

SPECIMEN — ILLUSTRATIVE DOCUMENT

This is a specimen prepared to demonstrate the Greyline Mirror reporting format. The case, the parties, the exhibits and the findings are fictitious. Hash values, filenames and technical output are illustrative and were not produced by an examination. Nothing in this document is a finding about any real person, organisation or item of media

GREYLINE INVESTIGATIONS LIMITED

Private Intelligence and Investigations

Greyline Mirror

Pre-emptive Exposure Audit

Baseline assessment · Prepared ahead of a non-executive board appointment

Field	Detail
Case reference	GIL-2026-SP-M01 (specimen)
Subject of the report	The client. Name withheld from this copy
Instructed by	The client, directly
Identity verification	Completed at scoping, 6 July 2026
Purpose stated at scoping	Understanding public exposure ahead of a non-executive appointment
Research window	8 to 16 July 2026
Date of this report	20 July 2026
Report version	1.0 (baseline)
Reviewed and released by	Principal Investigator, Greyline Investigations Limited
Annual re-scan due	July 2027, against this baseline
Classification	Confidential — named recipient only

CONFIDENTIALITY AND DISTRIBUTION

This report is prepared solely for the client to whom it is addressed and solely for the purpose set out in the Scope section. It may not be disclosed, quoted, reproduced in part, or relied upon by any other person without the prior written consent of Greyline Investigations Limited. Greyline accepts no duty of care or liability to any third party who obtains this report, with or without consent.

Greyline Investigations Limited — registered in England and Wales, Company No. 17121990. greylineinvestigations.co.uk

How to read this report

Findings carry two independent markers: a risk rating, and a classification describing what can be done about them. A high-risk finding may be fixed, and a low-risk finding may be easily reduced.

Risk rating

Rating	Meaning
HIGH	Creates a realistic route to physical, financial or reputational harm, or would materially embarrass the client in the context stated at scoping.
MEDIUM	Contributes to a profile that could be assembled against the client, or is likely to be surfaced by a competent researcher and require explanation.
LOW	Discoverable and unremarkable. Recorded for completeness and for comparison at re-scan.

Classification

Class	Meaning
INACCURATE	Wrong, or about a different person. Correction or clarification may be possible; removal usually is not.
REDUCIBLE	Accurate, and a route exists to remove, restrict or de-index it. A named route is given at Section 7.
FIXED	Accurate and lawfully published. No route to reduction exists. The response is preparation, not removal.

Section 8 sets out the boundaries of this work and should be read before acting on anything in it.

1. Executive summary

1. Structured open-source research was carried out against the client's own record between 8 and 16 July 2026, using the identifiers confirmed at scoping. Twenty-three findings were recorded across the four categories: four rated high, nine medium and ten low.
2. Two findings account for most of the assessed risk. The first is a fitness-tracking profile publishing route data that begins and ends at the client's home address, publicly viewable since the account was created. The second is a residential address that remains visible on a historical corporate filing, notwithstanding a later change to a service address. Both are reducible, and the routes are at Section 7.
3. A third finding requires preparation rather than reduction. The first page of search results for the client's name is shared with a namesake against whom adverse material is published. The two are distinguishable on inspection, but a rushed search would not distinguish them. This is classified INACCURATE and is addressed at paragraph 33.
4. Of the twenty-three findings, twelve are reducible, four are inaccurate, and seven are fixed. Section 7 gives a named route and an expected timescale for each of the twelve.

2. Scope and identifiers

5. The subject of this report is the client. Greyline verified the client's identity at scoping on 6 July 2026 before any research began. No research was conducted into any other person, and no third party was contacted at any point.
6. Where a family member or associate appeared incidentally in a source, they are recorded only so far as necessary to describe the client's own exposure, and their details are not reproduced here.
7. The identifiers confirmed at scoping were: full name and two known variants; date of birth; two current and two historical residential addresses; one personal and one professional email address; one mobile number; and four known online handles. The identifiers themselves are held on the case file and are not reproduced in this report.
8. Research covered the four standard Mirror categories: public records and directories; social and digital footprint; data broker and people-search listings; and breach and credential exposure.

3. Method

9. Research followed the standard Greyline open-source method, applied to the client's own record. Every search was run from a clean research environment, logged and timestamped. The full search log, including terms that returned nothing, is at Appendix A.
10. Sources returning a finding were captured at the point of discovery, with the URL, capture time and a hash of the capture recorded. Captures are retained and form the baseline against which the annual re-scan is compared.
11. Only publicly accessible sources were used. No account was created to gain access, no connection request was sent, no closed group was joined, and nothing behind an authentication or paywall barrier was accessed.
12. Breach checking was carried out against the client's identifiers using established breach-notification services. Where an identifier appeared, the disclosure was assessed to establish which fields were exposed. Greyline did not purchase, download or otherwise obtain any breach dataset.

4. Findings — public records and directories

Ref	Finding	Risk	Class	Source
PR-01	Residential address visible on a 2016 corporate filing, predating the change to a service address. The address is a current residence.	HIGH	REDUCIBLE	Corporate registry
PR-02	Three current directorships and two dissolved companies recorded, with dates and co-directors.	LOW	FIXED	Corporate registry
PR-03	Registered as a person with significant control of one entity, with month and year of birth shown.	LOW	FIXED	Corporate registry
PR-04	Property ownership recorded against the client's name at one address, with price paid and date.	MEDIUM	FIXED	Land registry
PR-05	Full name and current address appear on the open electoral register.	MEDIUM	REDUCIBLE	Electoral register (open)
PR-06	No county court judgment, bankruptcy or insolvency record identified against the name or known variants.	LOW	N/A	Court and insolvency records
PR-07	One historical planning application listing the client's name and a former address, with plans attached.	LOW	FIXED	Local authority portal

13. PR-01 is the significant finding in this category. Changing a registered address on a later filing does not remove the address from filings already made; the earlier document remains publicly available and indexed. Because the address is a current residence, this is rated high.
14. PR-04 and PR-07 are FIXED. Both are published under a statutory scheme and no route to removal exists. They are recorded so the client is not surprised by them.

5. Findings — social and digital footprint

Ref	Finding	Risk	Class	Source
SD-01	Fitness-tracking profile publicly viewable, publishing activity routes beginning and ending at the home address. 340 activities since 2021, with dates and times showing a consistent weekday pattern.	HIGH	REDUCIBLE	Fitness platform
SD-02	Professional networking profile publicly viewable with full career history, education and named connections.	LOW	FIXED	Professional network
SD-03	Dormant microblogging account, active 2011 to 2014, 412 public posts. Two express strongly worded views on a contested policy question.	MEDIUM	REDUCIBLE	Social platform
SD-04	Public photographs from a 2023 charity function, captioned with the client's name and role.	LOW	FIXED	News and event sites
SD-05	A school event photograph naming the client and identifying a family member by first name and year group.	HIGH	REDUCIBLE	School website
SD-06	Historical forum posts from 2009 to 2012 under a handle linked to the client by a reused username and an email fragment.	MEDIUM	REDUCIBLE	Special-interest forum
SD-07	A personal mobile number appears in a publicly cached copy of a sports club contact list.	MEDIUM	REDUCIBLE	Cached page
SD-08	Interviews and quoted commentary in trade press, 2019 to 2026, consistent with the stated professional record.	LOW	FIXED	Trade press

15. SD-01 is the highest-risk finding in this audit. Route data of this kind establishes a home address, a regular schedule and periods of absence in one place, requiring no research skill to read. The rating reflects that, not the content of the activities.
16. SD-05 is rated high because it concerns a child, identifies a school, and links both to the client. The client did not publish it.
17. SD-06 is recorded because the link between the handle and the client, while not immediate, is reconstructible from material already public. A researcher who found it would find it credible.

6. Findings — brokers, search results and breach exposure

Ref	Finding	Risk	Class	Source
DB-01	Four people-search directories list the client with current address, age band and named associated persons. Two include a partial telephone number.	MEDIUM	REDUCIBLE	People-search directories
DB-02	One directory shows an address history spanning three properties across eleven years.	MEDIUM	REDUCIBLE	People-search directory
DB-03	The postal address appears to be circulating in consumer marketing lists, inferred from the pattern of unsolicited addressed mail described at scoping.	LOW	REDUCIBLE	Client account
SR-01	The first page of results for the client's name is shared with a namesake in another jurisdiction, against whom adverse press is published.	MEDIUM	INACCURATE	Search results
SR-02	An aggregator page misstates the current employer, carrying a role held until 2022.	LOW	INACCURATE	Business aggregator
SR-03	A directory entry attributes to the client a professional qualification the client does not hold.	MEDIUM	INACCURATE	Directory listing
SR-04	A dormant profile on a former employer's site remains live with an outdated biography and photograph.	LOW	INACCURATE	Former employer site
BR-01	Personal email address appears in three disclosed breach datasets, dated 2013, 2019 and 2021. The 2019 disclosure included a password hash.	HIGH	REDUCIBLE	Breach notification services
BR-02	Professional email address appears in one disclosed dataset dated 2022, exposing email and employer only.	MEDIUM	REDUCIBLE	Breach notification services
BR-03	No credentials attributable to the client identified as offered for sale on monitored sources during the research window.	LOW	N/A	Monitored sources
BR-04	The same personal email address serves as the recovery address for at least four services identified during the audit, two of them financial.	HIGH	REDUCIBLE	Cross-referenced

18. BR-01 and BR-04 are rated together. A breached address that is also the recovery address for financial services concentrates risk at a single point. Neither is unusual alone; the combination is what raises the rating.
19. SR-01 is INACCURATE and not reducible. The adverse material concerns a different person and is lawfully published about them. It cannot be removed on the client's application, and an attempt to have it removed would be unsuccessful and, if reported, itself newsworthy. The response at paragraph 33 is preparation rather than removal.
20. BR-03 records a negative result. Nothing attributable to the client was identified during the research window. That is not evidence that nothing exists, and it is not a finding of safety.

7. Reduction plan

21. Reducible findings are set out in priority order with a named route and an expected timescale. Timescales are drawn from published response periods and ordinary experience. They are not guarantees.
22. Greyline does not carry out removals, submit applications, or correspond with platforms on the client's behalf. The routes below are for the client, or the client's solicitor, to action. Greyline verifies at re-scan whether each has taken effect.

Priority	Ref	Route	Timescale	Verified
1	SD-01	Set the profile to private, and separately enable a privacy zone around the home address. Both are needed: making a profile private does not retract data already syndicated to connected third-party services, which must be revoked individually.	Immediate	At re-scan
2	BR-01, BR-04	Establish a dedicated recovery email address, used nowhere else, for financial services. Change passwords on every service tied to the breached address. Enable app-based two-factor authentication rather than SMS where offered.	1 week	At re-scan
3	PR-01	Apply to the registrar to remove the residential address from historical filings on the ground available where it is a home address. A separate application is needed to suppress the address from public inspection going forward.	4 to 6 weeks	At re-scan
4	SD-05	Written request to the school for removal, citing the identification of a child alongside a named parent. Escalate to the school's data protection contact if not actioned.	2 to 4 weeks	At re-scan
5	PR-05	Opt out of the open electoral register with the local authority. This affects neither the full register nor the right to vote.	Next monthly update	At re-scan
6	DB-01, DB-02	Direct opt-out with each directory through its published route, followed by an erasure request to any that does not action it within its stated period. Directories commonly re-list from refreshed source data; a repeat opt-out at re-scan should be expected rather than treated as failure.	2 to 8 weeks	At re-scan
7	SD-07	Request removal from the club, and separately request removal of the cached copy through the search provider's outdated-content route.	2 to 3 weeks	At re-scan
8	SD-03	Review the 412 posts and decide between deleting individual posts and deleting the account. Deletion does not remove third-party copies already made; the review should proceed on that assumption.	Client decision	At re-scan
9	SR-03	Correction request to the directory. The listing is inaccurate and a correction route is published.	2 to 4 weeks	At re-scan
10	SR-04	Request removal or updating of the dormant profile from the former employer.	2 to 6 weeks	At re-scan
11	SD-06	Request removal or anonymisation from the forum operator, and cease reuse of the handle.	4 weeks	At re-scan
12	DB-03	Register with the mailing preference service and decline consent at the point of future collection.	4 to 6 weeks	At re-scan

23. SR-01 does not appear in the table because no reduction route exists. The appropriate response is a short, factual note prepared in advance and held ready, together with a distinguishing detail the client is comfortable stating. Prepared in advance, the matter is a footnote; raised without warning in an interview, it is not.
24. PR-02, PR-03, PR-04, PR-07, SD-02, SD-04 and SD-08 are FIXED. No action is available and none is recommended. They are recorded so the client can anticipate them.

8. Limitations and scope

25. Findings reflect what was discoverable at the date of the scan. Public sources change continuously, and this report is a photograph rather than a description.
26. This assessment was commissioned by the client and reports on the client. Greyline verified the client's identity before research began and does not accept instruction to compile this assessment about a third party.
27. The reduction plan identifies available routes. Outcomes depend on third parties and are outside Greyline's control. No representation is made that any route will succeed, or will succeed within the timescale indicated.
28. Only publicly accessible sources were used. Material behind an authentication barrier, in a closed group, or otherwise restricted was not accessed and is not covered.
29. A negative result means only that nothing was identified in the sources searched during the research window. It is not evidence that nothing exists.
30. Where an entry is classified INACCURATE, that reflects the research. It is not a legal determination, and no view is expressed on whether any publication is unlawful.
31. This report supports the client's own decision-making. It does not replace legal advice, and the correction and erasure routes referred to are described in outline only.

Appendix A — Search log and baseline

32. Every search is logged, including those returning nothing. A search returning no result is as material to the baseline as one returning a finding.

Category	Searches	Findings	Note
Public records and directories	31	7	Two registries returned no match under either name variant
Social and digital footprint	58	8	Includes reverse image searching on four photographs
Data brokers and people-search	24	3	Eleven directories checked; four carried a listing
Search result review	18	4	First five pages, three providers, logged out
Breach and credential exposure	14	4	Six identifiers checked across established notification services
Total	145	26	23 recorded as findings after de-duplication

Capture record

33. Twenty-six source captures were taken, each with URL, capture time and hash recorded. The capture set is retained and forms the baseline for the annual re-scan.

Capture	Finding	Captured	Hash (truncated)
CAP-001	PR-01	08/07/26 11:04	b7e2149a...3c81
CAP-007	SD-01	09/07/26 14:22	41d0c86f...9b27
CAP-012	SD-05	10/07/26 09:51	ee930b74...12a6
CAP-018	DB-01	13/07/26 16:37	2af51c09...7d40
CAP-023	BR-01	15/07/26 10:15	95b4e7d2...c063
...	Full index of 26 captures supplied with this report		

End of report. The annual re-scan is scheduled for July 2027 and will be reported against this baseline, showing what has changed, what has been reduced, and what has newly appeared.