



COMPLIANCE LAYER

example.com Security Assessment Report

REPORT ID	CL-SR0FWDSN
TARGET DOMAIN	example.com
ASSESSMENT DATE	2026-08-06
OVERALL GRADE	B (87/100)
RISK LEVEL	LOW-MEDIUM
SCAN DURATION	30679ms
TOTAL ISSUES	23



Prepared for: sample@compliancelayer.net



Scan to check the assessment record
Scope: see Verification & Integrity



COMPLIANCE LAYER

example.com | 2026-08-06

Executive Summary

Assessment Overview for example.com

The infrastructure scan evaluated 14 of 15 security modules and identified 23 total issues.

0 critical and 2 high-severity findings require immediate remediation.

The weakest area is Security Headers, scoring 60/100 (Grade C).

Strongest module: Blacklists at 100/100 (Grade A).

Not assessed this scan: Privacy & Trackers.

CRITICAL
0

HIGH
2

MEDIUM
2

LOW
2

INFO
17

Issue Distribution



Priority Recommendations

- 1 Add header: Strict-Transport-Security: max-age=31536000; includeSubDomains
- 2 Add header: Content-Security-Policy: default-src 'self'



COMPLIANCE LAYER

example.com | 2026-08-06

Module Scores

MODULE	DESCRIPTION	SCORE		GRADE	WEIGHT	STATUS
Blacklists	IP & domain reputation lists	100		A	0%	Pass
Breach Monitor	Known data breaches	100		A	0%	Pass
Cookie Security	Cookie flags & attributes	100		A	6%	Pass
DNS & Email Auth	SPF, DKIM, DMARC	90		A	20%	Review
DNSSEC	DNS integrity & signing	90		A	4%	Review
Security Headers	HTTP response headers	60		C	25%	Action Needed
JavaScript	Client-side libraries	100		A	2%	Pass
Port Security	Open port exposure	100		A	15%	Pass
Reputation	Threat intelligence feeds	100		A	0%	Pass
SSL/TLS	Certificate & encryption	100		A	25%	Pass
Subdomains	Public certificate-record discovery	100		A	0%	Pass
Technology	Tech stack detection	100		A	0%	Pass
Privacy & Trackers	Third-party tracking	—			—	Not Assessed
WAF Detection	Web application firewall	100		A	3%	Pass
WHOIS	Domain registration	100		A	0%	Pass

Modules weighted 0% are informational: they are assessed and reported but do not affect the overall score.



Module Analysis

Security Headers HTTP response headers

60 C
/100

- Missing Strict-Transport-Security (HSTS) header
 - Missing Content-Security-Policy (CSP) header
 - Missing X-Frame-Options header
- +1 more finding(s) in the Security Findings section

DNS & Email Auth SPF, DKIM, DMARC

90 A
/100

- DMARC has no aggregate reporting address (rua)

DNSSEC DNS integrity & signing

90 A
/100

- No CAA records found

Blacklists IP & domain reputation lists

100 A
/100

- Domain and IP are clean on all 11 conclusively checked blacklists *Informational — not scored*

Breach Monitor Known data breaches

100 A
/100

- No known data breaches associated with this domain *Informational — not scored*

Cookie Security Cookie flags & attributes

100 A
/100

- No cookies set on initial page load *Informational — not scored*



COMPLIANCE LAYER

example.com | 2026-08-06

JavaScript Client-side libraries

100 /100 **A**

- No detectable JavaScript libraries with known patterns *Informational — not scored*

Port Security Open port exposure

100 /100 **A**

Reputation Threat intelligence feeds

100 /100 **A**

- VirusTotal: Clean (91 engines checked, 0 detections) *Informational — not scored*

SSL/TLS Certificate & encryption

100 /100 **A**

Subdomains Public certificate-record discovery

100 /100 **A**

- 2 subdomains found in public Certificate Transparency logs and public DNS datasets... *Informational — not scored*

Technology Tech stack detection

100 /100 **A**

- Using CDN: Cloudflare *Informational — not scored*

WAF Detection Web application firewall

100 /100 **A**

- WAF detected: Cloudflare (confidence: 100%) *Informational — not scored*

WHOIS Domain registration

100 /100 **A**

- WHOIS registrant details are publicly visible (typical for corporate domains) *Informational — not scored*



COMPLIANCE LAYER

example.com | 2026-08-06

Privacy & Trackers

This module did not produce a verdict.

Not Assessed



Security Findings

HIGH (2)

Missing Content-Security-Policy (CSP) header

Recommendation: Add header: Content-Security-Policy: default-src 'self'

Missing Strict-Transport-Security (HSTS) header

Recommendation: Add header: Strict-Transport-Security: max-age=31536000; includeSubDomains

MEDIUM (2)

DMARC has no aggregate reporting address (rua)

Recommendation: Add rua=mailto:dmarc-reports@yourdomain.com to receive reports

No CAA records found

Recommendation: Add CAA records to specify which Certificate Authorities can issue certificates for your domain. ...

LOW (2)

Missing X-Content-Type-Options header

Recommendation: Add header: X-Content-Type-Options: nosniff



COMPLIANCE LAYER

example.com | 2026-08-06

Missing X-Frame-Options header

Recommendation: Add header: X-Frame-Options: DENY or SAMEORIGIN

INFORMATIONAL — NOT SCORED (17)

2 subdomains found in public Certificate Transparency logs and public DNS datasets. Cer...

Recommendation: Audit the inventory periodically and retire unused hosts.

DNSSEC is properly configured using ECDSAP256SHA256

Recommendation: DNSSEC is protecting your domain from DNS spoofing.

Domain and IP are clean on all 11 conclusively checked blacklists

Recommendation: No action needed. Continue monitoring regularly.

Domain has good reputation (score: 100/100) - verified by Google Safe Browsing and Viru...

Recommendation: Continue maintaining good security practices.

Missing Permissions-Policy header

Recommendation: Add header: Permissions-Policy: geolocation=(), microphone=()

Missing Referrer-Policy header

Recommendation: Add header: Referrer-Policy: strict-origin-when-cross-origin



COMPLIANCE LAYER

example.com | 2026-08-06

Missing X-XSS-Protection header

Recommendation: Add header: X-XSS-Protection: 1; mode=block (note: deprecated in modern browsers, use CSP instead)

No cookies set on initial page load

Recommendation: This is normal for static sites. Cookies may be set after authentication.

No detectable JavaScript libraries with known patterns

Recommendation: Site may use bundled/minified code. Consider additional auditing tools.

No known data breaches associated with this domain

Recommendation: Continue monitoring. Consider breach monitoring services.

No sensitive subdomains identified among 2 discovered

Recommendation: Good hygiene. Continue monitoring for new subdomains.

No trackers detected in static HTML. This scan does not execute JavaScript; trackers lo...

Recommendation: For comprehensive privacy auditing, use tools that execute the page (e.g. Blacklight, Ghostery, o...

Technologies detected: Cloudflare, Cloudflare

Recommendation: Regular security updates for all technologies are recommended.



COMPLIANCE LAYER

example.com | 2026-08-06

Using CDN: Cloudflare

Recommendation: CDN provides performance and security benefits.

VirusTotal: Clean (91 engines checked, 0 detections)

Recommendation: Domain has good reputation.

WAF detected: Cloudflare (confidence: 100%)

Recommendation: WAF provides protection against common web attacks.

WHOIS registrant details are publicly visible (typical for corporate domains)

Recommendation: No action required. Individual registrants may prefer to enable WHOIS privacy.



COMPLIANCE LAYER

example.com | 2026-08-06

Compliance-Relevant Technical Controls

SOC 2 Type II

43%

control coverage



● Pass: 2/7 ● Partial: 2/7 ● Fail: 3/7

7 of 33 framework controls externally testable
6 further controls (MFA, backups, logging, incident response) require internal review

PCI DSS 4.0.1

31%

control coverage



● Pass: 2/8 ● Partial: 1/8 ● Fail: 5/8

8 controls externally testable
29 further controls (MFA, backups, logging, incident response) require internal review

HIPAA Security Rule

50%

control coverage



● Pass: 3/6 ● Partial: 0/6 ● Fail: 3/6

6 controls externally testable
18 further controls (MFA, backups, logging, incident response) require internal review

NIST CSF 2.0

20%

control coverage



● Pass: 1/5 ● Partial: 0/5 ● Fail: 4/5

5 of 106 framework controls externally testable
19 further controls (MFA, backups, logging, incident response) require internal review

ISO 27001:2022

31%

control coverage



● Pass: 2/8 ● Partial: 1/8 ● Fail: 5/8

8 of 93 framework controls externally testable
18 further controls (MFA, backups, logging, incident response) require internal review

CIS Controls v8

31%

control coverage



● Pass: 2/8 ● Partial: 1/8 ● Fail: 5/8

8 of 153 framework controls externally testable
20 further controls (MFA, backups, logging, incident response) require internal review



COMPLIANCE LAYER

example.com | 2026-08-06

ComplianceLayer assesses externally observable technical controls. This report does not constitute a compliance certification. Full compliance requires organizational controls, policies, and formal audits.
Control names are summaries for readability, not quotations; refer to each standard, by control ID, for authoritative wording.

Compliance record digest: 799A-9913-3115-7D69 - compare with the value shown at the verification URL on the cover.



COMPLIANCE LAYER

example.com | 2026-08-06

Assessed Controls

Control identifiers are authoritative; names are our summaries. Look up wording in the standard using the identifier.

SOC 2 Type II

CC6.6	FAIL	Security measures against threats
CC6.7	FAIL	Restrict transmission/movement of data
CC6.8	FAIL	Prevent/detect unauthorized software
CC6.1	PARTIAL	Logical and Physical Access Controls
CC9.1	PARTIAL	Business continuity objectives
CC7.1	PASS	Detect configuration changes
CC7.2	PASS	Monitor system components

PCI DSS 4.0.1

1.2.1	FAIL	Restrict connections
11.6.1	FAIL	Change/tamper detection mechanisms
2.2.4	FAIL	Configure system security parameters
4.2.1	FAIL	Strong cryptography
6.2.4	FAIL	Software engineering techniques prevent cross-site scripting
5.4.1	PARTIAL	Mechanisms detect and protect personnel against phishing attacks
1.3.1	PASS	Restrict inbound traffic
2.2.5	PASS	Enable only necessary services

HIPAA Security Rule

164.308(a)(5)(ii)(B)	FAIL	Protection from malicious software
164.312(c)(1)	FAIL	Integrity
164.312(e)(1)	FAIL	Transmission Security
164.308(a)(1)(ii)(D)	PASS	Information system activity review
164.312(a)(1)	PASS	Access Control
164.312(e)(2)(ii)	PASS	Encryption

NIST CSF 2.0

PR.DS-01	FAIL	The confidentiality, integrity, and availability of data-at-rest are protected
PR.DS-02	FAIL	The confidentiality, integrity, and availability of data-in-transit are protected
PR.IR-01	FAIL	Networks and environments are protected from unauthorized logical access and usage
PR.PS-01	FAIL	Configuration management practices are established and applied
ID.RA-01	PASS	Vulnerabilities in assets are identified, validated, and recorded



COMPLIANCE LAYER

example.com | 2026-08-06

ISO 27001:2022

A.8.20	FAIL	Networks security
A.8.26	FAIL	Application security requirements
A.8.27	FAIL	Secure system architecture and engineering principles
A.8.7	FAIL	Protection against malware
A.8.8	FAIL	Management of technical vulnerabilities
A.5.14	PARTIAL	Information transfer
A.8.15	PASS	Logging
A.8.24	PASS	Use of cryptography

CIS Controls v8

12.2	FAIL	Secure network architecture
16.1	FAIL	Secure application development process
16.11	FAIL	Use standard hardening configuration
3.10	FAIL	Encrypt sensitive data in transit
4.1	FAIL	Establish secure configuration process
9.5	PARTIAL	Implement DMARC
13.1	PASS	Network monitoring and defense
9.2	PASS	Use DNS filtering services



COMPLIANCE LAYER

example.com | 2026-08-06

About This Report

Assessment Methodology

This report was generated by the ComplianceLayer Infrastructure Risk Intelligence platform. The assessment performs non-intrusive external scanning across 15 security modules: 8 carry scoring weight proportional to underwriting materiality, and 7 are informational (assessed and reported, but not scored).

Modules: Blacklists, Breach Monitor, Cookie Security, DNS & Email Auth, DNSSEC, JavaScript, Port Security, Privacy & Trackers, Reputation, SSL/TLS, Security Headers, Subdomains, Technology, WAF Detection, WHOIS.

Compliance mapping covers SOC 2 Type II, PCI DSS 4.0.1, HIPAA Security Rule, NIST CSF 2.0, ISO 27001:2022, CIS Controls v8.

Important Caveats & Limitations

- This score assesses externally observable technical controls only. It does not evaluate internal security, policies, procedures, or organizational maturity.
- A high score indicates strong external hygiene but does not guarantee insurability. Other factors include claims history, industry sector, revenue, data handling practices, and incident response capabilities.
- A low score indicates technical gaps that should be remediated, but does not automatically disqualify coverage. Underwriters will assess compensating controls and risk appetite.
- External scans cannot detect internal threats such as insider risk, weak passwords, unpatched endpoints, lack of MFA, or inadequate backups. These are assessed separately.
- This is a point-in-time assessment. Security posture changes over time. Continuous monitoring is recommended for maintained visibility.
- Some checks may produce false negatives (e.g., DKIM with custom selectors). Manually verify configurations with service providers when applicable.



COMPLIANCE LAYER

example.com | 2026-08-06

Grading Scale

A	90-100 Low Risk	B	75-89 Low-Medium Risk	C	55-74 Medium Risk	D	35-54 High Risk	F	0-34 Critical Risk
----------	---------------------------	----------	---------------------------------	----------	-----------------------------	----------	---------------------------	----------	------------------------------

Severity Levels

CRITICAL	HIGH	MEDIUM	LOW	INFO
Immediate action	Urgent fix needed	Should address soon	Minor improvement	Informational only

Verification & Integrity

Verification URL: <https://compliancelayer.net/verify/CL-SR0FWDSN>
Compliance record digest: 799A-9913-3115-7D69

What verification confirms:

- The report file as a whole. The SHA-256 digest shown at the verification URL is taken over the complete document, so the compliance table and every finding in it are covered by that one value even though their contents are not repeated on the page.
- The target domain, assessment date, overall score and grade, risk level, issue counts and module scores, read from the record created when the scan ran.
- Whether this assessment is still current, or has been superseded by a corrected scan engine.

What verification does NOT confirm:

- Any file whose digest does not match. ComplianceLayer cannot attest to a document it did not serve: compute this file's SHA-256 digest and compare it with the one shown at the verification URL.
- A report the verification page reports as not attested. Those were issued before document binding existed and cannot be proven retroactively, because no record was kept of what was emitted.
- Anything added by a reseller or intermediary after the report was issued, including white-label branding.
- Whether the organisation is compliant. This is an external technical assessment, not a certification.

This report is generated from external, non-intrusive scanning and may not reflect all internal security controls.
Results should be validated by qualified security personnel. ComplianceLayer is not a substitute for professional security assessment.