



Digital Threat Vulnerability Risk Assessment

Analyst-led intelligence assessment. Human judgement applied to machine-grade signal — the read behind the data. Lens: Executive & Board Leadership.

CLASSIFICATION

PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

RECIPIENT EYES ONLY

PREPARED BY

Stephen Morgan MSc, PSP

DIRECTOR OF INTELLIGENCE & TARGETING

ISSUED


29 June 2026

REVISION 05 · 2026

Executive Intelligence Summary

Public incivility and graphic-content posts undermine a credible CEO profile

SUBJECT	Marcus Bennett
ISSUED	29 June 2026
WINDOW	2026-04-25T16:12:59.615Z — 2026-06-20T21:40:00.191Z · 138 items reviewed



Across 138 posts (25 April–20 June 2026) the subject’s footprint shows commercial normality but is punctuated by a short, recent run of disparaging remarks about identifiable individuals across LinkedIn, X/Twitter, Facebook, Instagram and TikTok, plus multiple shares of graphic or violent imagery, including on LinkedIn. The pattern concentrates between 8–20 June. This cluster is enough to form a first-impression frame of poor judgement, low emotional control and weak boardroom discipline, despite otherwise conventional executive signalling. Identity verification of the exact corporate entity “Sentinel Digital” remains ambiguous in open sources, increasing misattribution risk until owned assets and authoritative bios are in place.

([companiesintheuk.co.uk](https://www.companiesintheuk.co.uk/ltd/sentinel-digital-1?utm_source=openai))

SO WHAT

For a CEO appointment or investor diligence, the current footprint creates a high risk of screenshot-driven narratives about culture and judgement unless remediated before announcement or engagement.

Reporting Lens

Executive & Board Leadership

This assessment applies the standards, stakeholder expectations, and adversarial scrutiny appropriate to the selected decision context.

Subject Intelligence Profile

NAME	Marcus Bennett
DISPOSITION	Co-founder and CEO of “Sentinel Digital” (per client intake); conventional multi-platform presence with recent spikes in negative tone.

Public persona

Commercially confident, informal, reactive; inconsistent executive restraint in public exchanges.

Digital footprint breadth

Broad across LinkedIn, X/Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, TikTok; no clearly verified owned site or authoritative bio observed in open sources.

Collection & Methodology

Sources, scope, and limitations. Aggregated platform signal interpreted by human analyst.

DATE RANGE	POSTS REVIEWED	SOURCES	LIMITATIONS
2026 → 2026 Window	138 Corpus	06 LinkedIn public posts	04 Documented

Sources

- LinkedIn public posts
- X/Twitter public posts
- Facebook public posts
- Instagram public posts
- TikTok public posts
- Open-web scan for identity and corporate verification

Methodology notes

We reviewed 138 normalised items across five platforms, focusing on observable signals that affect board-grade perception. Where possible we triangulated corporate identity via open-web sources; multiple similarly named ‘Sentinel’ entities and numerous ‘Marcus Bennett’ profiles exist, and we did not find an authoritative, single-point confirmation linking this subject to a registered UK company or a corporate site bearing the same name. ([companiesintheuk.co.uk](https://www.companiesintheuk.co.uk/ltd/sentinel-digital-1?utm_source=openai))

Limitations

- Identity linkage: open-web sources show multiple ‘Sentinel’ brands and many ‘Marcus Bennett’ profiles; no definitive public company page or bio was confirmed during this review window. ([companiesintheuk.co.uk](https://www.companiesintheuk.co.uk/ltd/sentinel-digital-1?utm_source=openai))
- The dataset spans 25 April–20 June 2026 only; older content and prior reputation arcs were out of scope.
- Flag categories reported by the pipeline exceed the enumerated samples; only the highest-risk examples are itemised here.
- Private posts, deleted items, and closed-group content were not accessible.

Key Evidence

Paraphrased extracts and platform-level signals. Each item carries a why-it-matters line for downstream weaponisation analysis.

E1 LINKEDIN	2026-06-19T16:07:00.192Z Publicly derides an individual’s competence using demeaning language on a professional channel. WHY IT MATTERS LinkedIn incivility directly undermines executive judgement and culture-carrier credibility. https://www.linkedin.com/feed/update/urn:li:activity:15000000000005004	● MED
E2 X/TWITTER	2026-06-20T21:40:00.191Z Labels a ‘regional manager’ as incompetent using pejorative phrasing. WHY IT MATTERS Targets a managerial role; easy for adversaries to frame as bullying of colleagues/partners. https://www.x.com/MarcusBennettGBR/status/15000000000005001	● MED
E3 INSTAGRAM	2026-06-20T01:57:59.615Z Dismisses a woman’s capability with appearance-based, gender-coded put-downs. WHY IT MATTERS Enables sexism/hostile-environment narratives relevant to HR and governance risk. https://www.instagram.com/p/15000000000005003	● HIGH
E4 FACEBOOK	2026-06-20T11:48:59.903Z Insults local service designers with blanket derogatory terms. WHY IT MATTERS Signals contempt; reduces warmth and stakeholder empathy. https://facebook.com/MarcusBennettGBR/posts/15000000000005002	● MED
E5 TIKTOK	2026-06-19T06:15:59.904Z Posts a short video captioned with demeaning language about an unnamed person. WHY IT MATTERS Short-form video increases screenshot and remix risk. https://www.tiktok.com/@MarcusBennettGBR/video/15000000000005005	● MED
E6 X/TWITTER	2026-06-18T20:24:59.616Z Uses animal-based insult to characterise an individual. WHY IT MATTERS Reinforces a pattern of personalised disparagement. https://www.x.com/MarcusBennettGBR/status/15000000000005006	● MED

E7 FACEBOOK	2026-06-18T10:34:00.192Z Calls an unnamed person ‘incompetent’ in a public post. WHY IT MATTERS Sustains the narrative of poor temperament across platforms. https://facebook.com/MarcusBennettGBR/posts/150000000000005007	● MED
E8 INSTAGRAM	2026-06-18T00:42:59.904Z Mocks a man’s appearance to belittle capability. WHY IT MATTERS Adds to a montage of ad-hominem content usable by critics. https://www.instagram.com/p/150000000000005008	● MED
E9 LINKEDIN	2026-06-09T09:51:59.904Z Shares graphic conflict imagery with a ‘warning’ caption. WHY IT MATTERS Graphic content on LinkedIn clashes with investor-grade tone and brand safety norms. https://www.linkedin.com/feed/update/urn:li:activity:150000000000005029	● MED
E10 FACEBOOK	2026-06-10T05:33:59.615Z Posts crash aftermath images, urging caution. WHY IT MATTERS Well-intended but graphic; creates avoidable reputational sensitivity. https://facebook.com/MarcusBennettGBR/posts/150000000000005027	● MED
E11 X/TWITTER	2026-06-10T15:24:59.903Z Amplifies a film clip described as highly violent. WHY IT MATTERS Associates the profile with violent imagery; trivial to montage. https://www.x.com/MarcusBennettGBR/status/150000000000005026	● MED
E12 INSTAGRAM	2026-06-09T19:43:00.192Z Describes a boxing match as ‘carnage’ with graphic visuals. WHY IT MATTERS Adds to volume of graphic posts within days. https://www.instagram.com/p/150000000000005028	● MED
E13 TIKTOK	2026-06-09T00:00:59.616Z Shows results of a hunting trip with explicit aftermath. WHY IT MATTERS Triggers weapons/violence associations; problematic for brand-safe leadership. https://www.tiktok.com/@MarcusBennettGBR/video/150000000000005030	● MED

E14 X/TWITTER	2026-06-08T14:10:00.191Z Posts a close-up of a sports injury (‘state of my knee’). WHY IT MATTERSFurther normalises graphic visuals on public channels. https://www.x.com/MarcusBennettGBR/status/1500000000000005031	● MED
E15 AGGREGATE	2026-04-25 TO 2026-06-20 Posting cadence clusters in May–June; cross-platform posting and replies are evenly distributed; LinkedIn, Twitter, Facebook, Instagram and TikTok all active. WHY IT MATTERSConcurrency multiplies screenshot risk and cross-audience spillover.	● MED

Priority Intelligence Requirements

Standing analyst questions resolved against the corpus, each with cited evidence and a confidence rating.

Is the subject perceived as credible?

Baseline commercial credibility is present via multi-platform activity and professional context, but credibility is dented by a spate of ad-hominem posts and graphic shares, including on LinkedIn. These create an impression of reactive temperament inconsistent with board-grade restraint.

E1 · E2 · E9 · E15

CONFIDENCE MEDIUM ●●●

Is the subject perceived as trustworthy?

Trust is weakened by personalised disparagement and contemptuous tone towards others; this signals low empathy and unpredictable judgement under pressure.

E1 · E2 · E4 · E6

CONFIDENCE MEDIUM ●●●

Does the footprint support executive positioning?

Not consistently. LinkedIn incivility and graphic content contradict executive-polish expectations, overshadowing otherwise normal professional activity.

E1 · E9 · E15

CONFIDENCE HIGH ●●●

Is authority signalling sufficient?

Authority signals (platform breadth, confident tone) exist, but they are offset by tone lapses that read as undisciplined authority rather than steady leadership.

E1 · E2 · E5

CONFIDENCE MEDIUM ●●●

Is the digital identity professionally coherent?

Currently inconsistent. Cross-posting and informal, sometimes contemptuous language create a fragmented identity; open-web ambiguity around the corporate entity increases coherence risk until owned assets are clarified.

E1 · E4 · E15

CONFIDENCE MEDIUM ●●●

Does the subject demonstrate poor judgement?

Yes, in a concentrated period. Public, personalised put-downs and graphic imagery on professional channels indicate lapses in judgement that adversaries can easily weaponise.

E1 · E2 · E9 · E10

CONFIDENCE HIGH ●●●

Are there professionalism concerns?

Yes. LinkedIn insults, gender-coded remarks and disdainful posts on mainstream platforms breach professional norms for a CEO and culture-carrier.

E1 · E3 · E4

CONFIDENCE HIGH ●●●

Could content be screenshot-amplified?

Easily. The posts are short, emotive and cross-platform; they montage neatly into a narrative of incivility and poor taste.

E1 · E2 · E3 · E9

CONFIDENCE HIGH ●●●

Is there likely journalist interest?

Moderate. Trade or local press could run a standards/leadership angle if the appointment is public; national interest would require an additional trigger (market event, whistle-blower, or prior controversy).

E1 · E9 · E15

CONFIDENCE MEDIUM ●●●

Could adversaries frame the subject negatively?

Yes. An opponent could present a pattern of bullying, sexism and poor judgement using a simple screenshot reel, especially highlighting LinkedIn content.

E1 · E3 · E6

CONFIDENCE HIGH ●●●

Could the footprint weaken investor confidence?

Yes. Investors and PE diligence teams are sensitive to culture and governance risk; the tone cluster from June would raise questions about temperament and brand safety.

E1 · E2 · E9

CONFIDENCE HIGH ●●●

Could it affect recruitment outcomes?

Yes. Prospective senior hires and procurement teams often review leaders' LinkedIn activity; public incivility and graphic posts are deterrents.

E1 · E3 · E9

CONFIDENCE HIGH ●●●

Does it conflict with brand positioning?

Yes. Desired positioning as a trusted, high-integrity CEO is contradicted by recent posts that signal volatility and low empathy.

E1 · E4 · E9

CONFIDENCE HIGH ●●●

Would this person be trusted with authority, judgement, capital, and institutional responsibility?

Not yet, without remediation. The observable pattern from 8–20 June would make a cautious nominations or investment committee seek corrective actions and assurances before proceeding.

E1 · E2 · E3 · E9

CONFIDENCE HIGH ●●●

Threat Vectors

Exploitable surfaces, ranked by combined exploitability and urgency. Coloured rules indicate severity.

Incivility on professional channels

● EXPLOITABILITY HIGH

● URGENCY HIGH

A cluster of ad-hominem posts, including on LinkedIn, frames the subject as combative and undisciplined. This enables headlines about 'toxic leadership' and culture risk, and plays directly into investor and HR concerns about psychological safety.

TARGET AUDIENCE

Journalists, activist investors, competitors, procurement teams

WHY IT MATTERS · EVIDENCE

LinkedIn screenshots carry disproportionate weight with boards and investors. E1·E2·E6·E7·E8

Graphic content normalised on public feeds

● EXPLOITABILITY MEDIUM

● URGENCY MEDIUM

Shares of crash aftermath, conflict footage, hunting results and violent clips—even with warnings—create brand-safety exposure and poor judgement optics when aggregated.

TARGET AUDIENCE

Client risk committees, press, social critics

WHY IT MATTERS · EVIDENCE

Graphic visuals are highly screenshottable and erode 'safe pair of hands' perception. E9·E10·E11·E12·E13·E14

Search and brand confusion

● EXPLOITABILITY MEDIUM

● URGENCY MEDIUM

Multiple 'Sentinel' and 'Sentinel Digital' entities and numerous 'Marcus Bennett' profiles complicate identity verification. Without owned assets (site, media bio), misattribution or wrong-company stories are more likely during announcement windows.
([companiesintheuk.co.uk](https://www.companiesintheuk.co.uk/ltd/sentinel-digital-1?utm_source=openai))

TARGET AUDIENCE

Journalists on deadline, competitors seeding doubt, diligence teams

WHY IT MATTERS · EVIDENCE

Ambiguity lets others define the subject before official materials do. E15

Gender-coded disparagement

● EXPLOITABILITY HIGH

● URGENCY MEDIUM

An appearance-based dismissal of a woman invites sexism narratives and HR governance questions, especially combined with broader incivility.

TARGET AUDIENCE

Reporters covering leadership standards, employee groups, buyers with DEI thresholds

WHY IT MATTERS · EVIDENCE

Sexism frames 'stick' and are difficult to rebut without stronger counter-proof. E3·E1

Red Team Assessment

How a competent adversary would convert the surface above into damage. Profiles, weaponisation paths, worst-case narrative.

Adversary profiles

JOURNALIST (BUSINESS OR TECH TRADE PRESS)

OBJECTIVE

Standards-in-leadership story; traffic and accountability framing.

PLAYBOOK

Compile LinkedIn/X screenshots; request comment from board/PE; publish montage-led piece ahead of appointment.

COMPETITOR

OBJECTIVE

Undermine credibility in sales cycles and investor conversations.

PLAYBOOK

Seed a curated deck of posts to key accounts; brief sector journalists; circulate within procurement forums.

PROCUREMENT OR CLIENT RISK TEAM

OBJECTIVE

Avoid supplier reputation exposure.

PLAYBOOK

Flag to internal sponsors; downgrade risk rating; require leadership substitution or additional assurances.

Weaponisation paths

- Create a visual reel of LinkedIn and cross-platform insults (E1–E8) titled ‘How this CEO talks about people’.
- Juxtapose graphic LinkedIn post (E9) with company values copy to allege hypocrisy.
- Use identity ambiguity to question legitimacy (‘Which Sentinel Digital?’) and delay deals, citing open-web confusion.
([companiesintheuk.co.uk])(https://www.companiesintheuk.co.uk/ltd/sentinel-digital-1?utm_source=openai)
- Pitch a ‘culture risk’ story to trade press timed to board announcement, including gender-coded example (E3).

This CEO lacks the judgement and temperament for a board-facing role: he belittles people in public and shares graphic content on professional channels—hardly the culture you want leading a company.

TIME TO EXPLOIT

Hours once the appointment is rumoured or announced; same news cycle if screenshots circulate.

Blue Team Assessment

Priorities, counter-narratives, and an owned action ledger.

Defensive priorities

- Stop the bleeding: remove or lock down high-risk posts and pause unsupervised posting.
- Establish identity control: deploy an authoritative bio and owned assets to anchor search.
- Reframe leadership: seed credible, values-aligned proof points that outweigh the June cluster.

Counter-narratives

- ‘Board-grade leadership is measured by how we treat people—inside and outside the company.’
- ‘We operate a zero-tolerance standard for public disparagement; we coach for candour without contempt.’
- ‘Our CEO invests in culture, safety and client trust; our channels reflect that discipline.’

Hardening actions

DECISION OWNER Communications Adviser

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 01 | HIGH · Comprehensive social audit and takedown of disparaging/graphic items (E1–E14); enable two-person review on all channels | CLIENT + COMMUNICATIONS ADVISER |
| | Remove primary screenshot fuel and prevent recurrence Expected benefit: Immediate reduction in exploitability and improved board confidence. Timeframe: immediate. | |
| 02 | HIGH · Issue a brief, non-defensive standards note on LinkedIn acknowledging tightened posting rules (no repeats, no excuses) | COMMUNICATIONS ADVISER |
| | Pre-empts ‘cover-up’ framing; sets future standard Expected benefit: Restores agency; signals governance. Timeframe: 7 days. | |
| 03 | HIGH · Publish owned executive bio page with verified affiliations, headshot, values and media contact; interlink from all profiles | TECHNICAL TEAM |
| | Resolve identity ambiguity and anchor search Expected benefit: Reduces misattribution; increases legitimacy. Timeframe: 30 days. | |
| 04 | MEDIUM · Draft and adopt a leadership social code (tone, topics, escalation path) | LEGAL COMPLIANCE ADVISER + COMMUNICATIONS ADVISER |
| | Institutionalise restraint and review Expected benefit: Sustained discipline and investor reassurance. Timeframe: 30 days. | |
| 05 | MEDIUM · Produce two board-grade thought pieces (governance/sector outlook) for LinkedIn and company site | CLIENT |
| | Replace negative salience with authoritative content Expected benefit: Authority and credibility uplift. Timeframe: 30 days. | |
| 06 | MEDIUM · Media coaching with focus on empathy language and de-escalation | COMMUNICATIONS ADVISER |
| | Correct behavioural triggers evident in June posts Expected benefit: Warmer, steadier executive signal. Timeframe: 30 days. | |
| 07 | LOW · Build a testimonials layer (board references, client quotes) on the bio page | CLIENT |
| | Third-party validation counters character frames Expected benefit: Trust and warmth. Timeframe: 90 days. | |

Monitoring triggers

- Any resurfacing of E1–E14 content or derivative screenshots.
- Unusual spikes in mentions combining ‘Marcus Bennett’ with ‘toxic’, ‘bully’, ‘graphic’, or ‘LinkedIn’.
- Media enquiries referencing ‘Sentinel Digital’ without accurate descriptors—signal of identity confusion.
([companiesintheuk.co.uk](https://www.companiesintheuk.co.uk/ltd/sentinel-digital-1?utm_source=openai))
- Employee or client forum threads discussing leadership tone or culture.
- New posts from the subject that include contempt, ad-hominem or graphic visuals.

Personal Brand & Outcome Alignment

From current persona to desired position — sequenced over 7, 30, and 90 days.

Desired outcome

A trusted, investor-grade CEO signal: authoritative, disciplined, empathetic, and verifiably linked to the right corporate entity.

Current position

Commercially conventional but exposed by a June cluster of incivility and graphic content; identity ambiguity persists in search due to multiple ‘Sentinel’ entities and no single authoritative bio anchoring results.

([companiesintheuk.co.uk](https://www.companiesintheuk.co.uk/ltd/sentinel-digital-1?utm_source=openai))

Risks to objective

- LinkedIn screenshots create sticky first impressions with boards/investors.
- Graphic posts undermine brand safety and judgement optics.
- Search ambiguity invites misattribution during announcement windows.
- Gender-coded insult fuels HR/governance narratives.

Positioning recommendations

- Lead with restraint: make civility a visible leadership standard.
- Own the biography: centralised, verifiable executive bio across channels.
- Replace salience: consistent publication of board-relevant analysis to outrank legacy posts.
- Third-party validation: board/client testimonials to strengthen trust heuristics.

Visibility strategy

Anchor identity with an owned bio page and LinkedIn as the primary public channel; restrict X/Twitter to corporate updates; avoid TikTok for personal commentary; run a 90-day editorial plan with two-person review.

7 / 30 / 90 day plan

07

DAY PLAN

- Priority: high | Action: Remove/lock E1–E14 items and pause personal posting | Rationale: Eliminate immediate exploitability | Benefit: Risk band reduction | Timeframe: immediate | Owner: client.
- Priority: high | Action: Publish a concise LinkedIn standards post committing to respectful discourse and content filters | Rationale: Reset public expectations | Benefit: Credibility and warmth | Timeframe: 7_days | Owner: communications_adviser.
- Priority: medium | Action: Update LinkedIn headline/about to emphasise governance, people leadership and client trust | Rationale: Counter ‘bullying’ frame | Benefit: Culture reassurance | Timeframe: 7_days | Owner: client.

30

DAY PLAN

- Priority: high | Action: Launch owned executive bio page with verified roles, media route and schema markup | Rationale: Resolve search ambiguity | Benefit: Legitimacy and control | Timeframe: 30_days | Owner: technical_team.
- Priority: medium | Action: Publish two long-form LinkedIn articles on sector outlook and leadership standards | Rationale: Replace narrative | Benefit: Authority signal | Timeframe: 30_days | Owner: client.
- Priority: medium | Action: Adopt leadership social code and implement 2-person approval for 6 months | Rationale: Governance assurance | Benefit: Investor confidence | Timeframe: 30_days | Owner: legal_compliance_adviser + communications_adviser.

90

DAY PLAN

- Priority: medium | Action: Secure two board-level references/testimonials and add to bio page | Rationale: Third-party proof | Benefit: Trust uplift | Timeframe: 90_days | Owner: client.
- Priority: low | Action: Place one controlled interview or podcast on leadership/culture | Rationale: Humanise and rebalance warmth/competence | Benefit: Perception resilience | Timeframe: 90_days | Owner: communications_adviser.
- Priority: low | Action: Build an evergreen ‘Our Standards’ content hub (no-ad-hominem, no-graphic) | Rationale: Codify expectations | Benefit: Reduced future risk | Timeframe: 90_days | Owner: technical_team.

Strategic Realism Briefings

Curated reading prepared by Hermes Digital.

Due Diligence Now Includes Digital Behaviour

Sets expectations for board and investor scrutiny of executive online conduct and how to pre-empt issues.

<https://hermesdigital.co.uk/strategic-realism/due-diligence-digital-behaviour>

Reading Digital Behaviour for Boardroom Risk

Framework to translate online tone and patterns into governance and culture risk for nominations committees.

<https://hermesdigital.co.uk/strategic-realism/digital-behaviour-boardroom-risk>

How to Check Your Own Digital Footprint Before Someone Else Does

Practical self-audit and remediation steps to execute the 7/30/90-day plan.

<https://hermesdigital.co.uk/strategic-realism/check-your-own-digital-footprint>

Analyst Confidence & Limitations

OVERALL

MEDIUM

Rationale

High clarity on a concentrated set of risky posts across multiple platforms; moderate uncertainty remains on historical behaviour and precise corporate identity anchoring.


Data gaps

- No authoritative, public executive bio or verified corporate site linking the subject to a specific ‘Sentinel Digital’. ([companiesintheuk.co.uk](https://www.companiesintheuk.co.uk/ltd/sentinel-digital-1?utm_source=openai))
- Pre-April 2026 content not assessed.
- Unknown privacy/deletion history; some flagged categories appeared in counts without itemised examples.

Caveats

- Risk scoring snapshot (severity 1–5; likelihood 1–5; score=sev×like×4): disparaging 4×4=64 (high); graphic/violent imagery 3×3=36 (medium); profanity 2×4=32 (medium); prejudice (gender-coded instance) 3×2=24 (low); politics/government 2×2=16 (low); weapons image 2×2=16 (low); threats 2×2=16 (low); self-harm 1×2=8 (low); drug/alcohol mention 2×2=16 (low); nudity/suggestive/rude gestures each 2×1=8 (low).
- Drivers increasing risk: LinkedIn as venue; recency (8–20 June 2026); cross-platform repetition.
- Drivers reducing risk: Issues appear concentrated in a brief window; no separate adverse media located during this review; footprint otherwise conventional.
- These scores are decision aids, not legal findings; identity ambiguity may blur attribution until owned assets are live. ([companiesintheuk.co.uk](https://www.companiesintheuk.co.uk/ltd/sentinel-digital-1?utm_source=openai))

Final Intelligence Judgement



On present evidence, Marcus Bennett’s footprint is not board-ready. A recent, multi-platform burst of incivility and graphic content—especially on LinkedIn—creates a high-risk narrative about temperament and culture. Proceed only with pre-boarding conditions: immediate content remediation, a visible standards reset, and identity control via owned assets. With disciplined execution over 30–90 days, the risk is manageable; without it, the appointment invites screenshot-driven scrutiny at the moment of maximum visibility.

Decision implications

Condition any appointment or investment on completion of the 7/30-day actions, implement a social governance protocol, and defer external announcements until search identity is anchored and LinkedIn is re-framed by fresh, board-grade content.

MONITORING RECOMMENDATION

Run continuous alerts on key terms for 90 days; manual weekly review of LinkedIn activity and search results; escalate immediately on media enquiries referencing the June posts or on identity-confusion signals.
([companiesintheuk.co.uk])(https://www.companiesintheuk.co.uk/ltd/sentinel-digital-1?utm_source=openai)