

GEO Analysis Report

Generative Engine Optimization

Ramp

January 18, 2026

Prepared by LLMEposure

Contents

I. About This Report	2
What is GEO?	2
What We Did	2
How We Calculate Scores	2
The Honest Truth	3
What's in This Report	3
II. Scorecard	4
Ramp Performance	4
Competitive Comparison	4
III. Analysis	5
Executive Summary	5
How You Compare	6
Why You're Not #1 (Patterns in "Why Not Ramp" Explanations)	9
Query Analysis (When Ramp Shows Up vs. When It Doesn't)	13
The Diagnosis: GEO vs. SEO – Where is the Gap?	17
Specific Recommendations (Content & Actions to Take)	19
Sample Conversations and Analysis	23

I. About This Report

What is GEO?

Generative Engine Optimization—GEO—is the practice of influencing how AI assistants like ChatGPT, Claude, and Perplexity talk about your company. When a potential customer asks an AI “What are the best options for X?”, will your company be mentioned? Will you be recommended first, or buried at the bottom, or left out entirely?

This is a new frontier, and we’ll be honest with you: **GEO is still a dark art.** Nobody—not even the labs building these models—fully understands why they say what they say. We can measure, probe, and experiment, but anyone claiming to have cracked the code is overselling.

That said, we *can* learn a lot by systematically testing how models respond to real customer questions. That’s what this report does.

What We Did

We simulated **200 conversations** that your potential customers might realistically have with an AI assistant.

For each conversation, we:

1. Took on the persona of someone in your target market
2. Asked a question they might genuinely ask when looking for solutions
3. Requested the AI recommend companies that could help
4. Tracked whether **Ramp** was mentioned, and at what position
5. Asked follow-up questions to understand *why* you were or weren’t recommended

We ran every conversation **twice**: once with the AI’s web search disabled (testing what the model “knows” from training), and once with web search enabled (testing your current SEO and web presence). The gap between these two modes tells us whether your problem is primarily about base model awareness or web visibility.

How We Calculate Scores

Metric	What It Means
Mention Rate	Percentage of conversations where you were recommended at all
Times #1	How often you were the top recommendation
Times Top 3	How often you appeared in the top 3 recommendations
Avg Position	Your average ranking when mentioned (1 = best)

A higher mention rate *with* web search than *without* suggests your SEO is working but the base model doesn’t know you well. The reverse—better *without* search—suggests the model has learned about you, but your web presence isn’t helping (or may even be hurting).

The Honest Truth

Before you dive into the numbers, a few things worth knowing:

90% of GEO is just good SEO. The models use web search. They're trained on web content. If your SEO is bad, your GEO will be bad. There's no magic trick that bypasses fundamentals.

The other 10% is genuinely different. The base model—the LLM itself, before it searches—has knowledge baked into its weights from training data. Optimizing for this is different from SEO, and it's where genuine "GEO alpha" exists. But it's slow: you're essentially trying to influence what gets learned in the next model training run.

AI-generated content is counterproductive. Here's the irony: the more "AI-optimized" content floods the web, the less valuable it becomes for training. Models are designed to learn more from surprising, novel text. Your authentic human voice is your competitive advantage.

What's in This Report

The rest of this report is divided into two sections:

Section II: Scorecard — The hard numbers. How you performed, how your competitors performed, where you stand. Just the facts.

Section III: Analysis — The deep research. Why you're being mentioned or ignored, what patterns we found in the AI's reasoning, and specific recommendations for improvement.

II. Scorecard

This is where you stand.

Ramp Performance

Metric	Without Search	With Search
Mention Rate	33.0%	39.0%
Times Ranked #1	22 / 100	22 / 100
Times in Top 3	29 / 100	35 / 100
Avg Position	1.76	1.82

Bottom line: You were mentioned in **39.0%** of conversations with web search enabled, ranking **#1 of 6** in your competitive set.

Search gap: +6.0% — web search helps you.

Competitive Comparison

Company	No Search	With Search	Avg Pos (No)	Avg Pos (With)
Ramp	33.0%	39.0%	1.76	1.82
Brex Inc.	24.0%	36.0%	2.92	2.69
Airbase, Inc.	25.0%	11.0%	3.24	3.82
Divvy (Bill.com)	10.0%	12.0%	3.0	3.58
Spendesk S.A.S.	3.0%	2.0%	5.0	4.5
SAP Concur (Concur Tec...	22.0%	25.0%	3.18	2.44

III. Analysis

Executive Summary

Ramp's AI Recommendation Performance: In 200 simulated CFO conversations, Ramp was recommended in **33%** of cases without web search and **39%** with web search. In both scenarios, Ramp was the top-ranked suggestion in **22 out of 100** queries. This means that with up-to-date web info, ChatGPT included Ramp more often (an **+6%** boost), indicating your **SEO content is effectively raising Ramp's profile**. However, the base AI model's knowledge of Ramp is more limited – without searching, it left Ramp out 2/3 of the time. Competitors like Brex and SAP Concur saw bigger gains with web search (Brex jumped from 24% to 36% mention rate), suggesting they have strong online content signals too.

Competitive Standing: Ramp edged out other spend platforms in overall mentions, but only by a slim margin. **Brex** was nearly as prominent with search (36% of conversations) and often shares the spotlight in recommendations. **SAP Concur** (25%) and **Coupa** frequently took the lead for enterprise-heavy and travel-focused questions. **Airbase** appeared often in the base model's answers (25%) but fell to 11% with search – a sign that Ramp's and Brex's content may be outranking Airbase's. Smaller players like **Divvy (Bill.com)** and **Spendesk** were rarely mentioned. In short, Ramp is usually in the mix and often #1 for mid-market spend management use-cases, but **for many finance questions the AI still defaults to competitors or specialized tools** when those queries go beyond Ramp's perceived sweet spot.

Diagnosis: **You perform better with web search than without – an “SEO > GEO” gap.** The AI's reliance on fresh web data boosted Ramp's inclusion rate from 33% to 39%, which means your current SEO efforts **are paying off** in those live queries. The flip side is the underlying model doesn't “instinctively” know or trust Ramp as much as it does some incumbents. This suggests a **Generative Engine Optimization (GEO)** opportunity: investing in authoritative, citable, human-written content that future models will be trained on. In effect, 90% of GEO is good SEO (since the model uses web info), but the other 10% is about making Ramp *unmissable* in the training data itself.

Top 3 Recommended Actions:

- **1. Publish “boundary content” to shape the category.** Create frank, human-voiced guides mapping out **when Ramp is the right solution vs. when it isn't**. For example, a guide on “Spend Management vs. Procurement Suites” that says: *“If you need full PO-to-pay automation with complex approvals, Ramp may not be the #1 choice – that's Coupa's realm. But if your issue is uncontrolled employee-initiated spend, Ramp is a top pick because...”* By explicitly defining Ramp's fit for various query intents (and backing it with real examples and customer stories), you teach both readers and AI models the **exact scenarios to recommend Ramp** – and equally importantly, when not to .
- **2. Release original research & benchmarks.** Produce **unique data-driven content** that others in finance will cite (and thus AI models will ingest). For instance, an annual **“Real-Time Spend Controls Benchmark”** report using anonymized Ramp data: e.g. *average receipt submission time dropped 40% when using real-time card controls; policy-violation spend fell to <1% at companies with pre-approval workflows*. Include your methodology and a narrative analysis by your finance experts. The goal is to create quotable stats or graphics (“*companies on Ramp close their books 2 days faster on average*”) that get picked up in articles and forums. That kind of **novel, citable signal** will make Ramp more salient in model training corpora.

- **3. Build targeted “use-case vs. competitor” pages.** Identify the finance queries where Ramp was absent or not top-ranked, and **fill those content gaps** on your site. For example: queries about “*virtual card APIs vs. spend platforms*” – write a blog comparing building with Stripe Issuing vs. using Ramp’s platform, so the nuances are on record. If CFOs ask about “*automated expense reconciliation vs. policy enforcement*,” have a page discussing how Ramp’s approach differs from legacy ERP or Concur. Create dedicated pages for **multi-entity international spend management, procurement vs. spend control, travel expense management vs. travel booking** – using the exact phrasing a user might. Each page should have clear headings, FAQs, and honest side-by-side comparisons (Ramp’s strengths *and* limitations). This not only improves SEO but gives AI a confident script to follow: when a question matches that niche, it can cite your well-structured answer and include Ramp .

Key Insight: To truly become the default recommendation, **Ramp needs to “teach” the AI when to recommend Ramp**. That means going beyond generic SEO blogs. It requires candid, *human-authored* content that delineates **specific use-cases, results, and trade-offs**. Right now, when a question strays into territory like global spend, travel policy, or FP&A analytics, the model often picks a competitor or specialty tool. We need to make sure that in the next training cycle, Ramp’s name is attached to authoritative content *in those adjacent topics* – either as the solution, or as the knowledgeable voice that even says “that’s not what we do.” In short, **be the source** that the AI quotes . The more authentic and informative your content, the more future AI (and human CFOs) will trust recommending Ramp in the right moments.

How You Compare

In the AI’s eyes, Ramp is a leading player in spend management, but it’s not alone on the podium. Here’s how ChatGPT’s recommendations shook out for Ramp vs. key competitors, and what that indicates:

Overall Recommendation Rates: Out of 100 varied finance-team questions, Ramp was mentioned ~35% of the time (averaging no-search and with-search runs). This was the **highest single mention rate** among peers – a positive sign. Brex was a close second (around 30% overall), followed by SAP Concur (~24%), Airbase (~18%), and others in the low teens or single digits. So at a high level, **Ramp is in the lead pack**, and often the frontrunner, when the AI thinks of spend management solutions.

Ramp vs. Brex – neck and neck. Brex is clearly Ramp’s toughest competitor in these conversations. With web search enabled, Brex was recommended in 36% of scenarios – just a hair behind Ramp’s 39%. The model tends to mention **Brex in the same breadth as Ramp** for many core use-cases, and if Ramp wasn’t #1, Brex often was. Why? The AI frequently cited Brex’s **“unified” platform and global-friendly features** as differentiators. For example, in one conversation about controlling spend across multiple entities, the assistant explained it ranked Ramp #2 because “*Brex positions itself as a single, integrated spend platform across cards, bill pay, procurement, reimbursements, travel...Brex often gets the nod when a company expects faster multi-subsidiary, global expansion complexity*” . In other words, for a finance team that values an all-in-one solution and international scale, ChatGPT currently leans slightly toward Brex’s story. The good news: Ramp was still usually in the top 2 alongside Brex, with the AI noting that Ramp has **excellent controls and automation** but perhaps a bit more U.S.-centric or modular approach

in those scenarios. **Action:** Emphasize content about Ramp's capabilities for multi-entity management, global cards, and how you integrate travel or procurement – to close that narrative gap where Brex leads.

Ramp vs. Airbase – winning the SEO battle. Airbase appeared in 25% of the no-search conversations (the base model clearly knows it as a peer), but only 11% with web search. That's a striking drop – it suggests that **Airbase's SEO/content presence is weaker**, causing ChatGPT to mention it far less when it had access to up-to-date info. In contrast, *Ramp's mention rate increased** with search.* Essentially, your content is outranking Airbase's in the AI's synthesis. Moreover, when Airbase was mentioned, it was positioned as a more **AP and purchase-order oriented** solution: e.g. *"Airbase – robust for companies needing deeper AP + PO workflows alongside card spend; strong approval chains and accounting automation for more complex procurement."* . The model sees Airbase as catering to those who prioritize **integrated AP automation with their spend tool**, perhaps at the cost of some complexity. Ramp, on the other hand, it casts as a cleaner, more all-in-one platform for spend **and** basic AP, unless the use-case is heavy on procurement workflows. Given Airbase's weaker showing with search, doubling down on content about Ramp's own AP features (bill pay, approval workflows) could further erode the AI's need to mention Airbase at all. As of now, **Ramp is ahead of Airbase** in both awareness and perceived versatility, especially in web-informed answers.

Ramp vs. SAP Concur – different leagues (mid-market vs. enterprise). SAP Concur was recommended in 22% (no-search) to 25% (with-search) of the conversations, usually *in addition* to Ramp or instead of Ramp when the query was enterprise-oriented. The AI basically uses Concur as the exemplar of “enterprise travel & expense” or “established large-company solution.” For instance, on a question about mobile expense apps, the assistant ranked Ramp #3, behind #1 Concur, specifically because *“Concur is stronger when you need an all-in-one, enterprise-grade setup across travel booking + expense + invoice/AP approvals, deep audit controls, and global program complexity. Ramp is excellent for spend, but Concur often wins on ‘big company complexity.’”* . In other words, Concur's breadth of features (travel booking integration, regulatory compliance, etc.) and decades-long enterprise pedigree give it the nod for Fortune-500-level needs. For **Ramp's target (mid-market)**, Concur is often overkill, which the AI also recognized – Ramp was still suggested for those who prioritize speed and usability. But if the question even hinted at “*at scale*” or “*global travel policy*”, Concur came up as either #1 or #2. **Takeaway:** This isn't necessarily bad – it reflects real market positioning. Ramp doesn't need to beat Concur at being Concur; rather, ensure content and positioning clarifies that Ramp can handle quite complex needs *up to a point*. Highlight any enterprise wins or capabilities you do have (e.g., multi-country support on the roadmap, advanced auditing features) so the AI's view of Ramp's ceiling moves up a notch. Right now, **Concur is the AI's safety pick for complexity**, so let's feed it reasons to trust Ramp a bit further up-market (or at least explicitly frame where Ramp stops and Concur starts, so the model can choose contextually).

Ramp vs. Coupa – the procure-to-pay heavyweight. While Coupa wasn't explicitly listed in the competitor percentages, it appeared in many answers as the top choice **when full procurement or AP automation was the focus**. ChatGPT consistently put Coupa at #1 for questions like controlling spend across many teams or capturing supplier discounts, with Ramp either lower ranked or left out. The rationale: Coupa covers **“procurement + invoicing + expenses more comprehensively (not just card spend/T&E) and has more mature workflows, auditability, and analytics for large orgs.”** . In a scenario about enforcing spend policies at scale, the AI listed Coupa first, noting it's best for multi-team procure-to-pay governance . Ramp was usually

mentioned in these contexts only if the question also touched on corporate cards or a simpler spend focus. Essentially, **Coupa is presented as the enterprise “everything including the kitchen sink” solution**, versus Ramp as the modern, streamlined spend tool. This competitor is tough to displace in AI recommendations for broad procurement needs, because the model likely has been trained on Coupa’s strong presence in procurement discussions. Ramp’s strategy here should be two-fold: (1) **Acknowledge the divide** – content that says “if you truly need an end-to-end procurement suite, a tool like Coupa may suit you; Ramp focuses on a leaner approach to spend control and efficiency” – and (2) **Tout what you do cover**. E.g., make it clear Ramp can integrate with existing procurement systems, or handle basic intake-to-pay for companies that find Coupa too heavy. We saw one answer where Ramp was recommended with Coupa and Coupa Pay in the list, implying an overlap in mid-size use-cases. Use that overlap in your messaging: positions like “Ramp covers 80% of what you need in one easy platform; Coupa might cover 100% but with 5x the cost/complexity.” If the AI picks up nuance like that, it might include Ramp more confidently even in procurement-centric queries (currently it tends to hand those to Coupa by default).

Ramp vs. Other Players (Divvy/Bill, Spendesk, Navan, etc.): Divvy (now part of Bill.com) showed up in a modest number of recommendations (around 10–12%). It was typically framed as a budget-focused spend tool for SMBs, not usually beating Ramp for mid-market scenarios. If a question was angled toward smaller businesses or simple budget management, the model might mention **“BILL Spend & Expense (formerly Divvy)** — practical choice for SMBs...with broad accounting integrations”. That indicates Ramp is not seen as an SMB-only tool (which is good for your mid-market focus), and Divvy is not a major threat in these AI answers except at the low end. Spendesk was almost invisible (2–3 mentions), likely due to less US presence; we can consider it a non-factor here.

It’s worth noting a few **specialty or adjacent platforms** that the AI recommended when context called for them:

- **Navan (formerly TripActions):** Navan came up specifically **for travel-heavy contexts**. In an example where travel expense automation was key, Navan was recommended for its ability to auto-itemize receipts and enforce travel policy at booking. And in an offboarding scenario, Navan was listed as a good pick “if travel is a major component,” to help reconcile travel-related charges. So while Navan isn’t a broad spend competitor to Ramp, the AI will favor it in answers about business travel management. Ramp’s own travel capabilities (like your integration with travel booking or per diem policies) were only mentioned when the question specifically touched on those (e.g. per diem rates). **Lesson:** If travel and T&E are a growing part of your value prop, make that case in content; if not, accept that the AI (and the market) will slot Navan/Concur in for pure travel needs and focus Ramp’s story elsewhere.
- **Rippling Spend:** Rippling’s spend management module appeared occasionally, usually positioned as “*great if you want spend management tightly integrated with HR/payroll/employee data*”. This happened if the query hinted at HR or org structure considerations (like dynamic approvals by seniority). It’s a niche angle, but the AI recognizes Rippling when HR integration is front-and-center. Ramp was still often in those lists too, but perhaps slightly lower if the HR factor was critical. This suggests an opportunity to highlight Ramp’s HRIS integrations or org-based controls (if you have them) in your content, so AI doesn’t automatically yield that ground to Rippling.
- **Fintech/Infrastructure solutions:** In some highly specific queries (e.g., needing custom card issuing or payment infrastructure), the AI recommended players like **Stripe Issuing, Marqeta**,

Visa, Mastercard, or Airwallex instead of Ramp. One striking example: a user asked about enforcing merchant-category and geographic blocks on cards for high-risk travel. The assistant's top picks were Marqeta, Stripe, Visa, etc., and it explicitly said it didn't include Ramp because "*that's more of a payments infrastructure question than an expense platform question*". This indicates that Ramp isn't seen as an *issuer-level* solution (which is accurate – you partner with banks). It's fine that Ramp isn't in those answers, but it underscores how the AI categorizes you: **application-level control, not network-level control**. Your content can reinforce this understanding by clearly stating Ramp's scope (and perhaps how you leverage those underlying networks – e.g., "Ramp cards use Visa with additional controls layered on"). That way, the model will cleanly separate infrastructure queries from spend app queries, and only call Ramp in where it makes sense.

Bottom Line: The AI views Ramp as **the leader in the mid-market, all-in-one spend management space**, with Brex right alongside. It sees legacy giants (Concur, Coupa) as the go-tos for heavy enterprise requirements, and niche players for niche needs (Navan for travel, etc.). This alignment isn't far off from reality. The key for Ramp is to **continue widening the scenarios where it's a top answer**. That means bolstering the story on multi-entity/global usage (to beat Brex more often), on integrated AP (to neutralize Airbase/Coupa), and on any unique strength (to distance from Brex). Conversely, be transparent in content about where Ramp isn't trying to compete (e.g., "we're not a travel booking tool or a cloud cost analyzer") – so the AI can confidently include a line like "*Ramp isn't for X use-case*" rather than simply omitting you. Right now, **being omitted 61% of the time with search** is the metric to improve. Every competitor has their domain; your goal is to make Ramp synonymous with *its* domain so strongly that even if the question is tangential, the AI might say "consider Ramp for the spend part of this problem."

Why You're Not #1 (Patterns in "Why Not Ramp" Explanations)

Whenever Ramp wasn't recommended or wasn't top-ranked, we looked at *why* the AI said that. Several clear patterns emerged from the assistant's explanations:

1. The question didn't match Ramp's category (out-of-scope). In a large portion of the "no, I didn't include Ramp" cases, the reason was simply that the user's question was about something **outside of spend management**. For example, one prompt was about platforms to run **in-app training/mentoring scenarios** for finance teams. The assistant explained it didn't list Ramp because "*Ramp is a corporate card + spend management platform, not a training/simulation layer you embed in your platform...Your question was specifically about tools for mentors to teach workflows within a platform*". It then pointed to WalkMe, Pendo, etc., as the appropriate category. Another user asked for ways to join **private CFO peer groups** – again Ramp wasn't listed, and the AI clarified: "*Ramp's core product is not forming confidential peer groups...Ramp might share templates or run a customer community, but that's different from a structured forum*". These are straightforward cases: if the query is about something like mentoring software, networking groups, **FP&A planning tools, cloud cost management**, etc., Ramp rightly didn't show up. The takeaway is not that Ramp should somehow be in those answers, but that **the AI needs a clear signal of what Ramp is not**. Currently it does know (which is good – it isn't forcing Ramp in irrelevantly), but making this even crisper in your content will ensure Ramp gets excluded for the right reasons and perhaps mentioned as a side-note where appropriate. For instance, the peer-group answer above added "*if you want templates and best practices for finance ops, Ramp can be a useful tool – but it's not a peer group company*." Being part of that nuanced side-note is actually a win (it keeps Ramp in the conversation even when not core). To sum up, **when the**

query is out-of-scope, the AI's reason was “Ramp is mainly X, and you asked about Y.” That's a sign to clearly define Ramp's boundaries in your own messaging (so the model gets it right and maybe adds, “if your need shifts to X, then Ramp is an option”).

2. Enterprise breadth & complexity – Ramp seen as narrower. If the question **did** touch Ramp's domain but emphasized heavy enterprise requirements, Ramp often wasn't #1 and sometimes wasn't included. The AI's explanations showed a pattern of positioning *Ramp as a simpler, mid-market-oriented solution, versus competitors built for complex workflows*. For example, on a query about **multi-dimensional approval workflows** (thresholds by department, seniority, etc.), the assistant gave a top-5 of Coupa, Ariba, Workday, etc., and omitted Ramp. It then wrote: *“The five I listed skew toward enterprise-grade procurement/AP engines...Ramp is excellent for corporate cards + expense management with solid controls, but the others are picked when the core need is complex procure-to-pay routing...‘Seniority-based’ routing is often HRIS-driven, where Workday wins because it uses HR org structures natively. Ramp can integrate with HRIS, but it's not the canonical system for org/seniority logic.”* . In other words, the model didn't include Ramp because **the question was framed as an enterprise workflow problem**, not a spend control problem. Similarly, in scenarios combining *travel booking, expense, and AP*, Ramp would be ranked below something like Concur, with the AI stating that Ramp lacks the “all-in-one enterprise-grade” breadth . These repeated explanations boil down to: **when complexity and breadth are required, the AI treats Ramp as a bit lightweight** (relative to big suites). This is both a product positioning issue and a content issue. If in reality Ramp can handle more complex flows than the model gives credit for, you need content (like case studies or docs) to prove it. If Ramp intentionally doesn't chase those use-cases, then content should explicitly say “we focus on simplicity; if you need HR-driven multi-level blah, use Workday.” Right now the AI's default is to assume Ramp doesn't do the complex stuff, so it defers to incumbents. Your goal is to either **change that perception by showcasing capabilities or embrace it and educate where Ramp stops**. The pattern is clear though: phrases like “enterprise-wide”, “multi-team/multi-location governance”, “deep configurability” triggered competitors in the #1 spot and Ramp got demoted or left out.

3. Missing niche feature or focus (specialized domains). Several “why not Ramp” answers cited **specific feature gaps or lack of specialization** for a particular query. For instance, for a question on ensuring **early payment discounts and rebates to extend cash runway**, the assistant left Ramp out and explained: *“Your question was about unlocking discounts, rebates, and early-pay savings. Ramp can tighten spend and compliance, but it's not the best engine for dynamic discounting or supply-chain finance programs, which require supplier-by-supplier early-pay workflows and financing options.”* . In short, Ramp isn't built for **dynamic discounting at scale**, so the model recommended Coupa, C2FO, Taulia, etc., and said Ramp only helps indirectly. Another example: a question about identifying **cost-saving opportunities for budgeting (FinOps/TBM)** led the AI to list cloud cost analytics and FP&A tools (Apptio, Anodot, Datarails) and explicitly say *“Ramp is for spend management (cards, expense, AP)...your prompt was about reporting/analytics to inform budgeting, which implies FinOps/TBM + FP&A capabilities. Ramp generally won't replace that.”* . So the model omitted Ramp due to **lack of depth in FinOps and planning**. We also saw the audit/coaching scenario where Ramp was included but third, because it “*excels at preventing mistakes at time of spend, but isn't as oriented around a formal audit desk or coaching analytics as AppZen or Concur's audit service*” . These are all cases of **feature mismatch**: the question needed a specialized capability (be it discount marketplaces, cloud analytics, or 100% expense auditing), and the AI judged Ramp as not having that core focus. The honest truth is these aren't things Ramp currently does – so the AI is correct. The opportunity is to **produce content (or product enhancements) that address these adjacent needs**. For content,

even a blog like “How Ramp users capture early payment discounts” acknowledging that Ramp isn’t a dynamic discount platform but highlighting how controlling maverick spend improves rebate capture, could give the model something to chew on. Otherwise, expect that when the prompt zeroes in on a specialty outside Ramp’s feature set, you’ll continue to be excluded. The pattern here: **specialty need mentioned = Ramp often not in list, with AI explaining “Ramp doesn’t do X, it does Y.”**

4. Global operations and credit/capital needs. When the user’s question implied **international or multi-entity requirements, or a heavy emphasis on credit**, Ramp sometimes lost the top spot to Brex (or wasn’t alone at the top). The AI often framed this as: Brex is perceived to handle global scale or offer a more unified suite for a fast-scaling startup. In one answer, after ranking Brex #1 and Ramp #2, it said: *“Brex often gets the nod when the company expects faster expansion complexity – multi-subsidiary controls, global spend patterns, travel, etc. Ramp can absolutely work here too, but Brex is frequently chosen for that profile.”* . Another reason it gave was Brex’s positioning of a **fully integrated platform (cards, travel, reimbursements, even a travel portal)** versus Ramp’s modular approach . This suggests the model assumes **Brex is more ready for global/multi-currency scenarios or offers things like travel booking natively**, which influence rankings for queries about scaling internationally. It didn’t say Ramp *can’t* do multi-entity, just that Brex markets that angle more loudly. So Ramp was not omitted, but it wasn’t #1 either. **Pattern:** Global = Brex advantage (in AI’s current mind). Also, worth noting, if the question was about **corporate credit or financing** (e.g., “high credit limit cards for startups”), the model might lean Brex due to its origin story of providing credit based on VC funding. We didn’t explicitly see that in the provided convos, but it’s something to consider in your content – the AI likely “knows” Brex for credit and global, Ramp for savings and control. To change that narrative, highlight any global capabilities or customer examples you have (if you are, say, supporting entities in Canada or UK, get that on the web). Otherwise, accept that for now, **Brex might often be recommended as the global-ready choice** while Ramp is the efficiency choice – and many answers basically said if a customer *doesn’t* need global complexity, Ramp could be #1 .

5. Travel-heavy or travel-first questions. If the question was specifically about **travel management or travel expense policy**, Ramp was usually not top of mind. SAP Concur or Navan took precedence. The AI explained, for example, why Ramp was #3 in a mobile expense scenario: *“Concur is stronger for travel booking + expense at scale...Ramp is excellent for spend, but Concur often wins on big company travel workflows”* . In a query about **per diem meal allowances**, Ramp actually was #1 because the question was framed around automating per diem reconciliation, which Ramp has a feature for. The assistant noted Ramp’s “*explicit Per Diem Travel Policy feature with GSA rates, daily caps, and automatic reconciliation*”, and said that directly matched the user’s need . However, even in that answer it caveated: for very complex multi-country per diem rules, Concur would be the heavier-duty solution . The pattern: **if travel is mentioned in passing as part of spend, Ramp appears; if travel is the focus (booking, complex policy), Ramp is either not top or omitted.** This is logical given Ramp doesn’t do travel booking and companies with intense travel programs often use dedicated tools. The AI is picking up on that. To improve, any content about how Ramp integrates with travel or handles T&E could help. But realistically, unless Ramp builds or partners deeply on travel, the AI will keep defaulting to Concur or Navan for those travel-centric queries – which is fine as long as *when travel is just a component* (like offboarding or mobile apps), Ramp still gets credit for its part (cards, expense) as it did in some answers .

6. “Human-in-the-loop” finance processes (auditing, coaching, etc.). A few prompts were

about how finance mentors or auditors can review and improve spend compliance. In these, Ramp was mentioned but ranked below tools specifically designed for after-the-fact auditing (e.g. SAP Concur's audit service, AppZen) or mentoring analytics (Chronus, etc., in a different context). The AI's reasoning was: Ramp's strength is **real-time prevention** of mistakes, whereas the question was about **post-hoc review and coaching**. One answer said: *"Ramp excels at stopping mistakes at the time of spend... Your ask is about mentor-led audits to coach employees on mistakes. Platforms centered on audit workflows (Concur Intelligent Audit, AppZen) fit that better. Ramp isn't as oriented around a formal 'audit desk' experience."* . Similarly, in a mentorship ROI question, Ramp wasn't included because, as the assistant put it, Ramp doesn't provide *"mentoring program analytics or tracking, it's a spend platform"* . These are instances where **people-processes** were the focus (mentoring, auditing, training users), and the AI looked for solutions explicitly supporting those processes. It acknowledged Ramp can generate data or flags that a human could use to coach, but it doesn't have the built-in workflow for it . So Ramp was either secondary or left out. The pattern: whenever the question is "how do we review or teach people based on spend data," the model doesn't naturally put Ramp as the top answer – it prefers either services or software that explicitly mention audits, coaching, training. To change this, you might consider content around **how finance teams can use Ramp's data for coaching**. Even though Ramp might not have an "audit module," you can highlight things like using Ramp's reports to hold monthly compliance reviews. If the AI sees Ramp mentioned in context of "running audit sessions" or "mentoring on policy compliance," it might be more inclined to include it in those answers. Currently, it almost apologetically adds "you can use Ramp's flags to coach, but it's not as formalized" .

In summary, the **objections keeping Ramp from being recommended or ranked #1** boil down to:

- *"That's not what Ramp does."* – The query was for a different category (training software, planning tool, etc.).
- *"Ramp is good, but doesn't cover this edge case."* – The query needed a specialized function (dynamic discounts, deep procurement, travel booking, etc.) that Ramp isn't known for.
- *"Ramp is solid, but competitor X is built for scale/complexity."* – The query could use Ramp, but for large/global scenarios, the AI chose a bigger solution (Brex, Concur, Coupa).
- *"Ramp focuses on prevention, not this after-the-fact process."* – The query was about reviewing or analyzing spend after it happens, and the AI felt other tools were more targeted there, whereas Ramp's value is more upfront.

None of these are random; they're all **consistent narratives**. This is actually a positive sign, because it means we can directly address them. By creating content that either **counters** these perceptions (if you believe Ramp truly can do more than the AI thinks) or **embraces and guides** on these points (if those limitations are real), you can shift how models position Ramp. E.g., if many answers said "Ramp isn't for supplier discounts," you could publish a guide "Using Ramp to maximize early-pay discounts" acknowledging the limits but ensuring Ramp is mentioned in that context in a positive way. The goal is that next time a model is on the fence about including Ramp, it has seen something in training data that helps it say "include Ramp and explain how it fits or doesn't fit." Right now, if it's unsure, it might exclude Ramp entirely (leading to those 61% no-mention cases with search). We want to reduce the *unknowns* by addressing each of these recurring points in your public content.

Query Analysis (When Ramp Shows Up vs. When It Doesn't)

Let's categorize the types of customer questions where Ramp was a go-to recommendation, versus those where it tended to be invisible or secondary. This helps illustrate **where Ramp's positioning is strong in AI's mind and where it's weak**.

□ Queries that favor Ramp (strong presence):

- **Core Spend Control & Expense Automation:** Whenever the question was fundamentally about *controlling spend, reducing manual expense work, or automating finance workflows related to spend*, Ramp was almost always mentioned, often ranked #1. For example, a user asked “*What features help reduce manual accounting work and free up finance team capacity...?*” – essentially looking for spend management solutions to streamline accounting. The assistant’s answer put **Ramp at #1, citing its all-around automation, real-time controls, and unified card + expense + bill pay platform**. Brex, Rippling, etc., followed, but Ramp clearly owned the “*save time through automation*” angle. Similarly, prompts about **enforcing spend policies or improving visibility** tended to feature Ramp prominently. ChatGPT clearly associates Ramp with **efficiency in expense processing, strong policy enforcement, and integration of cards with software**. This is exactly your core value prop, and it’s coming through in the answers.
- **Combined Cards + AP in one platform (mid-market context):** Several questions touched on managing both corporate card spend and accounts payable together – for instance, handling bills, reimbursements, and card expenses in a growing company. Here, Ramp shined. One conversation’s recommendations: “*1. Ramp – strong pre-spend controls, receipt capture, tight accounting integrations...supports continuous close. 2. Brex – strong for global teams... 3. Airbase – robust for deeper AP + PO workflows... 4. Bill.com... 5. Tipalti...*” . Ramp was #1 because the user’s goal was **“scaling spend controls + automated accounting together.”** The assistant explicitly said it kept Ramp on top since no other single tool combined those strengths as well . Only if the question veered to **heavier AP complexity** did it note others might win (Tipalti for global AP, Airbase for complex PO needs) . But in mid-market use-cases where a finance team wants to consolidate cards, expenses, and basic AP automation, Ramp was typically the first recommendation. This indicates that for queries like **“replace our corporate card and AP systems with one?”** or **“best tool for both expense management and bill pay?”**, Ramp is strongly in the mix.
- **Real-time Controls and Approvals (incl. virtual cards):** When questions drilled into capabilities like **issuing one-time virtual cards, setting strict limits, requiring approvals** – essentially the nitty-gritty of spend control tech – Ramp often took the #1 spot. A great example: **“How can I create a one-time virtual card for a contractor, limit it to an exact invoice amount, and auto-expire after payment?”** The answer: **“1) Ramp – strong virtual card controls: single-use cards, exact spend limit equal to the invoice, merchant/category restrictions, set expiration or auto-freeze after charge... good for US businesses with approvals and accounting sync.”** . Ramp was followed by Airbase, Brex, Divvy, and Stripe Issuing in that list, but the detailed description for Ramp shows the model was drawing on specific knowledge of Ramp’s features. Notably, it likely leveraged your documentation (it even mentioned setting an expiration date and the “one-and-done” nature of Ramp’s single-use cards). This kind of query is **highly tactical and feature-specific**, and Ramp excelled. Another scenario in this vein is an **offboarding workflow** question (how to immediately freeze spend and reassign expenses when someone leaves). Ramp was #1 there too, with the AI praising **“instant card freeze/lock actions, virtual cards for subscription migration, and integrated expense audit trails”** as reasons . These are deep operational use-cases where Ramp’s actual product capabilities stand out, and the AI

picked up on them, especially with web search (implying your feature pages or support articles helped). **Summary:** Queries focused on **control, speed, and automation in the spend process** strongly favor Ramp in answers. This is your wheelhouse, and both the base model and the web-augmented model recognize it.

- **Expense Policy and Compliance (mid-size focus):** When users asked about enforcing policies or improving compliance in spending, Ramp usually appeared. For instance, a question on *“automatically reconciling daily meal expenses against per diem allowances”* had Ramp at #1 because of your per diem feature . The assistant noted Ramp’s ability to set daily meal per diems with GSA rates and auto-flag overages, aligning perfectly with the query . In contrast, it mentioned SAP Concur as a better fit only if the environment was extremely complex (multiple countries, union rules, etc.) . That shows that for typical mid-market policy compliance needs (like setting limits, matching receipts, preventing out-of-policy spend), Ramp is seen as an ideal solution. Only when the question scaled up in complexity did the AI switch to an enterprise answer. Another example: *“How can the platform enforce spend policies and approval workflows across multiple teams or locations?”* – Ramp was recommended (ranked #2) behind an enterprise tool, with caveats that if the company is scaling fast across many entities, some choose Brex . But importantly, Ramp was still included, meaning the model did consider Ramp relevant for multi-team policy enforcement (just not #1 in that phrasing). In short, **for plain-language questions about controlling spend and ensuring compliance in a growing company, Ramp tends to be listed and often highlighted for its real-time enforcement strengths.**
- **Integrations and accounting (when mentioned):** If the question touched on integration with accounting systems or closing the books faster, Ramp usually popped up. The model frequently cited Ramp’s **“tight sync with common accounting systems and continuous close”** benefits . So queries like *“reduce time to close”* or *“automate accounting entries for expenses”* triggered Ramp’s inclusion. In contrast, those that were more about analysis of spend data (rather than operational integration) went to other tools. But anything that hinted at *“we have QuickBooks/Netsuite and want our spend data to flow in seamlessly”*, the AI knew Ramp is strong there (as are a couple of others like Airbase). This is a good sign: it means your messaging around integrations and saving accounting time has permeated some of the info the model saw.

In essence, **Ramp shows up and ranks highly for queries that align with spend management’s core promise: saving time, enforcing rules, and giving real-time visibility/control over operational spending.** These are typically questions a mid-market CFO or controller would ask when frustrated with manual expense reports, unchecked card spending, or disconnected systems. The AI recognized Ramp as a top solution in those scenarios – exactly where you want to be.

Now, let’s look at the flip side:

□ **Queries that don’t favor Ramp (little or no presence):**

- **Strategic Finance & Planning:** When a question veered into the realm of *financial planning, budgeting, forecasting*, or high-level cost optimization, Ramp was usually not mentioned. For example, a prompt like *“What tools help identify cost-saving opportunities and inform budgeting for growth?”* led the AI to list FP&A and FinOps platforms (Apptio, Anaplan, etc.), explicitly stating it did **not** recommend Ramp because the user needed analytics and planning, which implies tools beyond spend management . The answer even elaborated that Ramp is great for controlling spend but *“not an FP&A planning platform...Ramp can feed FP&A but usually doesn’t become FP&A.”* . So any query that sounds like a CFO thinking about **big-picture finances**

(budgeting, unit economics, cloud cost allocation, etc.) did not trigger Ramp. The AI stuck to the traditional understanding that Ramp is an operational tool, not a strategic planning suite. If a finance leader asks something like “how do I forecast better?” or “how to tie spend to growth plans?”, the model currently doesn’t see Ramp as relevant. To change that, Ramp either needs to build FP&A features (a major undertaking) or more realistically, **produce thought leadership on how operational spend data (from Ramp) can drive strategic decisions** – but even that may not make Ramp a top recommendation in these contexts. It might be fine to let Anaplan, Adaptive, etc., own that territory in AI answers, since it’s genuinely not your product category.

- **Procurement, Invoicing & Supplier Payments (complex AP):** If the question is essentially, “*How do I manage my purchasing and vendor payments better?*” without explicitly mentioning corporate cards or expense, Ramp often wasn’t included or was ranked lower. The AI favored dedicated procurement/AP solutions. For instance, a question about capturing supplier discounts and improving cash runway (a procurement/AP optimization task) had recommendations like Coupa, C2FO, Taulia – and **Ramp was not in the five**. The assistant said it didn’t include Ramp because “*for unlocking discounts and early-pay savings, Ramp is typically not the system of record versus platforms built for dynamic discounting and invoice-to-pay depth.*” . This shows that if a CFO’s question is framed around **accounts payable efficiency, supplier terms, or procurement processes**, the AI doesn’t associate Ramp with the answer (unless the question also throws in something about card spend or a phrase like “spend management”). Similarly, queries about **complex approval workflows for POs/invoices** brought up Ariba, Coupa, etc., and sometimes did not list Ramp . Ramp might be omitted because the question didn’t mention expenses or cards – it was purely an AP/procurement context. So, Ramp is *invisible* in questions like “tools for procurement optimization” or “AP automation for multi-entity”. Only if the user specifically includes corporate cards or expense in the scope might Ramp appear. This indicates a content opportunity: make sure Ramp is mentioned in contexts of combined spend and AP (which you do in marketing), but also perhaps create content around how Ramp fits into an AP workflow (or integrates with AP systems). Right now the AI sees a pretty hard line: procurement/AP stuff -> legacy tools, *spend stuff* -> *Ramp*. Bridging that in its training data could make Ramp pop up more in “grey area” questions that span both.
- **Travel Management:** As noted earlier, a question heavily about **travel booking or travel policy at scale** will not favor Ramp. For example, “*What’s the best way to manage business travel and expenses globally?*” (from our observations of similar contexts) would almost certainly bring up Concur, Navan, maybe TravelPerk, etc., but not Ramp. Unless the question specifically ties travel to spend control (like the per diem query did), Ramp won’t appear. In our data, Ramp only showed up in travel contexts when the question was about expense side of travel (like reconciling expenses or using cards for travel spend). If the question was “*manage travel bookings*” or “*end-to-end travel platform*”, Ramp wasn’t relevant in the AI’s view. This makes sense and likely isn’t a battle worth fighting unless Ramp develops travel booking features. The one thing to ensure is that if a question mixes travel with general spend (e.g., “*manage travel expenses and general expenses together*”), the AI knows Ramp can do the expense side. Currently it does (e.g., Ramp still showed up as #3 in the mobile scenario which was partly travel-related) .
- **Human capital and training queries:** Any query about **training employees, mentoring, on-boarding/offboarding beyond cards**, etc., didn’t favor Ramp – unless it specifically asked about offboarding spend (which one did, and Ramp was #1 for the spend portion). For example, “*coaching techniques for employees submitting expenses*” might get a generic answer or mention a combination of tools (maybe an LMS or nothing about Ramp). In one conversation about “*coaching remote employees on using the platform to submit expenses*,” the assistant’s answer was more about best practices (not specific tools) – Ramp wasn’t specifically mentioned

there either (it gave general advice on workflow coaching). The pattern is that **soft processes and training** are not associated with Ramp by the AI (nor would we expect them to be). Ramp might enable better training outcomes via easier UX, but the model wouldn't make that connection on its own.

- **Peer forums / communities / content repositories:** A very interesting query came up about joining or creating a **private peer group to share best practices**. The AI listed peer networking organizations (Vistage, YPO, etc.), and explicitly *did not* include Ramp. Ramp was not considered because that's not your business – fair. But the assistant did mention, "*If what you actually want is templates and best practices for finance operations, Ramp can be useful as a tool + content source, but I'd categorize it as a tool, not a peer group.*" . This implies that the model is aware Ramp produces content/templates for finance (likely through your blog or resources). That's a plus: Ramp is seen as a thought leader to some degree (at least enough that the AI considered "maybe the user just wants Ramp's content"). We should note that to keep or grow that perception, your content needs to remain high-quality and unique. If the AI thought of Ramp's content once, it can do it again, so continue to publish those best practice guides – it might cause the model to mention Ramp even in advisory answers where software isn't an obvious answer (like it almost did in the peer group question).

To visualize it, imagine a spectrum of question types:

- **Operational spend control (cards/expenses)** – Ramp is front and center.
- **Adjacent to spend (basic AP, reimbursements, travel expenses)** – Ramp is present but may not be #1, depending on complexity.
- **Beyond spend (strategic finance, procurement depth, travel booking, HR/training)** – Ramp fades out of the picture.

That spectrum held true across the simulations. The **closer the query was to “How do I manage spending better?” the more likely Ramp was to be recommended**. The more it drifted toward “How do I manage finance (or operations) in ways not directly about spending?” the less Ramp appeared.

This analysis tells us where to focus GEO content. For areas in the middle (adjacent categories) – like moderate AP automation, multi-entity spend, basic travel expense management – Ramp *can* play, but the model might not be fully aware. Those are prime targets for content to boost Ramp's presence. For the far-end areas (FP&A, etc.), content might still help mention Ramp as a footnote (like “don't use Ramp for this, except to get the data”), but it's okay if Ramp isn't a top answer there.

In summary:

- **Ramp-dominant query themes:** Spend policy enforcement, expense automation, corporate card programs, real-time spend visibility, controlling employee expenses, combining expense and AP for efficiency.
- **Ramp-absent query themes:** Budget planning, financial analytics/BI, pure procurement optimization, working capital finance, travel management systems, employee training programs, finance team org/design questions.

Understanding this division helps in crafting content and also in product messaging. It shows where Ramp is naturally considered the answer and where it isn't even on the radar. The goal is to **expand Ramp's radar coverage a bit further into those adjacent domains** (without diluting the focus on what you truly do well). Each adjacent domain where you can credibly say “Ramp

can help with a piece of that" is a chance to be included in answers where you currently are not.

The Diagnosis: GEO vs. SEO – Where is the Gap?

From the data, we diagnose that **Ramp's primary gap is a GEO (Generative Engine Optimization) issue, more than a pure SEO issue**. In other words, your web SEO is doing relatively well – but the base AI model's knowledge about Ramp could be stronger.

Here's the evidence:

- **Higher mention rate with web search (SEO) vs without:** Ramp was recommended in 39% of conversations when ChatGPT could use web search, compared to 33% with no search. This means that **the AI found information on the web that prompted it to include Ramp more often**. For instance, in the travel per diem scenario, the assistant specifically pulled details from a Ramp support article (it linked to Ramp's "Per Diem Travel Policy" page) to confidently recommend Ramp. Without web access, the model might not have recalled that Ramp has a per diem feature – but your SEO content ensured it knew. That's a direct win for SEO: your content influenced the answer.
- **Competitors with strong SEO also gained, those without fell off:** Look at Brex and Airbase. Brex's mention rate jumped from 24% (no web) to 36% (with web) – a bigger jump than Ramp's. The model clearly found a lot of relevant Brex info online (likely content about Brex's travel integration, global capabilities, etc., which it then echoed). Airbase, conversely, dropped from 25% to just 11% with web. This suggests that *in the base training data* (which might be older, circa 2021 knowledge), Airbase was known as a key competitor, but *current web content* about solutions to these questions did not feature Airbase as prominently (perhaps overshadowed by Ramp and Brex content, or simply not ranking). This aligns with human SEO realities: Ramp and Brex have been very active in content and marketing recently, whereas Airbase may have less footprint. The AI's behavior mirrors that. **This tells us SEO is a differentiator** – Ramp's and Brex's content helped them surface more with web enabled, whereas Airbase suffered from lack of fresh content. So, doubling down on SEO (technical quality, targeted topics) will continue to give Ramp an edge in dynamic AI queries.
- **Base model awareness is good but not dominant:** A one-third inclusion rate without web means the core model (likely GPT-4 with training data up to 2021 or so) certainly knows about Ramp, but it's not treating Ramp as universally relevant. It's likely relying on patterns from its training data – which might include news up to 2021, some websites, maybe Ramp's earlier marketing. By then, Ramp was on the scene (founded 2019, ramping up in 2020-21 with funding, etc.), but it might not have been as extensively covered as Brex (founded 2017) or Concur (decades of content). The model might also have less context on Ramp's features if that detail wasn't widely written about pre-2022. The good news is Ramp still led in the base model's picks (33% vs Brex 24% with no search). That implies that even the older data gave Ramp strong credit in spend management. **However, 67% of the time, the base model omitted Ramp.** Many of those were legitimate (as we saw in patterns above: if question = not spend-related, no Ramp anyway). But there's likely a chunk where Ramp *could* have been relevant but the base model didn't "think" of it, whereas the web-enabled model did. For example, the base model might not have mentioned Ramp for the per diem question or the multi-entity question, while the web model did – precisely because it had the up-to-date info on Ramp's latest features and use-cases. This gap is the **GEO gap**.
- **"SEO better than GEO" diagnosis:** We label it this way because your **SEO content is already helping influence AI outputs (a positive)**, but to get the base model (next-gen GPT, etc.) to

know Ramp deeply, you need content that becomes part of widely-read knowledge sources. Essentially, **the other 10% beyond SEO**: things like Wikipedia (does Ramp have a well-detailed Wikipedia page? If not, that's a low-hanging fruit – GPT models heavily rely on Wikipedia for factual company info), news articles, academic or business case studies that mention Ramp, etc. Also, **content format matters**. Long-form authentic articles that get cited by others, data that gets quoted in press, and unique insights will get scooped into model training. Meanwhile, SEO-optimized fluff or purely self-serving content might be ignored or down-weighted by the model (it tries to avoid just parroting marketing). The emphasis needs to be on **authoritative, referenceable content**.

- **The model's humility with Ramp vs. confidence with others:** One subtle clue: in several answers where Ramp wasn't mentioned initially, when the user specifically asked, "Why didn't you recommend Ramp?", the AI responded with very careful reasoning. It didn't say "Oops, I forgot"; it essentially justified why Ramp didn't fit. This means the model wasn't unsure – it had some rule or knowledge causing it to exclude Ramp. That suggests an area to focus GEO efforts: **alter the knowledge story so that the model would have included Ramp in borderline cases**. For example, in the early-pay discounts case, it definitively excluded Ramp. If Ramp wants to even be an afterthought in that scenario, it could publish content on that topic (like how Ramp users can capture discounts). Then a future model might say, "Mostly use Coupa/C2FO, *but* Ramp has an approach here too...". Right now, it didn't have that second thought. Base GPT-4 likely hadn't seen Ramp associated with dynamic discounting in its training, so it confidently excluded it. This is the kind of thing GEO can change over time: by ensuring the model's training includes context where Ramp is at least mentioned in relation to those concepts, the model's answer might become more inclusive of Ramp.
- **The 90/10 rule confirmation:** As we prefaced, 90% of GEO is good SEO – and we see that in how the web search usage helped Ramp. The remaining 10% is direct model training influence. To hit that, think about **the sources models train on**: Wikipedia, news sites (TechCrunch, Forbes, etc.), large forums or Q&A (Stack Exchange, maybe Reddit), academic papers, and high-traffic web content. For Ramp, likely the relevant ones are Wikipedia and news/business articles (maybe open source documentation too, if any). You might consider working on a comprehensive Wikipedia entry for Ramp (if one doesn't exist or is stubby) – neutral, factual, well-sourced. Those tend to be baked into models. Also, ensure any major milestones or research you produce get press coverage or community discussion. If, say, you publish that "Spend Controls Benchmark" and it gets covered by a business outlet or heavily shared on LinkedIn/Reddit, that creates more diverse references for the model to ingest.
- **SEO is still critical to maintain:** Note that when web search was enabled, Ramp's recommendation rate was 39%. That's good, but it's not 80 or 90. Many questions still didn't result in Ramp even with search. Some of those are fine (we don't expect Ramp in FP&A answers). But others might be because the SEO content for that niche query isn't there or isn't ranking. For instance, the "merchant-category + geo blocking" question pulled up likely developer docs or blogs about card issuing – Ramp's own content on that might be minimal (since you rely on Visa controls via partner). So the AI found others. Or the "complex approval routing" query likely turned up content about Coupa/Workday, not Ramp, because Ramp isn't writing about "delegated approvals by seniority" much. These gaps are SEO content gaps. So, while GEO (base knowledge) is the longer-term play, **continuing to fill out the specific SEO topics (via landing pages, blogs, docs) is the immediate-term lever to appear in more with-search answers**. The data shows it works: the more relevant content you have, the more often ChatGPT with browsing includes you.

Conclusion of diagnosis: Ramp's visibility problem is **not because search engines can't find you (they can), but because AI's prior knowledge is missing some context and nuance about you.** You're reliant on the AI doing a fresh search each time – if it does, you often get in. If it doesn't (or if a user is using a model with no browsing, like the base ChatGPT or an API integration without web access), you miss out more. Therefore, to improve, you should treat the AI model as another audience to "optimize" for: put out content that is so relevant, well-cited, and high-quality that it gets into the training data and **stays in the model's "memory."** In practical terms, that means authoritative content on your site, widespread distribution of unique insights, and ensuring Ramp is part of the public conversation on spend management topics. The gap between 33% and 39% is where that work will show its effect – closing it means the next-gen base model might mention Ramp 40%+ of the time even *without* needing a live search.

Specific Recommendations (Content & Actions to Take)

Based on all the analysis, here are **concrete recommendations** for content creation and messaging changes that can help Ramp be better recognized and recommended by AI in the future. We focus on being specific – the exact topics, formats, and angles that address the gaps identified:

1. Create "Is Ramp the Right Fit for X?" Decision-Tree Content. Why: The model often had to decide whether Ramp belonged in an answer. Let's make that decision easy by literally publishing the logic. **What to do:** Write a series of **candid, category-defining guides** that map out *when to use Ramp vs. when to use something else*. For example: "**Spend Management vs. Procurement Suites: A Guide for CFOs.**" In this piece, explicitly discuss scenarios: "If your main pain is stray employee spending, **use Ramp**. If you need full PO lifecycle with complex approvals, **use Coupa or SAP** (Ramp isn't a full procurement system). If you're somewhere in between – e.g., you have an ERP doing POs but need better spend controls – **use Ramp alongside it.**" Do this for various adjacent categories: **Travel & Expense vs. Spend Platform, ERP/AP vs. Ramp, Corporate Card Programs vs. DIY Card + Software, Spend Management vs. FP&A tools.** The tone should be *bluntly honest and explanatory*. Include comparison tables or flowcharts that a model could easily parse. For instance, a table row might be "Multi-currency, multi-country entities" – column under Ramp: "Limited today (USD-centric) – consider Brex or Amex for global issuance," column under Ramp's competitor: "Brex offers multi-currency cards, etc." It might feel counterintuitive to explicitly mention a competitor as better for something, but this **builds credibility**. It's exactly the kind of content AI models absorb: neutral, factual explanations of trade-offs. One example from the data: the AI effectively said, "*If you heavily need HR-based approval routing, Workday wins; Ramp can integrate but it's not the source of truth.*" . You could incorporate that into a guide on approval workflows, stating plainly where Ramp relies on integration vs. where others have it natively. By producing these **boundary-setting pages**, you achieve two things: (a) You target SEO keywords that align with those nuanced queries (so you show up in web search results that the AI will read), and (b) you feed the model a **balanced narrative** that includes Ramp as a key consideration (even if "not #1 for this particular use-case"). The next time a similar question arises, the model might recall, "Oh, Ramp's own site says if it's X scenario, Ramp isn't the top choice." Ironically, that's okay – better the AI says "Ramp isn't right for this" citing your logic , than it ignores Ramp entirely. It shows up as a consulted source and can still mention Ramp for the parts it is good at. Essentially, **be the one to define the rules of the category** so that the AI follows *your* framing when deciding if "it should recommend Ramp."

2. Publish original research that provides quotable metrics and insights. Why: The model loves concrete data and novel insights, but currently most references to Ramp are feature de-

scriptions or marketing claims. Give the AI something substantive to chew on – unique facts or figures that only Ramp can provide. **What to do:** Leverage your data across customers to create at least one **flagship annual report or study** that would be seen as a reference in the spend management space. For example, a “**Spend Management Benchmark Report**” or “**State of Finance Automation 2024**.” Populate it with metrics like: “Average time to close the books with vs. without spend automation,” “% of out-of-policy spend prevented by real-time controls,” “Typical reduction in reimbursement volume after adopting corporate cards,” etc. The key is to include a **credible methodology** and insightful commentary from your finance experts (not just raw stats). Perhaps have your CFO or Head of Finance co-author it with a data scientist – this adds a human voice and authority. Make claims that are interesting enough for media or bloggers to cite. For example, “*Our study of 500 companies found that those using Ramp’s automated controls had 25% fewer expense report corrections, saving approximately 30 hours of finance team time per month.*” Now, imagine a future CFO-type question to ChatGPT: “How much time can expense automation save?” If your report is out there and got cited, the model could answer: “*Studies have shown roughly 30 hours/month saved by using tools like Ramp, due to fewer corrections and faster reconciliation.*” You want to become the **data source** that the AI references (instead of generic or competitor-sourced data). Another angle: produce research on something like **employee spending behavior** (since you have anonymized data). E.g., “the impact of real-time feedback on spend compliance” – maybe you can show how instant receipt reminders up compliance by X%. Package these findings in a visually appealing PDF and an HTML summary for SEO. Ensure it’s **accessible without paywall** so it’s likely to be scraped. Every statistic should be accompanied by a plain-English explanation, which models love to quote. Also, consider releasing a few **open datasets or an API for researchers** (if possible) – that can lead to academic citations. In short, **go beyond content marketing into original research**. It gives others a reason to talk about Ramp (linking to you) and gives AI something factual to latch onto.

- *Tactical tip:* One idea mentioned was a “**Real-time Spend Controls Benchmark**.” This could measure things like average transaction approval time vs. policy, percentage of transactions auto-flagged and later approved vs. denied, receipt submission lag times, etc., across your user base. If you find, for example, “Companies using real-time controls see 15% fewer over-budget purchases quarter over quarter,” that’s a juicy stat. Present it with context (maybe a case study quote from a customer). The models will absorb not just the stat but the narrative that “Ramp = spend control → cost savings.” This helps reinforce your core message in a concrete way. And because it’s *original*, the AI isn’t finding that info anywhere else – you become the primary source.

3. Expand content to cover use-cases where Ramp was absent. Why: We identified specific question types where Ramp didn’t show up. Many of those have overlapping themes with what Ramp does, but the framing was different. By creating content addressing those themes *from Ramp’s perspective*, you increase the chance the AI will include Ramp in future similar answers. **What to do:** For each of the following scenarios, develop a blog post, guide, or FAQ page that speaks directly to the scenario, using the language a customer would use in a question:

- **Capturing Early Payment Discounts / Managing Cash Runway:** Write an article like “**Maximizing Vendor Discounts: Tactics for Finance Teams**.” In it, discuss dynamic discounting and rebate programs AND crucially, mention how controlling spend (Ramp’s forte) plays a role. E.g., ““Early-pay discounts can save money, but you won’t realize their full value if employees are making off-contract purchases. That’s where spend control platforms like Ramp come in – by ensuring spend is on-plan, you’re in a position to take advantage of

discount terms consistently . However, for running a formal dynamic discounting program, you'd integrate Ramp's data with solutions like **(The answer continues below due to length)**

3. Expand content to cover use-cases where Ramp was absent. (continued) ...like C2FO or Taulia.”* By doing this, your content acknowledges the question (“how do we extend runway with discounts?”) and inserts Ramp into the conversation legitimately. The AI might then recall, “Ramp’s blog said Ramp helps by controlling spend to unlock discounts” and include that nuance . Right now, it said “Ramp isn’t the engine for discounts” and left it at that – let’s give it a more supportive angle to mention.

- **Financial Planning & Analysis (FP&A) and Cost Analytics:** You’re not an FP&A tool, but consider a piece like **“Operational Spend Data in Financial Planning”** or **“Linking Expense Controls to Budget Outcomes.”** In it, talk about how the data from Ramp (actual spend in real-time) can feed into forecasting models, improve budget accuracy, etc. and perhaps mention partnerships or integrations you have (if any) with planning tools. The AI likely won’t replace Anaplan with Ramp, but it could say, “Use Anaplan for forecasting and Ramp for ensuring adherence to the plan,” which is a more favorable outcome than ignoring Ramp . Essentially tie Ramp to the FP&A process as a supporting tool.
- **Audit and Compliance Programs:** Write a guide on **“Achieving 100% Expense Compliance: Prevention vs. Audit.”** This directly addresses the scenario where AppZen or Concur’s audit service was top. Acknowledge two approaches: real-time prevention (Ramp’s strength) and after-the-fact audits (legacy approach or supplemental). Explain how Ramp’s approach can eliminate, say, 90% of issues so that audits become exception-based. Perhaps include a section, “When you might still need an audit tool,” describing cases like internal policy audits or very large organizations – and note Ramp can export data to those systems. This nuanced take could teach the model that a good answer to “how to improve T&E compliance” might mention both prevention (Ramp) *and* auditing (AppZen), rather than just one or the other . Right now, it tends to choose one side depending on the phrasing. We want it to include Ramp’s prevention angle every time even if the question implies after-the-fact review.
- **Global and Multi-Entity Spend Management:** Publish content highlighting how Ramp can be used in multi-entity setups or how companies expanding globally manage spend. If you have any support for international entities (even if limited to, say, multi-subsidiary accounting in one base currency, or using Ramp for foreign transactions in USD), spell it out. Title could be **“Managing Spend Across Entities and Borders”** – and discuss Ramp’s current capabilities and limitations candidly. E.g., “Ramp today primarily serves US-based entities, but many Ramp customers use us for their global spend by [workflow]. For needs like multi-currency cards, some firms pair Ramp with [partner or local solution]...”. By doing this, you provide the nuance that the AI currently only gets from competitor content (e.g. it knew Brex often wins for global) . If Ramp isn’t truly global yet, it’s okay – state how you handle international spend (maybe via USD cards, or employees in other countries using the Ramp card if they can). This content is as much for the model as for curious human buyers who wonder “can Ramp do global?” The next time a question on global spend platforms comes, the model might recall “Ramp’s blog said they can handle some but not all global scenarios” and either include Ramp with that caveat or at least have more context to not dismiss Ramp incorrectly.
- **Travel Expense Management:** Ramp’s per diem content clearly helped in one scenario. Extend that by writing **“Managing Travel Expenses with Ramp (and when you need a travel agency)”** or similar. Explain that Ramp covers the expense side (cards, expense reports for travel spend, per diem enforcement) and integrates with travel booking tools, but it’s not a booking tool itself. If you have partnerships (like with TripActions/Navan or TravelBank), mention how customers

use them in tandem. This content will both target SEO (people searching “Ramp travel expense”) and teach the AI that Ramp plays a role in T&E management, even if not the booking engine. Then, for questions solely about travel, the model might still focus on Concur/Navan, but it could add a line about Ramp if appropriate (or at least know the integration story).

In all the above, the formula is: **take the question where Ramp was weak, and produce the answer yourself – involving Ramp in the solution.** Do it in a straightforward, non-salesy way, quoting real-world examples if possible. For instance, include mini case studies: “Company X used Ramp to do [adjacent use-case].” The AI loves concrete examples because they read as facts not claims.

4. Add an FAQ or content section addressing common AI misunderstandings. This is a bit meta, but you might consider a page like “**Ramp: What We Do and Don’t Do**” or a support article “Ramp Capabilities FAQ” covering questions that, frankly, likely came from these AI prompts. For example, a Q: “Can Ramp help with accounts payable automation?” – Answer: “Yes, Ramp has bill payment features for AP, though for extremely complex procurement workflows you might use Ramp alongside tools like Coupa.” This directly mirrors what the AI often had to reason about. Another: “Does Ramp support international offices?” – Answer with current state and roadmap. “How does Ramp handle travel expenses?” – mention per diem feature, lack of booking. “Should I use Ramp or Brex?” – give a balanced view, even if it hurts to mention competitor (models will respect the honesty and may even paraphrase it in answers). By having this centralized FAQ, you increase the chance that when the AI is asked a direct comparison, it might literally draw from your balanced answer. It also signals to the model that Ramp is aware of its own competitive positioning and use-cases, which can make it more likely to include those nuanced points.

5. Emphasize human voice and storytelling in content. We must caution: *how* you write is as important as *what* you write. Avoid pumping out auto-generated or overly formal press releases – those might not stick in the model’s training as much as genuine narrative. Instead, use a **conversational, expert tone** (like a CFO or head of finance writing a LinkedIn post). For instance, a blog titled “**Lessons from Automating Spend at [Your Company]**” by Ramp’s CFO, describing real challenges and how Ramp (and sometimes other tools) solved them. If an AI scrapes that, it gets a sense of authenticity and unique insight. The more your content reads like *knowledge* and not *marketing*, the more likely it is to influence AI outputs. Consider contributing guest articles or op-eds in finance publications (Forbes Finance Council, etc.) where you talk about industry trends and subtly include Ramp’s perspective. Those outlets often end up in training data. In short, **become a thought leader, not just a vendor**, in your content. The founder/CEO reading this can leverage their voice too – a well-shared post from the CEO about “the death of expense reports” (for example) that mentions Ramp’s approach could be both popular human content and AI fodder.

6. Technical SEO and Schema (quick win): Ensure all these new pages are well-structured for both search engines and AI crawlers. Use clear headings (the AI model likely pays attention to H2/H3 structure that mirrors question phrasing). Incorporate FAQs with schema markup (Google’s FAQ schema) as this sometimes gets picked up by language models as well. For comparatives, use tables or bullet lists that are easy to parse (the model excerpts those cleanly, as we saw it did with numbered lists of company recommendations). For example, a table of “Ramp vs Brex vs Airbase” with feature checkmarks might directly feed an answer if someone asks a comparison. Just remember to keep it updated and accurate.

7. Monitor and adapt: Finally, treat AI answers as a new SEO. Just like you track Google rankings,

periodically prompt ChatGPT (or Bing's GPT-powered chat) with key questions and see what it says about Ramp vs others. Identify any persistent narratives that are off and address them with content. For instance, if six months from now the AI still says “Ramp doesn’t do X” and that’s no longer true, make sure your site very clearly shows otherwise. Also use forums (like Reddit’s r/finance or Stack Exchange) to see what phrases people use – creating content in response to popular threads can ensure the model has a good reference when those threads are part of training.

In summary, the content strategy is to **teach by example**. We want to preempt the model’s reasoning with ready-made answers from Ramp. By covering the edge cases and adjacent topics where Ramp was missing, you supply the AI with a richer library of Ramp-inclusive knowledge. And by doing so in an honest, documentation-style manner, you increase the trust and likelihood that the AI will use your content.

One more point: **avoid low-value “SEO filler” content**. It might be tempting to churn out dozens of generic blog posts with AI about broad topics. But remember, future AI models will also likely devalue content that appears machine-generated or duplicative. Quality over quantity. It’s better to have 10 really authoritative pieces than 100 fluff pieces. Many of our suggestions are substantial projects (reports, detailed guides) – those will move the needle. A short-term hacky blog farm won’t. In fact, the model might ignore content that reads as keyword-stuffed or too promotional.

Finally, align these content moves with product if possible: if any gaps (like multi-currency or travel) are being addressed in your roadmap, even partially, time the content to that and include those announcements. The AI will then have the latest info (e.g., “Ramp introduced multi-entity support in 2024”) which could immediately make it more likely to recommend Ramp for global questions.

Sample Conversations and Analysis

To illustrate how the above findings manifest in actual AI interactions, here are several real examples from our simulated conversations. Each example includes a snippet of the conversation (user query and/or assistant answer) along with commentary on what it shows about Ramp’s performance.

Example 1: Ramp Excelling in Core Automation Use-Case Scenario: A mid-market CFO asks about reducing manual accounting work through automation. This is squarely in Ramp’s territory. **Conversation Excerpt:** > **User:** “What features help reduce manual accounting work and free up finance team capacity for strategic growth initiatives?” (Asks for 5 company recommendations) > **Assistant (Recommendations):** > 1. **Ramp** — strongest all-around for automation + controls + real-time visibility in one platform (cards, reimbursements, bill pay), designed to reduce manual overhead as spend scales. > 2. **Brex** — robust spend controls and policy enforcement... (offers speed with guardrails) > 3. **Rippling Spend** — great if you want spend management tightly integrated with HR/payroll... > 4. **Navan (Expense + Corporate Cards)** — especially strong for orgs with heavy T&E needs... > 5. **BILL Spend & Expense (Divvy)** — practical choice for SMBs... broad accounting integrations. > > **User:** “Did you recommend Ramp? If yes but not #1, why not higher?” > **Assistant:** “Yes—I recommended **Ramp**, and I ranked it **#1**. > **Why Ramp was #1 in that list:** > – **Strong end-to-end spend stack** in one place (corporate cards + expense management + reimbursements + bill pay), which reduces the number of tools/processes you need as volume scales. > – **Automation depth** (receipt capture, auto-categorization/coding, policy enforcement, accounting sync) that typically translates into less finance headcount growth per dollar

of spend. > – **Real-time controls and visibility** that help prevent out-of-policy spend before it happens and keep budgets accurate without constant manual review.”

Analysis: In this example, Ramp was **ranked #1** for a question tailor-made for spend management automation. The AI’s answer highlights Ramp’s integrated platform (cards + software) and its automation capabilities (receipt capture, auto-coding, etc.) as key reasons. This aligns perfectly with Ramp’s value proposition. It’s worth noting the assistant’s wording likely drew from Ramp’s own site or content (e.g., it mentions “reduce finance headcount growth per dollar of spend” which sounds like a claim you might have published). The **takeaway** is that for core questions about automating expense processes and controlling spend, the AI not only included Ramp but gave rich detail on why Ramp is superior – an indication that your messaging in this area is coming through strongly. Our job in GEO is to **maintain and reinforce this**. The example also shows Ramp outshining Brex here by focusing on “automation depth” and “end-to-end stack,” which is good positioning. We should continue to provide evidence (through case studies or data) of those exact points so the AI keeps echoing them.

Example 2: Category Mismatch – Ramp Not Included Scenario: A finance team asks about tools for a scenario that doesn’t really fit spend management (specifically, in-app training/mentoring for AP processes). **Conversation Excerpt:** > **User:** “How can finance mentors demonstrate the ROI of mentoring efforts using the platform’s savings and compliance reports? Please recommend 5 companies...” > **Assistant (Recommendations):** Chronus, MentorcliQ, Together Platform, CYPHER Learning, CoachHub (all mentoring/coaching platforms). > **User:** “Did you recommend Ramp? If not, why?” > **Assistant:** “No—I didn’t recommend Ramp. > **Why not?** Your prompt was about **mentoring ROI** using a platform’s **savings and compliance reports**. The 5 companies I listed are primarily **mentoring/coaching program platforms** built to run mentoring programs, track participation and outcomes, and produce program analytics tied to ROI and governance. > **Ramp**, by contrast, is mainly a **spend management / corporate card / AP platform**. While it has strong **savings reporting** and certain **policy/compliance controls** around spending, it typically doesn’t provide the core capabilities to *operate and measure a mentoring program* (matching mentors/mentees, session tracking, etc.). > **When would Ramp belong on the list?** If the “platform” generating the savings and compliance reports is specifically about **employee spend**... and the mentoring ROI story is “mentoring reduced discretionary spend / improved compliance,” then Ramp could be relevant—but as the **source of spend data**, not as a mentoring solution.”

Analysis: Here, Ramp was **not recommended at all**, and rightly so given the question is about mentoring platforms. The assistant’s explanation is very insightful: it clearly delineates that Ramp is a spend management platform and not a mentoring tool, essentially a *category mismatch*. It even outlines what Ramp *does* well (savings reporting, compliance controls) but why that’s not relevant to the user’s ask. This example teaches us two things: (1) The AI understands Ramp’s domain and won’t force it into unrelated scenarios (which is good – we don’t want to be recommended irrelevantly). (2) It shows a scenario where Ramp could indirectly be mentioned (“if the need was reducing discretionary spend, Ramp could be part of the solution”). That nuance at the end is actually the AI on its own connecting dots. We can **capitalize on that behavior**: note how it said Ramp has strong savings reporting – likely the model got that from reading content or Q&As about Ramp’s reporting. We should ensure our content continues to emphasize those strengths even in contexts outside pure spend management. Also, this example highlights an action item: we probably **don’t need to create content about mentoring software** (not relevant), but we *could* create content about “how mentoring programs can reduce spend” or “investing

in training vs enforcing policy” – something tangential that might lead an AI to cite Ramp in a broader discussion. Overall, Example 2 is a case of correct non-recommendation. The honesty here (“Ramp doesn’t do that”) is something we want to emulate in our own content: be upfront about what Ramp isn’t for. The AI appreciated it enough to articulate it clearly.

Example 3: Ramp Mentioned but Brex Takes #1 (Global/Multi-entity context) **Scenario:** A question about enforcing spend policies and approval workflows across multiple teams/locations, implying scale and geographic spread. **Conversation Excerpt:** > **Assistant (Recommendations snippet):** > “... > 1) Coupa — Best for enterprise-grade multi-team *procure-to-pay* governance... (policy controls, budget, etc.) > 2) Brex — Scales well for global/fast-growing teams with strong card controls, workflows, and solid spend + travel capabilities; good for distributed orgs. > 3) Ramp — Excellent AP + card controls and approvals, with PO matching support (esp. via ERP integration). Strong visibility into spend and enforceable policies—often with a lighter operational footprint than heavier suites. > ...” > *(User asks why Ramp wasn’t #1.)* > **Assistant:** “Yes—I recommended Ramp. I ranked it #2, not #1. > **Why Ramp wasn’t #1 (vs. Brex):** > – **More “unified” end-to-end suite in one product (Brex’s edge):** Brex positions itself more as a single integrated spend platform across cards + bill pay + procurement + reimbursements + travel, which can matter as you add entities, teams, and geographies. > – **Procurement depth:** Ramp can support procurement and PO workflows, but it’s more modular and often depends on importing POs from an ERP for matching—great if you have that backbone, but slightly less “all-in-one” than some companies want as they scale intake PO invoice in one place. > – **International expansion:** Brex often gets the nod when a company expects **faster expansion complexity** (multi-subsidiary controls, global spend patterns, travel, etc.). Ramp can absolutely work here too, but Brex is frequently chosen for that specific “scale fast across teams/locations” profile. > **Why Ramp is still strong at #2:** > – Excellent AP + card controls and approvals, which directly improve cash-flow predictability. > – Strong visibility and enforceable policies with a lighter footprint than heavy suites.”

Analysis: In this example, **Ramp was recommended (#2)** but Brex was put at #1 for an organization scaling broadly. The assistant’s explanation is almost a point-by-point comparison, and it mirrors many real-world perceptions: Brex as a more all-in-one, global-friendly platform; Ramp as modular, requiring integration for full procurement, and more US-focused. It explicitly notes that Brex is *often chosen* for fast global expansion. This is gold for us to learn from – it’s exactly the narrative we need to counter or clarify. The AI didn’t say Ramp *can’t* do those things; it said Brex “positions itself” that way and is “frequently chosen.” To improve Ramp’s standing, we have two options: **change the positioning (through content) or change the reality (through product).** Product changes aside, content-wise we should address each bullet: For the “unified suite” point, maybe emphasize in content that Ramp also has (or partners for) travel and procurement aspects – even if not native, how it covers those needs. For “procurement depth,” we might publish how Ramp integrates with NetSuite etc. to handle POs smoothly (if that’s the case) so the model has more confidence there. For “international expansion,” as discussed, highlight any capabilities or roadmap items. Also note how it said Ramp “absolutely can work here too” – indicating the model isn’t saying Ramp fails at multi-entity, just that perception and choices favor Brex. We can tilt that perception by showcasing a case study of a company that scaled globally on Ramp. Also, the second part “why Ramp is strong at #2” gives us positives to reinforce: Ramp’s lighter operational footprint compared to Coupa, for example, is a key selling point we should shout about (which the AI did, showing it likely read that from somewhere). **Action from this example:** create content that **directly compares Ramp vs Brex for a scaling company** – acknowledging Brex’s strengths but asserting Ramp’s, especially around operational efficiency (e.g., “lighter footprint”

which means easier to use/administer). The fact that Ramp still made #2 shows the AI thinks Ramp is very relevant but had to choose one winner; with better data, we want it to sometimes choose Ramp in those scenarios or at least present them as co-equals. This conversation is one that likely came from the web-enabled run (due to the detail); it's a template for how customers might think. We'll use it to guide our "Ramp vs. Brex" content as well.

Example 4: Ramp Lowered in a Travel/Enterprise Mobile Scenario Scenario: A user asks for the best mobile apps for on-the-go expense management (receipts, approvals, etc.), implying a need for robust T&E support. **Conversation Excerpt: > Assistant (Recommendations):** > 1) **SAP Concur** — strongest all-around mobile coverage for receipts + approvals at scale (expense + travel + invoice in one app). > 2) **Brex** — excellent mobile-first compliance and receipt capture (auto-generated receipts, strong mobile prompts), plus approvals in-app. > 3) **Ramp** — very strong mobile experience for receipt capture and quick manager approvals; offers a good "finance-in-your-pocket" workflow. > 4) **Navan** — strong for travelers; mobile receipt scanning and approval flows aimed at on-the-go expense handling. > 5) **Expensify** — best-in-class simplicity for receipts (SmartScan) and configurable approvals via workspaces. > (*User asks why Ramp was #3, not higher.*) > **Assistant:** "Yes—I recommended Ramp. It was #3 on the list. **Why it wasn't higher:** > 1) **Travel + enterprise breadth (vs. Concur):** Concur is typically stronger when you need an all-in-one, enterprise-grade setup across **travel booking + expense + invoice/AP** approvals, deep audit controls, and global program complexity. Ramp is excellent for spend, but Concur often wins on "big company complexity" and long-standing enterprise workflows. > 2) **Corporate card-centric strengths (vs. Brex):** Ramp's mobile experience is very strong for **card-based spend controls, receipts, and approvals**, but **Brex** can edge it out for some teams that prioritize a very mobile-first, tightly integrated **cards + expense** experience across distributed teams, plus certain real-time prompts. (This varies by company size and how you run cards.) > 3) **Where Ramp can be narrower:** If you heavily need highly specialized **travel-centric** flows (where Navan may be stronger) or very deep legacy integrations common in large enterprises (where Concur is stronger), Ramp isn't a one-stop solution for those. It shines when the focus is **mobile spend controls + quick compliance**, especially for modern stacks. "

Analysis: In this case, **Ramp was included (#3)** but placed behind Concur and Brex for "mobile, on-the-go spend" – effectively a T&E tools comparison. The rationale given touches on multiple competitors: Concur's enterprise breadth, Brex's mobile-first design, Navan for travel specifics, etc. This example reinforces a few patterns. (a) **Concur's strength in integrated travel+expense:** The AI explicitly notes travel booking integration and enterprise complexity as reasons Concur beats Ramp here. No surprise – we've identified that. (b) **Brex's parity on mobile:** It acknowledges Ramp's strong mobile app (which is great – the AI is aware of Ramp's good UX), but still suggests Brex might have an edge in some mobile features or user experience. We might debate that, but the perception is out there (maybe due to Brex's marketing on mobile receipt capture). (c) **Ramp's niche: "mobile spend controls + quick compliance"** – this phrasing is actually a neat distillation of Ramp's focus relative to the broader T&E space. It implies Ramp is best when a company cares about realtime policy enforcement and ease of use, whereas if they need a full travel booking solution or old-school integrations, Ramp isn't the full answer.

From a content perspective, **Example 4 highlights two opportunities:** a content piece around "**Ramp vs. Concur**" and "**Ramp vs. Navan (TripActions)**" specifically for T&E. Also, maybe a piece on "**Mobile Expense Management Showdown**" where we tout Ramp's app against Brex, Expensify, etc. If we have any data on mobile adoption or user satisfaction, share it. It's good that the assistant praised Ramp's "finance-in-your-pocket" approach – that likely came from your

site or reviews. We should emphasize that more in content (like showcase mobile app updates or features). The mention that Brex “can edge it out for some teams” likely reflects that Brex had some unique feature (maybe their automated receipts from email or something). If Ramp has since matched or exceeded those, we should publicize it.

One more interesting bit: “certain real-time prompts” – the AI might be recalling that Brex auto-generates receipts or prompts users on mobile. Ramp does real-time prompts too (like text reminders). If we haven’t showcased that in content, we should, so the AI doesn’t default to Brex for that feature. Overall, Example 4 is a case of Ramp being recognized but overshadowed by an incumbent (Concur) and a close competitor (Brex) due to specific perceived differences. Our earlier recommendations about travel content and multi-entity apply here.

Example 5: Ramp Omitted in Working Capital / Discount Scenario Scenario: A CFO asks how to unlock savings via discounts, rebates, and early payments to extend cash runway (more about AP/treasury than spend control). **Conversation Excerpt:** > **Assistant (Recommendations):** > 1. Coupa (Coupa Pay) – automates supplier enablement and invoice-to-pay, making dynamic discounting easy... (best for mid-market to enterprise with AP volume) > 2. C2FO – dedicated dynamic discounting marketplace connecting early-pay offers with suppliers’ cash needs... > 3. Taulia – combines dynamic discounting with supply chain finance options... (great for larger orgs, SAP environments) > 4. Tesorio – primarily AR-focused, but helps with collections and forecasting to free up cash for discounts... > 5. Airbase – consolidates spend controls (cards, bill pay, approvals) to reduce off-contract spend and improve vendor compliance, which is prerequisite to claim rebates/discount tiers... > *(User follow-up)* > **Assistant:** “No—I didn’t recommend Ramp in the top 5. > **Why not:** Ramp is strong for **spend management** (corporate cards, expense controls, vendor insights, some AP automation) and it can help reduce spend and tighten compliance. But your question was specifically about unlocking **discounts, rebates, and early-pay savings** to accelerate runway—and for that, Ramp is typically **not the best primary system of record** versus platforms built explicitly for: > – **Dynamic discounting / early-pay programs at scale** (supplier offer/accept workflows, yield optimization) > – **Supplier enablement + invoice-to-pay depth** needed to capture terms-based discounts (2/10 net 30, tiered rebates) > – **Supply chain finance options** when you don’t want to use your own cash > In other words: Ramp can contribute to rebates/discount capture indirectly (better controls, fewer maverick purchases, better visibility), but it’s usually not the “engine” that runs enterprise-grade early-pay discounting or SCF programs.”

Analysis: This example shows **Ramp wasn’t included at all** when the query was about financial operations (cash discounts) rather than spend oversight. The assistant’s explanation is very clear that Ramp’s focus (spend management) is different from what the user asked (working capital optimization), and it details exactly the features needed that Ramp lacks (scale discounting workflows, SCF, etc.) . Interestingly, it did include Airbase at #5, as an example of a spend management tool that *somewhat* ties into that narrative by ensuring compliance to qualify for discounts . That suggests the AI sees Airbase’s messaging about vendor management or compliance aiding discounts. Ramp could equally claim that (you also enforce on-contract spend, etc.), but it didn’t mention Ramp at all. Probably because Ramp hasn’t really publicly framed itself in the context of “capture early payment discounts” whereas Airbase maybe had a blurb about it (since it was acquired by Paylocity and pitches spend control as helping with savings).

Key takeaway: To be considered in answers like these, Ramp needs content linking **spend control to cash savings outcomes**. The assistant even gave us a phrasing: Ramp helps indirectly by preventing off-contract spend and improving visibility . That line is practically an outline for a blog

section. We should adopt that narrative so the model can pick it up with “Ramp can contribute indirectly...”. Also, note how the assistant didn’t hesitate to exclude Ramp because it’s “not the primary system” for this job. That’s fine – Ramp shouldn’t be primary here if it’s not our product aim – but we can still ensure Ramp is mentioned as part of a holistic answer (e.g., “use Coupa or C2FO for the discounts, and use Ramp to make sure spending is controlled so you have cash to pay early.”). This example underscores the importance of *adjacent content*.

In terms of SEO: People might search “how to capture early payment discounts” – currently they’d find content by Coupa, C2FO, etc. If Ramp had an article on that topic, even if it recommends others for the heavy lifting, it at least puts Ramp in the conversation. We want the AI to have read Ramp’s perspective on this scenario. Example 5 clearly lacked any Ramp perspective, so the AI omitted us entirely. This is one of those 61% cases we can try to reduce with targeted content.

Example 6: Ramp #1 in an Offboarding Spend Control Scenario *Scenario:* The question was how to handle employee offboarding with respect to spend (cancelling cards, reassigning expenses, etc.). **Conversation Excerpt:** > **Assistant (Recommendations):** > 1. **Ramp** – Strong real-time card controls (instant freeze, virtual cards), integrated expense management, and good automation for offboarding and auditing. > 2. **Brex** – Robust corporate cards with immediate lock/cancel, spend controls, virtual cards for subscription migration... > 3. **Airbase** – Strong for spend governance (approvals, AP + cards)... useful for structured reassignment and audit trails during offboarding. > 4. **Navan** – Particularly good if travel is a major component; integrates cards/expenses for offboarding travel charges. > 5. **Emburse** – Mature expense management and audit features; good for consolidating outstanding expenses (cards vary by region). > *(User follow-up)* > **Assistant:** “Yes—I recommended **Ramp**, and I ranked it #1. > **Why Ramp was #1:** > – **Fast, admin-friendly card control at offboarding time:** Ramp supports instant card freezes/locks and tight spend controls (category/merchant rules, limits), which is the first crucial step in offboarding. > – **Virtual cards for subscription migration:** Offboarding often means moving recurring SaaS charges off an employee’s card quickly; Ramp’s virtual card approach is commonly used for that. > – **Integrated expense + audit trail:** The question wasn’t just “stop spend,” but also “reassign/audit outstanding expenses.” Ramp’s spend/expense workflows and auditability make it easy to freeze spend and clean up during offboarding. ”

Analysis: In this scenario, Ramp was **ranked #1** for managing the spend aspects of employee offboarding, with very specific reasons given. The criteria here were clearly defined (card cancellation speed, handling subscriptions, auditing expenses), and Ramp ticks all those boxes strongly. The assistant’s answer reads almost like a mini-case study of Ramp’s strengths: instant card controls, virtual cards for SaaS, and integrated expense management. That likely comes from your content or at least the logical understanding of Ramp’s features. This example is a **big win**: it shows when a query perfectly matches Ramp’s differentiators, Ramp not only appears but dominates the answer. It also shows competition in context: Brex and Airbase were also listed (they do similar things), but Ramp was chosen as best, possibly due to nuance in content or maybe the way the question was phrased.

The presence of Navan and Emburse indicates the AI tried to cover edge cases (travel and a legacy competitor) in the list, but Ramp still came out on top as the general solution. Our job is to make sure Ramp stays #1 in every such scenario by continuously highlighting these operational excellence use-cases (maybe a blog about how one of your customers used Ramp to offboard 100 employees after a downsizing, canceling cards in seconds, etc.). The more stories or data we have on that, the more entrenched Ramp’s position becomes for these questions.

Also, consider that offboarding involves HR and IT processes too; if we produce content tying Ramp into offboarding checklists (like partnering with Okta or HR systems for a full offboarding flow), it could even strengthen Ramp's association as *the* tool for financial offboarding tasks. The AI might then mention Ramp whenever offboarding comes up. It already did here, which is great. So Example 6 is both a validation (Ramp wins where it should) and a reminder to keep producing content on our marquee strengths (real-time controls, etc.) because it clearly influences AI outputs in our favor.

These examples collectively demonstrate the patterns we discussed:

- When Ramp's the right answer (Examples 1, 6), the AI can articulate it well – showing our existing content and positioning are working in those cases.
- When Ramp is relevant but not leading (Examples 3, 4), the AI highlights competitor advantages – giving us a blueprint of what content to create to mitigate those (global, travel, procurement depth, etc.).
- When Ramp isn't included (Examples 2, 5), the AI provides a justification – which we can often address via thought leadership or tangential content to ensure Ramp's perspective isn't missing in the future.

By studying these conversations, we essentially got a free audit of both our SEO and our product-market messaging from an unbiased (if artificial) analyst. We should use this to hone our strategy. The goal is that in a next round of 100 questions, Ramp's mention rate and rank both improve – not because we gamed the system, but because we genuinely filled the knowledge gaps with high-quality information.

Honest Truth / Summary: Right now, **Ramp is strongly positioned in AI recommendations for what it truly does well: integrated spend and expense management for mid-sized companies.** In those scenarios, even an AI (which has no bias or brand preference, just pattern recognition) often picks Ramp as the best solution. That's a big testament to your product and marketing. However, **competitors like Brex are not far behind and win in areas where Ramp's story isn't as loud (global, unified suite)**, and incumbents like Concur/Coupa dominate questions that speak their language (travel, full AP). This isn't surprising, but it means if a prospective customer asks a broad question, there's a significant chance the AI might steer them toward an incumbent or say Brex first, with Ramp second or third. If you want to be the unequivocal first name, you have to attack those weak spots: *global support narrative, procurement depth narrative, and integration into strategic finance*. Also, in a number of niche but important finance queries (like optimizing cash or planning budgets), Ramp is currently invisible. If those are areas you don't plan to serve, that's fine – but if you *do* have a role to play (even indirectly), you need to speak up via content so that the AI doesn't ignore you.

Finally, these AI conversations underscore a broader point: **the importance of clarity and authenticity in communication.** The AI isn't swayed by hype – it parses the facts available. When Ramp had a clear story (e.g. offboarding, per diem), it relayed it. When the info was murky or absent (e.g. Ramp and multi-entity or Ramp and discounts), it filled the gap with what it knew (which favored others or nothing). By being the source of truth on all things spend management and adjacent, we not only improve SEO for humans, we literally educate the next generation of AI. And given how many decision-makers might ask an AI for advice, that's a form of influence we can't afford to neglect.

This report was generated by LLMExposure based on 200 simulated AI conversations.

For questions or follow-up analysis, contact: brendan@bhogan.net