` (3,177 words) and `/guides/switch-accounting-software-ireland` (3,466 words). Both return 200, both self-canonical, neither blocked. **OBSERVED**

INTERPRETATION

Google has queued these URLs and not judged them worth crawling. On a six-week-old domain that is a signal about site authority and internal linking, not about the pages.

DECISION

Three things, in this order. Submit both URLs through the URL Inspection tool's "Request indexing", one per day. Add a guide section to the homepage linking directly to four or five named guides, including these two — the homepage currently links to no guide at all, which wastes the domain's strongest page. Then add a contextual link to each of these two from inside the RTD and VAT3 guides, which are the pages Google already crawls most often. If they remain unindexed after 30 days, the next step is consolidation rather than persistence: fold the switching guide into the Xero-alternative page as a section, and redirect. One strong page beats two ignored ones.

HOW TO KNOW IT WORKED

Coverage's indexed count moves from 15 to 17, and both URLs begin appearing in the Pages tab. Check at 7, 14 and 30 days.

Move 2 — Concentrate on the compliance cluster

THIS MONTH

EVIDENCE

42% of reported impressions (151 of 359) come from generic "accounting software" queries at an impression-weighted average position of 81.1, with 55 of 72 at position 70 or worse. The compliance cluster sits far higher, with its best term inside the top twelve results nationally, and one guide holds a strong position on roughly a third of the impressions. TERMS, POSITIONS AND PAGE WITHHELD **OBSERVED**

INTERPRETATION

The site has relevance across the whole category but authority only in one corner of it. Impressions in the generic cluster are not early progress towards ranking; they are the cost of competing where the outcome is already decided.

DECISION

Treat the three best-ranking compliance guides as the pages that matter and improve those rather than adding new ones PAGES WITHHELD. Fix the duplicated brand in all six affected titles and put the keyword first; each can be brought inside 60 characters without losing anything. Add FAQ structured data to the guides that are already written as question-and-answer, which most of them are. Re-point `/guides/accounting-software-small-business-ireland` away from the category term it cannot win and towards the comparison question it can — what Irish small businesses should check before choosing — and link it hard to the two pages from Move 1. Add `Organization` markup sitewide and `Offer` markup on pricing; give the pricing page a title somebody searches for.

HOW TO KNOW IT WORKED

Average position for the named compliance queries, tracked individually, not the site-wide average — which will keep moving for reasons unrelated to this work. Filter Search Console to Ireland before reading anything. Check at 30 and 60 days.

Move 3 — Make the Irish contrast concrete, and settle the price

NEXT 30 DAYS

EVIDENCE

Xero's Irish pricing page quoted $29/$50/$75 with no euro symbol on 22 September 2026; BrightBooks' Irish page carried four featured articles on UK Making Tax Digital the same day. MyLedgerBook's entry price sits roughly a third below the cheapest credible competitor FIGURE WITHHELD. Twelve impressions reached the pricing page in fourteen days. OBSERVED

INTERPRETATION

The "built for Ireland" claim is currently an assertion. Today it can be evidenced. And the price is low for reasons that have nothing to do with what the market will bear — nobody has yet reached the pricing page in numbers sufficient to test it.

DECISION

On the Xero-alternative page, replace generic comparison language with the specific, dated, checkable contrast: euro pricing, VAT3 and RTD prepared as Revenue lays them out, Irish deadlines on the dashboard. Date every competitor claim and re-check it quarterly — a claim about a competitor's page is only true until they edit it, and a stale one is worse than none. Separately, decide the entry price deliberately before the customer base makes it expensive to change — a level with BrightBooks and below Sage, while still reading as the affordable Irish choice FIGURE WITHHELD. Do not match the competitors' discounting.

HOW TO KNOW IT WORKED

Pricing-page impressions and trial starts, over 60 days — and, once volume allows, trial- to-paid conversion at whatever price is set. This is the move with the longest feedback loop and it should be judged last.

SECTION 10

Method, Limits and What I Could Not See

The boundaries of this investigation, stated plainly.

Every claim about a live page in this report was verified by opening that page in a browser on 22 September 2026 and reading the rendered content. Every figure attributed to Search Console comes from the client's own exports, unaltered. Where I have drawn a conclusion the evidence supports but does not prove, it is marked INFERRED.

The data's own limits

- **Fourteen days is a baseline, not a trend.** The export covers 6–19 September 2026 and that is the site's entire recorded history. Nothing here should be read as a trajectory, and day-to-day movement in average position is noise.
- **Two clicks cannot be analysed.** Both fall outside the reported query set, so their source is unknown. No conclusion in this report rests on them.
- **359 impressions, not 581.** Query-level figures use only the impressions Google reports at query level. I have not scaled them up to the property total.
- **Competitor pages are a snapshot.** The Xero currency finding and the BrightBooks MTD finding were true on 22 September 2026 and may be corrected at any time. Both should be re-verified before being used publicly.

What was not available

- **Analytics.** No behavioural data was supplied, so this report says nothing about bounce rate, time on page, scroll depth, or where visitors abandon the trial signup.
- **Trial and conversion data.** Signup counts, trial-to-paid rate and churn were not supplied. The pricing argument in Section 7 is therefore a judgement about market position, not a conclusion drawn from conversion evidence, and it is labelled as such.
- **The product itself.** I reviewed the public marketing site. I have not used the application, so nothing here assesses whether the VAT3 and RTD figures it produces are correct — which is, for this product, the thing that matters most.
- **The brand-name collision.** Flagged in Section 8, not investigated.

WHAT THIS MEANS FOR THE FINDINGS

Moves 1 and 2 rest entirely on the supplied exports and the live site, and neither would change if more data arrived. Move 3's price recommendation is the one element that behavioural and trial data could sharpen or overturn, and I would want to revisit it once there is enough traffic for the pricing page to have been tested at all.

What I would want next

Analytics and trial-signup data over the same window, and a further 60 days of Search Console so that the compliance cluster can be judged on movement rather than on a single reading. With those, the open question becomes answerable: whether the constraint is still discovery, or has become conversion.

Prepared by Rolf Stenberg · Global Web Technologies · Dublin · globalwebtec.com · Reference GWT-26-MLB · 22 September 2026. Competitor observations are evidence-backed readings of public pages on the date stated; they are not guarantees of ranking, traffic or revenue.

ABOUT THIS PUBLIC EDITION

This is a complete example of the current Growth Investigation format, in every respect but one: a small number of figures have been withheld and marked WITHHELD — the specific search openings identified in Section 4 and the pricing decision in Section 7. Every other finding, including the unflattering ones, is printed exactly as it was written.

A client's own report is delivered in full, with nothing withheld, and no part of it is published anywhere without their written agreement. This edition exists only because the subject is my own business and I chose to publish it. Competitor observations are evidence-backed readings of public pages on the date stated; they are not guarantees of ranking, traffic or revenue.