

Sample Written Diagnostic

Business panorama, full customer journey and problem diagnosis that leads to a decision

Understand the picture. Identify the problem. Know what to do first.

A demonstration document by Zahavi Digital Clarity for a fictional local service business in Israel. It shows the two layers of the product: understanding the business and the customer, alongside concrete findings, evidence, prioritization and an action plan.

This document does not examine a real business. The company, numbers, logs and test results were created for demonstration purposes only. Even the label FACT means a fact only within the fictional scenario.

How to read this document

Sections 1-6 explain the business, the customer, the journey, the limits of the review and what should be preserved. Sections 7-11 present all findings, priorities and what to do or not do. Sections 12-16 connect each task to a check, decision, owner, completion criterion and evidence.

The logic behind the report

BUSINESS PANORAMA → CUSTOMER THINKING → FULL JOURNEY → EVIDENCE → FINDINGS → PRIORITY → TOP 3 → DO / DON'T → ACTION PLAN

This document demonstrates a 16-section structure. In a real diagnostic, scope and the number of findings depend on the business and the available information; sections are not filled by inventing problems.

16

sections for a complete picture

12

findings linked to evidence

90

days in the action plan

01 | Business panorama

Context before conclusions | fictional source: E00

The business and the offer

"Local Climate - demo business" provides residential air-conditioner repair, cleaning and maintenance, and planned installations in Lod, Ramla and the surrounding area. The name is fictional and has no connection to a specific company. The owner receives enquiries and schedules technicians; there is no full online purchase on the website.

Who buys, and in what situation

A household with a broken air conditioner wants availability and reliability now. A maintenance customer wants a planned, understandable service and price. An installation customer compares suitability, scope of work, warranty and timing. These are different buying situations, so one message may not be enough for all of them.

Existing channels and assets

In the scenario there is a Hebrew website with three service pages, a Google Business Profile, search ads for urgent repair, a form, WhatsApp and phone. Enquiries are recorded in a manual spreadsheet; quotations and service summaries are sent in writing. Installations close after clarification and fit assessment, and payment takes place outside the website.

Goal of the diagnostic

To understand whether a relevant enquiry can reach the business, receive proper handling and move into a clear service process - and only then decide where it makes sense to invest. There is no starting assumption that the answer is more advertising, SEO or a new website.

Numerical starting point - demonstration data only

In a fictional 30-day window: 1,240 visits; 31 lead events in GA4; 18 new enquiries in the business log; source known for only 9 of them. These are different units of measurement. There is no basis for calculating a true conversion rate or financial loss by simply dividing these numbers.

Important limit: there is no data on margins, full operating capacity or customer history. A growth direction therefore cannot be chosen from traffic volume alone.

02 | How the customer thinks

Hypotheses to test - not a substitute for customer research

Situation A | Urgent breakdown

Need: restore cooling. **Trigger:** the air conditioner stopped working. Possible questions: can someone come to my area today? How much is a visit? Will I know the price before the repair? **Concern:** a surprise charge or a technician who does not show up. **Alternative:** a known technician, a neighbour's recommendation, or waiting. The customer's solution hypothesis may be "I only need a gas refill", even though the cause has not yet been diagnosed.

Situation B | Planned maintenance

Need: a convenient, understandable service. **Trigger:** smell, dirt or preparation for the season. **Expectation:** know what is included and how long it takes. **Concern:** partial service or upselling. **Alternatives:** DIY cleaning or postponing. Possible criteria: price, scope, availability and trust.

Situation C | Installation

Need: a solution that fits the home and budget. **Trigger:** moving home or replacing a system. **Concern:** the wrong fit and extra costs. **Alternatives:** a retailer with installation, an independent installer, or repairing the existing unit. The customer may assume that the appliance price is the total price, while installation conditions change the final cost.

What is known and what is assumed

The service situations come from the fictional E00 brief. Needs, concerns and choice criteria are **HYPOTHESES**. There are no real interviews or surveys. The same order of priorities should not be assigned to every customer.

How to get an answer

The owner would collect five to ten written cases from each buying situation: what happened before the search, what was asked, what alternatives were compared and why the person chose or declined. Short answers can be requested from customers with consent. Customer quotes should be kept separate from analyst interpretation.

Implication for the report: first test clarity around availability and service scope; do not write emotional claims or promise "today" based on hypotheses alone.

03 | The full customer lifecycle

Every stage is visible; the evidence level is not the same at every stage

Need → search → market

A breakdown or a planned need; Google search or a recommendation request; exposure to technicians, retailers and DIY solutions. Search needs are assumed; market coverage was not tested.

Discovery → understanding → trust

An ad or profile leads to a page. The customer needs to identify the service, area, availability and scope. E01 shows an availability gap alongside otherwise consistent business information.

Comparison → enquiry

The customer compares terms and proof, then chooses a form, WhatsApp or phone. E02 demonstrates a delivery problem and validation friction; the quality of comparison has not been tested with real customers.

Sales → purchase

The business clarifies the need, provides a quotation, and the customer approves and pays according to the terms. E04 lacks response-time and closing outcome data; the payment process itself is outside the test.

Service delivery → outcome

The technician receives the details and performs the job. E08 demonstrates missing information in the handoff; work quality and repair outcome were not tested.

Feedback → return

A service summary, a route back when there is a problem, and a future need. E09 demonstrates an incomplete template; there is not enough information on satisfaction or return rate.

Loyalty → referral

The customer chooses the business again or recommends it. It is unknown whether loyalty exists, what drives it, or how many customers came by referral. There is no basis for declaring a retention problem.

A complete journey does not mean every stage was tested. Untested areas stay visible so that lack of evidence is not confused with a failure.

04 | The business through the customer's eyes

Analytical impression from the scenario - not user-research results

What is immediately clear

The page presents residential air-conditioning services and the service area; the business name and contact details are consistent between the profile and the page. A local customer can identify basic relevance. Source: E01. This is an observed feature in the example, not proof that the customer will choose the business.

What may build trust

An explanation of the visit fee and a quotation before work reduces ambiguity. The scenario does not independently verify delivery of the promise or the authenticity of reviews, so there is no overall rating such as "high trust".

Where a question appears

Someone who arrived from a "today" promise does not get clear conditions for same-day availability on the page. Someone who sees a form success message can reasonably assume the business received the enquiry, but in the demo log that did not happen every time. The first is a friction hypothesis; the second is an observed operational mismatch.

After booking

If the technician does not receive the fault description, the customer may need to explain it again. If there is no clear route back after the job, the customer may be left with a question. These are possible effects only; complaints and satisfaction were not measured.

How to avoid turning impressions into facts

Ask relevant readers to describe in their own words what the service is, when it can be received and what happens after submitting an enquiry. Record verbal answers, not only "I liked it". Test urgent and planned scenarios separately and cross-check them against the actual enquiry-receiving process.

Conclusion: first connect what is promised, what the customer understands and what the business actually receives. The observations do not justify a full redesign.

05 | What was checked - and what was not

All checks here are fictional; no real business systems or services were operated

Content, offer and journey checks | E01

In the example: one ad, one landing page, business information and opening WhatsApp. Preservation points and a message-alignment question were found. No full competitor map was created.

Website, form and mobile | E02

In the example: five successful submissions and one invalid-input case. Weaknesses were found. There is no complete QA across every device, browser or language.

Analytics and enquiry logging | E03-E04

In the example: an event sequence and a 30-day summary. Duplication and logging gaps were found. There is no real access to GA4, GTM or a CRM.

SEO and performance | E05-E06

In the example: one indexing directive and three laboratory runs. One item requires clarification; real-user performance is unknown.

Accessibility | E07

In the example: one keyboard path through a navigation component. A failure was found. There is no full accessibility audit or legal conclusion.

Sales handoff and post-purchase | E08-E09

In the example: three technician handoffs and one service-completion template. Content gaps were found. Service quality, sales and close rates were not tested.

Security, payment and internal systems

Not tested. There is no security scan, permission review, backup check or payment-process review. Online store/payment is not relevant to the demo model; off-site payment remains outside scope.

06 | What is already working well

Preserve what exists when there is no evidence-based reason to intervene

Consistent local identity | E01

The business name, service area and contact details are identical across the fictional assets that were checked.

Preserve that consistency when changing a page; there is no need to rename, rebrand or restructure simply to make something feel new.

WhatsApp opens as expected | E01

The demo link opens the intended recipient with relevant text. This proves destination opening only; it does not prove that a message was sent or answered. Preserve the link and re-test after any related change.

The quotation process is already explained | E01

Explaining the visit fee and that a quotation comes before work is a useful clarity element. Preserve that explanation and the approved terms, and test whether availability policy can be integrated without replacing useful text with a generic slogan.

The repair page already appears for relevant search demand | E05

In the fictional Search Console summary: 420 impressions and 24 clicks for local repair queries over 30 days. This does not prove quality or sales, but it shows an existing asset. Do not change the URL or rewrite the whole page before understanding which queries and sections already work.

There is already a base for enquiry tracking | E04

The spreadsheet contains 18 enquiries, so the business is not starting from zero. Add the minimum required fields to the existing table before buying a system. Preserve records and history; do not label a guessed source as fact.

Preservation decision: the repair page, the working contact link and clear service information remain the base. A specific component can change when evidence supports it, with a backup and a check that the existing journey still works.

07 | All significant findings

Part 1 of 4 | source, stage, confidence and intervention risk

Part 1 of 4 | F identifiers link the diagnosis to tasks and the appendix

F01 | A success message does not prove the enquiry was received

Stage: contact request | FACT | Evidence: E02 | Priority: CRITICAL

Observation: in the demo log, five submissions showed success; only three appeared in the destination inbox within the 30-minute test window.

Possible impact: risk that an enquiry is not handled. This does not estimate lost customers or revenue.

Confidence: high for the observation; cause unknown. **Intervention risk:** medium - changing delivery can disrupt channels that do work.

F02 | Reloading creates an additional lead event

Stage: enquiry measurement | FACT | Evidence: E03 | Priority: IMPORTANT

Observation: in the demo sequence, the generate_lead event fired again when the thank-you page was refreshed, without a new submission.

Possible impact: lead reporting may be inflated; campaign performance cannot be inferred from the count alone.

Confidence: high. **Intervention risk:** medium - changing the trigger can also stop valid events.

F03 | The enquiry source is missing in half the records

Stage: enquiry to sale | FACT | Evidence: E04 | Priority: IMPORTANT

Observation: the demo summary contains 18 new enquiries; only 9 have a known source. A WhatsApp click is not automatically linked to an enquiry record.

Possible impact: it is difficult to compare sources by enquiry quality. The gap between 31 events and 18 records is not automatically 13 lost leads.

Confidence: high for the logging gap. **Intervention risk:** low - tracking that is too heavy may not be maintained.

Legend: FACT = an observation within the scenario; HYPOTHESIS = a possible explanation; UNKNOWN = missing information; LIMITATION = a boundary of the review. None of these is a finding about a real business.

07 | All significant findings

Part 2 of 4 | source, stage, confidence and intervention risk

Part 2 of 4 | F identifiers link the diagnosis to tasks and the appendix

F04 | The urgency promise is not clearly answered on the page

Stage: discovery, understanding and comparison | HYPOTHESIS | Evidence: E01 | Priority: IMPORTANT - TEST

Observation: the demo ad says "air-conditioning technician today"; the page says "home air-conditioning solutions" without same-day availability conditions.

Possible impact: the customer may not know whether service is available today. There is no proof that this gap caused abandonment.

Confidence: medium. **Intervention risk:** medium - an unverified timing promise can damage trust.

F05 | There is no basis for saying response time is slow

Stage: enquiry and response | UNKNOWN | Evidence: E04 | Priority: MEASURE FIRST

Observation: the demo records do not include first-response time. Enquiry creation time alone is not enough.

Possible impact: delay may exist, but there is no evidence of its size or effect on closing.

Confidence: high for the missing data, not for actual performance. **Intervention risk:** low - measure without imposing an arbitrary target that burdens the team.

F06 | The phone-number error is not explained

Stage: mobile form completion | FACT | Evidence: E02 | Priority: IMPORTANT

Observation: in a fictional test with a phone number that was too short, submission was blocked without a message next to the field.

Possible impact: the user may not understand how to continue. The real frequency among customers is unknown.

Confidence: high for the tested scenario. **Intervention risk:** low to medium - overly strict validation can reject valid numbers.

07 | All significant findings

Part 3 of 4 | source, stage, confidence and intervention risk

Part 3 of 4 | F identifiers link the diagnosis to tasks and the appendix

F07 | A service page is marked noindex

Stage: search and discovery | FACT | Evidence: E05 | Priority: IMPORTANT - CHECK INTENT

Observation: the fictional /maintenance service page contains a noindex directive. It is unknown whether this was intentional.

Possible impact: when processed, the directive prevents the page from being included in the index; search demand and business value are unknown.

Confidence: high for the directive; low for the value of potential traffic. **Intervention risk:** medium - removing it without checking could expose a duplicate or unfinished page.

F08 | A lab measurement does not represent all customers

Stage: mobile page loading | LIMITATION | Evidence: E06 | Priority: MEASURE FIRST

Observation: three fictional lab runs produced LCP values of 3.8, 4.1 and 4.0 seconds. There is no field data or link to business outcomes.

Possible impact: loading friction may exist, but abandonment cannot be attributed to it and a website rebuild cannot be recommended from this alone.

Confidence: high for the data limitation. **Intervention risk:** high for broad optimization - layout, forms and tracking could break.

F09 | A navigation component is not keyboard-accessible in the test scenario

Stage: navigation and reaching a service | FACT | Evidence: E07 | Priority: IMPORTANT

Observation: in the demo test, the services menu does not open with Enter after it receives focus via Tab.

Possible impact: keyboard users may have difficulty reaching content. This is not a legal or standards-compliance opinion.

Confidence: high for the tested scenario. **Intervention risk:** medium - changing navigation can affect mobile behaviour.

07 | All significant findings

Part 4 of 4 | source, stage, confidence and intervention risk

Part 4 of 4 | F identifiers link the diagnosis to tasks and the appendix

F10 | Enquiry information is not passed to the technician

Stage: sale and handoff to delivery | FACT | Evidence: E08 | Priority: IMPORTANT

Observation: in three fictional handoff records, the fault description captured at enquiry stage is missing from the technician handoff; in two, the model is missing.

Possible impact: risk of repeated questions or insufficient preparation for the visit. Cost and frequency across all work were not measured.

Confidence: high for the small sample. **Intervention risk:** low - an overlong form can create friction, so transfer only what is needed.

F11 | The service summary does not explain what to do if the problem returns

Stage: service delivery, outcome and feedback | FACT | Evidence: E09 | Priority: SECONDARY

Observation: the fictional completion template has no route for contacting the business if a problem returns and no reference to approved warranty terms.

Possible impact: the customer may not know what to do after service. Actual satisfaction is unknown.

Confidence: high for the template only. **Intervention risk:** medium - new wording could accidentally promise warranty terms that were not agreed.

F12 | Return and referral cannot be separated from first purchase

Stage: return, loyalty and referral | UNKNOWN | Evidence: E04, E09 | Priority: MEASURE FIRST

Observation: the summary has no returning-customer identifier, referral source, margin data or sufficient history.

Possible impact: LTV cannot be calculated and there is no basis for deciding whether a loyalty programme is worthwhile.

Confidence: high for the missing information. **Intervention risk:** low for logging; higher for launching an automated campaign too early.

08 | Prioritization of all findings

Urgency, confidence, scope of impact, effort and intervention risk

Critical | Handle first

F01: an enquiry may fail to reach the business even though the customer sees confirmation. This is a direct link in receiving work, so clarification and a targeted fix come before expanding demand.

Important | After the receiving blocker, or alongside the investigation

F02-F03: event reliability and linking events to enquiries. **F06:** form error explanation. **F09:** keyboard navigation. **F10:** handoff to delivery. These are not five new projects; several can be handled as limited tasks within the existing repair or operational process.

Important, but the decision depends on a check

F04: validate availability and message understanding. **F07:** determine whether noindex is intentional and whether the page should be indexed. Do not remove the directive or change the promise before that answer exists.

Secondary

F11: complete the service-summary template according to approved policy. This is a small task that can follow stabilization of enquiry receipt and handoff; there is no evidence that it is the main source of lost work.

Measure first / monitor

F05: response times; **F08:** loading performance under relevant conditions; **F12:** return and referral. There is not enough evidence to turn these into system-level fixes. If a tangible journey failure appears, priority should be updated.

Do not touch now

A full rewrite of the organic page, CRM replacement, rebranding or a complete website rewrite are not required by the evidence. These are preservation decisions, not additional negative findings.

Prioritization is not an automatic score: a direct, verified risk comes first; a hypothesis gets a test; missing information gets measurement. Expensive and less reversible changes require stronger evidence.

09 | The owner's three priorities

If only three things can move forward in the near term

1

FIX: make sure an enquiry reaches the business

F01 + F06. Start by locating the gap between customer confirmation and actual receipt, and also fix the mobile error explanation. Owner: developer and email owner. The goal is a reliable testable path, not a promise of more sales.

Gate: 10 test enquiries are received and logged; invalid input is explained and valid input passes. If not, return to diagnosing the cause before sending more traffic.

2

MEASURE: connect the event to the enquiry and its handling

F02 + F03 + F05. Separate a click from an enquiry that was actually received, remove verified duplication, and record source, status and response times. Owners: Analytics and Sales. The existing spreadsheet is enough to start.

Gate: one-event-per-submission test passes and two weeks of records are collected. Only then assess source quality and response time; a small sample may require more measurement.

3

TEST: does the promise match the service?

F04. Confirm what the business can actually deliver and what a customer understands from the urgency ad and the page. Owners: owner, Ads and UX. Only if a gap is verified should a defined message change be made, while preserving content and URLs that already work.

Gate: availability and terms are approved, and a comprehension test supports the message. If there is no gap, preserve the page and do not create unnecessary copy work.

Growing activity may come later; it is not automatically a Top 3 priority. At this point there is not enough information on capacity, margin and close outcomes to rank expansion ahead of the items above.

10 | What to do

Tasks that follow directly from the findings; ownership and completion criteria are detailed in Sections 13-14

F01 CRITICAL

Check server logs, the email provider and spam; fix the verified cause and re-test.

F02 IMPORTANT

Tie the event to confirmed submission; separate clicks from enquiries actually received.

F03 IMPORTANT

Record ID, source if known, channel, service and status; keep "unknown" instead of guessing.

F04 IMPORTANT - TEST

Confirm availability with the owner; test message understanding with five relevant readers before a targeted change.

F05 MEASURE FIRST

Record enquiry time and first human response for two weeks, separated by working and non-working hours.

F06 IMPORTANT

Show an explanation next to the field and test valid and invalid numbers; preserve the working submission path.

F07 IMPORTANT - CHECK INTENT

Confirm page purpose, duplication and search data before deciding whether to remove noindex.

F08 MEASURE FIRST

Measure on a relevant device and journey; identify the limiting component before a local, reversible change.

F09 IMPORTANT

Fix activation and focus; test keyboard, touch and the path to the form.

F10 IMPORTANT

Define minimum handoff fields and technician receipt confirmation.

F11 SECONDARY

Add a short summary and contact route according to policy approved by the owner.

F12 MEASURE FIRST

Record new/returning customer and referral source when provided; do not infer LTV from a short window.

11 | What not to do now

Not acting can also be a diagnostic decision

Do not replace the whole website

The evidence relates to specific components. There is no evidence that the entire website system is preventing work. A broad change increases risk to forms, measurement and organic visibility.

Do not increase budget before receipt and measurement are verified

F01-F03 prevent a reliable evaluation. This is not an automatic instruction to turn off an existing campaign: if active enquiries are not reaching the business, the owner can temporarily redirect traffic to a tested channel according to capacity and data.

Do not replace the CRM because fields are missing

Start with the existing spreadsheet. Only if a simple process is not maintained or is insufficient for the work volume should requirements be defined and alternatives evaluated.

Do not rewrite all content or change URLs

The example has relevant organic visibility. Fix a specific message gap if it is verified, with a backup and comparison. Do not remove noindex without understanding why it is there.

Do not chase a PageSpeed score of 100

F08 does not prove customer loss. Look for a real barrier under relevant conditions; evaluate optimization by risk and impact, not by the score alone.

Do not launch retention automation or a new availability promise

There is not yet enough information about return behaviour, consent, capacity or economics. Logging and an approved service template come before an automated campaign.

These are decisions for this scenario, not permanent prohibitions. New evidence, a broader failure or a business change may change the recommendation.

12 | 90-day action plan

Working windows, not promised dates | FIRST → VERIFY → DECIDE → NEXT

Days 1-30 | Stabilize receipt and create a measurement base

FIRST: diagnose F01 and fix only the verified cause; handle F06. Set up F02-F03 and response-time logging for F05. Check whether the availability promise in F04 is operationally feasible.

VERIFY: 10 controlled submissions arrive; refreshing does not create another event; two weeks of enquiries include status and handling time. Tests are coordinated and marked so they do not burden the business.

DECIDE: if receipt still fails, return to logs and consider a temporary tested channel. If receipt is stable but data are sparse, continue measuring. Do not treat a successful technical test as proof of business growth.

NEXT: move to message clarity and handoff to delivery; address keyboard issue F09 early as capacity allows.

Days 31-60 | Fix verified gaps and test the result

FIRST: comprehension test for F04; clarify indexation intent for F07; fix F09-F10; complete F11. Gather relevant performance conditions for F08.

VERIFY: repeat the comprehension check, complete the navigation journey, test 5 technician handoffs and 5 service summaries. Before changing indexation, document the decision; after the change, run a technical check and monitor.

DECIDE: if a change creates a journey regression, restore the working version and investigate. If the message hypothesis is not supported, do not expand the change. If there is no performance barrier, leave it under observation.

NEXT: compare enquiry quality, capacity and outcomes; begin classifying return and referral for F12 without launching a new campaign.

Days 61-90 | Decide the next investment

FIRST: summarize source, handling, outcomes and operating capacity. **VERIFY:** review completeness and sample adequacy with the owner. **DECIDE:** if the data and economics support it, consider a limited increase in one source; otherwise continue measuring or fix a verified blocker. **NEXT:** define a limited experiment, budget and stop condition before launch.

Implementation is the responsibility of the business and its providers. ZDC provides a written diagnostic and recommendations; the plan is not a promise of results and does not include implementation services.

13 | Who should receive each task

The owner approves business decisions; the specialist executes within their area of responsibility

F01 | Developer / email owner

Pass on: E02 and recommendation F01. Estimated effort: medium; depends on log access.

F02 | Analytics / GTM specialist

Pass on: E03 and recommendation F02. Effort: small-medium; after F01.

F03 | Owner / Sales / Analytics

Pass on: E04 and recommendation F03. Effort: small; no CRM purchase required.

F04 | Owner / Ads / UX

Pass on: E01 and recommendation F04. Effort: small-medium.

F05 | Sales / owner

Pass on: E04 and recommendation F05. Effort: small; depends on F03.

F06 | UX / developer

Pass on: E02 and recommendation F06. Effort: small.

F07 | SEO / owner / developer

Pass on: E05 and recommendation F07. Effort: small-medium.

F08 | Analytics / developer

Pass on: E06 and recommendation F08. Effort: medium; after enquiry blockers.

F09 | Developer / accessibility specialist

Pass on: E07 and recommendation F09. Effort: medium.

F10 | Sales / operations

Pass on: E08 and recommendation F10. Effort: small.

F11 | Owner / customer service

Pass on: E09 and recommendation F11. Effort: small.

F12 | Owner / CRM

Pass on: E04, E09 and recommendation F12. Effort: small and ongoing.

Handoff rule

Attach the observation, evidence, requested change and completion criterion from Section 14. The owner approves availability, responsibilities and spend; the provider should not have to reinvent the diagnosis. Effort estimates are relative and should be confirmed after reviewing the system.

14 | When a task is considered complete

Completion is checked against behaviour or information - not against a message saying "done"

F01 10 out of 10 test enquiries are documented as reaching the destination and receiving valid confirmation.

F02 One submission creates one event; refresh and back-navigation do not create another lead.

F03 Every new enquiry has an ID and status; source is known or marked "unknown", and missing-source causes are reviewed weekly.

F04 Availability policy is approved in writing; readers understand area, hours and conditions, or the message is revised and re-tested.

F05 Every enquiry in the period has an enquiry time and response time, or is marked unanswered; median and outliers are summarized.

F06 The error is displayed and can be corrected; valid input passes; there is no regression in F01 tests.

F07 A reasoned decision is documented; if the page is opened to indexing, the directive and canonical are checked and monitoring is defined.

F08 Test conditions and the limiting component are documented, or the item remains under observation; every change passes a journey check.

F09 The menu opens and closes by keyboard; focus is visible; there is no trap; mobile navigation remains intact.

F10 In 5 consecutive handoffs, fault description, address, availability and model if known are passed and acknowledged.

F11 The approved template is used in 5 sample jobs and includes what was done, how to contact the business and relevant terms.

F12 The classification exists in new records; after 90 days, data quality and the need for a longer window are reviewed.

For every check, record who performed it, when, in which environment, and the result. A passed test does not guarantee the issue can never return; define a re-test after a relevant change.

15 | What is still unknown

Missing information and the practical route to an answer

Why did two submissions not appear? | F01

Obtain server, email-delivery and spam logs with test identifiers; compare time and event for every submission. Owner: developer and email owner, first stage. Until then, the cause remains **UNKNOWN**.

How do customers actually choose? | F04

Collect written questions and decision reasons across the three buying situations and run a comprehension test. Owners: business owner and UX, within 30-60 days. A small sample gives direction, not a population rate.

What is the response time and quality of each source? | F03-F05

For two weeks, record response time, source, status and next outcome; separate working hours. Owner: Sales. If volume is low, extend the window rather than declaring a winner.

Is noindex intentional, and does speed hurt? | F07-F08

SEO reviews decision history, duplication and search data. The developer collects relevant loading conditions and user context. Do not infer causality from a score or a single observation.

What happens after service? | F10-F12

Review handoffs and service summaries; collect feedback with consent and classify returning customers and referrals. Owner: Operations. Ninety days may still be insufficient for loyalty or LTV.

Is there a case for growth?

The owner adds margin by service, capacity, acquisition cost and close outcomes. Only then can budget expansion be considered. Do not calculate return without those inputs.

Are the systems fully secure and accessible?

This report cannot establish that. If a full review is required, define the scope with an appropriate professional; absence of a finding is not proof of compliance or safety.

16 | Evidence appendix

Part 1 of 2 | synthetic records for demonstration only

E identifiers are internal links to the fictional evidence below. There are no real screenshots, reports exported from services or claims that these checks were actually performed. In a real client report, they would be replaced by verifiable sources with date, environment and precise location.

E00 | Fictional business brief

Services: repair, maintenance and installation. Area: Lod and Ramla. Intake: business owner; delivery: technicians. Hebrew website, Google Business Profile, search ads and a manual spreadsheet. Quotation before work. Margin and capacity data were not provided in the scenario. Used in Sections 1-3.

E01 | Fictional content excerpts and destination check

Ad: "air-conditioning technician today". Page heading: "home air-conditioning solutions". In the content area reviewed, there are no conditions for same-day availability. Name and area match between the profile and page. Explanation: visit fee and quotation before work. WhatsApp opens the intended fictional recipient; no message was sent. Used for F04 and preservation points.

E02 | Synthetic QA log

Fictional environment: mobile Chrome, 390 px width. Observation window: 30 minutes per submission. T01, T02, T04: success message and receipt in destination inbox. T03, T05: success message with no receipt in the window. All five used valid input. Separate V01: phone number too short; submission blocked without an explanation next to the field. No server or mail-provider log. Used for F01 and F06.

E03 | Synthetic event sequence

10:00 one submission and confirmation; generate_lead event #1. 10:01 thank-you page refresh without submission; generate_lead event #2. This demonstrates duplication in one sequence, not its rate across traffic. Used for F02.

E04 | Synthetic 30-day data summary

1,240 sessions; 31 lead events; 18 new enquiry records; 9 with known source and 9 without. No first-response times, complete close outcomes or returning-customer identifiers. It is not possible to match all events to records. Used for F03, F05 and F12; it does not prove a number of lost leads.

16 | Evidence appendix

Part 2 of 2 | boundaries, attribution and use in a real report

E05 | Synthetic SEO summary

Fictional path /maintenance: robots tag with the value noindex. Owner intent unknown. Separate repair page: 420 impressions and 24 clicks for relevant local queries in a fictional 30-day window. No sales data. Used for F07 and preservation of the existing page.

E06 | Synthetic performance results

Mobile landing page; the same fictional lab scenario in three runs: LCP 3.8, 4.1 and 4.0 seconds. No trace, full throttling settings or field data. This is therefore a demonstration of an evidence limitation, not a reproducible performance report. A real report would attach the original output, run conditions and field data when available. Used for F08.

E07 | Synthetic keyboard log

Tab reaches the services menu; Enter does not open it; mouse opens it. Only one scenario was recorded. Used for F09. This is not a full standards audit or a legal compliance conclusion.

E08 | Synthetic handoff sample

H01-H03: fault description appears in the enquiry record but is missing from the technician handoff. H01-H02: model missing; H03: model present. It was not recorded whether this caused another visit. Used for F10.

E09 | Synthetic completion template

The template includes date and amount, but no route for contacting the business if the problem returns and no link to warranty terms. There is no feedback or return history. Used for F11-F12. The missing section does not prove that after-service support does not exist.

What a real client appendix looks like

For each E item: exact source or URL, date and time, data period, test environment, screenshot or redacted export, steps and result, limitation and related F identifiers. One screenshot does not replace a test. Personal details and secrets are excluded. The expanded findings in Section 7 together with Sections 10, 13 and 14 allow the reader to follow a line from evidence through action to completion.

ZDC: a personalized written diagnostic of the website and customer journey. A broad picture plus concrete findings, recommendations and an action plan. No technical implementation and no promise of sales growth.