A clearer picture. A practical plan.

Selected Findings

Sample Audit Extract
Website & SEO review

A closer look at the work behind an audit
This extract shows how we explain selected findings and turn them into a correction plan. It is not a complete audit. The website scenario, page paths and measurements are synthetic; no real client is represented.

THE EXAMPLE BRIEF

An established professional-services business wants its existing website to support more enquiries. Before committing to a redesign, it needs to understand which problems can be corrected and whether a rebuild is justified.

Our recommendation in this scenario

Start with focused repairs. Restore the contact journey, review unintended indexing restrictions and investigate slow mobile loading. The example evidence does not justify a full rebuild.

A useful audit should help you decide what to fix first, what to investigate next and what can wait. It should also make clear what has not been tested.

WHAT YOU RECEIVE

Your full report follows the agreed scope: coverage, evidence, prioritised findings and a practical correction plan. See page 6 for deliverables and the boundary between audit and implementation.

01 / SCOPE OF THIS EXTRACT

Selected findings, not the whole report

The example is a professional-services WordPress website with 12 pages intended to be publicly accessible. This extract presents three technical findings, one usability hypothesis and one verification gap. It does not reproduce a complete crawl inventory or every passed check.

Public pages in the example Illustrative scope only	**12**
Unintended noindex directives Publishing intent must be checked	**2 pages**
Broken contact links One obsolete destination	**3 links**
Mobile lab LCP Median of 3 synthetic test runs	**4.1 seconds**
Real-user performance No conclusion from field Core Web Vitals data	**Unavailable**
Search Console / Analytics No traffic or attribution findings	**Not supplied**
Form delivery Inbox verification still required	**Not tested**

How to read the findings

P1 - address first: a direct obstacle or an important missing verification.
P2 - investigate or improve next: a performance or usability opportunity requiring further evidence.

Missing data is reported separately from a failed check. Page counts alone do not demonstrate that customers were lost. This example does not set a page limit for any package.

Local presence, AI visibility and transaction journeys are outside the scope of this extract. Their inclusion depends on the website, agreed scope and available evidence.

02 / DETAILED FINDING - F01

Two service pages are marked noindex

P1 / CORRECT FIRST / OWNER: WORDPRESS IMPLEMENTER

Both pages are intended to attract enquiries from search. In the synthetic evidence below, both return HTTP 200 but tell search engines not to index it. The service overview is included as a comparison.

Example path	HTTP	Robots meta	Expected
/services/consulting/	200	noindex, follow	Eligible for indexing
/services/business-planning/	200	noindex, follow	Eligible for indexing
/services/	200	index, follow	Eligible for indexing

Evidence excerpt - synthetic HTML:

```
<meta name="robots" content="noindex, follow">
```

What we can conclude. The output conflicts with the stated publishing intent on two pages. We cannot establish their current Google index status or traffic loss from this evidence alone. A shared page-level setting is a possible cause, not yet a confirmed diagnosis.

Correction specification

1. Confirm both pages are intended for public search and record their current settings.
2. Inspect page-level SEO controls, template output and any X-Robots-Tag header to locate the source.
3. Remove the unintended noindex at its source on these pages. Preserve intentional exclusions elsewhere.
4. Clear the relevant cache and check the public response and rendered page again.

Acceptance checks

Both pages return 200, have no unintended noindex in HTML or response headers, and retain the intended canonical and content. The service overview remains unchanged. Use Search Console URL Inspection when access is available; eligibility does not guarantee indexing.

Rollback: restore the recorded setting if the publishing intent was wrong or the change exposes restricted content.
Commercial decision: this finding supports a focused repair, not a rebuild.

03 / PRACTICAL IMPROVEMENTS

Remove friction where it matters

F02 / P2 - MOBILE LOADING

Investigate the main content loading delay

Example evidence: mobile lab LCP is 4.0, 4.2 and 4.1 seconds across three synthetic runs. The hero image is the example LCP element. Real-user measurements are unavailable.

Interpretation: inspect image delivery, request timing and blocking resources before selecting a fix. The hero image being the LCP element does not establish the root cause.

Action and check: make the smallest supported change, then repeat tests under comparable conditions. Confirm image quality and responsive behaviour. Restore the prior asset or configuration if either regresses. Do not assume that a lab improvement will increase sales.

F03 / P1 - CONTACT LINKS

Repair one broken destination used by three buttons

Example evidence: contact buttons on three service pages point to /contact-us-old/, returning HTTP 404. The intended route in the example is /contact/.

Interpretation: this specific route to an enquiry is broken. Without analytics, the number of affected visitors is unknown.

Action and check: verify the correct destination, update all three links and assess a redirect for the obsolete address. Test each button on desktop and mobile devices, and verify that it works with keyboard navigation. If the replacement is wrong, restore the saved revision while correcting the route.

Owner for both actions: WordPress/front-end implementer.
Record the original configuration and repeat the same checks after implementation.

04 / FROM FINDING TO ACTION

Help visitors take the next step

F04 / P2 - USABILITY HYPOTHESIS

Let visitors explain the problem before choosing the solution

In the example, the professional-services enquiry form requires visitors to select a detailed consulting package before explaining their needs. Offer a clear **“Discuss your project”** route and a **“Not sure yet”** option in the service selector.

Confirm that the selected service or enquiry context is carried through to the form correctly. Then evaluate the quality of actual enquiries and the projects that result from them. This is a hypothesis to test, not evidence of a measured conversion problem. Restore the previous presentation if the revision loses useful information or creates confusion.

F05 / P1 - NOT TESTED

Verify delivery and measurement from end to end

A form is visible in the example, but inbox and analytics access have not been supplied. Its delivery and conversion behaviour remain unverified.

Run an authorised, clearly labelled test. Check validation, submission, delivery to the intended recipient, the reply address and the intended analytics event. Check whether retries or page refreshes create duplicate analytics events. Exclude tests from commercial lead reporting. Paid-click attribution requires a separate check.

Recommended order of work

1. Verify form delivery and measurement; repair the broken contact route.
2. Correct unintended noindex on public service pages.
3. Investigate and improve loading with comparable before/after tests.
4. Test the clearer enquiry route and review real lead quality.

The next decision

Agree the repair scope and success checks first. Revisit the rebuild decision only if the implementation review reveals wider constraints. A larger project should follow the evidence.

05 / BEYOND THIS EXTRACT

What your full report gives you

The purpose is to help you decide what deserves attention, what evidence supports that decision and what the person implementing the changes needs to do. The final scope for your website is agreed before work begins.

Deliverable	What it contains
Scope and coverage	The pages, templates and journeys reviewed; the review date; available access; exclusions and limitations.
Evidence-backed findings	Affected URLs, the relevant measurement or observation, why it matters, and the difference between a confirmed issue and a hypothesis.
Prioritised correction plan	What to address first, dependencies, the proposed owner and a clear description of the correction.
Verification criteria	How to check each correction, what success means and when a previous setting should be restored.
Decision summary	Where focused repairs appear sufficient, where further investigation is needed and whether a wider rebuild is justified by the evidence.

Scope that fits the website

A business website, a multilingual site and an online shop require different coverage. Relevant local-presence checks, AI visibility checks and purchase or booking journeys are included only where agreed and supported by the required access.

Audit and implementation

The audit provides the findings and plan. Repairs and rebuilds are quoted separately. Verification criteria are part of the report; hands-on implementation and post-fix retesting are included only when explicitly stated in the written scope.

Discuss an audit for your website

Send your website address and the main questions you want answered. We will confirm the appropriate scope and price before work begins.

View audit scope and pricing | **Discuss your website**

This extract demonstrates the report format. It is not a client case study, a complete list of findings or a forecast of rankings, leads or revenue.