

VIRGO DEVELOPMENT

SEO & AEO/GEO Audit

virgodev.com

Baseline review of technical SEO, on-page signals, structured data, internal linking, content trust, AI-search readiness, performance, and accessibility.

Prepared for	Virgo Development LLC, St. George, Utah
Prepared by	Virgo Development, SEO & AI Search Optimization
Audit date	October 23, 2026
Site version reviewed	Production site build of October 23, 2026 (57 HTML pages)
Document version	1.0

1. Executive Summary

virgodev.com has a **strong technical foundation**. Every page we reviewed has a unique title and description, a single H1, a valid canonical tag, and structured data that parses without errors. Thirty FAQ schema blocks match their visible answers word-for-word, which is rare. Lab tests score 96–100 for performance and 100 for SEO on all five templates we tested, with no layout shift.

The opportunities are less about fixing errors and more about **connecting what's already there**. The site's 34 articles link to the service pages, but the service pages don't link back. Article titles were being cut off by a shared template. A handful of statistics on the SEO service page need sources. And there's no measurement baseline yet to show whether any of these changes move results.

Scorecard

Area	Rating	Summary
Crawling & indexing	Strong	Sitemap complete and valid; crawl allowed for search and AI crawlers; noindex used deliberately. Contact page noindex needs a decision.
On-page signals	Strong	Unique titles and descriptions everywhere; one H1 per page; no skipped heading levels. Title truncation on articles fixed in this cycle.
Structured data	Good	Valid on every page; FAQ answers match visible text. Gaps: FAQ markup on 9 newer posts, image in article markup, richer business entity.
Internal linking	Needs work	No links from homepage or service pages to articles; case studies thinly linked.
Content & trust	Good	Direct answers, sourced figures, and named authors on articles. Service-page statistics need linked sources.
AI-search readiness	Good	Crawlable, text-first content; llms.txt present; consistent entity details. Minor text-extraction noise on the blog index.
Performance (lab)	Strong	Performance 96–100, LCP 1.5–2.4 s, TBT 0 ms, CLS 0. Font loading is the main remaining cost.
Accessibility	Good	Skip links, landmarks, and alt text everywhere. Sitewide brand-bar contrast issue.

Top Priorities

1. **Link service pages and the homepage to the articles that support them (L1).** Highest-impact, lowest-risk change in this audit.

2. **Keep article titles within search-result limits (O1).** Implemented in this cycle through one template change; verify after deploy.
3. **Source or retire the statistics on the SEO & AEO/GEO service page (C1).**
4. **Set up and record a measurement baseline** in Search Console, Bing Webmaster Tools, and GA4 before the next release (M1).
5. **Complete FAQ markup on the remaining 9 articles and add an image to article markup (S1, S2).**

2. Scope and Method

This is a baseline audit. It records where the site stands today so that later reassessments can measure change against it.

- **Crawl:** all 57 HTML pages in the October 23, 2026 site build (homepage, About, 6 service pages, 34 articles, 3 case studies, hubs, legal and utility pages). For each page we checked titles, meta descriptions, headings, canonicals, robots directives, Open Graph tags, structured data, FAQ markup parity, images, internal and external links, and sitemap and llms.txt coverage.
- **Lab performance:** Lighthouse 12.2.1, mobile emulation, on five representative templates (homepage, SEO service page, blog index, an article, About), served locally with compression. Third-party fonts and the HubSpot form could not load in the test environment, so real-world timings will be somewhat slower.
- **Live spot checks:** the live blog index was read as plain text to see the page the way text-based crawlers and answer engines do.
- **Standards:** Google Search Central documentation, including “AI features and your website” (updated December 2025) and the FAQ structured data documentation (updated May 2026); Bing Webmaster Tools AI Performance documentation (February 2026); WCAG 2.2 AA for contrast.

Limitations

We did not have access to Search Console, Bing Webmaster Tools, GA4, backlink data, or the Google Business Profile for this audit. The findings describe the site itself; they do not yet include traffic, rankings, citation counts, or field Core Web Vitals. Finding M1 addresses this.

3. What's Working Well

- **Unique, well-formed metadata.** 57 of 57 pages have a unique title and description; no duplicates.
- **Clean heading structure.** Exactly one H1 on every page and no skipped heading levels anywhere on the site.
- **Canonical tags.** 56 of 57 pages carry a correct self-referencing canonical (the exception is the 404 page).
- **Structured data you can trust.** Every JSON-LD block parses, and all 30 FAQPage blocks match their visible answers word-for-word, an integrity standard many sites miss.
- **Complete sitemap.** All 49 sitemap URLs resolve to real pages, and intentionally noindexed pages are correctly left out.
- **Open to search and AI crawlers.** robots.txt allows crawling, and a detailed llms.txt summarizes the site's services and articles.

- **Answer-ready articles.** Recent articles open with a direct answer and a summary, use question headings, cite sources, and name an author with a verified profile.
- **Consistent business details.** One phone number and one support email are used everywhere.
- **Accessibility basics.** Every page has a skip link and main landmark; every image has alt text; images are WebP.
- **Fast pages.** Lab Performance 96–100 and zero layout shift across all tested templates.

4. Findings and Recommendations

Each finding records where the problem comes from, because that decides who fixes it and how many pages one fix improves:

- **Individual page:** fixed by editing that page.
- **Shared website system:** a template, component, or setting that repeats the issue across many pages, fixed once.
- **Business information:** needs a decision or confirmation from the business before anyone can publish an accurate fix.

Findings at a Glance

ID	Finding	Priority	Source type	Status
L1	The homepage and service pages don't link to any articles	High	Shared website system	Open
O1	31 of 37 article and case-study titles were too long for search results	High	Shared website system	Implemented Oct 23, 2026; verify after deploy
C1	Statistics on the SEO & AEO/GEO service page lack linked primary sources	High	Business information	Open
M1	No confirmed measurement baseline for search and AI visibility	High	Business information	Open
S1	FAQ schema is missing on 11 newer articles with visible FAQs	Medium	Individual pages (batch)	2 of 11 completed Oct 23, 2026
S2	Article schema has no image	Medium	Shared website system	Open
S3	Business entity details are incomplete and the address appears in two formats	Medium	Business information	Open
T1	The Contact page is set to noindex	Medium	Business information	Decision needed
P1	Fifteen web-font weights load before the page renders	Medium	Shared website system	Open
X1	Brand bar text fails color contrast on every page	Medium	Shared website system	Decision needed
L2	Some valuable articles are thinly linked	Low	Individual pages	Open
T2	Minor crawl-signal inconsistencies	Low	Shared website system	Open

ID	Finding	Priority	Source type	Status
O3	Portfolio and Case Studies share the same H1	Low	Individual pages	Open
O2	Four meta descriptions run long	Low	Individual pages	Open
P2	Images aren't served in responsive sizes	Low	Shared website system	Open
A1	Decorative card artwork reads as stray words to text-based readers	Low	Shared website system	Open
V1	Two service pages show FAQs without FAQ schema	Medium	Individual pages	Open
V2	The Recurly partner page is thin and excluded from search	Medium	Business information	Decision needed
V4	Core pages miss two planned schema types	Low	Shared website system	Open
V5	Main headings put the message ahead of the search phrase	Low	Business information	Decision needed
C2	Team-size claim should be confirmed	Low	Business information	Decision needed

Internal linking

L1 · The homepage and service pages don't link to any articles

Priority	High · Effort: Low–Medium · Owner: Marketing + Engineering
Source type	Shared website system
Status	Open
Evidence	All 34 published articles link out to a service page, but the homepage, the About page, and all six service pages contain zero links to individual articles. Two service pages link to one case study each; the Whitaker Studio case study is linked only from the case-study hub.
Why it matters	Service pages are the site's strongest commercial pages. Linking them to the articles that explain each service passes authority to that content, helps crawlers and answer engines understand topical depth, and gives visitors a reason to stay.
Recommendation	Add a short "Related reading" block (3–5 links) to each service page and a "Latest thinking" strip to the homepage, built as a reusable component. Add the matching case study to each service page where one honestly exists.

L2 · Some valuable articles are thinly linked

Priority	Low · Effort: Low · Owner: Marketing
Source type	Individual pages
Status	Open
Evidence	Five articles have three or fewer internal links pointing to them besides the blog index, including the AI-search visibility guide, the SEO/AEO/GEO explainer, and the software terms glossary.
Why it matters	Thinly linked pages are harder for crawlers and readers to find, even when they're strong.
Recommendation	Fold these into the L1 "Related reading" blocks first, then add in-text links from the newest articles in the same topic.

On-page**O1 · 31 of 37 article and case-study titles were too long for search results**

Priority	High · Effort: Low · Owner: Engineering
Source type	Shared website system
Status	Implemented Oct 23, 2026; verify after deploy
Evidence	The blog and case-study templates appended " Virgo Development" (20 characters) to every title. 31 of 37 titles exceeded 60 characters (longest: 80), so the end of the title, often the brand, was likely to be cut off in search results. Every one of the 31 fit within 60 characters without the suffix.
Why it matters	Truncated titles look unfinished, and search engines are more likely to rewrite titles that run long. One template controls every article and case study, so one change fixes the pattern, including for future posts.
Recommendation	Append the brand suffix only when the full title still fits in about 60 characters. Done in both templates; 0 of 39 titles now exceed 60 characters, all remain unique, and 8 short titles keep the brand suffix. After deploy, confirm the live titles and check Search Console over the following weeks.

O3 · Portfolio and Case Studies share the same H1

Priority	Low · Effort: Low · Owner: Marketing
Source type	Individual pages
Status	Open

Evidence	Both pages use “Code still running. Clients still growing.” as their H1. Their titles and descriptions are distinct.
Why it matters	Two pages with the same main heading send a mixed signal about which page answers which search.
Recommendation	Give each page an H1 that names what it holds, for example “Software Development Portfolio” and “Client Case Studies”, and keep the line as a subheading.

O2 · Four meta descriptions run long

Priority	Low · Effort: Low · Owner: Marketing
Source type	Individual pages
Status	Open
Evidence	SEO & AEO/GEO service page (181 characters), Built to Last (170), Berry’s Manufacturing case study (166), and Slow Down to Build Faster (162). All other descriptions are unique and within range.
Why it matters	Long descriptions are cut off in results, often mid-sentence.
Recommendation	Trim each to roughly 150–155 characters with the key promise first.

Content & trust (E-E-A-T)

C1 · Statistics on the SEO & AEO/GEO service page lack linked primary sources

Priority	High · Effort: Low · Owner: Marketing + Business owner
Source type	Business information
Status	Open
Evidence	The stat strip cites “58% of Google searches end with zero clicks (SparkToro, 2024)”, “1B+ monthly ChatGPT users (OpenAI, 2025)”, “41% citation rate for pages with FAQPage schema (VirgoDev AEO/GEO Analysis)” and “3x higher AI citation rate ... (Search Engine Journal, 2024)”. None are linked. The SparkToro figure matches a public 2024 study. We could not match the ChatGPT figure to an OpenAI publication. The 41% figure is credited to Virgo’s own analysis on the page, but Virgo’s June 2026 strategy document credits the same number to “SE Ranking / Relixir research, 2025,” and we could not locate either source. A May 2026 Ahrefs test reported by Search Engine Journal found that adding schema to pages already cited by AI did not change their citation rates.
Why it matters	This is the page where Virgo sells credibility in search. An unverifiable number there is the claim a skeptical buyer, or an answer engine weighing trust, is most likely to discount.

Recommendation	Link each statistic to its primary source and date it. Replace any figure that can't be traced. For the internal 41% figure, either publish a short methodology note (sample, date, method) or reframe it as an observation from client work.
-----------------------	---

C2 · Team-size claim should be confirmed

Priority	Low · Effort: Low · Owner: Business owner
Source type	Business information
Status	Decision needed
Evidence	The About page says “12 engineers, designers, and project managers.” Other experience claims (21 years, since 2005, 500+ projects) are consistent across the site.
Why it matters	Specific numbers build trust only while they stay accurate.
Recommendation	Confirm the current number, or use a phrasing that won't go stale.

Measurement

M1 · No confirmed measurement baseline for search and AI visibility

Priority	High · Effort: Low · Owner: Marketing
Source type	Business information
Status	Open
Evidence	This audit was performed from the site files and lab tools, without access to Google Search Console, Bing Webmaster Tools, or GA4. There is no recorded baseline to compare future changes against.
Why it matters	Without a baseline, no one can answer “did visibility change?” or “did the business benefit?” after a release.
Recommendation	Confirm Search Console (including the Search generative AI performance report, introduced June 2026), Bing Webmaster Tools AI Performance, and GA4 conversion events for Discovery Call and contact submissions. Export a dated baseline before the next release.

Structured data

S1 · FAQ schema is missing on 11 newer articles with visible FAQs

Priority	Medium · Effort: Low · Owner: Engineering
Source type	Individual pages (batch)

Status	2 of 11 completed Oct 23, 2026
Evidence	30 FAQPage blocks across the site match their visible answers word-for-word, which is excellent. But 11 articles published since September have visible FAQ sections and no FAQPage markup: building-mobile-apps-with-room-to-grow, connecting-systems-with-the-customer-in-mind, crm-migration-checklist, hipaa-compliant-software-development, multi-tenant-saas-architecture, recurly-integration-guide, the-path-the-user-took, when-does-hubspot-need-a-custom-integration, when-your-curriculum-becomes-software, software-discovery-call, and what-happens-after-an-seo-audit.
Why it matters	Virgo's standard is to keep FAQ schema on pages with FAQ content, because it describes useful content clearly to any system that reads it. Google stopped showing FAQ rich results on May 7, 2026, so the value is consistency and machine-readable clarity, not a search-result feature.
Recommendation	Add FAQPage markup to the remaining 9 articles, generated from the visible questions and checked word-for-word. On service pages, describe FAQs as content and user-experience value rather than as a way to win rich results or guaranteed AI citations.

S2 · Article schema has no image

Priority	Medium · Effort: Low · Owner: Engineering
Source type	Shared website system
Status	Open
Evidence	The BlogPosting markup in the article template includes headline, dates, author, and publisher, but no image, even though every article already has its own 1200×630 share image.
Why it matters	Google's Article structured-data guidance recommends an image. The asset already exists, so this is one template line.
Recommendation	Add the post's share image to the BlogPosting markup in the template, plus an author URL. Validate with the Rich Results Test after deploy.

Entity data

S3 · Business entity details are incomplete and the address appears in two formats

Priority	Medium · Effort: Low · Owner: Business owner + Engineering
Source type	Business information
Status	Open

Evidence	Homepage markup uses the generic LocalBusiness type with no geo coordinates, service area, or image. The street address appears as “87 East 2580 South” in most places and “87 E 2580 S” in 12. The phone number and email are consistent everywhere.
Why it matters	Consistent name, address, and phone details across the site, Google Business Profile, and directories help search engines and answer engines connect them to one business.
Recommendation	Choose one address format that matches the Google Business Profile exactly and use it everywhere. Use ProfessionalService (a LocalBusiness subtype) and add geo, areaServed, and an image.

Indexing

T1 · The Contact page is set to noindex

Priority	Medium · Effort: Low · Owner: Business owner
Source type	Business information
Status	Decision needed
Evidence	pages/contact.html carries a noindex tag and is excluded from the sitemap. Discovery, the legal pages, and the Recurly partner page are also noindex, which appears intentional.
Why it matters	A contact page with the business name, address, and phone number is a normal, useful page for branded and local searches.
Recommendation	Unless there is a reason to hide it, remove noindex from the Contact page and add it to the sitemap.

T2 · Minor crawl-signal inconsistencies

Priority	Low · Effort: Low · Owner: Engineering
Source type	Shared website system
Status	Open
Evidence	The Terms page is blocked in robots.txt while linked from the footer. The robots.txt comments say the Recurly page was added to the sitemap, but it is noindex and not listed. The 404 page has no canonical tag (a site rule).
Why it matters	A blocked page can't pass on its noindex instruction, and out-of-date comments mislead the next person to edit the file.
Recommendation	Replace the robots.txt Disallow with a noindex tag on the Terms page, update the comments, and add a canonical to the 404 page.

Performance

P1 · Fifteen web-font weights load before the page renders

Priority	Medium · Effort: Medium · Owner: Engineering
Source type	Shared website system
Status	Open
Evidence	Every page requests Montserrat (7 weights), Inter (5) and JetBrains Mono (3) from Google Fonts as a render-blocking stylesheet. Lab scores are already high (see Appendix A), but this is the largest remaining loading cost we can see.
Why it matters	Fewer font files means faster first paint, especially on mobile connections.
Recommendation	Request only the weights the stylesheet actually uses, or self-host subsetting fonts with preload. Re-test with field data in Search Console's Core Web Vitals report.

P2 · Images aren't served in responsive sizes

Priority	Low · Effort: Medium · Owner: Engineering
Source type	Shared website system
Status	Open
Evidence	Lighthouse estimates up to 72 KiB savings on the homepage from responsive images and 41 KiB from deferring off-screen images. Three images (Portfolio, Case Studies hub) lack width and height attributes.
Why it matters	Smaller images on phones load faster; explicit dimensions prevent layout shift.
Recommendation	Add srcset sizes for the largest photos, and width/height to the three images.

Accessibility

X1 · Brand bar text fails color contrast on every page

Priority	Medium · Effort: Low · Owner: Engineering + Design
Source type	Shared website system
Status	Decision needed
Evidence	Lighthouse reports the "Our Brands" links at 2.79:1 (WCAG AA requires 4.5:1). The Recurly partner link's accessible name doesn't include its visible text. The previously documented orange-label-on-cream issue remains open.

Why it matters	Accessibility issues on a shared component repeat on all 57 pages, and accessible pages are easier for every kind of user agent to read.
Recommendation	Raise the brand bar link color to a passing token, align the Recurly link's label with its visible text, and make the pending decision on the orange label color.

AI search (AEO/GEO)

A1 · Decorative card artwork reads as stray words to text-based readers

Priority	Low · Effort: Low · Owner: Engineering
Source type	Shared website system
Status	Open
Evidence	When the live blog index is read as plain text, words from card illustrations appear between entries (for example “livemoveaccessprove” and “NO”). The artwork is hidden from screen readers, but text extractors still see the SVG text.
Why it matters	Answer engines and summarizers often read pages as text. Stray fragments add noise to a page whose purpose is to list articles clearly.
Recommendation	Convert the text inside decorative card SVGs to outlined paths, or remove it.

Plan vs. site (Volume 3)

V1 · Two service pages show FAQs without FAQ schema

Priority	Medium · Effort: Low · Owner: Engineering
Source type	Individual pages
Status	Open
Evidence	The June 2026 plan requires a 5+ question FAQ with FAQPage markup on every service page. System Integration and CRM Automation each show 6 visible FAQs but carry only Service markup. The other four service pages comply.
Why it matters	This is the same consistency issue as S1, on two of the site's most important commercial pages.
Recommendation	Add FAQPage markup generated from the visible questions, checked word-for-word.

V2 · The Recurly partner page is thin and excluded from search

Priority	Medium · Effort: Medium · Owner: Business owner + Marketing
-----------------	--

Source type	Business information
Status	Decision needed
Evidence	The plan rated a dedicated, indexed Recurly page as Critical for technical buyers (recurly.js, REST API, FAQ). pages/recurly.html is 243 words, noindex, and has no structured data. The depth now lives in two articles: the Recurly integration guide and the Recurly-to-CRM guide.
Why it matters	Premier Partner status is one of Virgo's strongest third-party credentials, and partner-specific searches are high-intent.
Recommendation	Either build the page out and index it (credential, services, FAQ, links to both guides and the My Music Workshop case study), or keep it as a partner landing page and make the Recurly integration guide the indexed hub. Record the decision.

V4 · Core pages miss two planned schema types

Priority	Low · Effort: Low · Owner: Engineering
Source type	Shared website system
Status	Open
Evidence	Articles and case studies have BreadcrumbList markup, but the homepage, About, and service pages do not. Person markup for Jamie Lords and key team members exists only inside article author fields; there are no team or author profile pages.
Why it matters	Breadcrumbs describe site structure; Person entities connect named experts to the work they publish.
Recommendation	Add BreadcrumbList to service and About pages. Add Person markup (name, jobTitle, sameAs) for the named team on the About page.

V5 · Main headings put the message ahead of the search phrase

Priority	Low · Effort: Low · Owner: Marketing
Source type	Business information
Status	Decision needed
Evidence	The homepage H1 is the brand tagline ("Connect Everything. Automate What Matters. Build What Doesn't Exist Yet."), and service-page H1s are benefit statements (for example "Your CRM should work for your team"). The plan called for the primary keyword in each H1. Every page's title tag and section label do carry the keyword.
Why it matters	The H1 is a strong relevance signal. The current approach trades some of it for brand voice, which can be the right call.

Recommendation	Keep the brand lines, and work the service keyword into each H1 or into a visible subheading directly beneath it (for example “CRM setup and automation for HubSpot, Zoho and Salesforce”).
-----------------------	---

Resolved During This Audit

- **Discovery Call length.** The homepage, service pages, and portfolio described a 1-hour session while the Discovery page said 30 minutes. All now say 30 minutes, matching the standard call.
- **Team location wording.** Copy that described the entire team as being in St. George now reads “100% U.S.-based team with headquarters in St. George, Utah,” including in the matching FAQ markup.
- **Discovery page context.** The Discovery page now links to an article explaining what happens during a discovery call.
- **FAQ markup on the two newest articles.** “What Happens During a Software Discovery Call” and “What Happens After an SEO Audit?” now carry FAQPage markup that matches their visible FAQs word-for-word (part of S1).

5. Recommended Roadmap

Sequenced by impact, effort, and dependencies. Items marked as decisions need the business owner before work can start.

When	Work	Findings
Now (0–2 weeks)	Deploy and verify the title fix. Record the measurement baseline. Add “Related reading” links to service pages and the homepage. Source or replace the service-page statistics.	O1, M1, L1, C1
Next (2–6 weeks)	Finish FAQ markup on 9 articles and the 2 service pages. Add image to article markup. Standardize the address and upgrade entity markup. Decide on Contact page indexing, brand-bar contrast, and the Recurly page.	S1, V1, S2, S3, T1, X1, V2
Later (6+ weeks)	Trim font weights or self-host fonts. Responsive images. Breadcrumb and Person markup. Keyword-bearing subheadings. Strengthen links to thinly linked articles. Clean up decorative SVG text, robots.txt, the 404 canonical, and long descriptions.	P1, P2, V4, V5, L2, A1, T2, O2, C2
Reassess	Re-audit after the Now and Next work ships, or after any major template or platform change.	All

6. Measurement Plan

Every release should answer three separate questions, each with its own evidence and timing:

Question	Evidence	When to check
Did the change work?	Acceptance criteria pass on staging and on the live rendered page; Search Console URL Inspection; structured data matches visible text.	At release
Did visibility change?	Search Console Performance (AI Overviews and AI Mode are included in Web totals) and the Search generative AI report; Bing Webmaster Tools AI Performance (citations, cited pages, grounding queries). Citation counts don't indicate placement or ranking.	After recrawl, over weeks
Did the business benefit?	GA4 conversions for Discovery Call and contact submissions; inquiries logged in the CRM; quality of sales conversations.	Over months

Appendix A. Lighthouse Lab Results

Mobile emulation, Lighthouse 12.2.1, October 23, 2026. Lab results, not field data.

Page	Perf.	Access.	Best pr.	SEO	FCP	LCP	CLS
Homepage	97	97	96	100	1.4 s	2.1 s	0
SEO & AEO/GEO service	100	96	96	100	1.4 s	1.5 s	0
Blog index	97	96	96	100	1.5 s	1.8 s	0
Article (discovery call)	98	96	96	100	1.4 s	1.5 s	0
About	96	96	96	100	1.4 s	2.4 s	0

Total Blocking Time was 0 ms on every page. Best-practices scores reflect console errors from fonts that could not load in the test environment, not site errors.

Appendix B. Pages Intentionally Excluded From the Index

Page	Method	Assessment
Discovery (pages/discovery.html)	noindex	Reasonable for a booking landing page
Contact (pages/contact.html)	noindex	Review: see T1
Legal: data privacy, process management, service agreement	noindex	Reasonable
Recurly partner page (pages/recurly.html)	noindex	Reasonable; update robots.txt comment (T2)
Terms (pages/terms.html)	robots.txt Disallow	Switch to noindex (T2)
404 page	noindex, follow	Correct; add canonical (T2)

Sources

- Search Engine Journal, “Schema Markup Didn’t Move AI Citations In Ahrefs Test,” May 11, 2026.
- SparkToro, 2024 Zero-Click Search Study (cited on the SEO & AEO/GEO service page).
- Google Search Central, “AI features and your website,” last updated December 10, 2025. developers.google.com/search/docs/appearance/ai-features
- Google Search Central, “FAQ (FAQPage) structured data,” updated May 2026: FAQ rich results no longer appear in Google Search as of May 7, 2026. developers.google.com/search/docs/appearance/structured-data/faqpage

- Google Search Central, “Do you need an SEO?” last updated June 5, 2026.
developers.google.com/search/docs/fundamentals/do-i-need-seo
- Google Search Central Blog, “Introducing Search Generative AI performance reports in Search Console,” June 2026.
- Bing Webmaster Blog, “Introducing AI Performance in Bing Webmaster Tools (Public Preview),” February 10, 2026.
- HTTP Archive, Web Almanac 2025, SEO chapter, published January 2026.
almanac.httparchive.org/en/2025/seo
- Google Lighthouse 12.2.1; W3C WCAG 2.2 contrast guidance.