

Online Visibility Report — Feedback Journey

Need: As a consultant I need to collect customer feedback to self-improve and document customer satisfaction · Regions: Europe · Generated 7 September 2026

This report was generated automatically using AI and automated measurement. It has not been reviewed, verified, or endorsed by a human expert and may contain inaccuracies. It is provided for informational purposes only and does not constitute professional advice. Learn more at online-visibility-report.eu.

Executive summary

Website audit score

64/100 **D**

Feedback Journey is, on the measured evidence, a well-built but essentially invisible product for the need it was designed to serve. Its own website scores a **website audit score of 64/100, grade D** — a result driven up by an excellent technical base (crawlability and indexing 100/100, mobile usability 100/100, semantic HTML and headings 97/100, performance and Core Web Vitals 94/100) and pulled down almost entirely by off-site and agent-facing signals: agent usability 0/100, named by AI assistants 0/100, Knowledge Graph 0/100, security and headers 50/100, meta tags and indexability 66/100. In other words, the site is not the problem. The absence of independent evidence about the brand is.

The verified search picture is unambiguous. Across 30 brand-free buyer queries measured in Google Search in three European markets (France, Germany, the United Kingdom), Feedback Journey's own site ranked in the organic results for **zero** of them. Google displayed an AI Overview for all 30 and cited Feedback Journey in **none**. When three leading AI assistants were asked, without the brand being named, which providers they would recommend for this need, **none of the three** mentioned Feedback Journey; they named Typeform, Qualtrics, SurveyMonkey and similar instead. The domains that actually win these searches are the measured competitors — SmartSurvey (present in 18 of 30 searches, best position 1, cited in 6 AI Overviews), Mopinion (10 of 30, best position 1, cited in 8 AI Overviews) and Zendesk (8 of 30, best position 1, cited in 4) — together with comparison publishers such as europeanmartech.eu, eualternative.eu, heymarvin.com and guideflow.com, and community threads on Reddit. Feedback Journey appears in none of these places.

Commercially, this means the product is currently discoverable almost exclusively through the founder's own network and direct outreach, not through search or AI assistants. That is a fragile position for a niche SaaS product, but it is also a recoverable one: the niche framing Feedback Journey occupies — feedback designed specifically for individual consultants,

freelancers and knowledge workers who want to improve and to document client satisfaction — is barely contested in the measured results. Notably, for the most on-target query, "How can I gather customer satisfaction data for my consulting business?", Google's AI Overview returned generic advice with no citations at all in two of three markets. No source owns that answer yet. The realistic route to visibility is therefore to become the source that independent publishers, review platforms and communities describe as the answer for consultants — and to make the site's own pages easy for engines and models to quote while doing so.

Top priorities

- 1. **Get Feedback Journey listed and reviewed in the European comparison sources that already win these searches** — the single highest-leverage step towards appearing in Google's AI Overview and in assistant answers.
- 2. **Create a Wikidata item and align the brand's core facts everywhere** — gives assistants and Google's Knowledge Graph a canonical record where none exists today.
- 3. **Build a genuine, visible review pipeline on G2, Capterra and Trustpilot, plus named consultant references** — supplies the third-party evidence models repeat.
- 4. **Rewrite titles, meta descriptions and the homepage copy for clarity and quotability, and add a canonical tag** — fixes the measured 78-character title, 217-character description, missing canonical and Flesch Reading Ease of 0.
- 5. **Publish original, citable material on consultant feedback (data, benchmarks, a practical guide) and place it where buyers discuss the need** — gives journalists, listicle writers and language models a reason to reference the brand.

These and the remaining actions are detailed in chapter 10.

Contents

1 Introduction	3
2 Description of Feedback Journey	5
3 Visibility assessment based on research	7
4 Overview of competitors	12
5 Review of relevant channels	19
6 Website and technical assessment (SEO & AEO)	22
7 Technical test results	28
8 Building authority: mentions, reputation and trust	39
9 SWOT analysis	45
10 Recommended actions	49
11 Conclusion	59
Appendix: How online visibility works	61

1 Introduction

This report assesses how visible Feedback Journey is to a specific buyer with a specific need: a consultant — independent, freelance, or working inside a consultancy — who wants to collect feedback from clients in order to improve their own practice, and to document client satisfaction in a way that can be shown to employers, prospects or procurement functions. The geographic scope is Europe, sampled across France, Germany and the United Kingdom, which together represent the three largest and most search-mature consulting markets on the continent and cover the main regulatory and language variations a European buyer will encounter.

Visibility matters for this need more than it does for many others, and for a reason that is worth spelling out. The buyer here is almost always a small buyer: one person, or a team of a few. They do not run a formal procurement process, they do not issue a request for proposals, and they rarely have a shortlist handed to them by a purchasing department. They form their shortlist in minutes, from whatever a search engine or an AI assistant puts in front of them, supplemented by what peers mention in a community thread or on LinkedIn. If a product is not in that first set of options, it is usually not evaluated at all — not rejected on price or features, simply never seen. The measured data in this report shows exactly that pattern: for every one of the 30 buyer queries tested, Google produced an answer, and in none of them did that answer include Feedback Journey.

The report is structured to move from the outside in. Chapter 2 describes what Feedback Journey actually is, based on what can be established from the web and from the structure of its own site. Chapter 3 takes the buyer's perspective rather than the brand's: it works through the different ways a consultant can genuinely meet this need — dedicated survey tools, European privacy-first platforms, CSAT/NPS specialists, review and reputation platforms, CRM-based logging, and simply asking well in a structured conversation — and assesses each on its merits, using searches that never mention Feedback Journey by name. Chapter 4 sets Feedback Journey against the competitors that actually surfaced in those searches, measured the same way, and then widens to the broader competitive field. Chapter 5 reviews the marketing channels that are realistically available. Chapter 6 assesses the website itself as a technical foundation for both search engines and AI answer engines, grounded in the measured audit; the complete measured test list follows it as chapter 7. Chapter 8 turns to the decisive factor — authority: the independent mentions, reviews, citations and entity data that determine whether a brand is recommended at all. Chapter 9 consolidates this into a SWOT analysis, chapter 10 sets out prioritised actions, and chapter 11 concludes. An appendix explains, for readers who want the underlying theory, how online visibility and large language models actually work.

One framing point runs through the whole report and should be stated at the outset. The technical findings describe a foundation. They decide whether search engines and AI systems

can read, understand, quote and cite Feedback Journey. That foundation is necessary, and in Feedback Journey's case it is largely in place. But it is not sufficient. A technically flawless site that independent sources barely mention will still lose — in organic rankings and in AI-assistant answers — to a rival that the wider web vouches for. What ultimately decides whether a brand is surfaced and recommended is authority: the breadth, quality and consistency of independent evidence that this brand is a credible answer to this need. Every technical recommendation in this report should therefore be read as work that removes obstacles and makes authority-building pay off, not as work that will by itself produce rankings or recommendations.

2 Description of Feedback Journey

Feedback Journey is a software product operating at feedbackjourney.com, aimed at individuals in consulting and knowledge work who want a structured way to collect feedback from the people they serve. The evidence available about the brand is thin — which is itself one of the report's central findings — so it is worth being explicit about what can be established, what can be reasonably inferred, and what cannot be verified.

What can be established. The site is live and returns HTTP 200, is indexable, has a valid sitemap and a robots.txt, and publishes an llms.txt file for AI answer engines. The audit sampled 20 pages, and their URLs give a clear and unusually informative picture of how the product is organised and positioned. There are audience pages for consultants, for freelancers, for consultant leaders, for clients and for knowledge workers; conceptual pages explaining what feedback is, what the consultant role is about, and what Feedback Journey is; functional pages covering surveys, survey types, improvement goals, a "journey card", coaching, a manual and a how-to-use page; and commercial pages for pricing, FAQ, about and contact. The structured data on the site parses cleanly and includes high-value schema types as well as FAQ/Q&A markup, and the headings on the site are question-shaped — both measured facts, and both unusual for a product of this size.

Read together, this page inventory tells a coherent story. Feedback Journey is not a general-purpose survey builder competing on form design or logic branching. It is a feedback practice for individuals: a way for a consultant to define what they want to improve (improvement goals), to ask clients about it in a structured, repeatable way (surveys and survey types), to keep a running record of what clients say over time (the "journey" metaphor and the journey card), and to have something documented to show for it. The presence of a coaching page and a "what is the consultant role about" page suggests the product is sold alongside a point of view about professional development, not purely as a data-collection utility.

Who is behind it. Public sources identify Jørgen Landsnes as the founder of Feedback Journey, based in Bergen, Norway. His professional background, as described on LinkedIn and in a speaker profile for the Booster conference in Bergen, is software development and consulting — including time at the Norwegian consultancy Miles and at imove/Casi — and he holds a master's degree in software development from the University of Bergen. The Booster speaker profile describes him as someone who founded a company and launched a product in 30 days, and who now speaks about feedback and why it matters for continuous improvement. His LinkedIn activity includes a post, written in Norwegian, about moving the solution off Cloudflare and onto a private server because prospective users raised concerns about where data is stored geographically and about privacy.

That last detail is more strategically significant than it looks. Data residency and GDPR compliance are, on the measured search evidence, among the strongest differentiators in the European feedback-tool market: several of the queries that dominate this space are explicitly

about European, EU-hosted and GDPR-compliant options, and Google's AI Overviews in this space repeatedly foreground exactly that attribute. Feedback Journey has apparently made a deliberate infrastructure decision on this axis — and, as far as the available evidence shows, has not yet turned that decision into a visible, citable claim anywhere that search engines or AI assistants can find it. There is no page in the sampled inventory obviously dedicated to data protection, hosting location or GDPR, and no third-party listing describing Feedback Journey as a European, privacy-first option.

What cannot be verified. Searches on Google for the brand name, for the domain, and for the founder's name in combination with the product surfaced almost nothing about Feedback Journey itself beyond the founder's own LinkedIn presence, a conference speaker biography and a contact-data aggregator entry. No reviews were found on G2, Capterra, Trustpilot or Software Advice. No entry was found in the European alternative directories (european-alternatives.eu, eualternative.eu, europeanmartech.eu) that rank at or near the top of the measured European buyer queries. No press coverage, no comparison-article inclusion, no community discussion. The audit confirms there is no Wikidata entity for the brand. The report therefore cannot state pricing, customer numbers, funding, company registration details, team size, integrations or feature depth as facts — none of that is independently visible. Where later chapters discuss the product's positioning, they draw on the site's own page structure and the audit's measurements, both of which are reliable, rather than on claims that cannot be checked.

A naming risk worth flagging. The phrase "feedback journey" is a common generic expression in customer-experience writing — Zendesk, for example, uses it in ordinary marketing prose ("kickstart your feedback journey"), and there are many pages about "customer journey" and "feedback" that have nothing to do with this brand. There is also an unrelated site at feedbackjourney.net publishing content on peer-to-peer investment. For an entity that has no Wikidata record and few independent mentions, a generic, easily-confused name is a genuine handicap: it makes it harder for a search engine or a language model to distinguish the brand from the phrase, and harder for the brand's scattered mentions to be attributed to one identified entity. This does not mean the name should change — it means the disambiguation work described in chapter 8 matters more here than it would for a distinctive name.

Summary characterisation. Feedback Journey is best described as an early-stage, founder-led, Norwegian-built SaaS product with a sharply defined niche — individual consultant feedback and continuous self-improvement — a technically competent and thoughtfully structured website, an apparently deliberate privacy and data-residency posture, and effectively no independent digital footprint. The gap between the quality of the on-site work and the absence of off-site evidence is the defining feature of its visibility profile.

3 Visibility assessment based on research

This chapter takes the buyer's position, not the brand's. The question is: if a consultant in Europe sets out today to solve this need, what do they find, what are their real options, and how do those options compare? Every search reported here was run without the brand name, so that the assessment reflects the market as a buyer encounters it.

3.1 What the market actually shows a buyer

The measured Google Search data is the strongest evidence available, and it is consistent across all three sampled markets. Three patterns stand out.

First, **the results are dominated by comparison content, not by vendors' own pages**. A buyer searching for tools lands on round-ups: "The top 10 best European GDPR-compliant customer feedback tools" (mopinion.com, which held position 1 in all three markets for the European tools query), "11 best customer feedback tools reviewed and ranked" (heymarvin.com), "20 best customer feedback tools in 2026" (guideflow.com), "Best European Survey Tools: Free Options, All EU-Hosted" (europeanmartech.eu), "European survey tools" (european-alternatives.eu), "European Alternatives to SurveyMonkey" (eualternative.eu). Even the vendors that rank well often rank with editorial content rather than product pages — SmartSurvey ranks with blog guides such as "Customer Feedback Tools: A Quick Guide", "How To Get Customer Feedback" and "6 ways to measure customer satisfaction". The buyer's shortlist is assembled by publishers, and the vendors that appear on it are those the publishers chose to include.

Second, **Google answers the question itself before the buyer reaches any vendor**. An AI Overview appeared for all 30 measured queries. Where it cited sources, it cited the comparison publishers and community threads listed above, plus Typeform's own blog and, in the UK, Trustpilot's business site and G2's category pages. Where it did not cite sources — notably for the consultant-specific query in France, Germany and the UK — it produced generic method advice: send short post-project surveys, run NPS, hold review calls, log everything in a CRM. A buyer who accepts that answer never visits a vendor site at all; a buyer who wants a tool takes the named tools from the Overview and searches those.

Third, **community and peer sources carry real weight**. Reddit threads appeared in the organic top eight for several queries — "Looking for a European survey platform" in r/BuyFromEU, "How Do You Collect Client Feedback to Improve Your..." in r/agency, "What tools (if any) actually help automate customer..." — and Reddit was cited as a source in Google's AI Overview in both Germany and France. LinkedIn articles also ranked repeatedly. For a niche product aimed at consultants, this is important: peer recommendation in these venues is both a discovery channel in its own right and a feedstock for the AI answers.

Searches run for this report on Google, using the terms "best client feedback tools for freelancers consultants 2026 comparison", "Simplesat CSAT feedback for consultants MSP

reviews", "AskNicely Customer Thermometer Netigate Questback comparison NPS Europe", "Clutch verified client reviews consultants how it works" and "european-alternatives.eu submit listing add a service", broadly confirmed and extended this picture. They also surfaced a useful market signal: an Enterpret guide notes that Delighted, a widely-used lightweight NPS tool, is closing on 30 June 2026, which is prompting migrations. Displacement moments like this are when buyers reconsider — and when a small, well-positioned alternative can be picked up by comparison writers, if it is visible to them.

3.2 The realistic ways to meet this need

A consultant who needs to collect client feedback for self-improvement and to document satisfaction has six substantively different routes. They are not equally good, and they are not mutually exclusive.

Route 1: A general-purpose survey platform. Typeform, SurveyMonkey, Google Forms, Microsoft Forms, Jotform, SmartSurvey, QuestionPro, Alchemer, SurveySparrow. This is what assistants recommend by default: all three assistants in the measured test named tools of this kind, with Typeform named by two of them and described in flattering terms for survey design and completion rates. *Advantages:* extremely low friction, familiar to clients, free or cheap at low volume, enormous template libraries (SurveyMonkey publishes a customer-satisfaction survey template specifically for consultants, which ranked in the UK results), and instant credibility because the buyer has heard of them. *Disadvantages:* they are collection instruments, not improvement systems. They do not model a consultant's improvement goals, do not track one professional's development over time, and produce no coherent longitudinal record of satisfaction that a consultant could show to a client or an employer. Response data lives in a spreadsheet, and the discipline of asking regularly depends entirely on the consultant's own habits. For the "self-improve" half of the need, they are a blunt instrument.

Route 2: A European, privacy-first survey or feedback platform. Mopinion (Netherlands), Survicate (Poland), Formbricks (Germany, open-source and self-hostable), easy-feedback and Netigate (Germany/Sweden), Enalyzer (Denmark), Questback (Norway/Germany), Feedbackly (Finland), Pisano (Turkey), Feedier (France), YourCX (Poland), plus the European Commission's free EUSurvey, which held position 1 in all three markets for the "survey platforms popular in Europe" query. *Advantages:* GDPR posture and EU data residency are genuine procurement requirements for many European clients, particularly in the public sector, healthcare and finance — and, as the measured AI Overviews show, this is the attribute that European buyer queries are actually about. Several of these vendors are well-covered by the directories that dominate the search results, which is why they surface. *Disadvantages:* most are built for CX and product teams inside companies, not for individual professionals. Pricing and complexity are often scaled to teams; onboarding assumes a website or app to instrument. Feedbackly, Mopinion and Netigate all position around touchpoints and digital experience rather than around a single consultant's practice. A solo consultant can use them, but is buying far more machinery than the need requires.

Route 3: A CSAT/NPS specialist for service businesses. SimpleSAT, SmileBack, AskNicely, Customer Thermometer, Nicereply, Retently, Zonka Feedback, CustomerSure. SimpleSAT is the closest structural analogue to Feedback Journey's positioning found in this research: it is built for service providers and managed service providers, integrates with ticketing tools such as ConnectWise and Autotask, and — importantly — publishes collected feedback as website testimonials with one click, which addresses the "document satisfaction" half of the need directly. *Advantages:* purpose-built for post-engagement satisfaction measurement; one-click surveys with high response rates; the testimonial-publishing loop turns feedback into marketing assets; strong published customer stories with concrete numbers. *Disadvantages:* the centre of gravity is service desks and support tickets, not advisory engagements. Much of the value is in ticket-system integrations a consultant does not have. AskNicely and Customer Thermometer are similarly frontline-team oriented. Delighted's closure removes one of the simplest options in this category. None of them frames feedback around the individual's own development goals.

Route 4: A review or reputation platform. Trustpilot, G2, Capterra, Clutch, Google Business Profile, Provenexpert, and for individuals, LinkedIn recommendations. This route addresses "document customer satisfaction" in the strongest possible way: publicly, verifiably, and where prospects look. Clutch is particularly relevant for consultants — it describes itself as a B2B marketplace with vetted providers across thousands of categories, verifies reviewer identity via LinkedIn, Google or company email, and captures project scope, budget range and outcomes rather than a bare star rating. Its own materials note that verified providers are eligible for a guarantee it describes as a trust signal that AI search engines evaluate when recommending providers. Trustpilot's business site ranked at position 1 in the UK for "top-rated online feedback collection services", and was cited in that market's AI Overview. *Advantages:* public proof, third-party verification, and — critically for this report — these are exactly the sources that search engines and AI assistants read when deciding who to recommend. *Disadvantages:* it does not serve the self-improvement need at all. Reviews are marketing artefacts; clients write them for the provider's benefit, which suppresses candour. Nobody tells you what to fix in a five-star public review. And for an individual inside a larger consultancy, public review platforms are usually not available as a channel.

Route 5: CRM or general tooling. Logging feedback in HubSpot, Salesforce, Pipedrive, Notion or a spreadsheet. Google's AI Overviews recommended this in several markets — CRM logging appeared as a "core method" for documenting client feedback in the France, Germany and UK answers to the documentation query. *Advantages:* free or already paid for; keeps feedback next to the client relationship; no new tool to introduce to clients. *Disadvantages:* it is a filing cabinet, not a feedback method. Nothing prompts the ask, nothing standardises the questions, nothing produces comparable measures over time, and nothing gives the client a safe, semi-anonymous channel to be honest.

Route 6: Structured conversation and human method. Post-project debriefs, review calls, exit interviews, a peer or coach reviewing the feedback with you, and 360-style feedback

processes. Google's AI Overviews recommended precisely this for the consultant-specific query: short post-project surveys plus scheduled review calls plus retention tracking. Harvard Business Review's guidance on getting honest, substantive feedback appeared in the UK organic results, and several sources emphasised anonymity as the key to candour.

Advantages: by far the richest material for genuine self-improvement, with no software cost. Nuance, tone and "what you should stop doing" come out in conversation far more than in a survey. *Disadvantages:* it does not scale, it is not comparable across clients or over time, it produces no documentation that a third party would accept as evidence of satisfaction, and it is systematically biased — clients soften criticism when they are looking at you.

3.3 Assessment: where Feedback Journey fits, and what that implies

Set against these six routes, Feedback Journey's positioning is genuinely differentiated. Routes 1, 2 and 3 collect feedback but do not organise it around the individual's improvement. Route 4 documents satisfaction but generates no learning. Routes 5 and 6 generate learning but no comparable documentation. Feedback Journey's page structure — improvement goals, survey types, a journey record, a card, coaching, and separate pages for consultants, freelancers, consultant leaders and knowledge workers — describes a product that deliberately joins the two halves of the need for one person rather than one company. On the evidence of this research, very few products occupy that space; SimpleSat is the nearest neighbour and it comes at the problem from the service-desk side.

That is the good news, and it should not be understated: a defensible niche with a clear buyer is worth more than a marginally better general survey tool. The bad news is that the niche is invisible. The measured data shows Feedback Journey ranking for none of the 30 buyer queries and cited in none of the 30 AI Overviews. Not one of the comparison articles, directories or community threads that decide this market's shortlists mentions it. A consultant who follows the completely normal path — search, read a round-up, ask ChatGPT, check a review site — will never encounter it.

There is also a structural opportunity visible in the data that is worth naming precisely. For the query closest to the need, "How can I gather customer satisfaction data for my consulting business?", Google's AI Overview returned no citations at all in France and Germany, and in the UK cited only SmartSurvey, LinkedIn, SurveyMonkey, SuperOffice and YouTube. The organic results for that query were a scattering of low-authority pages: LinkedIn posts, a Scribd document, small consultancy blogs, a Medium article. This is a weakly-contested question. The generic "customer feedback tools" queries are dominated by well-resourced publishers and will be expensive to enter; the consultant-specific framing is not. A brand that produced the definitive, quotable, well-structured answer to how a consultant should collect and document client satisfaction — and got that answer referenced by a few independent sources — could plausibly become the cited source for it. That is a far more achievable target than displacing Mopinion from position 1 for "best European feedback tools".

3.4 Nearby variants of the need

Buyers rarely phrase their need exactly once. Four adjacent framings were researched, each of which leads to a different competitive set — and each of which represents either an opportunity or a distraction for Feedback Journey.

"How do I get honest feedback from clients?" This is the method question, and the measured results are dominated by editorial advice: Zendesk, SmartSurvey, Salesforce, LinkedIn, HBR, and a Reddit thread in r/agency that ranked first in Germany and the UK. The consistent recommendation across sources is anonymity plus specific open-ended questions plus timing immediately after delivery. This variant is highly relevant to Feedback Journey, because the product's premise is precisely about making honest feedback routine — and because the winning content here is guidance, not product pages. It is the most natural content territory for the brand.

"European / GDPR-compliant feedback tools" This is the compliance question, and it is where the European directories rank. It is a strong fit for Feedback Journey's apparent data-residency posture, but entry is gated by directory inclusion rather than by content quality: european-alternatives.eu, eualternative.eu and europeanmartech.eu are curated lists, and being on them is a submission-and-review process rather than an SEO exercise. european-alternatives.eu states that suggestions for new products in existing categories can be submitted through a suggestion tool after registering.

"Customer feedback analysis / CX analytics" This variant — analysing large volumes of feedback with AI, sentiment analysis, theme extraction — is owned by Sprinklr, Chattermill, Enterpret, Contentsquare, Productboard, Zendesk, Sentisum and similar. It is a genuinely different need (thousands of data points per month, product and CX teams) and, on the evidence of the page inventory, not where Feedback Journey competes. Chasing it would be a distraction; the audience is wrong and the incumbents are heavily resourced.

"360-degree feedback / professional development" Adjacent to the self-improvement half of the need, and served by employee-experience and performance tools. This variant did not surface in the measured buyer queries, which suggests the buyer in question frames the need as customer feedback rather than as performance management. It is nonetheless worth watching, because "consultant leaders" — one of Feedback Journey's stated audiences — sit at the boundary between the two, and a consultancy manager looking to track their consultants' client satisfaction may well search in the professional-development vocabulary rather than the CX vocabulary.

4 Overview of competitors

Three competitors were measured the same way Feedback Journey was, selected without judgement because they are the domains that actually surfaced in the 30 brand-free buyer searches. Their measured numbers are the anchor for this chapter; the wider field that follows comes from research and is labelled as such.

4.1 The measured comparison

SmartSurvey (smartsurvey.co.uk) — measured. SmartSurvey is the strongest measured performer in Google Search for this need. It appeared in 18 of the 30 measured buyer searches, with a best position of 1, and was cited by Google's AI Overview in 6 of them. Feedback Journey appeared in none of the 30 and was cited in none. That is the whole competitive story in two sentences: for the queries a European consultant actually types, SmartSurvey is present more than half the time and Feedback Journey is never present. On the authority panel measured for this report, SmartSurvey's domain authority is 7.8 out of 10; Feedback Journey's authority was not measured (returned as unknown), and domain age was not measured for either, so no age-adjusted comparison can be made.

What is instructive is *how* SmartSurvey wins. Its measured homepage is unremarkable in scale — a 59-character title ("Online Survey Software and Questionnaire Tool - SmartSurvey"), a 134-character meta description, a plain benefit-led H1 ("Create surveys with ease and get insights faster"), 952 words of readable body text, and schema.org markup limited to a single corporation type. Its measured homepage mobile performance in the Lighthouse lab is 28/100 — dramatically weaker than Feedback Journey's measured 93/100 on mobile and 100/100 on desktop. It publishes an llms.txt, as Feedback Journey does, and its robots.txt does not block the AI crawlers checked. In other words, SmartSurvey does not out-engineer Feedback Journey; on the site-quality measures where the two can be compared directly, Feedback Journey is ahead on performance and richer in structured data. SmartSurvey wins because it has spent years publishing guide content on the exact buyer questions — "Customer Feedback Tools: A Quick Guide", "How To Get Customer Feedback", "6 ways to measure customer satisfaction", "The Importance of Customer Feedback", "Top 10 Best Online Survey Tools" — and has accumulated the domain authority to rank it. It is a direct competitor for the collection half of the need, clearly present in Europe with a UK base and UK-focused content, and it is the competitor most likely to be shown to a British consultant instead of Feedback Journey. Commercially, the gap means SmartSurvey is in the consideration set by default while Feedback Journey has to be introduced by a human.

Mopinion (mopinion.com) — measured. Mopinion is the strongest measured performer in Google's AI Overview. It appeared in 10 of the 30 searches with a best position of 1, and was cited by the AI Overview in 8 — the highest citation count of the three measured competitors, and eight more than Feedback Journey's zero. Its measured domain authority is 6.8 out of 10, lower than SmartSurvey's, yet it converts its presence into AI citations more efficiently, which

is a useful lesson: the asset doing the work is one specific, repeatedly-cited article — its round-up of the best European GDPR-compliant customer feedback tools, which held position 1 in France and appeared in the top five in all three markets. Mopinion's measured homepage carries a 46-character title, a 136-character description, and the H1 "The European #1 Feedback Software for Web, App and Email"; it runs a broader schema set than SmartSurvey (breadcrumblist, imageobject, organization, webpage, website), has 696 words of readable homepage text, does not publish an llms.txt, and scores 70/100 on measured homepage mobile performance — better than SmartSurvey but still below Feedback Journey's 93/100.

Mopinion is a Dutch platform, so its European presence is not a claim but a fact, and its explicit "European" and GDPR framing is the position Feedback Journey's own infrastructure choices would entitle it to occupy. Relationship to the need: an indirect competitor. Mopinion is built for digital, UX and product teams collecting contextual feedback on websites, apps and email — not for an individual consultant documenting client satisfaction after an engagement. A consultant who follows Google's recommendation to Mopinion will probably find it heavier than required. But that consultant will have been sent there, and Feedback Journey will not have been mentioned. The commercial implication is specific and actionable: Mopinion demonstrates that in this market a single authoritative comparison article can be worth more visibility than an entire product site, and that being *listed in* such an article is the cheaper route to the same outcome.

Zendesk (zendesk.com) — measured. Zendesk appeared in 8 of the 30 searches with a best position of 1 and was cited by the AI Overview in 4 — and, uniquely among the measured set, it was named unprompted by 1 of the 3 AI assistants asked the brand-free need question. Neither SmartSurvey nor Mopinion was named by any assistant; nor was Feedback Journey. Zendesk's measured domain authority is 9.1 out of 10, the highest in the panel by a wide margin. Its homepage carries a 46-character title, a 135-character description, the H1 "AI-powered customer service platform", the broadest measured schema set of the group (corporation, imageobject, softwareapplication, webpage, website), 1,644 words of readable body text, a published llms.txt, and no AI-crawler blocks. Its measured homepage mobile performance is 29/100 — roughly a third of Feedback Journey's 93/100, and further evidence that page speed is not what determines who gets recommended here.

Zendesk is an indirect competitor for this need. Its product is a customer service platform, and a solo consultant is not its buyer; it appears in these results because it publishes an enormous library of authoritative guide content ("Customer feedback: 7 ways to improve service fast", "5 methods for measuring customer satisfaction", "29 of the best customer feedback tools of 2026") localised into zendesk.fr, zendesk.de and zendesk.co.uk, which is why it ranked in all three sampled markets. It operates globally with a strong European commercial presence, though not with a specific focus on the consultant segment. The relevant commercial insight is that Zendesk's inclusion in an assistant's answer, and in AI Overviews for method questions, rests on a decade of accumulated authority and topical coverage — a reminder that Feedback Journey cannot out-publish it and should not try. The niche is the counter-move.

What the measured comparison establishes overall. On the on-site measures that can be compared directly, Feedback Journey holds up well and in some respects leads: measured mobile performance of 93/100 against 70, 29 and 28; a clean, error-free JSON-LD implementation with high-value types; FAQ/Q&A structured data and question-shaped headings, which none of the three competitors' measured homepage data shows; lms.txt published, matching SmartSurvey and Zendesk. On the measures that determine whether a buyer ever sees the brand, Feedback Journey is at zero across the board: zero of 30 organic appearances against 18, 10 and 8; zero AI Overview citations against 6, 8 and 4; zero assistant mentions against Zendesk's one. Two things follow. First, the deficit is not technical. Second, one measured fact should temper any assumption that assistant visibility is easy to buy: even SmartSurvey and Mopinion, with substantial search presence and domain authority, were named by none of the three assistants. Being named by a model without web search is a high bar that reflects long-accumulated, widely-repeated third-party description — which is exactly why chapter 8 treats it as an authority outcome rather than a technical one.

4.2 The wider competitive field

Competitor	Measured?	Relationship to Feedback Journey	Presence in Europe	What it offers for this need	Why an engine or assistant may surface it instead
SmartSurvey	Measured	Direct competitor (collection half)	Yes — UK-based, UK-focused content	General survey and questionnaire platform with extensive guide library	Ranked in 18/30 measured searches, best position 1; cited in 6 AI Overviews; domain authority 7.8/10
Mopinion	Measured	Indirect competitor (built for digital/UX teams)	Yes — Dutch, explicitly European positioning	Website, app and email feedback for digital teams	Cited in 8/30 measured AI Overviews; owns the top-ranking European GDPR round-up; authority 6.8/10
Zendesk	Measured	Indirect competitor (customer service platform)	Global, with localised European sites; no consultant-segment focus	Service platform plus a very large feedback-method content library	Named by 1 of 3 AI assistants; 8/30 searches, best position 1; authority 9.1/10
Typeform	Research	Direct competitor (default assistant answer)	Yes — headquartered in Barcelona	Conversational survey builder, high completion rates	Named by 2 of 3 assistants in the measured test; cited by name in several AI Overviews; its own blog ranks
SurveyMonkey	Research	Direct competitor	Global with UK/EU sites; broad rather than local focus	Templates including a consultant customer-satisfaction survey	Named repeatedly in AI Overviews; uk.surveymonkey.com ranked in UK results
SimpleSAT	Research	Direct competitor — closest positional analogue	Global (US-led); no evident dedicated European presence	CSAT/NPS for service providers, one-click testimonial publishing	Cited in Germany's AI Overview for the honest-feedback query; strong published customer stories
Survicate	Research	Indirect competitor	Yes — Polish, EU-hosted	Multichannel surveys (email, web, in-app) with deep integrations	Named first in France's AI Overview for European feedback tools

Competitor	Measured?	Relationship to Feedback Journey	Presence in Europe	What it offers for this need	Why an engine or assistant may surface it instead
Formbricks	Research	Indirect competitor	Yes — German, open-source, self-hostable	GDPR-compliant, self-hosted survey infrastructure	Ranked organically and cited in AI Overviews on the GDPR/European axis
EUSurvey (European Commission)	Research	Indirect competitor (free public option)	Yes — EU institution	Free EU-hosted survey tool	Held position 1 in all three markets for "survey platforms popular in Europe"
Netigate / Questback / Analyzer	Research	Indirect competitors	Yes — Nordic and German operations; Questback has Norwegian roots	Enterprise-oriented customer and employee feedback	Cited in Germany's AI Overviews; well covered in European directories
Feedbackly	Research	Indirect competitor	Yes — Finnish	Journey-based feedback with emotional value indexing	Ranks and is compared in Nordic/European contexts
Zonka Feedback / Retently / AskNicely / Customer Thermometer / Nicereply	Research	Indirect competitors	Global; varying European coverage, no consultant focus	CSAT/NPS survey specialists	Appear across the comparison articles that dominate these queries
Trustpilot	Research	Complementary player (documentation, not collection)	Yes — Danish origin, strong European presence	Public verified reviews and review invitations	Held position 1 in the UK for "top-rated online feedback collection services" and was cited in that AI Overview
G2 / Capterra / Software Advice	Research	Complementary players and gatekeepers	Yes — European storefronts and localised sites	Software category listings and verified user reviews	Cited directly in the UK AI Overview; models draw category consensus from them

Competitor	Measured?	Relationship to Feedback Journey	Presence in Europe	What it offers for this need	Why an engine or assistant may surface it instead
Clutch	Research	Complementary player for consultants	Yes — global marketplace used across Europe	Verified B2B client reviews with project detail; provider directory	Positions itself as a trust signal that AI search engines evaluate when recommending providers
Comparison publishers (europeanmartech.eu, eualternative.eu, european-alternatives.eu, heymarvin.com, guideflow.com, getperspective.ai, thecxlead.com)	Research	Gatekeepers rather than competitors	Mixed; the European directories are explicitly EU-focused	Curated round-ups and "best X" lists	They are the most-cited sources in the measured AI Overviews — inclusion here is the shortest path into AI answers
Google Forms / Microsoft Forms / CRM logging (HubSpot, Salesforce, Pipedrive)	Research	Indirect competitors (the "good enough" default)	Global, universally available	Free forms plus a place to file responses	Google's AI Overviews recommended CRM logging and free forms as core methods in multiple markets
Structured conversation, review calls, coaching	Research	Indirect competitor — the no-software option	Universal	Richest qualitative learning, zero cost	Google's AI Overview recommended exactly this for the consultant query, often with no citations at all

Beyond the measured three, the field divides into four groups, and Feedback Journey's relationship to each is different.

The **default global survey brands** — Typeform and SurveyMonkey above all — are the real incumbents in the buyer's mind, and the measured assistant test proves it: Typeform was named by two of the three assistants, described in terms of conversational design and response rates, and SurveyMonkey and Qualtrics were named as well. Typeform's European credentials are genuine (it is headquartered in Barcelona, which several of the measured AI Overviews noted explicitly), so the "European alternative" argument does not automatically work against it. These are direct competitors for the collection half of the need, and they will keep being recommended by default. The realistic response is not to argue that Feedback Journey is a better survey builder — it is to argue that a survey builder is not what a consultant tracking their own development actually needs, and to get that argument into the sources models read.

The **European privacy-first group** — Survicate, Formbricks, Mopinion, Netigate, Questback, Enalyzer, Feedbackly, easy-feedback, Feedier, YourCX, and the Commission's own free EUSurvey — is the group Feedback Journey most resembles in substance and least resembles in visibility. Every one of these has some form of representation in the European directories or the round-ups; Feedback Journey has none. Questback in particular is worth noting as a Norwegian-rooted player with an established European footprint, which means a Norwegian origin story is not by itself a differentiator in this market. Most of these are indirect competitors: they solve the compliance and collection problem for teams, not the improvement problem for individuals. Their regional presence is unambiguous, and it is where Feedback Journey's most winnable competitive argument lies — same European posture, but designed for one professional rather than a CX department.

The **service-business CSAT specialists** — Simplesat, SmileBack, AskNicely, Customer Thermometer, Nicereply, Retently, Zonka Feedback, CustomerSure — are the closest to Feedback Journey in intent. Simplesat is the one to watch: it is a direct competitor in the sense that it serves service providers who want post-engagement satisfaction data and public testimonials, and it has built a visible library of customer stories with specific figures, which is precisely the kind of citable material that gets a brand into round-ups. Its European presence appears incidental rather than focused — the evidence points to a US-led, MSP-centric go-to-market — so a European consultant is unlikely to find a localised or GDPR-forward pitch there. That is a gap, though a modest one, since the buyer is unlikely to be comparing the two: they will simply find Simplesat and not find Feedback Journey.

The **review and directory layer** — Trustpilot, G2, Capterra, Software Advice, Clutch, and the comparison publishers — is best understood not as competition but as infrastructure. These are complementary players: a consultant may well use Feedback Journey to collect and learn, and Trustpilot or Clutch or LinkedIn recommendations to publish proof. They matter enormously to this report because they are what the engines and models read. The measured AI Overviews cite G2 category pages, Trustpilot's business site, and a long list of round-up publishers; the assistants' training data is full of them. Any player absent from all of them is, from a model's perspective, a brand with no evidence attached. Feedback Journey is currently in that position. The uncertainty worth acknowledging: it is not possible to verify from public sources whether Feedback Journey has applied to, or been rejected by, any of these listings — only that no listing was found.

Finally, the honest competitor that no vendor likes to name: **doing nothing formal**. Google's AI Overview for the consultant query recommends post-project surveys, NPS, a review call and retention tracking — advice a consultant can implement with a free form and a calendar reminder. For a solo buyer, "free plus discipline" is a strong competitor, and any product in this space has to be visibly better than a Google Form plus a habit. Feedback Journey's improvement-goal and journey-record framing is a plausible answer to that, but the answer has to be made publicly, in language a model can quote.

5 Review of relevant channels

Organic search. This is the channel where the need is expressed most explicitly and where the measured evidence is most damning: zero appearances across 30 buyer queries in three European markets. The discovery scenarios here are well defined. A consultant finishing an engagement searches for how to gather satisfaction data for a consulting business, and lands on a round-up or a guide. A consultant whose client has asked about GDPR searches for European or EU-hosted survey tools, and lands on a directory. A consultant who wants better answers searches for how to get honest feedback from clients, and lands on editorial advice from Zendesk, SmartSurvey or Reddit. In each scenario the winning page is content, not a product page — which tells Feedback Journey where to compete. The realistic entry point is not the head term "customer feedback tools", where Mopinion, heymarvin and Zendesk are entrenched, but the consultant-specific long tail, where the measured results are thin and the AI Overview frequently cites nothing at all. The site's technical foundation supports this ambition: crawlability and indexing measured 100/100, the sitemap and robots.txt are in place, and the page inventory already contains topic pages a search engine can understand. What is missing is depth of content on those buyer questions and the external authority to rank it.

AI assistants. This is the channel where the measurement is most direct and the result is most stark: asked, without the brand being named, which providers they would recommend for this need, none of the three assistants tested named Feedback Journey. They named Typeform, Qualtrics and SurveyMonkey. Because web search was switched off, this reflects what the models already hold about the space — the accumulated weight of third-party description in their training data. The buyer scenarios matter here: a consultant asking ChatGPT "what should I use to collect client feedback and track my own improvement?" receives a shortlist and generally works from it; a consultant asking Perplexity or Google's AI Mode gets a live-search answer that draws on the round-ups and directories, which is why AI Overview citations and comparison-article inclusion feed straight into this channel. Feedback Journey has done the technically useful parts — llms.txt is published, AI answer-engine crawler access passed, FAQ/Q&A structured data and question-shaped headings are present — and the measured result is still zero, which is the clearest possible illustration that this channel is won off-site. Agent usability measured 0/100, meaning the site publishes none of the newer machine-readable capability descriptors; that limits what an autonomous agent could *do* on the site, but it is not the reason assistants fail to name the brand.

Review platforms. For this need, review platforms are simultaneously a discovery channel and a source that other channels quote. G2's category pages and Trustpilot's business pages were cited directly in the measured UK AI Overview, and Trustpilot ranked first for a commercial buyer query there. Capterra and Software Advice appear in the same searches. The discovery scenario is a buyer who already has a shortlist and goes to check whether anyone actually uses these tools — and finds nothing for Feedback Journey. For a consultant-facing product there is a second scenario worth noting: Clutch, where B2B buyers evaluate

consultants themselves, which puts Feedback Journey's own audience on the platform and makes it a plausible partnership as well as a listing target. No reviews of Feedback Journey were found on any of these platforms during this research, so the channel is currently unused.

Communities and forums. Reddit ranked in the organic top eight for several measured queries and was cited in Google's AI Overview in two markets — including a thread in r/agency about collecting client feedback to improve, and one in r/BuyFromEU about European survey platforms. That is unusually strong community weight, and it reflects how sceptical this audience is of vendor claims. The discovery scenario is a consultant asking peers what they actually use, in r/consulting, r/agency, r/freelance, r/BuyFromEU, or in Nordic and European consulting groups on LinkedIn and Slack. This is a channel where a founder with genuine consulting experience has a natural advantage — and where promotional posting is punished. Presence has to be earned by being useful in threads about the problem, not by announcing the product.

Social media. The evidence shows LinkedIn is where this brand currently lives: the founder's posts, in Norwegian, are effectively the brand's only visible ongoing communication, and LinkedIn articles ranked in the organic top eight for several of the measured queries in all three markets. Two discovery scenarios are realistic. A consultant sees a peer engage with a post about feedback practice and follows the link — this is the channel that has plainly produced whatever traction exists. And a buyer searching Google encounters a LinkedIn article or post that ranks in its own right, which argues for publishing substantive English-language pieces on LinkedIn as well as on the site. The language question is strategic rather than cosmetic: Norwegian-language posting reaches Bergen and Oslo consultancies; a European ambition needs English.

Paid advertising. Search advertising on the consultant-specific terms is cheap relative to the head terms in this market, and it can put the brand in front of a buyer immediately without waiting for authority to accumulate. Two honest caveats. First, paid clicks do not build authority — they do not make a model more likely to name the brand, and they stop the day the budget stops. Second, with no reviews, no directory listings and no Knowledge Graph record, a buyer who clicks a paid ad and then searches the brand name to validate it finds nothing, which suppresses conversion. Paid is best used narrowly here: to test which framings of the value proposition actually resonate with consultants, and to feed that learning back into the content and positioning work, rather than as a primary acquisition channel.

Partnerships. For a product aimed at consultants, the highest-value distribution is through the organisations consultants already belong to: consultancy firms that want documented client satisfaction across their staff (Feedback Journey's "consultant leaders" audience), professional bodies and management-consulting associations, coaching networks, freelance platforms and marketplaces, and conferences such as the Bergen developer and agile events where the founder already speaks. The discovery scenario is a consultant hearing about it from their own employer, coach or professional network — a warm channel that converts far better than search. Partnerships also produce something search and paid do not: independent

third-party pages describing the brand, which is exactly the raw material both search engines and language models need.

6 Website and technical assessment (SEO & AEO)

The measured **website audit score is 64/100, grade D** — moderate, with clear room to improve. Reading the category weights makes clear what is actually driving that number, and the answer is unusual. The core technical craft categories are excellent: crawlability and indexing 100/100, mobile usability 100/100, semantic HTML and headings 97/100, performance and Core Web Vitals 94/100, content and AEO quotability 82/100, structured data 81/100. If the score were built from on-page quality alone, Feedback Journey would grade well. What pulls it to 64 is a cluster of off-site and machine-interface categories that are all at or near zero: agent usability 0/100 (11% weight), named by AI assistants 0/100 (9%), Knowledge Graph 0/100 (3%), together with security and headers at 50/100 (5%), meta tags and indexability at 66/100 (13%) and domain and email trust at 65/100 (5%).

The interpretation matters more than the arithmetic. Two of the three zero-scoring categories — named by AI assistants, and Knowledge Graph — are not website problems at all. They are measurements of what the wider world knows and says about the brand, taken through the audit. No amount of on-site work will change them directly. The third, agent usability, is a genuine site-side gap, but it concerns emerging machine-interface conventions rather than whether the site can be found and read. The practical conclusion is that Feedback Journey's website is in good shape as a foundation, and that the score is mostly telling us about the authority deficit examined in chapter 8. Chapter 7, which follows immediately, carries every individual measured test result with its evidence; this chapter interprets and prioritises rather than enumerating.

Information structure and architecture

The measured page inventory shows a site organised along two axes that map well onto how buyers think. One axis is audience: dedicated pages for consultants, freelancers, consultant leaders, clients and knowledge workers. The other is concept and function: what feedback is, what the consultant role is about, what Feedback Journey is, how to use it, survey types, surveys, improvement goals, the journey card, coaching, a manual, plus pricing, FAQ, about and contact. This is a sensible architecture for a product with several closely-related buyer personas, and it is better thought through than most sites of this size. A consultant leader evaluating the tool for a team has a page to land on; a client being asked to give feedback has one too, which is a thoughtful touch that reduces friction in the actual feedback moment.

Two qualitative observations. First, the audience pages risk overlapping heavily — consultants, freelancers and knowledge workers are close enough that near-duplicate content is a real hazard, and the audit's finding that no `rel="canonical"` link is declared makes that hazard sharper than it needs to be. Each of those pages should say something genuinely different about the need, not the same thing with a different job title in the heading. Second, the architecture is organised around the product's own vocabulary — "journey card", "improvement goals" — rather than the buyer's. That is defensible as branding, but it means

the site's internal structure does not naturally capture searches phrased as questions. There is no visible page addressing GDPR, data location or privacy, which the founder's own public communication suggests is a genuine strength and a live buyer concern in this market; that is a missing node in the architecture rather than a flaw in the existing one.

Page types

The **homepage** is the page the audit measured most closely, and the results are mixed. It performs well technically (mobile performance 93/100, desktop 100/100, SEO 100/100, accessibility 99/100 in the Lighthouse lab) and carries clean JSON-LD with high-value schema types. But its 761 words of readable body text register a Flesch Reading Ease of 0 with an average of 63.4 words per sentence — a measurement that indicates the text a machine extracts from this page is not parsing into readable, self-contained sentences. Whatever the visual design does for a human reader, the extracted text is not in a form a language model can lift a clean sentence from. For the page that is supposed to establish what this brand is, that is the most consequential single finding in the chapter.

The **product and concept pages** — feedback-journey-explained, survey-types, surveys, improvement-goals, journey-card, about-feedback, what-is-the-consultant-role-about, manual, how-to-use-feedback-journey — are, on the evidence of their measured performance (95–98 mobile across most of them) and the site's overall passing marks for question-shaped headings and FAQ structured data, the strongest asset here. Pages that explain a concept in the buyer's own terms are precisely what both search engines and answer engines reward, and "what is the consultant role about" and "about feedback" are exactly the kind of topical anchors that give a small site something to rank with. Their weakness, from the audit's evidence, is a lack of external substantiation: the site as a whole carries 9 statistics but zero outbound citation links. Explanatory content that cites nothing reads as opinion; explanatory content that cites research reads as expertise, and is measurably more likely to be quoted.

The **pricing page** measured 84/100 on mobile — the second-lowest of the 20 sampled pages — and the **FAQ page** measured 82/100, the lowest. Both are conversion-critical and both are heavier than the rest of the site. The FAQ page is doubly important because FAQ content is disproportionately likely to be surfaced in AI answers, and the site already has FAQ/Q&A structured data passing. Making that page fast and making its answers self-contained is high-leverage work.

The **about and contact pages** matter more for this brand than they usually would, and here the assessment is partly qualitative. An early-stage product with no reviews and no press has to establish credibility on its own pages, and the strongest available material is the founder's real track record: two decades in software development and consulting, a master's degree from the University of Bergen, and public speaking on feedback and continuous improvement. Whether that material is actually presented on the about page could not be verified from the audit data; if it is not, that is a straightforward opportunity. The about page measured 89/100

on mobile, and the "for consultant leaders" page the same — both noticeably below the 95–98 band of the rest of the site.

Crawlability and indexing

This is the category where Feedback Journey scored a perfect 100/100, and it deserves to be stated plainly: there is no technical blocker to visibility here. The page returns a successful status, is indexable, a valid sitemap is present, and robots.txt is present. The audit also confirms that AI answer-engine crawlers have access — a check some sites fail inadvertently by blocking GPTBot or ClaudeBot — and that the site publishes an llms.txt file, which is a deliberate and forward-looking choice not yet common among small SaaS sites. The measured competitors are comparable on crawler access, so this is table stakes rather than an advantage, but it means every subsequent problem is a discoverability problem, not an accessibility one. In practice: search engines and AI crawlers can read every page of this site today, and the reason they are not surfacing it is that nothing on the wider web points them here and no page competes strongly enough on the buyer's questions.

One warning in the agent-usability set touches this area: no Content Signals were found in robots.txt. Content Signals extend robots.txt with machine-readable statements about how content may be used — for AI answering versus training, for example. Adding them does not improve crawlability, which is already perfect; it declares intent, which is worth doing for a brand that wants to be quoted while retaining a clear position on training use.

Structured data

Structured data measured 81/100. JSON-LD is present, parses without errors, and includes high-value schema types — a materially better implementation than SmartSurvey's measured single corporation type, and comparable in ambition to Zendesk's set. FAQ/Q&A structured data passed as well, which is directly relevant to AI answer engines because it presents questions and answers in a form machines can extract unambiguously.

The audit does not enumerate which types are absent, so this assessment is a prioritisation rather than a measurement. For this need, three additions would carry the most weight. `SoftwareApplication` (Or `Product`) with `offers` is the type that lets a search engine and an assistant understand that this is a purchasable tool with a price and a category — Zendesk's measured markup includes `softwareapplication`, and for a product whose pricing page is public this is a straightforward win. `Organization` with `sameAs` links to LinkedIn, any directory listings and, once created, the Wikidata item, is the connective tissue that lets engines tie scattered mentions to one entity; given that the brand has no Knowledge Graph record and a generic, easily-confused name, this is arguably the highest-value schema work available. And `Person` markup for the founder, tied to the organisation via `author` or `founder`, converts a real professional track record into a machine-readable expertise signal. `BreadcrumbList`, which Mopinion's measured markup includes, would help engines understand the site's hierarchy — modest value, low cost.

Meta tags

Meta tags and indexability measured 66/100, and at 13% weight it is the heaviest-weighted category that is genuinely under the site's own control. Three findings drive it. The title tag is 78 characters and may be truncated in search results; the recommendation is a unique 30–60 character title that front-loads the need the page serves. For comparison, all three measured competitors sit comfortably in range — SmartSurvey at 59 characters, Mopinion and Zendesk at 46. The meta description is 217 characters and will be truncated at around 160. And no `rel="canonical"` link is declared, which matters particularly on a site with several closely-related audience pages, because it leaves duplicate-content dilution unmanaged.

Open Graph and Twitter card tags both passed, so the site presents properly when shared — a small but real advantage given that LinkedIn is currently the brand's main distribution channel.

The qualitative point behind the measurements is about meaning rather than length. A title has one job: to say, in the first few words, which need this page answers. "Feedback for consultants" says it; a clever brand phrase does not. The same applies to the description, which is the page's pitch in the search result — 160 characters that name the buyer and the outcome will outperform 217 characters of positioning language, because the reader only ever sees the first 160 anyway.

Headings and content structure

Semantic HTML and headings measured 97/100 — the site has exactly one H1, declares its document language, does not skip heading levels, uses HTML5 landmark elements, and provides alt text on images. Separately, under content and AEO quotability, the "question-shaped headings" test passed, meaning the site already phrases at least some headings as the questions buyers ask. That combination is genuinely good practice and better than most sites this size achieve.

The qualitative opportunity is to extend that discipline systematically. Page titles like "what is the consultant role about" show the instinct is there; the question-shaped approach should reach every page and every major section, and the questions should be the ones buyers actually type. On the evidence of the measured search data, those questions include how to gather customer satisfaction data for a consulting business, how to get honest feedback from clients, how to document client satisfaction, and whether a feedback tool is GDPR-compliant and EU-hosted. Each of those is a heading waiting to be written, with the answer directly underneath it in a self-contained paragraph. That structure serves the human reader, gives Google a passage to feature, and gives a language model a block it can quote and attribute.

Content quality for SEO and AEO

Content and AEO quotability measured 82/100, with the individual passes and failures pointing in a consistent direction: the *architecture* of the content is right and the *prose* is not yet quotable.

On the positive side, and these are measured passes: FAQ/Q&A structured data is present, question-shaped headings are present, AI answer-engine crawlers have access, and llms.txt is published. Qualitatively, the strongest content on this site is the explanatory material. A page titled "what is the consultant role about" is exactly the kind of asset that earns citations, because it answers a general question rather than selling a product — and because it establishes that the brand understands the buyer's world, which is the precondition for a model describing it as a credible answer for consultants. Similarly, "about feedback" and "feedback journey explained" are the right pages to exist. Good content in the AEO sense means a paragraph that stands alone: a reader — or a model — encountering it out of context understands who it is about, what is claimed, and for whom. "A consultant using Feedback Journey defines two or three improvement goals, asks each client the same short set of questions after every engagement, and builds a documented record of how their client satisfaction develops over time" is quotable, attributable and specific. It names the actor, the mechanism and the outcome in one sentence.

On the negative side, the measured Flesch Reading Ease of 0, with an average of 63.4 words per sentence across 761 homepage words, is the clearest signal that the homepage prose is not in that form. An average of 63 words per sentence is far beyond what any reader parses comfortably, and the recommendation in the audit is explicit: shorten sentences and prefer plain words, targeting a Reading Ease of 60 or better, so answers are easy to quote. Poor content in this context is not necessarily badly written — it is text a machine cannot turn into a usable, attributable statement. Slogan-style copy is the classic failure mode: a headline promising better feedback, growth or insight says nothing a model can connect to "consultant", "customer satisfaction documentation" or "Europe", so the page contributes nothing to the brand's chance of being named. So is copy that relies on the reader already knowing the product's vocabulary — a page about "your journey card" that does not, in its first sentence, say what a journey card is and who it is for, cannot be quoted by anything.

The second measured content weakness is substantiation: 9 statistics (11.8 per thousand words) and zero outbound citation links. Concrete numbers and references to reputable sources both measurably increase the chance of being quoted by AI answer engines, because they give the answer something checkable to attach to. Feedback Journey is in an unusually good position to fix this: it operates a feedback product, which means it can generate original statistics about consultant feedback — typical response rates, how often consultants ask, what clients most commonly raise — that nobody else has. That is discussed further in chapter 8, because original data is as much an authority asset as a content one.

Security and trust

Security and headers measured 50/100, and domain and email trust 65/100. These findings do not directly move search rankings or AI-assistant visibility, and they should not be presented as visibility levers. They are included because they underpin the brand's credibility with visitors, partners and the press, and because putting them in place proactively protects the

brand from incidents — a defaced page, a spoofed email in a client's inbox, an injected script — that would damage its reputation far faster than any ranking gain could repair.

What was measured: no Content Security Policy header, no HTTP Strict Transport Security header, and no X-Frame-Options header (all failures), plus a warning for a missing X-Content-Type-Options header. On the positive side, HTTP redirects to HTTPS, Subresource Integrity passed, and Cross-Origin Resource Sharing passed. On email, an SPF record limits who can send mail for the domain and the domain is configured to receive email, but the DMARC record uses `p=none`, which monitors only — it does not stop spoofed mail from being delivered.

For this particular brand these are more than hygiene points, for one specific reason. Feedback Journey asks consultants to invite *their clients* to submit feedback. The product's core transaction is a third party trusting an email and a link. A DMARC policy that does not block spoofing, on a domain whose emails land in the inboxes of a consultant's clients, is a reputational exposure that sits directly on the value proposition. Similarly, a brand that has publicly made data residency and privacy a differentiator — as the founder's own communication indicates — invites scrutiny of its security posture; missing baseline headers are easy for a technically literate prospect to check and awkward to explain. Fixing these is cheap, and it removes a credibility risk rather than adding visibility.

Framing: what this chapter does and does not promise

Everything measured in this chapter is foundation. It determines whether Feedback Journey's site can be crawled, read, understood, quoted and attributed — and on most of those counts the site already performs well: perfect crawlability, near-perfect semantic structure, strong measured performance, clean structured data, an `llms.txt` and FAQ markup that many larger competitors lack. The remaining site-side work — the title and description lengths, the missing canonical, the unreadable homepage sentence structure, the absent citations, the security headers, the agent-discovery endpoints — is worth doing, and chapter 10 sets it out in priority order. But it should be read for what it is. The measured competitors demonstrate the point uncomfortably well: SmartSurvey ranks in 18 of 30 buyer searches with a measured homepage mobile performance of 28/100, and Zendesk is named by an AI assistant with 29/100. Their advantage is not technical. Fixing everything in this chapter would not, on its own, produce a single organic ranking or a single assistant recommendation. It would make the authority work in chapter 8 pay off when it lands. That is the honest relationship between the two, and it is why the priorities in chapter 10 put both on the list.

7 Technical test results

64 D

Audit score · <https://feedbackjourney.com/>

A deterministic audit of the subject's own website, measured by fetching and inspecting the live page. It is a heuristic health indicator (not a ranking factor) for a single page; the issue list below is the actionable part. One category is measured differently: whether AI assistants name the brand is established by asking them directly, not by reading the page.

Category		Score	Weight
Crawlability & indexing		100/100	11%
Meta tags & indexability		66/100	13%
Structured data		81/100	7%
Performance & Core Web Vitals		94/100	13%
Mobile usability		100/100	7%
Semantic HTML & headings		97/100	7%
Content & AEO quotability		82/100	9%
Agent usability		0/100	11%
Named by AI assistants		0/100	9%
Knowledge Graph		0/100	3%
Domain & email trust		65/100	5%
Security & headers		50/100	5%

Tests run

Agent usability

WARN Content is available as Markdown for agents

Site does not support Markdown for Agents. Serving a Markdown version of pages ("Markdown for Agents" content negotiation) gives AI agents clean, token-efficient text instead of layout markup — one of the strongest agent-usability levers.

→ Offer a Markdown representation of your key pages (Markdown for Agents content negotiation) so AI agents can read them cleanly.

WARN Content Signals declare how content may be used

No Content Signals found in robots.txt. Content Signals extend robots.txt with machine-readable statements about how content may be used (e.g. AI answering vs. training).

→ Add Content-Signal directives to your robots.txt declaring preferences for ai-train, search, and ai-input.

WARN API catalog for capability discovery

API Catalog not found. An API catalog (RFC 9727) at /.well-known/api-catalog lists the site's machine-readable API descriptions in one standard, discoverable place.

→ Publish an API catalog at /.well-known/api-catalog linking your machine-readable API descriptions.

WARN MCP server card for AI agents

MCP Server Card not found. An MCP (Model Context Protocol) server card at `/.well-known/mcp/server-card.json` tells AI agents which tools and capabilities the site exposes for them to use directly.

→ Publish an MCP server card at `/.well-known/mcp/server-card.json` describing the capabilities agents can use on the site.

WARN Agent Skills index

Agent Skills index not found. An Agent Skills index describes, in machine-readable form, the tasks an AI agent can perform on the site.

→ Publish an Agent Skills index so agents can discover the tasks your site supports.

WARN Link headers point agents to machine-readable resources

No Link headers found on target page. HTTP Link headers let an AI agent discover related machine-readable resources (API descriptions, feeds) without parsing the HTML.

→ Serve HTTP Link headers on key pages pointing to your machine-readable resources (e.g. `rel="service-desc"` for an API description).

WARN DNS records for AI discovery (DNS-AID)

DNS for AI Discovery (DNS-AID) well-known endpoint records not found. DNS-AID publishes well-known DNS records that let AI agents discover a site's AI entry points before fetching a single page.

→ Publish DNS-AID well-known endpoint records for the domain so agents can discover your AI entry points via DNS.

WARN OAuth discovery metadata

No OAuth/OIDC discovery metadata found. OAuth discovery metadata lets an agent find, without guesswork, how to authenticate against the site's protected APIs.

→ Serve OAuth authorization-server discovery metadata so agents can authenticate against your APIs.

WARN OAuth Protected Resource metadata

No OAuth Protected Resource Metadata found. This metadata document (RFC 9728) names the authorization server that guards a protected API, so an agent knows where to obtain a token before it calls the API rather than having to guess.

→ Serve OAuth Protected Resource Metadata (RFC 9728) at `/.well-known/oauth-protected-resource` so agents can discover which authorization server protects your APIs.

WARN auth.md registration guide for agents

`auth.md` not found. `auth.md` is an open convention from WorkOS: a Markdown file at the site root that walks an AI agent through registering and authenticating on a user's behalf, without a sign-up form or a consent screen built for humans. It is the readable companion to the OAuth metadata above.

→ Publish an `auth.md` at your site root describing how an agent registers and authenticates on a user's behalf, pointing at your OAuth discovery metadata.

WARN A2A agent card

A2A Agent Card not found. An A2A (Agent-to-Agent) card describes how other agents can interact with the site's own agent programmatically.

→ If the site operates its own agent, publish an A2A agent card so other agents can discover and interact with it.

WARN WebMCP page-level tools

No WebMCP tools detected on page load. WebMCP exposes page-level tools that in-browser AI agents can call directly on the page.

→ Consider exposing WebMCP tools on interactive pages so in-browser agents can act on them.

WARN Agentic Resource Discovery (ARD) manifest

ARD capability manifest not found. ARD is an open specification led by Microsoft together with Google, GitHub, Nvidia, Salesforce and others. The site publishes a manifest — typically at `/.well-known/ard.json` — that lists the capabilities it offers AI agents, so agents and capability registries can find them without a bespoke integration for each site.

→ Publish an ARD capability manifest (e.g. `/.well-known/ard.json`) listing what AI agents can do on your site.

N/A UCP catalogue and checkout for agents

UCP profile not found (not a commerce site). The Universal Commerce Protocol, built by Shopify with Google, lets an AI agent search a catalogue, build a cart and complete a checkout through one open standard instead of a separate integration per shop. Shopify storefronts publish it at `/.well-known/ucp`.

N/A ACP agent checkout

ACP discovery document not found (not a commerce site). The Agentic Commerce Protocol, from OpenAI and Stripe, standardises the checkout exchange between an AI agent and a merchant. It is the mechanism behind Instant Checkout inside ChatGPT.

N/A Web Bot Auth verification

Web Bot Auth directory not found (informational only). Web Bot Auth lets the site cryptographically verify requests from legitimate bots, separating trusted agents from scrapers.

N/A x402 pay-per-request (HTTP 402)

x402 payment protocol not detected (not a commerce site). x402, introduced by Coinbase in 2025, revives the HTTP status code 402 Payment Required, reserved since 1997 and never used. The server answers a request with machine-readable payment terms; the agent pays and retries automatically. It lets software buy an API call, a data feed or a piece of content with no human at the keyboard.

N/A MPP machine payments

MPP payment discovery not detected (not a commerce site). The Machine Payment Protocol, from Tempo and Stripe, builds on the same HTTP 402 exchange as x402 but widens it: ordinary payment methods such as cards alongside stablecoins, billing across a session rather than per request, and a challenge-credential-receipt flow.

N/A AP2 payment authorisation

AP2 not detected (no A2A Agent Card) (not a commerce site). The Agent Payments Protocol, led by Google with card networks and banks, is the trust layer beneath an agent purchase: the customer signs a "mandate" stating what the agent may buy and for how much, and that signed proof travels with the payment so the merchant can verify the agent was genuinely authorised. It is detected through the A2A agent card.

Content & AEO quotability

FAIL Readability (Flesch Reading Ease)

Flesch Reading Ease 0 (grade ~29), avg 63.4 words/sentence over 761 words.

→ Shorten sentences and prefer plain words (target Reading Ease ≥ 60) so answers are easy to quote.

WARN Statistics & citations density

9 statistic(s) (11.8/1k words) and 0 outbound citation link(s) (0/1k words).

→ Add concrete statistics and cite reputable sources — both measurably increase the chance of being quoted by AI answer engines.

PASS AI answer-engine crawler access

AI retrieval and training crawlers are allowed in robots.txt.

PASS FAQ / Q&A structured data

faqpage schema present — directly extractable by AI answer engines.

PASS Question-shaped headings

7 of 16 H2/H3 headings are phrased as questions.

PASS llms.txt for AI answer engines

llms.txt published with a title, a summary, 42 curated link(s) (30 described) across 6 section(s).

Crawlability & indexing

PASS Page returns a successful status

Homepage responded with HTTP 200.

PASS Page is indexable

No noindex robots meta tag found.

PASS Sitemap is present and valid

Valid sitemap found at <https://feedbackjourney.com/sitemap.xml> (62 URLs), declared in robots.txt.

PASS robots.txt is present

A robots.txt file was served at the site root.

Domain & email trust

WARN DMARC protects the domain from email spoofing

A DMARC record exists but uses p=none, which only monitors — it does not stop spoofed email from being delivered.

→ Move the DMARC policy from p=none to p=quarantine, then p=reject, once reports confirm legitimate senders pass.

PASS SPF record limits who can send email for the domain

An SPF record is published and ends in -all.

PASS Domain is configured to receive email

The domain publishes 5 MX records (alt1.aspmx.l.google.com, aspmx.l.google.com, alt4.aspmx.l.google.com).

N/A DKIM signing key is published

No DKIM key was found under the common selectors probed; DKIM may still be configured under a custom selector.

Knowledge Graph

FAIL Brand has a canonical Knowledge Graph record

No Wikidata entity exists for the brand, so AI assistants and Google's Knowledge Graph have no canonical, structured record to ground answers about it.

→ Register the brand on Wikidata (free: [wikidata.org](https://www.wikidata.org) → "Create a new item") with the official website (P856), type (P31), industry (P452), country (P17) and founding date (P571) — the single most effective step to give AI assistants a canonical record of the brand.

Meta tags & indexability

WARN Title tag

Title is long and may be truncated in search results. (78 chars).

→ Write a unique 30–60 character title that front-loads the need the page serves.

WARN Meta description

Meta description is long and will be truncated (~160 chars). (217 chars).

→ Write a 50–160 character description that summarises the page and invites the click.

WARN Canonical URL declared

No rel="canonical" link.

→ Add a self-referencing <link rel="canonical"> to avoid duplicate-content dilution.

PASS Open Graph tags present

Found 3/3 core Open Graph tags (og:title, og:description, og:image).

PASS Twitter card present

twitter:card = "summary_large_image".

N/A hreflang annotations

No hreflang links (only relevant for multi-language/region sites).

Mobile usability

PASS Responsive viewport meta tag

viewport = "width=device-width, initial-scale=1".

PASS Tap targets are adequately sized

Passed the PageSpeed Insights mobile audit on 20 of 20 sampled pages.

N/A Content sized to the viewport

Not measured (PageSpeed Insights unavailable for this URL).

Named by AI assistants

FAIL Named by Claude when asked about the need

Claude did not name the brand when asked which providers it would recommend for this need. It answered without web search, so this is what the model already holds about the brand — a buyer who asks this way is shown competitors instead.

→ Build the third-party evidence these models learn from: clear, quotable descriptions of what you do and who you serve on your own site, plus presence in the comparison articles, review platforms, listings and press that cover this need. Models repeat what independent sources say about you.

FAIL Named by ChatGPT when asked about the need

ChatGPT did not name the brand when asked which providers it would recommend for this need. It answered without web search, so this is what the model already holds about the brand — a buyer who asks this way is shown competitors instead.

→ Build the third-party evidence these models learn from: clear, quotable descriptions of what you do and who you serve on your own site, plus presence in the comparison articles, review platforms, listings and press that cover this need. Models repeat what independent sources say about you.

FAIL Named by Google Gemini when asked about the need

Google Gemini did not name the brand when asked which providers it would recommend for this need. It answered without web search, so this is what the model already holds about the brand — a buyer who asks this way is shown competitors instead.

→ Build the third-party evidence these models learn from: clear, quotable descriptions of what you do and who you serve on your own site, plus presence in the comparison articles, review platforms, listings and press that cover this need. Models repeat what independent sources say about you.

Performance & Core Web Vitals**PASS** Performance score (PageSpeed Insights)

Average PageSpeed performance across 20 pages: 94/100 (range 82–98; lab estimate, varies run-to-run).

N/A Core Web Vitals (real-user field data)

No real-user (CrUX) field data — typical for lower-traffic sites. Lab metrics above are the only available signal.

Search & AI Overview visibility (informational)**FAIL** Ranks in Google Search for buyer queries

The subject's own site ranked in Google's organic results for 0 of 30 brand-free buyer queries.

→ Strengthen on-page SEO and content for the buyer queries where the site does not yet rank, so it appears in the organic results people and AI assistants read.

FAIL Cited in Google's AI Overview

Google showed an AI Overview for 30 of 30 buyer queries and cited the subject in 0.

→ Publish quotable, well-structured answers to these buyer questions and earn third-party citations (reviews, listings, reputable articles) so Google's AI Overview is more likely to reference the subject.

Semantic HTML & headings**PASS** Exactly one H1

One H1: "Verifiable client feedback for IT consultants and freelancers".

PASS Document language declared

<html lang="en">.

PASS Images have alt text

6/6 images have an alt attribute (100%).

PASS Heading levels are not skipped

17 headings in a well-nested order.

PASS HTML5 landmark elements

Uses: header, nav, footer.

Structured data**PASS** Structured data (JSON-LD) present

Found 3 JSON-LD block(s) declaring: organization, website, softwareapplication, faqpage.

PASS JSON-LD parses without errors

All JSON-LD blocks parsed successfully.

PASS High-value schema types present

Present: Organization, WebSite. Missing: BreadcrumbList, Product / Service / Offer.

Security & headers

Security and HTTP security headers do not directly affect visibility in search results or AI answers. They are included because they underpin the brand's credibility: a site that visibly handles security properly gives visitors, partners and reviewers reason to trust it — and having these protections in place proactively is the best defence against incidents that could damage the brand's reputation.

FAIL Content Security Policy (CSP)

Content Security Policy (CSP) header not implemented

→ Add a Content-Security-Policy header (roll it out in report-only mode first) to control which sources may load scripts, styles and frames — the strongest defence against cross-site scripting and content injection.

FAIL HTTP Strict Transport Security (HSTS)

Strict-Transport-Security header not implemented.

→ Send a Strict-Transport-Security header with a max-age of at least six months so browsers always connect over HTTPS after the first visit.

FAIL Clickjacking protection (X-Frame-Options / frame-ancestors)

X-Frame-Options (XFO) header not implemented.

→ Set X-Frame-Options to DENY or SAMEORIGIN (or a frame-ancestors CSP directive) so the site cannot be embedded in a malicious frame.

WARN MIME-sniffing protection (X-Content-Type-Options)

X-Content-Type-Options header not implemented.

→ Add X-Content-Type-Options: nosniff so browsers do not reinterpret a response as a different, potentially executable content type.

PASS Redirects HTTP to HTTPS

Initial redirection is to HTTPS on same host, final destination is HTTPS

PASS Subresource Integrity (SRI)

Subresource Integrity (SRI) is implemented and all scripts are loaded securely.

PASS Cross-Origin Resource Sharing (CORS)

Content is not visible via cross-origin resource sharing (CORS) files or headers.

N/A Secure cookie flags

No cookies detected

N/A Referrer-Policy

Referrer-Policy header not implemented.

N/A Cross-Origin Resource Policy (CORP)

Cross Origin Resource Policy (CORP) is not implemented (defaults to cross-origin).

Search & AI Overview visibility

Across 30 representative brand-free buyer queries, Feedback Journey ranked in Google's organic results for 0. Google showed an AI Overview for 30 of them and cited Feedback Journey in 0.

Region	Buyer query	Your rank	AI Overview
Europe · France	What are the best tools for collecting customer feedback in Europe?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · France	How can I gather customer satisfaction data for my consulting business?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · France	Are there any survey platforms popular in Europe for client feedback?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · France	What are some effective methods for documenting client feedback and satisfaction?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · France	I need to find software to help me improve based on customer input.	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · France	What are some European regulations regarding customer data collection for feedback?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · France	Can you suggest ways to get honest feedback from my clients?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · France	What are the top-rated online feedback collection services for businesses?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · France	How do I analyze customer feedback to drive business improvements?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · France	Looking for solutions to measure and track customer satisfaction levels.	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · Germany	What are the best tools for collecting customer feedback in Europe?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · Germany	How can I gather customer satisfaction data for my consulting business?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · Germany	Are there any survey platforms popular in Europe for client feedback?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · Germany	What are some effective methods for documenting client feedback and satisfaction?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · Germany	I need to find software to help me improve based on customer input.	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · Germany	What are some European regulations regarding customer data collection for feedback?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · Germany	Can you suggest ways to get honest feedback from my clients?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · Germany	What are the top-rated online feedback collection services for businesses?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · Germany	How do I analyze customer feedback to drive business improvements?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · Germany	Looking for solutions to measure and track customer satisfaction levels.	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · United Kingdom	What are the best tools for collecting customer feedback in Europe?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · United Kingdom	How can I gather customer satisfaction data for my consulting business?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · United Kingdom	Are there any survey platforms popular in Europe for client feedback?	not in top 10	shown — not cited

Europe · United Kingdom	What are some effective methods for documenting client feedback and satisfaction?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · United Kingdom	I need to find software to help me improve based on customer input.	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · United Kingdom	What are some European regulations regarding customer data collection for feedback?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · United Kingdom	Can you suggest ways to get honest feedback from my clients?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · United Kingdom	What are the top-rated online feedback collection services for businesses?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · United Kingdom	How do I analyze customer feedback to drive business improvements?	not in top 10	shown — not cited
Europe · United Kingdom	Looking for solutions to measure and track customer satisfaction levels.	not in top 10	shown — not cited

Named by AI assistants

Asked which providers they would recommend for this need — without naming anyone — none of the 3 leading AI assistants (Claude, ChatGPT, Google Gemini) mentioned Feedback Journey. Buyers who ask an assistant this way are pointed at competitors instead.

The question asked: Which providers would you recommend for As a consultant I need to collect customer feedback to self-improve and document customer satisfaction?

Assistant	Result	Position	From the answer
Claude	did not name you	—	Customer Feedback & Satisfaction Tools 1. Typeform – Beautiful, easy-to-use survey builder with conditional logic and excellent response rates, ideal for consultants wanting professional-looking feedback forms. 2. Delighted – Purpose-built for NPS (Net Promoter Score...
ChatGPT	did not name you	—	Here are reputable options to collect customer feedback, measure satisfaction, and drive self-improvement for a consultant: 1) Qualtrics XM: Robust survey and feedback platform with advanced analytics, NPS tracking, and actionable insights tailored for consultants and service-ba...
Google Gemini	did not name you	—	Here are the best providers for collecting client feedback and documenting satisfaction as a consultant: 1. Typeform – Highly recommended for its conversational, beautifully designed surveys that result in much higher completion rates from busy clients. 2. Qualtrics – Th...

Every assistant was asked this same question — without your brand name, and with web search switched off — so the answer shows what the model already holds about this market rather than what it can look up. This section counts towards the audit score.

API surface detected

How detection works: the audit probes the site's own domain for conventional machine-readable entry points — an API catalog (/well-known/api-catalog, RFC 9727), OpenAPI/Swagger specifications at standard paths, a GraphQL endpoint, and RSS/Atom feeds advertised on the page.

No public/conventional API surface detected (this signal is weak — it does not mean no API exists).

Knowledge Graph readiness

No Wikidata entity was found for Feedback Journey. AI assistants have no canonical, structured record to ground answers about the brand — the single biggest knowledge-graph gap to close.

No Wikidata record exists for the brand yet, so the structured facts assistants look for are missing entirely. Registering the brand on Wikidata is free and is the single most effective step to give AI assistants a canonical record to ground on.

How to improve

- Create a Wikidata item for Feedback Journey (wikidata.org → "Create a new item"): it is free, CC0, and the canonical fact base that ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Perplexity and Google's Knowledge Graph draw on for who a brand is.
- Populate the core properties from the start: official website (P856), instance of / type (P31), industry (P452), country (P17) and inception date (P571).
- If the brand is notable enough for a Wikipedia article (independent coverage in reliable sources), create one — a Wikipedia sitelink materially strengthens the entity, especially in your primary market languages.

Authority vs. age

Domain authority for Feedback Journey could not be measured this run, so authority-vs-age could not be assessed.

Domain	Authority	Age	Assessment
feedbackjourney.com your site	—	—	not available
smartsurvey.co.uk	7.8/10	—	not available
mopinion.com	6.8/10	—	not available
zendesk.com	9.1/10	—	not available

How to improve

- Build domain authority for Feedback Journey with reputable inbound links and citations — it is one of the strongest off-page signals search engines and AI assistants weigh.

AI reviewer notes

Title & meta: The title and meta description clearly front-load the core need: 'verifiable client feedback for IT consultants & freelancers.' They immediately communicate the value proposition and target audience, making it sharp and effective.

Quotability: Paragraphs are generally self-contained and answer-first, making them suitable for AI assistants. For example, 'Feedback Journey is the feedback tool built for IT consultants and knowledge workers. Run a fast survey after each project, sprint or workshop — then turn honest client scores into a QR-verifiable Journey Card you can put on your CV, proposal, or Upwork profile.' is a concise, quotable explanation of what the tool is and does.

Semantic fit: The visible content clearly maps to the stated need of verifiable client feedback for IT consultants and freelancers. Terms like 'QR-verifiable Journey Card,' 'fast survey after each project,' and 'put on your CV, proposal, or Upwork profile' are specific and directly address the problem and solution, avoiding generic marketing copy.

Pages measured (20)

Page	Source	Mobile	Desktop
/	homepage	93	100
/pricing	llms.txt	84	—
/faq	llms.txt	82	—
/about	llms.txt	89	—
/journey-card	llms.txt	93	—
/feedback-journey-explained	llms.txt	95	—
/how-to-use-feedback-journey	llms.txt	95	—
/survey-types	llms.txt	95	—
/surveys	llms.txt	95	—
/feedback-journey-coaching	llms.txt	96	—
/feedback-journey-for-freelancers	llms.txt	95	—
/feedback-journey-for-consultants	llms.txt	96	—
/feedback-journey-for-consultant-leaders	llms.txt	89	—
/feedback-journey-for-clients	llms.txt	96	—
/feedback-journey-for-knowledge-workers	llms.txt	97	—
/what-is-the-consultant-role-about	llms.txt	98	—
/manual	llms.txt	96	—
/about-feedback	llms.txt	97	—
/contact	llms.txt	98	—
/improvement-goals	llms.txt	96	—

This section is a technical heuristic, not a Google ranking factor. Performance figures are estimates that vary between runs; Core Web Vitals reflect the homepage only. Performance and rendered-mobile scores were averaged across 20 pages (the homepage plus key pages from llms.txt/sitemap). Security headers were assessed with the self-hosted MDN HTTP Observatory (MPL-2.0), run in-process against the site. Domain authority (Open PageRank, 0–10) was cross-referenced with domain age (RDAP registration date) to read authority in context — informational, not part of the score. AI-assistant visibility was measured by asking 3 leading assistants one plain question about the need — without naming the brand — with web search switched off, and checking which of them named the brand unprompted. The question, the models and the mention test are fixed, so the measurement can be repeated; the assistants' answers are their own and can vary between runs. This is part of the score. Agent usability (how usable the site is for AI agents) was measured by scanning the site's agent-web configuration — machine-readable content, bot access signals and capability-discovery endpoints — and is part of the score.

8 Building authority: mentions, reputation and trust

8.1 Where Feedback Journey stands today

The measured evidence on Feedback Journey's authority position is consistent, and it is weak.

The audit found **no Wikidata entity** for the brand, which means the canonical structured record that Google's Knowledge Graph and the major AI assistants consult for "who is this company" does not exist. The Knowledge Graph category measured 0/100 for that reason. **No AI assistant named the brand:** asked which providers they would recommend for this need, with the brand unnamed and web search off, zero of three assistants mentioned Feedback Journey — and their answers instead led with well-established names. Because web search was off, this is a measurement of accumulated third-party description, and it returned nothing. In Google Search, the brand's site ranked in **zero of 30** brand-free buyer queries, and Google's AI Overview — shown for all 30 — cited it in **none**. The **domain authority** panel returned an unknown value for feedbackjourney.com, alongside 7.8 for SmartSurvey, 6.8 for Mopinion and 9.1 for Zendesk; domain age was not measured for any of them, so no age-adjusted reading is possible. The audit's own recommendation on this point is to build authority through reputable inbound links and citations, described as one of the strongest off-page signals search engines and AI assistants weigh. And no verified media presence was recorded.

Independent research for this report corroborates the picture rather than softening it. Searches on Google for the brand name, the domain, the founder's name in combination with the product, and the product's distinctive terminology surfaced: the founder's LinkedIn profile and posts, a speaker biography from the Booster conference in Bergen, a Norwegian company-role registry entry for the founder, and a contact-data aggregator page. No reviews on G2, Capterra, Trustpilot or Software Advice. No inclusion in any of the European directories — european-alternatives.eu, eualternative.eu, europeanmartech.eu — that rank at the top of the measured European buyer queries. No inclusion in any of the round-up articles that dominate those results. No press coverage. No community discussion identified. A search of the phrase itself returns mostly generic uses of "feedback journey" as an English expression, plus an unrelated site on a neighbouring domain.

What Feedback Journey does have, and should not undervalue: a founder with a verifiable twenty-year professional record in software development and consulting, a master's degree from the University of Bergen, a conference speaking slot on precisely the topic the product addresses, an active if Norwegian-language public voice on feedback practice, and an apparently deliberate, publicly-argued position on data residency and privacy. These are the raw materials of authority. None of them has yet been converted into the form that engines and models can read: independent pages, published by someone else, describing Feedback Journey as an answer to this need.

The honest summary is that Feedback Journey is, from the perspective of a search engine or a language model, an entity with almost no evidence attached. That is not the same as a bad reputation — there is nothing negative either. It is an absence, and absences are recoverable. But they are recoverable only through the specific, slow work below, not through anything that can be done on the website alone.

Earned mentions and citations

The measured search data identifies, with unusual precision, which sources actually matter for this need — and therefore where effort should go first. In descending order of demonstrated influence on the answers European buyers see:

The European alternative directories. europeanmartech.eu ("Best European Survey Tools: Free Options, All EU-Hosted"), european-alternatives.eu ("European survey tools") and eualternative.eu ("European Alternatives to SurveyMonkey", "Forms and Surveys: 21 European Providers Compared") ranked in the organic top eight across all three sampled markets and were cited in Google's AI Overview repeatedly — europeanmartech.eu in France and Germany, eualternative.eu and european-alternatives.eu in Germany and the UK. These are curated lists with submission processes rather than SEO targets: european-alternatives.eu states that suggestions for new products in existing categories can be submitted through its suggestion tool after registering. For a Norwegian-built product that has already moved off a US cloud provider for data-residency reasons, these listings are both winnable and directly on-message. This is the single highest-return authority action available.

The comparison round-ups. mopinion.com's European GDPR round-up, heymarvin.com, guideflow.com, getperspective.ai, thecxlead.com, chatarmin.com, ortto.com, timetoreply.com, softr.io ("10 top client feedback platforms"), wiserreview.com and typeform.com's own blog were all either top-ranking or AI-Overview-cited in the measured data. Some are competitor-owned and will not include Feedback Journey; many are independent publishers who add tools on request, particularly if the pitch offers a genuinely distinct category — feedback built for individual consultants rather than CX teams — rather than asking to be listed as one more survey tool. Softr's client-feedback-platforms piece and the "best tools for freelancers/consultants" genre are the most receptive.

Software review directories. G2's category pages and Trustpilot's business pages were cited directly in the measured UK AI Overview; Capterra and Software Advice appear in the same result sets. A claimed, complete profile on G2 and Capterra with an accurate category, description and a handful of genuine reviews is the standard evidence base these models draw category consensus from.

Consultant-side platforms. Clutch is worth specific attention because it sits where Feedback Journey's audience already is. Its own materials state that verified providers are eligible for a guarantee it describes as a trust signal AI search engines evaluate when recommending providers, and that verification combines business registration data, third-party credit checks and client review history. A partnership or integration angle — helping consultants convert

Feedback Journey responses into Clutch or Trustpilot reviews — would place the brand in a trusted third-party context rather than merely in a directory.

Reddit and community threads. Reddit was cited in Google's AI Overview in France and Germany, and Reddit threads ranked organically in all three markets. This is not a "listing" to be won but a body of discussion to be genuinely part of, discussed below.

Reviews and social proof

Feedback Journey currently has, as far as this research could establish, no reviews on any public platform. For a product whose entire premise is collecting and documenting satisfaction, that is an uncomfortable position and also a solvable one — the brand has, by definition, customers who are in the habit of giving feedback.

The pipeline should be deliberate rather than opportunistic. Priorities: G2 and Capterra, because they are what the AI Overviews and assistants read for software categories; Trustpilot, because it ranked first in the UK for a commercial buyer query in this space and carries weight with European buyers; and named case references on the site itself, which are not third-party evidence but do give journalists and comparison writers something to verify. Volume matters less than three other things. Recency: a profile whose newest review is eighteen months old reads as a product losing momentum, and G2's own interface flags profiles that have not received a review in months. Specificity: a review that says "I now ask every client the same five questions after each engagement and can show a two-year satisfaction record to my employer" is worth ten that say "great tool". And visible response: replying to reviews, including critical ones, is read as a signal of an operating business by human readers and by models summarising sentiment.

Two cautions. Fabricated or incentivised reviews are a reputation risk rather than a shortcut — the major platforms actively police them, Clutch verifies reviewer identity through LinkedIn, Google or company email, and a removed or flagged review set does more damage than an empty profile. And reviews should be asked for in a way consistent with what the product teaches: a genuine request, at the right moment, with no pressure on the score. A feedback company caught gaming feedback would be a self-inflicted wound of the worst kind.

Digital PR and material worth citing

The audit measured zero outbound citation links and 9 statistics across 761 homepage words. The mirror image of that finding is the opportunity: Feedback Journey is a feedback product and can therefore generate data nobody else has.

The most valuable asset available is **original benchmark data on consultant feedback**. Anonymised and aggregated: what response rate do consultants actually achieve when they ask clients for feedback after an engagement? How does that vary with timing, with anonymity, with question count? What do clients most often say consultants should do differently? What proportion of consultants ask systematically at all? A short annual report — even one built on a few hundred engagements, clearly labelled as such — is precisely the kind

of material that comparison writers cite, that journalists cover, and that language models absorb because it is the only source for a specific number. Statistics are the most citable content form that exists, and a small company that owns one useful statistic can be quoted alongside much larger ones.

Second, a **practical, definitive guide** to collecting and documenting client feedback as a consultant, in English, structured as questions with self-contained answers. The measured data shows this question is weakly contested: Google's AI Overview answered it with no citations at all in two of three markets. A guide that is genuinely better than the generic advice — covering the awkward parts, such as how to ask a client who is also a friend, how to handle feedback that reflects badly on your employer rather than on you, and how to document satisfaction in a form a procurement function accepts — would be linkable and quotable.

Third, **expert commentary and speaking**. The founder already speaks at conferences on feedback and continuous improvement; every such appearance should produce a durable, citable artefact — a published talk page, a write-up, a slide deck with a stable URL — rather than evaporating after the event. Guest articles for consulting and freelancing publications, podcast appearances in the Nordic and European consulting space, and contributions to industry-body newsletters all create the third-party pages that carry authority.

Fourth, **partnerships and integrations that place the brand in trusted contexts**. An integration listing in another product's marketplace is a high-quality independent page describing what Feedback Journey does — SimpleSat's presence in the ConnectWise marketplace is an example of the pattern. Integrations with the tools consultants actually use (calendar, invoicing, CRM, LinkedIn, and review platforms) would each generate such a page, in addition to their product value.

Demonstrated expertise

For a brand with no reviews and no press, demonstrated expertise on its own pages is the credibility bridge — and Feedback Journey has stronger material here than most early-stage products, currently underused.

The founder's record is verifiable: roughly two decades across software development and consulting roles including a Norwegian consultancy, a master's degree in software development from the University of Bergen, and a public speaking practice on feedback and continuous improvement. That is a genuine first-hand claim to expertise about the consultant role, and about why feedback is hard to ask for honestly. It should be visible: named authorship on every substantive page, a real biography with credentials and links to the LinkedIn profile and speaking appearances, and Person schema connecting the author to the organisation. Anonymous marketing copy and named expert commentary are read very differently by human buyers and are weighted differently by engines assessing whether a source has genuine experience.

Publishing cadence matters as much as credentials. A steady rhythm — one substantive piece a month, in English, on a question consultants actually ask — accumulates into a body of work that establishes topical ownership. Sporadic bursts do not. The specific opportunity here is that the founder is already producing this material on LinkedIn, in Norwegian, for an audience of a few thousand. The same thinking, written in English and published where it can be indexed, linked and quoted, would do considerably more work.

A consistent entity everywhere

This is where Feedback Journey's most concrete authority gap sits, and where the cheapest high-value action is available.

The measured finding is that no Wikidata entity exists. The audit's recommendation is explicit and worth following exactly: create an item at [wikidata.org](https://www.wikidata.org) and populate the core properties from the start — official website (P856), instance of/type (P31), industry (P452), country (P17) and inception date (P571). Wikidata is free, CC0-licensed, and functions as the canonical fact base that Google's Knowledge Graph and the major assistants draw on for who a brand is. It does not by itself make a brand recommended; it makes a brand *identifiable*, which is the precondition for every other mention being attributed correctly. If, in time, independent coverage in reliable sources makes the brand notable enough for a Wikipedia article, a sitelink would materially strengthen the entity — but notability is earned through the coverage described above, not asserted.

Consistency is the other half. The same brand name, the same one-sentence description, the same category and the same core facts should appear on the site, on LinkedIn, on G2 and Capterra, on the European directories, in Trustpilot listings, in any marketplace integration page, and in Wikidata. The one-sentence description is worth drafting once and reusing verbatim everywhere — something on the order of "Feedback Journey is a European feedback tool for consultants and freelancers who want to collect structured client feedback, work on defined improvement goals and document client satisfaction over time." Repetition of an identical formulation across independent sources is exactly the pattern that teaches a language model what a brand is. Divergent descriptions across platforms teach it nothing.

Given the generic brand name and the existence of an unrelated site on a neighbouring domain, disambiguation deserves explicit attention: Organization schema with `sameAs` links, consistent use of the full brand name rather than "Feedback Journey" as a common noun, and the Wikidata item all help engines separate the entity from the phrase.

Community presence

The measured data gives community presence unusual weight for this need: Reddit ranked in the organic top eight in all three markets for at least one query, and was cited by Google's AI Overview in France and Germany. The specific threads that surfaced — "How Do You Collect Client Feedback to Improve Your..." in [r/agency](https://www.reddit.com/r/agency), "Looking for a European survey platform" in [r/BuyFromEU](https://www.reddit.com/r/BuyFromEU), "What tools (if any) actually help automate customer..." — are, in effect, permanent public shortlisting conversations that both buyers and models read.

The relevant venues are r/consulting, r/agency, r/freelance, r/BuyFromEU, r/smallbusiness, the European and Nordic consulting groups on LinkedIn, and the Slack and Discord communities where independent consultants organise. The goal, stated plainly, is to become a name people mention — not to post promotional material. In practice that means answering the question that was actually asked, from experience, and mentioning the product only when it is genuinely the answer and only with a clear disclosure of the connection. These communities detect and punish vendor astroturfing quickly, and a negative thread is worse than no thread. The founder's background is an asset here: someone who has spent years as a consultant answering "how do you get clients to tell you the truth?" from experience will be read as a peer.

There is also an offline community dimension worth keeping. The Bergen and wider Nordic conference circuit, where the founder already speaks, is a legitimate route to both users and citable artefacts, and local professional bodies for consultants and freelancers are natural partners for a product built for their members.

8.2 Sustaining authority

Authority compounds slowly and decays when neglected, and it cannot be bought quickly. That is the honest expectation to set. A Wikidata item and a set of directory submissions can be completed in weeks. Reviews accumulate over months. Inclusion in comparison round-ups follows once there is something to include — a listing, a few reviews, a distinct category claim — and typically takes a further few months from first outreach. Being named by an AI assistant without web search is the slowest outcome of all, because it depends on the brand appearing often enough, described consistently enough, across enough independent sources, to become part of what the model holds about the category. The measured fact that neither SmartSurvey nor Mopinion — both with real search presence and real domain authority — was named by any of the three assistants tested should calibrate expectations: on a realistic timeline, appearing in live-search AI answers (AI Overviews, Perplexity, AI Mode) is achievable within a year of consistent work, while being named from a model's internal knowledge is a multi-year outcome.

The sustaining cadence is unglamorous and should be scheduled rather than improvised. Monthly: check new mentions of the brand and of the founder, respond to every review, ask for two or three new reviews from recent customers, publish one substantive English-language piece. Quarterly: refresh the flagship guide and any statistics so cited material stays current, review the entity facts across every listing for drift, and pitch one comparison publisher or one podcast. Annually: republish the benchmark data with a new year's figures, which converts a one-off asset into a recurring citation magnet, and re-run the kind of measurement this report is based on to see whether organic appearances and AI-Overview citations have moved off zero. The measurable leading indicators are, in order of how soon they should move: directory listings live, reviews published, referring domains from independent sites, appearances in AI Overview citation lists, organic rankings for consultant-specific queries, and — last — unprompted mentions by assistants.

9 SWOT analysis

Strengths

A genuinely differentiated niche with almost no direct competition. The research in chapter 3 found no other product positioned squarely at individual consultants who want to combine self-improvement with documented client satisfaction; SimpleSAT is the nearest analogue and approaches from the service-desk side. The site's own page structure — improvement goals, journey record, survey types, and separate pages for consultants, freelancers, consultant leaders and knowledge workers — expresses that position clearly.

A technically sound website that removes obstacles rather than creating them. Measured crawlability and indexing 100/100, mobile usability 100/100, semantic HTML and headings 97/100, and performance and Core Web Vitals 94/100, with homepage mobile performance of 93/100 and desktop 100/100. Against the measured competitors' homepage mobile performance of 70 (Mopinion), 29 (Zendesk) and 28 (SmartSurvey), this is a clear on-site advantage.

AEO groundwork already in place that larger competitors lack. Measured passes for FAQ/Q&A structured data, question-shaped headings, AI answer-engine crawler access, and a published llms.txt, plus clean, error-free JSON-LD with high-value schema types — a richer implementation than SmartSurvey's measured single corporation type.

A credible, verifiable founder story with first-hand domain experience. Twenty years across software development and consulting, a master's degree from the University of Bergen, and public speaking on feedback and continuous improvement — the raw material for demonstrated expertise, and unusual authenticity for a product about consulting practice.

A privacy and data-residency posture that matches what European buyers are actually searching for. The founder's publicly-described move off a US cloud provider to gain control over data location aligns directly with the compliance framing that dominates the measured European queries and AI Overviews.

An uncontested content opening. For the query closest to the need, Google's AI Overview returned no citations at all in two of three sampled markets, and the organic results were low-authority. No source owns the consultant-specific answer yet.

Weaknesses

Zero measured search presence. The site ranked in 0 of 30 brand-free buyer queries across three European markets, while SmartSurvey appeared in 18, Mopinion in 10 and Zendesk in 8, each with a best position of 1.

Zero measured presence in AI answers. Google showed an AI Overview for all 30 queries and cited Feedback Journey in none; 0 of 3 AI assistants named the brand when asked about the

need with the brand unnamed and web search off.

No canonical entity record. The audit found no Wikidata entity, so Knowledge Graph measured 0/100 — Google and the assistants have no structured record to ground answers about the brand.

No measurable domain authority or independent link profile. The authority panel returned an unknown value for feedbackjourney.com against 7.8 for SmartSurvey, 6.8 for Mopinion and 9.1 for Zendesk, and the audit's own recommendation is to build authority through reputable inbound links and citations.

No reviews, listings or press found anywhere. Research surfaced no G2, Capterra, Trustpilot or Software Advice presence, no inclusion in the European directories that rank at the top of the measured queries, and no comparison-article inclusion or media coverage.

Homepage prose that machines cannot quote. Measured Flesch Reading Ease of 0, with an average of 63.4 words per sentence across 761 words — the most consequential on-site finding, because the page meant to define the brand cannot yield a clean, attributable sentence.

Unsubstantiated content. Measured 9 statistics and zero outbound citation links, both of which reduce the likelihood of being quoted by answer engines.

Meta-tag and indexability gaps. Measured 66/100 at 13% weight: a 78-character title at risk of truncation, a 217-character meta description that will be truncated, and no `rel="canonical"` link on a site with several near-adjacent audience pages.

Agent readiness at the floor. Agent usability measured 0/100 and the agent-readiness scan placed the site at level 1 of 5 ("Basic Web Presence"), with no Markdown-for-agents representation, no Content Signals, and none of the capability-discovery endpoints present.

A generic, collision-prone brand name. "Feedback journey" is common English usage in customer-experience writing, and an unrelated site occupies a neighbouring domain — which makes entity disambiguation harder for a brand with no Wikidata record.

Single-person dependency and Norwegian-language communication. The brand's only visible public voice is the founder's, largely in Norwegian, which limits reach across the European market the report was asked to assess.

Opportunities

Directory inclusion on the European axis. europeanmartech.eu, european-alternatives.eu and eualternative.eu rank in the organic top eight in all three sampled markets and were cited in the measured AI Overviews; european-alternatives.eu accepts product suggestions through a submission tool. Fast, cheap and directly on-message.

Owning the consultant-specific question. The weak, often uncited AI Overviews for "how can I gather customer satisfaction data for my consulting business?" represent an addressable gap that the incumbents, focused on generic tool round-ups, are not competing for.

Original benchmark data. As a feedback product, Feedback Journey can produce statistics on consultant feedback that no one else holds — the single most citable content form, and a direct answer to the measured zero-citation finding.

Market displacement. Delighted's announced closure on 30 June 2026 puts a cohort of lightweight-NPS users into the market and prompts comparison writers to refresh their lists — a window for a new entrant to be added.

Partnerships with consultancies and professional bodies. The "consultant leaders" audience implies a firm-level sale that would deliver multiple users and independent third-party pages describing the brand at the same time.

Review-platform symbiosis. Helping consultants turn Feedback Journey responses into published Trustpilot, Google or Clutch reviews would serve the documentation half of the need and place the brand in trusted third-party contexts.

Threats

Entrenched default answers. Typeform was named by two of three assistants and SurveyMonkey and Qualtrics by others; these defaults are self-reinforcing, because every new round-up repeats the previous consensus.

Incumbent content moats. SmartSurvey and Zendesk rank with large libraries of guide content, Zendesk localised across zendesk.fr, zendesk.de and zendesk.co.uk; out-publishing them on head terms is not realistic.

Publisher gatekeeping. The most-cited sources in the measured AI Overviews are round-ups controlled by third parties, some of them competitor-owned; inclusion cannot be bought with on-site quality.

The free-and-good-enough alternative. Google's AI Overviews recommend free forms, CRM logging and review calls as core methods, and EUSurvey ranked first in all three markets for European survey platforms — a zero-cost competitor with institutional credibility.

Compressed European positioning. The privacy-and-EU-hosting angle is already occupied by Mopinion ("The European #1 Feedback Software"), Survicate, Formbricks, Netigate and Questback, several with established European operations; arriving late to a crowded claim requires a sharper differentiator than geography.

Credibility exposure from unfixed security findings. Missing CSP, HSTS and X-Frame-Options headers and a DMARC policy of p=none do not affect visibility, but on a product that asks consultants' clients to trust an emailed link they represent an incident risk that could damage the brand's reputation faster than any marketing could repair it.

Time. Authority compounds slowly. A competitor that begins the same programme with an existing domain authority of 6.8 or 7.8 will compound faster from a higher base.

10 Recommended actions

10.1 Technical SEO

10.1.1 Rewrite title tags and meta descriptions across the site

Action: Rewrite the homepage title to 30–60 characters that front-load the need (for example "Client feedback for consultants | Feedback Journey"), shorten the meta description to 50–160 characters, and give every one of the 20 sampled pages a unique title and description written to the same rule.

Grounds: The audit measured a 78-character title flagged as long and at risk of truncation, and a 217-character meta description flagged as long and certain to be truncated at around 160; meta tags and indexability measured 66/100 at 13% weight. All three measured competitors sit in range — SmartSurvey 59 characters, Mopinion and Zendesk 46.

Why it matters: The title and description are what a buyer reads in the result and what a model uses to summarise the page. A truncated title cuts off mid-thought, and a description longer than the display limit wastes the pitch.

How to implement: Write the buyer's need first and the brand last. Check each page renders fully in a search-result preview. Ensure no two pages share a title, which matters especially across the near-adjacent consultant, freelancer and knowledge-worker pages.

Priority/impact: High priority, moderate impact — improves click-through and machine comprehension on every page, cheap to do.

10.1.2 Add self-referencing canonical tags

Action: Add a self-referencing `<link rel="canonical">` to every page.

Grounds: The audit found no `rel="canonical"` link, with the fix stated as adding a self-referencing canonical to avoid duplicate-content dilution.

Why it matters: With several closely-related audience pages (consultants, freelancers, consultant leaders, knowledge workers), unmanaged duplication splits whatever ranking signals the site accumulates across near-identical URLs and leaves parameterised variants free to compete with the originals.

How to implement: Emit the canonical from the page template using the absolute, preferred URL. Verify on the audience pages and the pricing and FAQ pages first.

Priority/impact: High priority, moderate impact — prevents dilution as content is added.

10.1.3 Add SoftwareApplication, Organization/sameAs and Person structured data

Action: Extend the existing JSON-LD with a SoftwareApplication (or Product) type including offers and applicationCategory, an Organization block with sameAs links to LinkedIn, every directory and review listing, and the Wikidata item once created, and a Person entry for the founder linked as founder/author.

Grounds: Structured data measured 81/100 with JSON-LD present, parsing cleanly and including high-value types — a good base with room to extend. Zendesk's measured markup includes softwareapplication; Mopinion's includes organization and breadcrumblist.

Knowledge Graph measured 0/100.

Why it matters: SoftwareApplication with offers tells engines this is a purchasable tool in a category with a price. sameAs is the connective tissue that lets engines attribute scattered mentions to one entity — particularly important for a generic brand name with an unrelated site on a neighbouring domain. Person markup converts a real professional record into a machine-readable expertise signal.

How to implement: Extend the existing JSON-LD block rather than adding competing blocks; validate with a schema testing tool; keep sameAs updated as new listings go live.

Priority/impact: High priority, high impact for entity clarity — directly supports the authority work in 10.3.

10.1.4 Improve performance on the pricing and FAQ pages

Action: Bring the pricing page (measured 84/100 mobile) and FAQ page (82/100 mobile) up to the 95+ band the rest of the site achieves, and review the about and consultant-leaders pages at 89/100.

Grounds: Performance and Core Web Vitals measured 94/100 overall with the homepage at 93 mobile and 100 desktop, but the sampled page list shows FAQ at 82 and pricing at 84 — the two weakest pages, and both conversion-critical.

Why it matters: These are the pages a serious buyer reaches after being convinced, and the FAQ page is also the most likely to be drawn on by answer engines. Note that this is page speed, distinct from mobile usability, which measured a perfect 100/100 — the site is fully responsive; these two pages are simply slower than the rest.

How to implement: Profile the two pages for oversized images, blocking third-party scripts and unused CSS; apply the same patterns already working on the pages scoring 95–98.

Priority/impact: Medium priority, moderate impact — protects conversion and AEO extraction on two important pages.

10.1.5 Strengthen internal linking around the buyer's questions

Action: Link the concept pages (about-feedback, feedback-journey-explained, what-is-the-consultant-role-about, improvement-goals) to and from the audience pages and the new question-led content, using descriptive anchor text that names the need.

Grounds: Crawlability and indexing measured 100/100 and semantic HTML 97/100, so the structural base is sound; the site's remaining weakness on-page is that its topical assets are not visibly connected to the queries buyers use. The measured search data shows the winning pages for this need are guide content, not product pages.

Why it matters: Internal links tell engines which pages the site itself considers most important on a topic, and they route whatever external authority arrives to the pages that should rank.

How to implement: Choose one primary page per buyer question, link to it from every related page with anchor text matching the question, and avoid generic "read more" anchors.

Priority/impact: Medium priority, moderate impact — compounds as content and links accumulate.

10.1.6 Add baseline security headers and tighten DMARC

Action: Add a Content-Security-Policy header (rolled out in report-only mode first), a Strict-Transport-Security header with a max-age of at least six months, X-Frame-Options set to DENY or SAMEORIGIN (or a `frame-ancestors` directive), and X-Content-Type-Options: nosniff. Move the DMARC policy from `p=none` to `p=quarantine` and then `p=reject` once reports confirm legitimate senders pass.

Grounds: Security and headers measured 50/100 with CSP, HSTS and X-Frame-Options recorded as failures and X-Content-Type-Options as a warning; domain and email trust measured 65/100 with a DMARC record present but set to `p=none`, which monitors only and does not stop spoofed email being delivered. HTTPS redirection, SRI, CORS and SPF all passed.

Why it matters: These findings do not move rankings or AI-assistant answers, and should not be expected to. They matter because Feedback Journey's core transaction is a consultant's *client* trusting an emailed link — a domain that cannot block spoofing sits directly on that trust — and because a brand that publicly argues for data control invites scrutiny of its security posture. Fixing them proactively protects the brand's reputation from incidents rather than adding visibility.

How to implement: Deploy headers at the edge or web server; run CSP in report-only mode for a fortnight before enforcing. Review DMARC aggregate reports before each policy step.

Priority/impact: High priority for reputation protection, no direct visibility impact — low cost, and the exposure is concentrated on exactly the workflow the product depends on.

10.1.7 Take the first steps on agent readiness

Action: Publish a Markdown representation of the key pages (Markdown-for-agents content negotiation), add Content-Signal directives to robots.txt declaring preferences for ai-train, search and ai-input, and serve HTTP Link headers on key pages pointing to machine-readable resources. Treat the remaining capability-discovery items — API catalog, MCP server card, Agent Skills index, DNS-AID records, OAuth discovery and protected-resource metadata, auth.md, A2A card, WebMCP tools and an ARD manifest — as a later phase, and only where the product genuinely exposes agent-usable capabilities.

Grounds: Agent usability measured 0/100 at 11% weight, and the agent-readiness scan placed the site at level 1 of 5 ("Basic Web Presence") with a next target of level 2 ("Bot-Aware"). The audit identifies Markdown-for-agents as one of the strongest agent-usability levers, and no API surface was detected (a weak signal — an API may still exist).

Why it matters: Markdown representations give AI agents clean, token-efficient text instead of layout markup, which improves how accurately a model reads and quotes the site. Content Signals declare, in machine-readable form, how the content may be used. The authentication and capability descriptors matter only if agents are meant to *act* on the site; they will not make assistants more likely to recommend the brand.

How to implement: Start with Markdown for the homepage, the consultant page, the FAQ and the pricing page, served via content negotiation; add Content-Signal lines to the existing robots.txt; revisit the capability endpoints when and if an API is offered publicly.

Priority/impact: Medium priority, moderate impact — improves machine legibility and lifts the weakest-weighted category off zero, but it is not the reason assistants currently omit the brand.

10.2 Content and AEO

10.2.1 Rewrite the homepage so a machine can quote it

Action: Rewrite the homepage copy in short, plain, self-contained sentences, opening with one sentence that names who the product is for, what it does and what outcome it produces. Target a Flesch Reading Ease of 60 or better.

Grounds: The audit measured Flesch Reading Ease 0 (grade ~29) with an average of 63.4 words per sentence over 761 words, and recommends shortening sentences and preferring plain words so answers are easy to quote. Content and AEO quotability measured 82/100.

Why it matters: This is the page that defines the entity. If no clean sentence can be extracted from it, nothing downstream — schema, llms.txt, directory listings — has a canonical formulation to align to, and a language model summarising the brand has nothing to work with.

How to implement: Poor version, of the type this site's measurement implies: a long compound sentence combining a promise about growth, insight and continuous improvement without naming the buyer or the mechanism. Good version: "Feedback Journey helps consultants collect honest feedback from their clients. You set two or three improvement goals, ask every client the same short questions after each engagement, and build a documented record of your client satisfaction over time." Two sentences, 12 and 33 words, both attributable, both quotable. Apply the same test to every page: read each paragraph in isolation and ask whether a stranger would know who it is about.

Priority/impact: Highest priority in this sub-section, high impact — a precondition for being quoted anywhere.

10.2.2 Publish the definitive guide to consultant client feedback

Action: Write and publish a substantial English-language guide — "How to collect and document client feedback as a consultant" — structured as the questions buyers ask, each with a self-contained answer directly beneath its heading.

Grounds: Feedback Journey ranked in 0 of 30 measured buyer queries; for the closest query, "How can I gather customer satisfaction data for my consulting business?", Google's AI Overview returned no citations at all in France and Germany, and the organic results were low-authority pages. Question-shaped headings and FAQ/Q&A structured data already pass on this site, so the format is established.

Why it matters: This is the most winnable query in the measured set and the most on-target for the product. A well-structured answer to an uncited question is the shortest path from zero to being referenced by an AI Overview.

How to implement: Use headings taken verbatim from buyer language: "How do I get honest feedback from a client I have a good relationship with?", "When should I ask for feedback after a project?", "How do I document client satisfaction for a procurement process?", "Is it better to ask anonymously?". Answer each in 80–150 words that stand alone. Cover the awkward parts

competitors avoid. Add FAQPage schema. Link from the consultant, freelancer and consultant-leader pages.

Priority/impact: High priority, high impact — the single best content opportunity the measured data reveals.

10.2.3 Add concrete statistics and cite reputable sources

Action: Add specific numbers to key pages and cite reputable external sources where claims are made about feedback, satisfaction measurement or consulting practice.

Grounds: The audit measured 9 statistics (11.8 per thousand words) and 0 outbound citation links (0 per thousand words), noting that both concrete statistics and citations of reputable sources measurably increase the chance of being quoted by AI answer engines.

Why it matters: Answer engines prefer statements they can attach to something checkable. A page that cites nothing reads as opinion; a page that cites research and reports its own figures reads as a source.

How to implement: Cite the GDPR text and the European Commission's data-protection pages on the privacy page; cite published research on feedback and performance where relevant; report the product's own measured figures once available. Link out — outbound links to authoritative sources do not leak value, they establish context.

Priority/impact: High priority, moderate-to-high impact — directly addresses a measured weakness and feeds 10.3.3.

10.2.4 Publish a data protection and hosting page

Action : Create a dedicated page covering where data is stored, on what infrastructure, under which legal basis, how long responses are retained, and what a consultant can tell their client about it.

Grounds: No such page appears among the 20 sampled pages in the audit. The measured search data shows GDPR and European hosting is one of the dominant framings of this need — "What are some European regulations regarding customer data collection for feedback?" and "Are there any survey platforms popular in Europe for client feedback?" were both measured queries, both returned AI Overviews foregrounding EU hosting and compliance, and the pages that rank for them are compliance-focused. The founder's own public communication indicates a deliberate move to gain control over data location.

Why it matters: This is a genuine differentiator that is currently invisible. It is also the prerequisite for inclusion in the European directories in 10.3.1, which categorise products precisely on this attribute.

How to implement: State facts, not reassurance: hosting location, data controller and processor roles, retention periods, sub-processors, and a downloadable data-processing agreement. Write it so a consultant can forward it to their client's procurement contact unedited.

Priority/impact: High priority, high impact — unlocks a whole query family and a directory listing route.

10.2.5 Differentiate the audience pages and lead each with the answer

Action: Rewrite the consultant, freelancer, consultant-leader, client and knowledge-worker pages so each opens with a one-sentence answer to that audience's specific version of the need and continues with content that is genuinely different from the others.

Grounds: The audit's page inventory shows five closely-related audience pages; no canonical tag was declared, and content and AEO quotability measured 82/100 with readability failing. Near-duplicate audience pages compete with each other and give a model no distinct statement to attribute to each segment.

Why it matters: A consultant leader's need (documenting satisfaction across a team, comparing consultants, evidencing quality to clients) is materially different from a freelancer's (winning the next engagement with proof) and from a client's (why am I being asked, and what happens to my answer). Distinct, specific pages can each be cited for a different question.

How to implement: Open each page with "If you are a [audience] who needs to [specific need], Feedback Journey..." and follow with a scenario, a concrete example and an audience-specific FAQ. Delete overlapping boilerplate rather than rewording it.

Priority/impact: Medium-high priority, moderate impact — improves both ranking clarity and quotability.

10.2.6 Standardise the entity description everywhere

Action: Draft one canonical one-sentence description of Feedback Journey and use it verbatim on the site, in the meta description, in llms.txt, in structured data, on LinkedIn, and in every directory and review listing.

Grounds: Knowledge Graph measured 0/100 with no Wikidata entity; the brand name is generic English usage and an unrelated site occupies a neighbouring domain. The audit's llms.txt test passes, so the vehicle exists.

Why it matters: Identical repetition across independent sources is the pattern that teaches a language model what a brand is. Divergent descriptions teach it nothing and make attribution ambiguous.

How to implement: Agree the sentence once, name a single owner for it, and treat any variation on a third-party listing as a bug to be corrected.

Priority/impact: High priority, low cost, high leverage — it is the input to every action in 10.3.

10.3 Authority and mentions

10.3.1 Get listed in the European alternative directories

Action: Submit Feedback Journey to european-alternatives.eu, eualternative.eu and europeanmartech.eu under the survey and feedback categories, and to euroboxx.eu and comparable European directories.

Grounds: The verified search data shows these domains ranking in the organic top eight in all three sampled markets and being cited in Google's AI Overview repeatedly — europeanmartech.eu in France and Germany, eualternative.eu and european-alternatives.eu in Germany and the UK. Feedback Journey appears in none of them. european-alternatives.eu

states that suggestions for products in existing categories can be submitted through its suggestion tool after registration.

Why it matters: These are the sources Google's AI Overview quotes when a European buyer asks about feedback tools. Being listed there puts the brand inside the answer rather than outside it — and it is achieved by submission, not by outranking anyone.

How to implement: Complete the data-protection page (10.2.4) first, since these directories categorise on hosting and compliance. Submit with the canonical description from 10.2.6, the hosting facts, and a clear category claim. Follow up politely; keep listings current.

Priority/impact: Highest priority in the whole report, high impact, low cost, fastest payback.

10.3.2 Create the Wikidata item and align entity facts

Action: Create a Wikidata item for Feedback Journey, populating official website (P856), instance of (P31), industry (P452), country (P17) and inception date (P571), then align the same facts across LinkedIn, the site, all listings and structured data.

Grounds: The audit found no Wikidata entity for the brand and recorded Knowledge Graph at 0/100, describing Wikidata registration as the single most effective step to give AI assistants a canonical record of the brand, and Wikidata itself as the free, CC0 fact base that ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Perplexity and Google's Knowledge Graph draw on for who a brand is.

Why it matters: Without a canonical record, every mention the brand earns risks being unattributable — a particular danger given the generic name. This does not make the brand recommended; it makes it identifiable, which is the precondition for the rest.

How to implement: Register at wikidata.org, create the item, populate the core properties, and reference them to verifiable sources. Do not attempt a Wikipedia article yet — that requires independent coverage in reliable sources, which is what 10.3.3 and 10.3.4 are for.

Priority/impact: Highest priority, low cost, high leverage for entity recognition.

10.3.3 Build a genuine review pipeline

Action: Claim and complete profiles on G2, Capterra and Trustpilot, then ask every satisfied customer for a review at a natural moment, aiming for a steady trickle rather than a burst, and respond publicly to every review received.

Grounds: No reviews were found on any platform during research for this report. The verified search data shows Trustpilot's business site at position 1 in the UK for "top-rated online feedback collection services" and G2 and Trustpilot cited directly in that market's AI Overview. The audit recommends building authority through reputable citations as one of the strongest off-page signals.

Why it matters: Reviews are the most direct third-party evidence a software brand can accumulate, and the platforms that host them are read by both search engines and language models when forming a view of a category. A product about documenting satisfaction with no documented satisfaction of its own is also a credibility problem in itself.

How to implement: Ask in-product at a moment of success, with no incentive attached to the score. Prioritise reviews that describe the specific use case — a consultant documenting satisfaction over time — because specificity is what gets quoted. Never buy or incentivise

reviews: platforms police them, Clutch verifies reviewer identity, and a flagged review set is worse than an empty profile.

Priority/impact: High priority, high impact, slow accumulation — start now precisely because it takes months.

10.3.4 Pitch inclusion in the comparison round-ups that decide this market

Action: Approach the independent publishers whose round-ups rank and are cited for these queries — heymarvin.com, guideflow.com, getperspective.ai, thecxlead.com, softtr.io, ortto.com, timetoreply.com, wiserreview.com and similar — with a pitch positioned on the distinct category rather than as one more survey tool.

Grounds: The verified search data shows these publishers occupying the organic top eight and appearing as cited sources in Google's AI Overviews across all three markets, while Feedback Journey appears in 0 of 30 results and 0 of 30 Overviews.

Why it matters: The measured evidence is that publishers, not vendors, assemble the buyer's shortlist for this need, and that AI answers quote those publishers. Inclusion in three or four such lists changes what both Google and the assistants have to work with.

How to implement: Lead with the gap in their existing article — "your list covers CX platforms for teams; you have nothing for individual consultants" — and offer verifiable specifics: what it does, who it is for, hosting and compliance facts, pricing, and a named customer willing to be contacted. Expect a low hit rate and pitch steadily. Skip competitor-owned lists.

Priority/impact: High priority, high impact, medium effort.

10.3.5 Publish original benchmark data on consultant feedback

Action: Produce and publish an annual, anonymised benchmark on consultant feedback — response rates, asking frequency, what clients most often raise, how satisfaction develops over time — clearly documented as to sample and method.

Grounds: The audit measured 0 outbound citation links and only 9 statistics on the site, and notes that concrete statistics measurably increase the chance of being quoted by AI answer engines. The measured AI Overviews for this need consistently cite sources that supply specific figures and structured comparisons.

Why it matters: Original data is the only content type a small company can own outright. A publisher writing a round-up, a journalist writing about consulting, or a model answering a question about consultant feedback response rates all need a source — and if Feedback Journey is the only one, it gets cited regardless of its size.

How to implement: Start small and honest — a few hundred engagements, stated as such. Publish the figures on a stable URL with a clear licence for reuse and attribution, add the numbers to relevant product pages, and repeat annually so the citation compounds.

Priority/impact: High priority, high long-term impact, medium effort.

10.3.6 Establish an English-language expert voice with named authorship

Action: Publish one substantive English-language piece a month under the founder's byline, with a real biography, credentials and links to his LinkedIn profile and speaking appearances, and mirror key pieces on LinkedIn.

Grounds: Research found the brand's only visible ongoing public communication to be the founder's Norwegian-language LinkedIn activity, while the verified search data shows LinkedIn articles ranking in the organic top eight in all three sampled markets and being cited in AI Overviews in France, Germany and the UK. The founder's credentials — two decades in software development and consulting, a University of Bergen master's degree, conference speaking on feedback — are verifiable.

Why it matters: Named expertise with first-hand experience is weighted differently from anonymous marketing copy by human readers and by engines assessing whether a source genuinely knows its field. The material largely exists already; it is being published in the wrong language and the wrong place to be indexed, linked and quoted.

How to implement: Write in English, publish on the site first with Person schema, then adapt for LinkedIn. Keep the cadence consistent — a monthly rhythm sustained for a year beats a dozen posts in one month. Convert every speaking appearance into a durable, citable page.

Priority/impact: Medium-high priority, compounding impact.

10.3.7 Become a known name in the communities where this need is discussed

Action: Participate genuinely and regularly in r/consulting, r/agency, r/freelance, r/BuyFromEU and European consulting groups on LinkedIn — answering the question asked, from experience, with the commercial connection disclosed whenever the product is mentioned.

Grounds: The verified search data shows Reddit threads in the organic top eight in all three markets — including "How Do You Collect Client Feedback to Improve Your..." in r/agency and "Looking for a European survey platform" in r/BuyFromEU — and Reddit cited as a source in Google's AI Overview in France and Germany.

Why it matters: These threads function as permanent public shortlists that buyers and models both read. A brand mentioned by a peer in a highly-ranked thread gains something no owned channel can produce. The goal is to become a name people mention, not to promote.

How to implement: Contribute for weeks before mentioning the product at all. Disclose the affiliation every time. Never use multiple accounts or seed mentions — these communities detect it, and a negative thread outranks a neutral absence.

Priority/impact: Medium priority, moderate-to-high impact, requires patience and consistency.

10.3.8 Pursue partnerships that generate independent pages

Action: Pursue three partnership types: consultancies adopting the tool for their staff (the consultant-leader segment), professional bodies and freelance networks for consultants in the Nordics and wider Europe, and integrations or listings in the marketplaces of tools consultants already use — including review platforms such as Trustpilot, Google and Clutch, where Feedback Journey responses could feed published reviews.

Grounds: The audit found no detectable public API surface (a weak signal), an unknown domain authority against measured competitor authorities of 6.8 to 9.1, and recommends building authority through reputable inbound links and citations. Clutch's own materials state that verified providers are eligible for a guarantee it describes as a trust signal AI search

engines evaluate when recommending providers.

Why it matters: Partnerships deliver users and authority in the same transaction: each integration listing, member-benefit page or partner directory entry is an independent page describing what Feedback Journey does, in a trusted context. That is the raw material both search engines and language models need.

How to implement: Start with one consultancy willing to be a named reference and one integration with a tool that publishes a public marketplace. Ensure every partner page carries the canonical description from 10.2.6.

Priority/impact: Medium priority, high impact where it lands, longer sales cycle.

11 Conclusion

Feedback Journey's visibility for this need is, at present, close to absent — and the reason is not the quality of its website. Across 30 brand-free buyer queries measured in Google Search in France, Germany and the United Kingdom, the site ranked in none. Google displayed an AI Overview for all 30 and cited Feedback Journey in none. Asked which providers they would recommend for this need, with the brand unnamed and web search switched off, none of the three leading AI assistants tested mentioned it. The measured competitors that surfaced instead — SmartSurvey in 18 of the 30 searches with 6 AI Overview citations, Mopinion in 10 with 8 citations, Zendesk in 8 with 4 citations and one unprompted assistant mention — win those positions on accumulated authority, not on technical craft. Their measured homepage mobile performance is 28, 70 and 29 out of 100 respectively, against Feedback Journey's 93. The market is not rejecting Feedback Journey; it has no evidence that Feedback Journey exists.

The **website audit score is 64/100, grade D** — the only score in this report. Reading it correctly is important. The categories that reflect how well the site is built are strong: crawlability and indexing 100/100, mobile usability 100/100, semantic HTML and headings 97/100, performance and Core Web Vitals 94/100, content and AEO quotability 82/100, structured data 81/100. FAQ/Q&A markup, question-shaped headings, an llms.txt and clean high-value JSON-LD are all in place — an AEO foundation better than several much larger competitors have. The score is held down by agent usability at 0/100, named by AI assistants at 0/100, Knowledge Graph at 0/100, meta tags at 66/100, domain and email trust at 65/100 and security and headers at 50/100. Two of those three zeros are not site problems at all: they measure what the wider world says about the brand, and what it says is nothing. There is no Wikidata record, no reviews on any platform, no inclusion in the European directories or comparison round-ups that dominate the measured results, and no press coverage identified.

Against that, Feedback Journey holds real assets. Its niche — feedback designed for the individual consultant, joining self-improvement to documented client satisfaction — is genuinely differentiated and, on the evidence of this research, barely contested. Its founder has a verifiable twenty-year record in software development and consulting and speaks publicly on the subject. Its infrastructure decisions on data residency align precisely with the compliance framing that dominates European buyer searches in this market, even though nothing on the site or off it currently says so. And the most on-target buyer query in the measured set — how a consultant should gather customer satisfaction data — is answered by Google with no citations at all in two of three markets. No source owns it. That is an opening.

What matters most going forward is the balance between the two kinds of work. The technical actions in this report are worth doing and mostly cheap: a shorter title and description, a canonical tag, SoftwareApplication and Organization/sameAs schema, a readable homepage in place of prose that measures a Flesch Reading Ease of 0, statistics and outbound citations,

faster pricing and FAQ pages, baseline security headers and a DMARC policy that actually blocks spoofing. They will make the site readable, quotable and attributable, and they will protect the brand's credibility. What they will not do is produce a ranking or an assistant recommendation on their own. The measured competitors prove that as clearly as any argument could.

The decisive work is off-site: getting Feedback Journey into the European directories and comparison articles that AI Overviews quote, creating the canonical Wikidata record that currently does not exist, building a genuine review pipeline, publishing original data on consultant feedback that nobody else holds, establishing a named expert voice in English rather than only in Norwegian, and becoming a name that consultants mention in the communities where they actually ask each other what to use. That work compounds slowly and decays if neglected, and its timescale is honest: directory listings and an entity record within weeks, reviews and round-up inclusions over months, appearances in live-search AI answers plausibly within a year, and unprompted mentions from a model's own knowledge only over several years of consistent presence. It cannot be shortcut. But it is the only route by which a well-built site becomes a recommended brand — and Feedback Journey's site is already good enough that the authority work, once it lands, will have somewhere solid to land.

Methodology

This report is generated automatically by AI. The subject's own website is measured by a deterministic audit: a fixed set of automated tests covering technical SEO, structured data, content quotability, performance, mobile usability, agent readiness, Knowledge Graph presence, email trust and security headers. Together they give the website audit score (0–100 with a letter grade), the only score in the report. One part of the audit is empirical: leading AI assistants are asked a brand-free question about the need, and whether they name the subject counts towards the score. Depending on the edition, the report also draws on verified Google results and AI Overview citations for brand-free buyer queries, media coverage, domain authority and measured competitor data. The market research, analysis and recommendations are written by a large language model using live web search, grounded in the measured data. Statements about the subject's visibility are that model's assessment, expressed in words rather than as a score.

Searches run: Feedback Journey feedbackjourney.com consultant feedback tool · "Feedback Journey" journey card consultant feedback · feedbackjourney.com · Feedback Journey consultant feedback "journey card" pricing · site:feedbackjourney.com · "Feedback Journey" consultants feedback surveys improvement goals Norway · Jørgen Landsnes Feedback Journey · Simplesat CSAT feedback for consultants MSP reviews · Clutch verified client reviews consultants how it works · best client feedback tools for freelancers consultants 2026 comparison · european-alternatives.eu submit listing add a service · reddit r/consulting collecting client feedback after project self improvement · AskNicely Customer Thermometer Netigate Questback comparison NPS Europe · "Feedback Journey" Landsnes konsulent tilbakemelding produkt LinkedIn · "feedbackjourney" journey card survey consultant · What are the best tools for collecting customer feedback in Europe? · How can I gather customer satisfaction data for my consulting business? · Are there any survey platforms popular in Europe for client feedback? · What are some effective methods for documenting client feedback and satisfaction? · I need to find software to help me improve based on customer input. · What are some European regulations regarding customer data collection for feedback? · Can you suggest ways to get honest feedback from my clients? · What are the top-rated online feedback collection services for businesses? · How do I analyze customer feedback to drive business improvements? · Looking for solutions to measure and track customer satisfaction levels.

Appendix: How online visibility works

This appendix is background for readers who want the underlying mechanics. The main report stands on its own without it.

How people find things online, and where traffic actually comes from

A website receives visitors through a small number of durable routes, and it is worth being precise about them because they behave very differently.

Organic search is a visitor who typed a question into a search engine and clicked a result. It is the largest source of demand-driven traffic for most B2B products, because it captures people at the moment they have articulated a need. It is also the slowest to build and the hardest to buy.

Direct traffic is someone who typed the address or used a bookmark — the residue of brand awareness built elsewhere.

Referral traffic is a click from another website: a comparison article, a directory, a partner's integration page, a forum thread. In markets like the one examined in this report, referral traffic is doubly valuable, because the referring page is simultaneously sending visitors and telling search engines and language models that the brand exists and what it is.

Social traffic is a click from a social platform. It is spiky, decays quickly, and depends on continuous posting — but it is often how a new product gets its first users, and it can seed the mentions that later become durable.

Paid traffic is bought attention. It arrives immediately, stops immediately when the budget stops, and — importantly for the argument in this report — leaves almost no residue in the systems that decide who gets recommended.

AI-assistant referrals are the newest route: a user asks a model for a recommendation, the model names a product, and the user follows up. The volume is still modest relative to search, but the qualification is extremely high — the user has effectively been handed a shortlist by a source they trust — and the mechanism by which a brand enters that shortlist is different enough from search to deserve its own treatment below.

How search engines decide what to show

A search engine performs three distinct jobs, and confusing them is the source of most SEO mythology.

Crawling is discovery: automated agents follow links and read sitemaps to find pages. A page that no link points to and no sitemap lists may simply never be found. **Indexing** is comprehension and storage: the engine parses the page, works out what it is about, extracts structured data, and stores a representation. A page can be crawled but not indexed —

because it is blocked, marked `noindex`, judged near-duplicate of something already stored, or too thin to be worth keeping. **Ranking** is selection: for a given query, the engine chooses which of the indexed pages to show and in what order.

Crawling and indexing are largely technical and largely binary — either the engine can read the site or it cannot. This is the layer a technical audit measures, and it is where the term "hard blocker" belongs: a site that cannot be crawled or indexed has no visibility at all, and fixing that is a precondition for everything else. Ranking is where the competition happens, and it is driven by a mix of factors that fall into three groups.

Relevance: does the page's content match what the query is asking? This is where titles, headings, body content and structured data do their work — not as magic tokens, but as the evidence the engine uses to determine what the page is about.

Quality and authority: is this page, and this site, a source worth trusting on this topic? The dominant signal historically has been links from other sites, weighted by the authority of the linking site — an idea that goes back to PageRank and has been elaborated enormously since. Alongside links, engines weigh brand mentions, entity recognition, topical consistency across a site, and a family of signals often summarised as experience, expertise, authoritativeness and trustworthiness: is there a real, identifiable author with genuine standing? Is the organisation behind the site identifiable and reputable? Does independent evidence corroborate its claims?

Usability: can the visitor actually use the page? Speed, mobile responsiveness, layout stability and accessibility all feature. These are real factors, but they are tiebreakers rather than primary drivers — which is why, in the market examined in this report, sites with poor page speed still rank first when their authority is high.

The practical consequence is a hierarchy. Technical health is necessary but not competitive: everyone serious has it, so it wins nothing. Content relevance is competitive but replicable: a rival can write the same page. Authority is the scarcest and slowest factor, and therefore the one that decides contested queries.

The shift to answers

For most of search's history, the engine returned a list and the user chose. Increasingly, the engine answers.

Google's AI Overview generates a synthesised answer at the top of the results page, drawing on a handful of sources it cites. Perplexity and similar tools are built entirely around this pattern. Google's AI Mode extends it further. The commercial consequence is significant: for informational queries, a large share of users now get what they need without clicking anything. Traffic falls even when rankings hold.

Two things determine whether a brand appears in these answers. The first is whether its own content is structured to be extracted: a clear question as a heading, a direct answer

immediately beneath it, self-contained paragraphs that make sense out of context, specific facts and figures, and structured data that removes ambiguity. This is what "answer engine optimisation" (AEO) or "generative engine optimisation" (GEO) means in practice, and it is largely an extension of good writing discipline. The second, and more decisive, is whether independent sources the engine trusts mention the brand as an answer. In the measured data behind this report, Google's AI Overviews for this need cited comparison articles, European directories, review platforms and community threads far more often than they cited vendors' own pages. The answer layer is, structurally, a citation layer — and being cited depends on being described by others.

How large language models actually work

A large language model is a statistical model of language, trained to predict what text plausibly follows a given input. Understanding its architecture at a high level explains exactly which levers a brand can pull.

Training. The model is exposed to an enormous volume of text — web pages, books, code, forums, reference works — and repeatedly asked to predict the next fragment of text. Through billions of such adjustments it internalises grammar, facts, associations and reasoning patterns. Crucially, it does not store documents. It stores statistical relationships. It does not know that page X said Y; it has adjusted its internal parameters so that in contexts resembling X, Y becomes more likely.

This has a direct consequence for brands. A brand mentioned once, in one place, barely moves the model's parameters. A brand mentioned hundreds of times, described consistently, in the same context ("feedback tools for consultants", "GDPR-compliant European survey platforms"), becomes strongly associated with that context — and the model will produce its name when asked about that context. This is why the measured question in this report ("which providers would you recommend for this need?", asked with web search off) is a measurement of accumulated third-party description rather than of anything a website does. It probes what the model already holds. The assistants named Typeform, Qualtrics and SurveyMonkey because those names appear in thousands of independent documents about this need. They did not name Feedback Journey because, as far as the model's training data is concerned, no such document exists.

Fine-tuning and alignment. After pre-training, models are refined to be helpful, harmless and honest, typically through supervised examples and reinforcement learning from human feedback. This shapes style and behaviour — including a strong tendency to give balanced, hedged recommendations and to prefer well-established options. It does not add product knowledge.

Retrieval. Modern assistants often supplement their internal knowledge by searching the web at query time and reading the results before answering — retrieval-augmented generation. This is why answers can include very recent information, and it opens a second, much faster route to being mentioned: rank or be cited for the queries the assistant runs. A brand invisible

in a model's training data can still be surfaced if it appears in the live search results the model consults. In practice this means AEO work and organic ranking feed the retrieval path, while long-term third-party description feeds the internal-knowledge path.

Why models hallucinate, and why entity data matters. Because a model is generating plausible text rather than looking up records, it can produce confident, wrong statements — particularly about entities it has weak or ambiguous information about. A brand with a generic name, no canonical record and few consistent mentions is precisely the kind of entity a model gets wrong, or conflates with something else, or omits because it has nothing solid to say. Structured, canonical fact bases — Wikidata above all, which is free, CC0-licensed and widely consumed — mitigate this. A Wikidata item with the official website, entity type, industry, country and inception date gives every system a single unambiguous anchor to attach mentions to. It does not make a brand recommended; it makes a brand *resolvable*, which is the precondition for the mentions to count.

What a brand can actually do to be relevant when buyers ask a language model

The levers, in order of how much they matter:

1. Be described by independent sources, repeatedly and consistently. This is the dominant factor and the one most brands try to skip. Comparison articles, "best X for Y" round-ups, category directories, review platforms, industry publications, podcasts, conference programmes, partner and integration pages, community threads. Each is a document, written by someone else, associating the brand with the need. Models repeat what independent sources say. There is no substitute, and no shortcut: this is earned, over time, by being genuinely worth mentioning and by asking.

2. Accumulate genuine reviews on the platforms that matter for the category. Review platforms are unusually influential because they are structured, high-volume and explicitly evaluative — exactly the shape of data both search engines and models draw category consensus from. Recency and specificity matter more than raw volume. Fabricated reviews are a serious risk: platforms detect them, and a sanctioned profile is worse than an empty one.

3. Give the brand a canonical, consistent identity. The same name, the same one-sentence description, the same category and the same core facts everywhere — site, structured data, social profiles, directories, review listings, and Wikidata where eligible. Consistency lets a system connect a hundred scattered mentions to one entity; inconsistency leaves them as noise.

4. Publish material that is worth citing. Original data, benchmarks, methodology, definitive guides, expert commentary. Statistics are the most citable content form that exists, because a writer or a model needing a specific number has to attribute it to someone. A small company that owns one genuinely useful figure gets quoted alongside far larger ones.

5. Write so that machines can extract and attribute your meaning. Question-shaped headings with the answer immediately beneath. Self-contained paragraphs that name the actor, the

mechanism and the outcome, so they still make sense lifted out of context. Short sentences and plain words — readability is not a stylistic preference here, it is a functional requirement for being quotable. Specific claims rather than slogans: "helps consultants document client satisfaction over time" can be attributed to a need; "unlock your potential" cannot.

6. Make the site machine-legible. Valid, comprehensive structured data (Organization, SoftwareApplication/Product, FAQPage, Person, BreadcrumbList) so systems do not have to infer what they could simply read. Access for AI crawlers, unless there is a deliberate reason to withhold it. An llms.txt file summarising the site for answer engines. Increasingly, Markdown representations of key pages, which give agents clean text instead of layout markup, and machine-readable capability descriptors where a site genuinely offers agents something to do.

7. Be present where buyers talk. Communities are both a discovery channel and a training-data source. Genuine, disclosed, useful participation compounds; promotional posting damages.

8. Keep the technical foundation sound. Crawlable, indexable, fast, responsive, secure, with clean titles and canonical URLs. This is the floor, not the ceiling.

Why the technical work is the foundation and never the substitute

The relationship is worth stating once more, plainly, because it is the single most common misunderstanding in this field.

Technical quality determines whether the evidence about a brand can be *read and attributed*. If a site cannot be crawled, nothing else matters — that is a hard blocker, and fixing it is a precondition for any visibility at all. If its pages cannot be parsed into clean sentences, no model can quote it. If its entity data is inconsistent, mentions cannot be connected to it. If its structured data is absent, systems must guess at what it is. All of that is necessary work, and all of it makes authority-building pay off when it arrives.

But none of it creates authority. Authority is a statement about what the rest of the world says. A search engine ranks the page that other credible sources point to; a language model names the brand that independent documents describe as an answer. A technically flawless site with no independent evidence attached is, to both systems, a well-formed page about a brand nobody vouches for — and it will lose to a slower, more poorly-marked-up rival that the web has been discussing for years. The measured competitors in this report illustrate the point precisely: they rank first with homepage mobile performance scores in the twenties.

Security findings sit in a category of their own. Security headers and email authentication do not move rankings or AI answers, and should never be sold as if they do. They belong in a visibility report for a different reason: they underpin the brand's credibility with visitors, partners and the press, they are cheap to put right, and having them in place proactively protects the brand from incidents — a defaced page, a spoofed email, an injected script — that can damage a reputation far faster than any marketing programme can rebuild it.

The practical implication for anyone planning work from a report like this is a sequence, not a choice. Remove the blockers and make the site legible, because that is fast and it is a precondition. Then spend the bulk of the effort, patiently and over years, on being genuinely worth mentioning and on getting mentioned — because that is what decides who gets recommended.

Who should read what

This report is written to be handed on. Each track below has a different owner: read your own chapters, and pass the rest to the people who can act on them. The technical work is the foundation and is usually done in days; mentions and authority are what move visibility, and that takes months.

Leadership, and whoever decides

Read the first page: the score, the verdict and the top priorities are written as decision support. Decide who owns each track and what it may cost.

- [Executive summary and top priorities \(first page\)](#)
- [9 SWOT analysis](#)
- [11 Conclusion](#)

IT, developers or your web agency

Everything that can be fixed on the website itself, each action traceable to a measured test. Put it in the backlog, or hand the agent brief to an AI coding agent.

- [6 Website and technical assessment \(SEO & AEO\)](#)
- [7 Technical test results](#)
- [10 Recommended actions](#) · [10.1 Technical SEO](#)

Marketing and content

The questions buyers actually ask, where the brand surfaces today, and how to rewrite and add pages so they are clear, specific and quotable.

- [3 Visibility assessment based on research](#)
- [5 Review of relevant channels](#)
- [10 Recommended actions](#) · [10.2 Content and AEO](#)

PR, communications or your agency

The track that decides whether search engines and AI assistants recommend you: reviews, citations, media coverage, consistent facts about the company, and presence in the communities buyers use.

- [8 Building authority: mentions, reputation and trust](#)
- [4 Overview of competitors](#)
- [10 Recommended actions](#) · [10.3 Authority and mentions](#)

The web report offers a separate download for AI coding agents: a Markdown brief with the on-site actions and the measured findings. It leaves out the authority track on purpose, because that work needs people, not code.