

GEO Audit - firmsfinder.eu

Generative Engine Optimization readiness review

Prepared by	Claude (AI assistant by Anthropic), model Claude Sonnet 5.5
Requested by	Account holder of this Claude session (Dan Ionesco / AiVenture S.R.L.)
Generated at	2026-10-14 08:37:27 (UTC+03:00, Europe/Bucharest)
Generated at (UTC)	2026-10-14 05:37:27 UTC
Time source	Session clock tool (current_time) at generation
Audited site	https://firmsfinder.eu
Document version	v1.0

Verdict

The technical GEO foundation is solid. The weak spots are contradictions between pages and signal files that declare themselves 'unverified'. No numeric score is given: the signals registry was not run.

What works (verified live)

- robots.txt explicitly allows 13 AI crawlers (GPTBot, ClaudeBot, PerplexityBot, etc.) and declares the sitemap.
- llms.txt is published with real content (v1.1, 13.10.2026), not a homepage fallback.
- entities.json and digital-dna.json return valid JSON.
- Homepage has title, meta description, canonical, robots meta and basic OG tags.
- FAQ has 50 direct, self-contained answers (good for AEO).
- /intelligence/ is the most citable page: dated figures (12.10.2026), reproducible SQL, explicit limits.

Issues, by impact

1. Cross-page contradiction (high)

Footer says data comes from 'MF, ANAF and Monitorul Oficial' for '1.7 million firms'. /intelligence/ says ANAF is not integrated and gives approx. 1.31M ONRC records; the FAQ says 'over a million'. An AI model will cite whichever version it picks up.

2. Signal files declare themselves unverified (high)

entities.json and digital-dna.json contain SPECIFICATION_NOT_RUNTIME_VERIFIED and NOT_TESTED. An agent reading them receives exactly that message about the site.

3. llms.txt contains internal working text (medium)

Phrases such as 'drafted artifact', 'supplied sitemap', 'user-provided GET test' and 'publication not verified' should be removed from the public version.

4. knowledge-graph.json returns 404 (medium)

llms.txt lists it as a proposed resource. The other 9 proposed JSON files were not tested.

5. Core function lives off-domain (medium)

The 'CAUTA' (Search) button goes to 1clic-ia.eu, so an AI cannot attribute the search to firmsfinder.eu.

6. Minor issues (low)

Homepage has no og:image or Twitter card (the FAQ has them). Sitemap has no lastmod. The ~40-line footer repeats on every page and dilutes extracted chunks. The LinkedIn link in the footer (company/aiventure-se) should be confirmed as the same profile used across the rest of the network.

Not verified

- JSON-LD (Organization/WebSite/WebPage): the fetch tool does not expose script tags, so what llms.txt claims could not be confirmed.
- The other 8 pages listed in the sitemap.
- Actual citation by AI models (no citation test was run).

Sources inspected

- <https://firmsfinder.eu>
- <https://firmsfinder.eu/robots.txt>
- <https://firmsfinder.eu/llms.txt>
- <https://firmsfinder.eu/sitemap.xml>
- <https://firmsfinder.eu/faq/>
- <https://firmsfinder.eu/intelligence/>
- <https://firmsfinder.eu/entities.json>
- <https://firmsfinder.eu/digital-dna.json>
- <https://firmsfinder.eu/knowledge-graph.json> (404)

Authorship and integrity record

SHA-256 of the audit content (canonical text: target, UTC time, verdict, findings, sources):

4aae6b970057525a13281cda5546e926f69baf4847cc1e9b366011e0a9031796

What this record is. A statement that Claude prepared this review at the time shown, plus a SHA-256 fingerprint of the audit text. Anyone holding the companion file FirmsFinder_GEO_Audit_v1.0_2026-10-14.canonical.txt can recompute the hash and confirm the text was not altered.

What this record is not. It is not a qualified electronic signature (eIDAS), not a certificate issued by a certification authority, and not an attestation by Anthropic. Claude cannot create such signatures. The date/time comes from the session clock and is not independently timestamped. To obtain independent proof of existence at this moment, stamp the PDF or the hash above with OpenTimestamps (or a qualified timestamp service) and keep the resulting proof file.

Findings reflect only what was observable through page fetches on the date above. Technical readiness does not guarantee AI citation or recommendation.