

The AI Narrative Index

How the Machines See Your Brand

Generative AI is the new search engine. When investors, journalists, and customers ask ChatGPT, Gemini, or Perplexity about your industry, does your brand appear as a market leader — or is it defined by past crises and low-quality sources? This report measures your AI narrative across four scored pillars and one independent safety check.

ChatGPT Google Gemini Perplexity

SCORING ENGINE

$AI\ Score = (V \times 0.35) + (R \times 0.25) + (F \times 0.20) + (C \times 0.10)$

V
35%

VISIBILITY — THE LEADERSHIP TEST

Does the AI naturally recommend you as a Top 5 leader in your industry? We ask each AI to rank the market. #1 rankings score maximum points; complete invisibility scores zero.

e.g. "Who are the top banks in Singapore?" — If DBS is ranked #1, full points. If a competitor is missing entirely, they score zero.

R
25%

REPUTATION — THE RISK TEST

Is your AI footprint weighed down by past crises? We scan the AI's memory for historical fines, scandals, and controversies. Each confirmed event subtracts from a perfect 100.

e.g. A 2019 regulatory fine may still appear as the #1 fact the AI associates with your brand — years after resolution.

F
20%

SOURCES — THE AUTHORITY TEST

Who is the AI listening to? We extract the URLs the AI cites. Tier 1 sources (Bloomberg, government sites) score high; unverified blogs and forums score low.

e.g. If 60% of your citations come from Reddit threads instead of Reuters, the AI is building your narrative on unreliable ground.

C
10%

CONSISTENCY — THE ALIGNMENT TEST

Do different AI models agree on your corporate story? We cross-check ChatGPT, Gemini, and Perplexity. Factual contradictions trigger penalties.

e.g. Gemini says your CEO is "John Smith" while ChatGPT names someone who left in 2019 — that confusion reaches users daily.

INDEPENDENT SAFETY CHECK

T
INDEPENDENT

TRUTHFULNESS — BRAND SAFETY GUARDRAIL

Even if your VRFC score is high, AI can invent facts. We deploy an auditor to fact-check the models against real-world data — catching fabricated executives, invented acquisitions, or competitors' achievements attributed to your brand. Tracked independently.

e.g. ChatGPT claims your company "acquired XYZ Corp in 2023" — an event that never happened. This could mislead investors and analysts.

ASSESSMENT PIPELINE

1

Interrogation

AI platforms queried with proprietary prompts

2

Fact-Checking

Responses audited against real-world data

3

Strategic Output

Scores calculated and action plan generated

Aston Martin: AI Brand Health Report

Consumer Goods | Generative AI Narrative Assessment

AI BRAND HEALTH CLASSIFICATION

Vulnerable

AI narrative has significant gaps

OVERALL SCORE

55.5

out of 100

VISIBILITY (V)

73.3

Healthy

REPUTATION (R)

18.7

Critical

SOURCES (F)

63.0

At Risk

CONSISTENCY (C)

80.0

Healthy

TRUTHFULNESS (T)

86.7

Healthy

Executive Summary

Aston Martin's AI Brand Health Score of 55.5 (Vulnerable) indicates strong presence but weak narrative control, with models frequently surfacing regulatory and product safety issues alongside brand leadership cues. The biggest strength is high factual stability (Truthfulness 86.7 and Consistency 80), meaning the core story is repeatable across models. The biggest vulnerability is severe reputation drag (Reputation 18.7), where legacy disputes, recalls, and motorsport compliance items disproportionately shape first impressions in AI answers.

AI Platform Visibility

OPENAI

#4

Industry Rank

GEMINI

#4

Industry Rank

PERPLEXITY

#3

Industry Rank

Narrative & Brand Safety Assessment

Reputation (R: 18.7) & Consistency (C: 80.0) Analysis

REPUTATION SCORE

18.7

7 crisis events detected

CONSISTENCY SCORE

80.0

1 discrepancy

TRUTHFULNESS SCORE

86.7

3 platforms verified

Crisis Events Detected by AI Models

SEVERITY	EVENT	SOURCES
Formal Penalty	The High Court of England and Wales ruled against Aston Martin Lagonda (AML) in a dispute with its former Middle East distributor, AMMENA...	gemini
Formal Penalty	The FIA fined the Aston Martin Aramco F1 team \$450,000 for a procedural breach of the 2021 cost cap regulations, specifically related to ...	gemini
Formal Penalty	Recall of DBX models (2020–2023 production) due to suspension issues and oil cooler hoses that could burst, posing fire and engine seizur...	openai, gemini
Formal Penalty	Global recall of 1,658 Vantage cars (built 2010–2013) due to transmission software defects causing engine stalling and loss of power, fol...	perplexity
Confirmed Systemic	Aston Martin accepted a procedural breach of Formula 1 cost cap rules for the 2024 season due to a late filing/missing signature. The tea...	openai, gemini
Confirmed Isolated	Intellectual property dispute with shareholder Geely over the use of a winged logo by subsidiary LEVC. UKIPO dismissed Aston Martin's cla...	gemini

+1 more event

Truthfulness Verification by Platform

OPENAI

5/5

GEMINI

4/5

PERPLEXITY

4/5

Cross-Model Discrepancies

- Gemini and Perplexity provide contradictory accounts of the 2024 Formula 1 design controversy: Gemini attributes a legal dispute to trademark issues with Geely, whereas Perplexity claims the 2024 controversy involved Red Bull Racing accusing Aston Martin of copying car designs (sidepods and floor).

Narrative Assessment

The Reputation score of 18.7 signals that AI systems are primed to lead with negative, evergreen risk markers, including DBX suspension and oil cooler hose recalls, Vantage transmission software defects, and multiple legal and FIA cost cap compliance items (including an Accepted Breach Agreement for a 2024 procedural breach). While Truthfulness is strong (86.7) and OpenAI is clean at 5/5, Gemini and Perplexity at 4/5 still leave room for narrative distortion at the margins, especially when complex F1 and legal topics are summarized. Corporate risk: prospective buyers, investors, and partners querying “Is Aston Martin reliable or compliant?” may get a crisis forward synopsis that compresses context (procedural vs performance breaches) and overweights dated recalls, impacting trust, consideration, and governance perceptions.

Media Authority & Ecosystem

Visibility (V: 73.3) & Sources (F: 63.0) Analysis

VISIBILITY SCORE

73.3

AI platform detection rate

SOURCES SCORE

63.0

46 unique sources cited

TIER 1 SOURCES

7

Gov / Top Press citations

Source Tier Distribution

- Tier 1 (Gov/Press): 7 (15%)
- Tier 2 (Quality Media): 18 (39%)
- Tier 3 (Industry/Corp): 13 (28%)
- Tier 4 (Blogs/Forums): 8 (17%)

Top Cited Domains

DOMAIN	TIER
euronews.com	Tier 1
news.sky.com	Tier 1
si.com	Tier 1
forbes.com	Tier 1
bbc.com	Tier 1
business-standard.com	Tier 1
static.nhtsa.gov	Tier 1
en.wikipedia.org	Tier 2
autosport.com	Tier 2
motor1.com	Tier 2

Authority Gap Analysis

Visibility is solid (73.3) with top 5 placement across models (OpenAI #4, Gemini #4, Perplexity #3), but this is not translating into reputational advantage because the cited corpus still over indexes on controversy and defects. Sources are mid quality (63) with meaningful Tier 1 coverage, but 21 of 46 sources sit in Tier 3 and Tier 4, allowing lower authority sites to reinforce recall and dispute narratives that AI may treat as persistent brand attributes. A cross-model discrepancy on the 2024 F1 controversy (trademark dispute with Geely versus Red Bull IP copying allegations that was investigated and cleared) creates avoidable confusion that can be misread as a broader integrity issue. Closing the authority gap requires concentrating the narrative in Tier 1 and canonical owned sources so models default to verified context and outcomes.

Strategic Agency Recommendations

Actionable PR & Communications interventions for Aston Martin

6-Month Action Plan

Based on the audit findings, the following interventions are recommended to improve Aston Martin's AI brand health scores. Each recommendation is tied directly to a weakness identified in the data.

Recommendations

- 1

Crisis Narrative Reframing Pack (Recalls and Compliance)

Publish and interlink a single authoritative "Safety and Compliance" hub (owned site plus newsroom) that clearly timestamps recalls, remedies, completion rates where available, and distinguishes procedural from performance breaches (FIA ABA context). Syndicate the same facts to Tier 1 auto and business press to ensure AI summaries lead with resolution, not allegation.
- 2

Tier 1 Authority Lift and Source Hygiene

Run a targeted media program with Tier 1 outlets already appearing in citations (BBC, Forbes, Sky, SI, Euronews) to place governance, quality, and transformation proof points that can outrank low authority recall roundups. In parallel, audit and update high visibility owned assets (Wikipedia, Wikidata, official brand pages) to anchor correct legal outcomes, investigation clearances, and chronology that models repeatedly reference.
- 3

AI Consistency Fix for F1 and Legal Disputes

Create a factual "controversy clarifier" one pager for F1 and trademark topics, explicitly stating what was alleged, who investigated, and the outcome (including the FIA clearance and the UKIPO decision plus appeal status). Use SEO structured data (FAQ schema and timeline markup) and proactive briefing with motorsport and legal correspondents to reduce cross-model contradictions and prevent conflation across separate issues.

CURRENT SCORE SNAPSHOT

55.5
Overall

73.3
V

18.7
R

63.0
F

80.0
C

86.7
T (Independent)