DECISION BRIEF

More customers bought. Revenue fell.

Did the checkout redesign actually work?

INVESTIGATION CONTEXT

SIMPLIFIED SAAS CHECKOUT

28 days before vs. 28 days after | 18,406 checkout visitors

DATA READINESS: PASSED Required fields existed across both windows.

THE NAGGING QUESTION

Checkout conversion improved. Why did revenue per visitor fall - and should the team keep the redesign?

THE ANSWER

The new flow removed purchasing friction, but changed what customers bought. Completion rose 14.6% while revenue per visitor fell 7.8%, alongside a sharp drop in annual-plan share.

EVIDENCE

MEASURE	BEFORE	AFTER	CHANGE
Checkout completion	4.1%	4.7%	**+0.6 pp**
Revenue / checkout visitor	$21.80	$20.10	**-7.8%**
Annual plan share	38.4%	24.7%	**-13.7 pp**
Payment-error rate	2.3%	2.2%	**Stable**

DECISION

Keep the simpler payment flow. Restore equal visibility for annual pricing and test before declaring the launch successful.

WHAT THIS MEANS

The top-line conversion metric hides an expensive tradeoff: easier buying, lower commitment.

Traffic, channel and device mix remained stable. The change was concentrated at billing-period selection. That identifies where to act next, but does not prove causality.

RECOMMENDED NEXT ACTION

1. Keep the simplified checkout and payment steps.
2. Give monthly and annual plans equal visual weight.
3. Test the change using revenue per visitor as the primary metric; monitor completion, annual-plan share and cancellation as guardrails.

CONFIDENCE

HIGH CONFIDENCE

The revenue decline is associated with a lower annual-plan mix.

MEDIUM CONFIDENCE

The redesigned plan presentation caused the shift.

IMPORTANT CAVEATS

Before/after comparison, not a randomized experiment | Later renewals and churn are not yet observable | Unmeasured sales activity may affect plan mix

NEXT DECISION

Approve the plan-selection test

Owner: VP Growth | Checkpoint: Before the next checkout release

Evidence before conclusions.