

AI Reputation Analysis and Signal Evaluation - Information Commissioner's Office

BRAND AI REPUTATION

Government, Municipal & Public Sector Reputation: Information Commissioner's Office (ico.org.uk)

<https://ico.org.uk>

Industry: Government, Municipal & Public Sector



REPUTATION LEVEL

GOVERNMENT, MUNICIPAL & PUBLIC SECTOR

68.9 Avg Reputation

Based on 303 businesses audited.

LOWER REPUTATION THAN AVERAGE

Information Commissioner's Office has 11.9 points less reputation than the average for Government, Municipal & Public Sector.

EXPERT VERDICT

The site is a utilitarian regulatory shell that currently functions more as a navigation directory than an authoritative source of proof. It avoids hyperbolic marketing fluff but suffers from 'The Transparency Paradox'?claiming accountability while providing zero verifiable data points in the primary navigation paths. The presence of stale temporal markers (June 2025) in a May 2026 context further erodes its authority.

[See how to improve >](#)

INFO DENSITY

Power-words vs. Substance ratio.

18

60% Reputation

Heading fluff is low (0%) as titles like [H1] For the public and [H1] Action we've taken are utilitarian. However, the body substance ratio is poor; most pages are flagged as 'insufficient' with character counts as low as 21 or 22. While the site mentions the 'Data (Use and Access) Act,' it fails to provide the actual guidance promised on the 'For organisations' and 'Action we've taken' pages, which contain only single-sentence definitions of their role.

SEMANTIC COHERENCE

Homepage promise vs. Sub-page reality.

14

70% Reputation

The homepage promises 'advice for individuals' and 'guidance for organisations,' but the corresponding sub-pages are essentially empty shells in the crawl. For example, the 'Action we've taken' page H1 suggests a repository of enforcement evidence, but the body text only provides a generic role description: 'Part of our role is to take action...' This creates a disconnect between the navigational signal and the content substance.

TRUST & PROOF

Verifiable evidence vs. Trust Theatre.

9

45% Reputation

DIAGNOSIS: TRUST THEATRE

While the site avoids 'trust theatre' flags like verified badges or commercial reviews (review_count 0 for most pages), it suffers from 'Proof Path Absence.' The 'Action we've taken' page makes a bold performance claim about ensuring organisations meet obligations without providing a single link to an enforcement notice, audit report, or case study. The proof_links_count is 1 across all pages, which appears to be a systemic footer link rather than specific evidentiary support.

EVIDENCE: PROOF DENSITY

The ratio of verifiable evidence to assertions is low. The only specific piece of evidence is the mention of the 'Data (Use and Access) Act,' which, given the system date of May 21, 2026, is now stale (11 months post-implementation) yet still listed as 'coming into law.' This suggests a failure to update core regulatory content, a major red flag for a public authority.

COMMODITY FINGERPRINT

Detection of industry cliches/templates.

9

60% Reputation

The site follows a strict government template fingerprint, utilizing standard labels like 'About Us,' 'Make a complaint,' and 'For the public.' The value proposition 'to ensure organisations meet their information rights obligations' is a common regulatory cliché. It is not 'BS' in the commercial sense, but it is highly commoditized and lacks the unique evidence-based positioning expected of an authority in 2026.

IDENTITY & AUTHORITY

Expert verifiability & Schema depth.

7

47% Reputation

DIAGNOSIS: AUTHORITY GAPS

There is a significant technical credibility gap; despite being a data protection authority, all analyzed pages have schema_json: null. There are no named experts, commissioners, or leadership profiles connected via Person schema or sameAs links. The technical implementation is functional but lacks the structured data depth required for a high-authority digital footprint.

EVIDENCE: PERFORMANCE VS. CLAIMS

The ICO claims to take action to ensure compliance, yet the 'Action we've taken' page provides zero metrics, percentages, or named entities involved in regulatory action. The 'For the public' page mentions home CCTV and nuisance marketing as areas of expertise, but fails to provide any specific results or 'Action taken' in these sectors. This creates a marketing tone of 'activity' without demonstrated 'output.'

See how to improve >

INDUSTRY MATCH & SCORE SUMMARY

Government, Municipal & Public Sector Reputation: Information

Reputation: 57 / 100

Commissioner's Office (ico.org.uk)

INDUSTRY CLASSIFICATION

The Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) perfectly aligns with the Government, Municipal & Public Sector industry classification. The content focuses on regulatory functions, information rights, and public guidance, confirming its role as a statutory authority.

"The score of 57 is driven primarily by 'Information Density' and 'Trust and Proof' gaps. While the site is not deceptive (low marketing fluff), its high volume of 'insufficient' content and failure to provide evidence for its 'Action' claims result in a moderate BS score. The lack of structured data for a data-centric regulator also heavily penalized the 'Identity and Authority' pillar."

ANALYSIS DISCLOSURE & SOURCE ATTRIBUTION

This analysis is part of a non-adversarial audit conducted by 1 Euro SEO. The results are intended as professional feedback to help improve any website's machine-readability and authority signals. The evaluation is free, and any company can request a fresh audit at any time.

Any company can use the insights for free and improve its voice. When a company has updated its content, it can always submit a new audit request, which will be reflected in a new current score.

You are encouraged to visit the live site at <https://ico.org.uk> to view the most current version of its content and see directly what this company is about and what it offers.

Verified Analysis Date: May 21, 2026

(c) 1EuroSEO Independent Evaluator - Non-Sponsored Result