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 x 0.35) + (R x 0.25) + (F x 0.20) + (C x 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

Barclays: AI Brand Health Report

Banking | Generative AI Narrative Assessment

AI BRAND HEALTH CLASSIFICATION

Vulnerable

AI narrative has significant gaps

OVERALL SCORE

58.3

out of 100

VISIBILITY (V)	REPUTATION (R)	SOURCES (F)	CONSISTENCY (C)	TRUTHFULNESS (T)
90.0	10.0	56.3	80.0	73.3
Healthy	Critical	At Risk	Healthy	Healthy

Executive Summary

Barclays has strong AI-era presence, consistently ranking as a top-three banking leader across OpenAI, Gemini, and Perplexity, but it is not controlling what that visibility contains. With an overall AI Brand Health Score of 58.3 (Vulnerable), the biggest strength is dominant, consistent visibility, while the biggest vulnerability is an AI footprint anchored to regulatory and governance crises that are resurfacing as defining context rather than historical events.

AI Platform Visibility

OPENAI	GEMINI	PERPLEXITY
#2	#2	#2
Industry Rank	Industry Rank	Industry Rank

Narrative & Brand Safety Assessment

Reputation (R: 10.0) & Consistency (C: 80.0) Analysis

REPUTATION SCORE	CONSISTENCY SCORE	TRUTHFULNESS SCORE
10.0	**80.0**	**73.3**
7 crisis events detected	1 discrepancy	3 platforms verified

Crisis Events Detected by AI Models

SEVERITY	EVENT	SOURCES
Formal Penalty	The UK Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) fined Barclays £42 million for systemic failures in managing money-laundering risks. This includ...	openai, gemini, perplexity
Formal Penalty	Barclays sold approximately $17.7 billion of securities beyond registered limits due to internal control failures. While the initial SEC ...	openai, gemini
Formal Penalty	Barclays agreed to a $19.5 million settlement to resolve a U.S. class-action lawsuit alleging the bank made false and misleading statemen...	openai, gemini
Formal Penalty	Former CEO Jes Staley was fined £1.8 million and banned from the UK financial services industry by the FCA and PRA for misleading regulat...	openai, gemini
Confirmed Isolated	Barclays faced significant protests, branch vandalism, and disinformation campaigns from climate activists (Greenpeace, Fossil Free Londo...	gemini, perplexity
Alleged	Barclays commenced a judicial review against the Financial Ombudsman Service (FOS) in the High Court regarding a decision on consumer cre...	perplexity

+1 more event

Truthfulness Verification by Platform

OPENAI	GEMINI	PERPLEXITY
3/5	4/5	4/5

Cross-Model Discrepancies

• Gemini and Perplexity provide contradictory accounts of Barclays' current business structure: Gemini states the group transitioned to five distinct operating divisions (Barclays UK, Barclays UK Corporate Bank, Private Bank and Wealth Management, Investment Bank, and US Consumer Bank), whereas Perplexity claims the core structure consists of three lines (UK Retail and Business Banking, Consumer Cards and Payments, and Corporate and Investment Bank).

Narrative Assessment

Reputation risk is critical (R: 10) because all models prominently associate Barclays with major regulatory and controls failures, including the FCA money-laundering fine (£42 million), the SEC-related over-issuance controls failure ($361 million, with continued remediation and Fair Fund developments), and U.S. litigation settlement exposure ($19.5 million). Executive governance risk is also salient due to the Jes Staley FCA/PRA ban and fine (£1.8 million, upheld June 2025), which reinforces a leadership-trust narrative. Truthfulness is moderate (T: 73.3), but OpenAI reliability is weaker (3/5), increasing the chance that stakeholders receive distorted summaries where older issues are presented as current operational risk, affecting investor confidence, recruitment, and consumer trust at the moment of decision.

Media Authority & Ecosystem

Visibility (V: 90.0) & Sources (F: 56.3) Analysis

VISIBILITY SCORE	SOURCES SCORE	TIER 1 SOURCES
90.0	56.3	4
AI platform detection rate	52 unique sources cited	Gov / Top Press citations

Source Tier Distribution

- Tier 1 (Gov/Press): 4 (8%)
- Tier 2 (Quality Media): 11 (21%)
- Tier 3 (Industry/Corp): 31 (60%)
- Tier 4 (Blogs/Forums): 6 (12%)

Top Cited Domains

DOMAIN	TIER
sec.gov	Tier 1
fca.org.uk	Tier 1
theguardian.com	Tier 1
pcg.law.harvard.edu	Tier 1
en.wikipedia.org	Tier 2
britannica.com	Tier 2
fintechmagazine.com	Tier 2
statista.com	Tier 2
bankingdive.com	Tier 2
bankingjournal.aba.com	Tier 2

Authority Gap Analysis

Barclays is clearly seen as a category leader (V: 90, position #2 across all platforms), which amplifies both strengths and negatives because AI answers are highly discoverable and frequently served. Source authority is mixed (F: 56.3): Tier 1 references exist (FCA, SEC, major press), but the narrative is heavily built on Tier 3 corporate and industry sources (31) plus Tier 4 low-authority sites (6), which increases drift, oversimplification, and reputational contagion. Cross-model inconsistencies on the current business structure (five divisions versus three lines) signal an attribution and recency gap that can undermine credibility with analysts, institutional clients, and prospective partners.

Strategic Agency Recommendations

Actionable PR & Communications interventions for Barclays

6-Month Action Plan

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

Recommendations

1 Rebalance the AI narrative with Tier 1 validation

Launch a proactive Tier 1 media and regulator-adjacent communications program that frames remediation outcomes, controls enhancements, and governance upgrades, explicitly linking them to the FCA and SEC matters that AI currently foregrounds. Prioritize placements and explainers that are easily citable by AI systems (clear timelines, quantified actions, and third-party corroboration) to reduce crisis-dominant summaries.

2 AI-source hygiene, Wikipedia and owned-asset alignment

Audit and update high-authority knowledge nodes (Wikipedia, Wikidata, corporate governance pages, investor relations FAQs) to correct the operating-structure discrepancy and ensure a single canonical description is consistently indexed. Add a concise, source-backed “regulatory matters and remediation” timeline on owned channels to prevent models from inferring ongoing risk from legacy headlines.

3 Crisis suppression via authoritative SEO and citations

Build an SEO thought-leadership and newsroom architecture that concentrates on risk management, financial crime controls, and governance transparency, supported by Tier 1 and Tier 2 citations to displace Tier 4 references in AI retrieval. Use a quarterly AI visibility and truthfulness monitoring cadence, with rapid-response content updates when hallucinations or outdated crisis framing re-emerge, especially on OpenAI where accuracy is currently weaker.

CURRENT SCORE SNAPSHOT

Overall	V	R	F	C	T (Independent)
58.3	90.0	10.0	56.3	80.0	73.3