READING ONE

Day 7

The document said this board would be read again on day 7, 14, 30 and 90, on the same method and against the same file. This is the first. The whole board was captured again, 1,775 rows against 1,188, and every calculated figure here is the difference between two files rather than a claim about one.

MEASURE	HOUR 89	HOUR 164	CHANGE
Rows on the board	1,188	1,775	+587
Sum of live bids	$181,820	$224,473	+$42,653
Top bid	$15,000	$17,000	+$2,000
Median bid	$5	$6	+$1
Money held by the top ten	$102,084	$106,771	+$4,687
Their share of it	56.1%	47.6%	-8.6 pp
Median cost per click, top 250	$1.59	$1.94	+22%
Clicks the board reports	286,297	361,266	+74,969

C **Computed by us from the full capture of the board.** Both captures taken through a browser, page by page, and parsed by the same script. Hour 89 is the file that ships with the document; hour 164 was taken on 26 August 2026 at 17:37 UTC and ships beside it. Visitor and revenue counters quoted on the next sheet are the site's own and are reported, not computed. Open

NEW MONEY ARRIVED ABOVE THEM

ARRIVED IN THE TOP THIRTEEN	RANK	BID	CLICKS
tutti.so	#2	$16,000	7,226
zerorank.ai	#8	$4,000	586
pecan.ai	#9	$3,750	356
modulate.ai	#11	$3,560	1,080

WHAT THIS CHANGES

$27,310 that was not on the board three days ago is now sitting inside the top thirteen, and one of them came within $1,000 of the top row. That is what the top row's extra $2,000 was for, and it is the only defence anybody mounted. What the incumbents did is on the next sheet, and it is almost nothing.

THE INCUMBENTS DID NOT HAVE TO ANSWER

ON THE BOARD AT HOUR 89	THEN	NOW	BID THEN	BID NOW	PAID SINCE
see.io	#1	#1	$15,000	$17,000	+$2,000
joni.ai	#2	#3	$14,028	$14,028	nothing
requesty.ai	#3	out of the top 13	$14,023		
outrank.so	#4	#4	$13,005	$13,005	nothing
orynth.dev	#5	#5	$12,716	$12,716	nothing
crowdreply.io	#6	#6	$12,711	$12,711	nothing
trycomp.ai	#7	#7	$10,000	$10,000	nothing
flopay.com	#8	#10	$3,551	$3,561	+$10
context.dev	#9	#12	$3,550	$3,555	+$5
fuellog.ai	#10	#13	$3,500	$3,500	nothing

C Computed by us from the full capture of the board. All rows computed from the two captures. Visitor counts and the hour-89 revenue counter are the site's own and are reported; the clone counts are the registry's. Open

6 of the day-four top ten are sitting at exactly the bid they held three days ago and are still inside the top 13. Two moved by $10 and $5, which is a rounding error rather than a fight. The mechanic says a rank cannot be held passively, and for three days most of these did not have to hold it at all, because the new money took the seats beside them instead of the ones under them.

A listing's own cost per click falls while it sits there. see.io went from $1.30 to $0.48, because its clicks 3.0-tupled while its bid rose 13%. **The board's median went the other way,** from $1.59 to $1.94 across the top 250, because rows like the four on the previous sheet keep refilling the expensive end. One listing's cost per click decays. The board's does not, and the $1.59 printed earlier in this document was a photograph of one afternoon rather than a rate.

Both curves fell and traffic fell harder. Against their own run rates to hour 89, visitors are down 86% and the money is arriving 72% slower, $569 an hour against $2,043. The board still added 587 rows, one every 8 minutes, and the top ten's money went **up** $4,687. Its share fell from 56.1% to 47.6% only because everything underneath grew faster. Nobody at the top withdrew. The copies went from 254 to 414, and against the nine boards the registry publishes totals for the original holds 84.4%, on a narrower denominator than chapter 9's and so not a comparison to make yet.

WHAT THIS CHANGES

A pay-to-rank board is supposed to make you defend a position. In its second week this one sold seats above people who never had to move. The next reading is day 14, and the question it answers is whether that keeps working once the seats run out.