



A BRAND GUIDE & FILLABLE CHECKLIST

Influencer Vetting Checklist.

A complete six-section creator due-diligence framework — engagement authenticity, audience quality, content consistency, sponsored performance, brand safety, and commercial readiness. Use it before confirming any paid or gifted partnership.

06

Sections



Pass



Flag



Fail

FOR BRANDS & MARKETING TEAMS

Influencer Vetting Checklist.

"Reach that does not reach the right people is not reach — it is waste. The point of vetting is to catch that distinction before the contract, not after the campaign."

DOCUMENT

Resource 14

FORMAT

Guide + Fillable Checklist

TIME PER CREATOR

20–30 minutes

INSIDE THIS CHECKLIST

Six sections · 23 check items · Letter portrait

Contents.

THE SIX VETTING SECTIONS

01	Engagement Authenticity	09
	Real humans · or inflated numbers?	
02	Audience Quality	12
	Does the audience match your target?	
03	Content Quality & Consistency	14
	Production standard · cadence · niche fit	
04	Sponsored Performance	17
	How commercial content actually performs	
05	Brand Safety & Values	19
	Historical content · community · controversy	
06	Commercial Readiness	21
	Professional · responsive · contract-ready	

GUIDE & REFERENCE

How to Use This Checklist	04
Pass / flag / fail — and when to use it.	
Five Principles of Vetting	05
Discipline that separates good programmes from bad.	
The Six Sections at a Glance	06
One-page map of the whole framework.	
Authenticity · the principle	08
Why engagement is the first signal — and the loudest.	
Creator Basic Information	07
Complete before the checklist.	
Brand Safety · the principle	16
Association is endorsement — vet for it.	
Overall Creator Score	23
Section ratings transferred to one summary.	
Red Flags Quick Reference	24
Bookmark this page.	
About LMG Media	26
How we support vetting end to end.	



HOW TO USE THIS CHECKLIST

A structured framework — **three ratings**, one decision.

Work through all six sections for every creator you are seriously considering for a paid or gifted partnership. Each check item is rated against one of three indicators: **Pass**, **Flag**, or **Fail**. At the end of each section, record your section score using the guide provided. Transfer section scores to the Overall Creator Score at the end of the document.

When to use this checklist: before confirming any paid partnership, before adding a creator to a gifting or seeding programme, when reviewing applications to a brand ambassador programme, or when

evaluating a creator recommended by a third party or agency.

What you will need: access to the creator's social media profiles, a third-party analytics tool (HypeAuditor, Modash, or equivalent) for Sections 1 and 2, and 20–30 minutes per creator.

The checklist is designed to be printed, completed by hand, and filed with the campaign record — or used as a working document in a PDF editor. Either way, it leaves an audit trail.

Five Principles of Creator Vetting

Specific signals. Honest answers. Filed decisions.

Creator vetting is the single highest-leverage decision in influencer marketing. The discipline below produces clear, defensible decisions — and an audit trail that protects the brand and the budget.

01**Vet every creator**

Including the ones you've worked with before. Audiences shift, content drifts, and last quarter's pass is not this quarter's pass.

02**Use third-party data**

Audience authenticity tools surface fraud the platform doesn't show you. A creator's self-reported audience is one data point, not the answer.

03**Score every section**

An overall impression is worth less than six section ratings. The structure exists to overrule your instinct when the data disagrees with it.

04**Flag don't fail too quickly**

A flag is a conversation — not a rejection. The vetting framework's role is to surface questions to ask, not to deliver a final verdict.

05**File every decision**

A completed checklist is the audit trail. Keep it with the campaign record — the next time you brief a creator, this page tells you why you trusted them.

Reach that does not reach the right people is not reach — it is waste. The vetting checklist catches that distinction before the contract, not after the campaign.

— LMG MEDIA VETTING DESK

THE FRAMEWORK

Influencer Vetting Checklist

LMG
MEDIA

☐ Pros/agent Contacts

☐ Social Media Content

☐ Reputation & Past Behavior

☐ Content & Engagement

☐ Sponsored Content

☐ Brand Safety

☐ Overall Score

"Six sections, twenty-three checks, one defensible decision."

SIX SECTIONS AT A GLANCE

A one-page map of the whole checklist.

All six vetting sections, the order they appear in, and what each one tests for.

01 Engagement Authenticity

Real humans or inflated numbers.

4 CHECKS

02 Audience Quality

Match against target customer profile.

4 CHECKS

03 Content Quality

Production, cadence, niche, aesthetic.

4 CHECKS

04 Sponsored Performance

Commercial content drop-off vs organic.

3 CHECKS

05 Brand Safety

Content history, community, public profile.

4 CHECKS

06 Commercial Readiness

Responsive, contract-ready, transparent.

4 CHECKS

Creator Basic Information

Creator basics.

REQUIRED

Complete this section before beginning the checklist. It anchors the audit trail — and gives anyone reviewing the decision later the context to read it correctly.

CREATOR NAME / HANDLE	<u>@handle</u>		
PRIMARY PLATFORM	<u>e.g. Instagram</u>	SECONDARY PLATFORM(S)	<u>e.g. TikTok, YouTube</u>
FOLLOWER COUNT	<u>on primary platform</u>	TIER	<u>Nano · Micro · Mid · Large · Mega</u>
CONTENT NICHE	<u>e.g. Fashion · Beauty · Luxury</u>	GEOGRAPHIC BASE	<u>City, country</u>
DATE OF EVALUATION	<u></u>	EVALUATED BY	<u>Name and title</u>
CAMPAIGN CONSIDERED FOR	<u>Campaign name / programme</u>		

A note on filing. A completed vetting checklist is part of the campaign record. Save it with the brief and contract. The next time the brand briefs a creator, this checklist tells you why you trusted them — and the next time it doesn't, it tells you why you didn't.

THE PRINCIPLE BEHIND SECTION 01

The first signal – and the loudest.

Engagement authenticity is the first section of the checklist for a reason. A creator who passes every other section but fails this one is paying you to broadcast to bots – and bots, for the avoidance of doubt, do not buy your product.

The four checks in Section 01 test for four different failure modes: **inflated engagement**, **fake comments**, **purchased followers**, and **low audience-quality scores**. Each one is independently meaningful – and each one, on its own, is enough to deprioritise the creator.

Third-party data is non-negotiable here. Platform-reported numbers will not show you what HypeAuditor or Modash will. If you are not using an audience-authenticity tool, you are not vetting – you are guessing.

SECTION 01 · PRINCIPLE



"Bots, for the avoidance of doubt, do not buy your product."

Section 01

Engagement Authenticity.

REQUIRED

Determine whether the creator's engagement is generated by real, active humans — or artificially inflated through purchased followers, bot activity, or engagement pods.

1.1 Engagement Rate vs Platform Benchmark

Calculate the creator's average engagement rate across their last 12 posts: $(\text{likes} + \text{comments} \div \text{followers} \times 100)$.

TIER	FOLLOWERS	HEALTHY ENGAGEMENT
Nano	1K – 10K	5–10%
Micro	10K – 100K	3–6%
Mid-tier	100K – 500K	1.5–3%
Large	500K – 1M	1–2%
Mega	1M+	0.5–1.5%

TikTok: healthy 3–8% across all tiers. **YouTube:** view-to-subscriber ratio of 20–50% is healthy.

CREATOR'S RATE

__%

- ☐  Within or above benchmark for tier
- ☐  30–50% below benchmark — investigate
- ☐  More than 50% below benchmark

Engagement rates dramatically above benchmark (15%+ for a mid-tier creator) can also indicate pod activity — flag for further investigation.

1.2 Comment Quality Assessment

Review the comments on the last 10 posts. Genuine comments reference the post specifically, ask questions, share personal stories, or sustain conversation. Fake or pod comments are generic ("🔥 amazing!"), repeat from the same small group, or come from accounts with no profile.

- ☐  Majority of comments are genuine and contextual

Section 01 · continued

Growth pattern & audience quality.

REQUIRED

1.3 Follower Growth Pattern

Use a third-party tool (HypeAuditor, Modash, Social Blade) to review historical growth. **Healthy:** gradual upward trend with explainable spikes. **Suspicious:** sudden +10K spikes with no viral content, sharp drops followed by sharp rises, or perfectly linear growth.

- ☐ ☒ Growth is consistent with organic audience building
- ☐ ☒ One or two unexplained spikes — ask the creator for context
- ☐ ☒ Multiple suspicious spikes or clearly non-organic patterns

1.4 Follower Quality Score

Use a third-party tool to check the audience authenticity score — the estimated percentage of real, active followers.

AUTHENTICITY SCORE

- ☐ ☒ 85%+ real followers — proceed
- ☐ ☒ 70–85% — investigate further
- ☐ ☒ Below 70% — significant fraud risk

SECTION 01 SCORE

☒ Pass ☒ Flag ☒ Fail

4 passes: Strong — proceed to Section 2. **3 passes + 1 flag:** Acceptable — note the flag. **2+ flags:** Investigate further. **Any fail:** Serious concern — strong recommendation to deprioritise.

RATING ☐ Strong ☐ Acceptable ☐ Investigate ☐ Fail

Section 02

Audience Quality.

REQUIRED

Verify that the creator's audience matches your target customer profile. Reach that does not reach the right people is not reach — it is waste.

2.1 Geographic Distribution

Request audience demographic data from the creator, or use a third-party tool. Check the percentage of audience in your target market(s) and whether the geography is consistent with the creator's stated location and content focus.

MARKET	CREATOR'S %	TARGET %	MATCH?
Target market 1			Y/N
Target market 2			

- ☐  Distribution is consistent with target market requirements
- ☐  Partial match — some but not majority in target markets
- ☐  Majority of audience in markets with no brand relevance

2.2 Age and Gender Demographics

DEMOGRAPHIC	CREATOR'S AUDIENCE	YOUR TARGET	MATCH?
Primary age range			
Gender split			

- ☐  Demographic profile aligns with target customer
- ☐  Partial alignment — review whether misalignment is material
- ☐  Significant demographic mismatch with target customer

Section 02 · continued

Interest & purchasing power.

REQUIRED

2.3 Audience Interest Alignment

Does the creator's audience demonstrate interest in the category relevant to your brand?

Review: what other accounts the audience follows (available in some analytics tools), what topics the audience engages with in comment sections, whether the audience appears genuinely interested in the creator's niche — or whether they are a broad, general audience that followed for a one-off viral moment.

- ☐  Audience is clearly interested in the relevant category
- ☐  Broad audience with mixed interest signals
- ☐  Interest profile does not align with brand category

2.4 Audience Income and Purchasing Power

PREMIUM / LUXURY CAMPAIGNS

Particularly important for luxury, high-consideration, and premium-priced brands. Indicators of a higher-income audience: creator's content focuses on premium products and experiences, geographic concentration in high-income markets, comment section reflects aspirational and purchase-oriented behaviour, partnership history includes premium brands.

- ☐  Audience purchasing power aligns with product price point
- ☐  Some signals but not conclusive
- ☐  Clearly misaligned with product price point

N/A — not relevant for this campaign

SECTION 02 SCORE



Pass



Flag



Fail

4 passes: Strong audience alignment. **3 passes + 1 flag:** Acceptable — note the flag. **2+ flags or any fail:** Audience quality concern — reassess creator fit.

RATING ☐ Strong ☐ Acceptable ☐ Investigate ☐ Fail

Section 03

Content Quality & Consistency.

REQUIRED

Assess whether the creator produces content that meets your brand's standard — and whether they do so consistently.

3.1 Visual and Production Quality

Review the last 30 days of content across all relevant formats. **Photo / static:** photography quality, alignment with brand visual world, distinguishable from generic stock. **Video:** resolution, lighting, audio, editing, pacing, on-camera presence.

- ☐  Content quality meets brand standard consistently
- ☐  Quality is inconsistent — some strong, others substandard
- ☐  Consistently below the standard your brand requires

3.2 Posting Consistency

Review posting frequency over the last 90 days.

PLATFORM	HEALTHY POSTING FREQUENCY
Instagram	3-7 posts per week · including Stories
TikTok	3-7 videos per week
YouTube	1-4 videos per month
LinkedIn	3-5 posts per week

CREATOR'S FREQUENCY

posts per week

- ☐  Frequency is consistent and within healthy range
- ☐  Dropped significantly in the last 30 days — ask why
- ☐  Creator has been inactive or inconsistent for 60+ days

Section 03 · continued

Niche & aesthetic alignment.

REQUIRED

3.3 Niche Consistency

Has the creator's focus shifted in the last 6 months? Is the content you'd be sponsoring consistent with the majority of their organic output? Are there signs of audience confusion related to content drift?

- ☐ ☒ Niche focus is consistent and stable
- ☐ ☒ Some content drift — monitor whether it is temporary
- ☐ ☒ Significant niche shift disrupting audience engagement

3.4 Aesthetic Alignment with Your Brand

A judgment call — but an important one. Does the creator's visual world feel compatible with your brand? Would your product look natural in their feed, or would it stand out as incongruous?

- ☐ ☒ Strong alignment — product would feel at home in their content
- ☐ ☒ Partial alignment — creative brief may need adjustment
- ☐ ☒ Aesthetic mismatch — the worlds do not align

SECTION 03 SCORE



Pass



Flag



Fail

4 passes: Strong content fit. **3 passes + 1 flag:** Acceptable. **2+ flags or any fail:** Content concern — address with creative brief or reconsider.

RATING



Strong



Acceptable



Investigate



Fail

Section 04

Sponsored Content Performance.

REQUIRED

Assess how the creator's audience responds to commercial content specifically — not just organic posts. Sponsored-content drop-off is the single most under-evaluated vetting signal.

4.1 Sponsored Content Engagement Rate

Review the last 3–5 pieces of clearly sponsored content. Calculate the average engagement rate on sponsored posts vs the creator's overall average.

ORGANIC ER	<u> </u> %	SPONSORED ER	<u> </u> %
RATIO (SPONSORED ÷ ORGANIC)	<u> </u>		

- ☐  **Above 70%** of organic — performs comparably
- ☐  **50–70%** of organic — some drop-off, review
- ☐  **Below 50%** of organic — significant disengagement

4.2 Sponsored Content Integration Quality

Good integration: sponsorships feel natural to the creator's voice, brand mentions feel like recommendations not script readings, creator is selective. **Poor integration:** tone switch between organic and sponsored, scripted delivery, every-other-post is sponsored, generic captions.

- ☐  Integrates brand partnerships naturally and selectively
- ☐  Some forced moments but generally acceptable
- ☐  Clearly struggles with sponsored content integration

SECTION 05 · PRINCIPLE

THE PRINCIPLE BEHIND SECTION 05

Association is endorsement.

Brand-safety vetting is not about finding reasons to reject creators. It is about understanding what your brand will be associated with by working with this person — and whether the association is one your brand can defend.

Three dimensions matter. **Historical content** — what has the creator posted over the last 12 months, including older posts that may be less visible? **Community culture** — what does their comment section read like, and how do they moderate it? **Public profile** — has the creator been the subject of any press coverage or controversy that would surface in due diligence?

The fourth check — disclosure compliance history — is the only one where you can correct the issue through briefing. The first three, you cannot. They sit in the public record, and they travel with every campaign you do together.

"Association is endorsement. Vet for it before the campaign — not after the incident."

Section 04 · continued

Competitive partnership history.

REQUIRED

4.3 Competitive Partnership History

Review the creator's recent brand partnerships for competitive conflicts. Has the creator worked with a **direct competitor** in the last 90 days? Are there existing partnerships that would create brand-association conflicts? Does the creator's partnership history reflect a brand-agnostic ("will work with anyone") or selective, values-driven approach?

- ☐  No competitive conflicts — selective partnership approach
- ☐  Adjacent partnerships warranting an exclusivity conversation
- ☐  Direct competitive partnership conflict within last 90 days

RECENT PARTNERSHIPS

List the brands the creator has partnered with in the last 90 days, with platform and approx. date...

SECTION 04 SCORE

 Pass

 Flag

 Fail

3 passes: Strong commercial performance. 2 passes + 1 flag: Acceptable. Any fail in 4.1 or 4.3: Significant concern — proceed only with clear mitigation plan.

RATING ☐ Strong ☐ Acceptable ☐ Investigate ☐ Fail

Section 05

Brand Safety & Values.

REQUIRED

Identify any content, positions, or community behaviour that could create reputational risk for your brand through association.

5.1 Historical Content Review

*Review the creator's content going back at least **12 months** — including older posts that may be less visible. Check for content that conflicts with your brand's values, controversial positions, content that would violate your brand's community standards, inappropriate humour or discriminatory language.*

- ☐  No brand safety concerns identified
- ☐  Some content warrants a conversation or monitoring
- ☐  Content creates clear brand safety risk

5.2 Community Culture

*Review the tone and culture of the creator's comment section. **Healthy:** respectful discussion, active moderation, welcoming and inclusive tone. **Concerning:** hostile or discriminatory culture, unmoderated inappropriate content, pile-ons directed at other users.*

- ☐  Community culture is healthy and brand-safe
- ☐  Some concerning elements — monitor before committing
- ☐  Community culture represents a brand safety risk

Section 05 · continued

Press history & disclosure.

REQUIRED

5.3 Public Profile and Press History

Search the creator's name and handle for press coverage, public controversies, or social media incidents. Recommended search terms:

[Creator name] controversy
 [Creator handle] cancelled
 [Creator name] lawsuit / legal
 [Creator name] [past brand partnership] issues

- ☐  No significant public controversies or incidents
- ☐  Historic incidents that have been addressed and resolved
- ☐  Active controversy or unresolved brand safety incident

5.4 Disclosure Compliance History

Review existing sponsored content. Are partnerships clearly labelled? Is disclosure appropriate for the markets where content is distributed? Any evidence of past non-disclosure attracting regulatory attention?

- ☐  Consistently discloses partnerships correctly
- ☐  Inconsistent disclosure – addressable through briefing
- ☐  Systematic non-disclosure or intentional non-compliance

SECTION 05 SCORE



Pass



Flag



Fail

4 passes: Strong brand safety. **3 passes + 1 flag:** Acceptable with monitoring. **Any fail:** Brand safety risk – strong recommendation to deprioritise.

RATING ☐ Strong ☐ Acceptable ☐ Investigate ☐ Fail

Section 06

Commercial Readiness.

REQUIRED

Assess whether the creator is prepared and equipped to operate as a professional brand partner.

6.1 Responsiveness and Professionalism

If you've already made contact: did they respond within a reasonable timeframe (48–72 hours for email, 24–48 hours for DM)? Was communication clear, professional, engaged? Did they ask relevant campaign questions? Were they represented by a manager or agent? (Representation is not a red flag — at larger tiers it indicates a professional approach.)

- ☐  Responsive, professional, and engaged
- ☐  Slow to respond or communication quality is inconsistent
- ☐  Unresponsive, unprofessional, or disengaged

N/A — not yet contacted

6.2 Analytics Access

Is the creator willing and able to share audience analytics? Have they provided or agreed to provide audience demographic data? Are they able to share post-level performance data after content goes live?

- ☐  Willing and able to share analytics on request
- ☐  Willing but limited access (common at nano / micro tier)
- ☐  Unwilling to share audience data — significant red flag

Section 06 · continued

Rate, terms & contract readiness.

REQUIRED

6.3 Rate and Commercial Terms

Are the creator's commercial terms reasonable and transparent? Is the rate within benchmark range for their tier and platform? Have they been transparent about what is included? Are usage rights, exclusivity, and additional fees discussed openly?

- ☐ ☒ Rates and terms reasonable, transparent, and benchmarkable
- ☐ ☒ Above-benchmark rate with justification under discussion
- ☐ ☒ Significantly above benchmark with no justification — or opaque terms

6.4 Contract and Compliance Readiness

Is the creator willing to sign a formal contract? Do they understand and accept disclosure obligations? If represented, is their management responsive and professional?

- ☐ ☒ Willing to work within contract and compliance framework
- ☐ ☒ Some hesitation — addressable through conversation
- ☐ ☒ Unwilling to sign contracts or comply with disclosure

SECTION 06 SCORE



Pass



Flag



Fail

4 passes: Strong commercial readiness. **3 passes + 1 flag:** Acceptable. **Any fail in 6.2 or 6.4:** Proceed only with clear mitigation plan.

RATING ☐ Strong ☐ Acceptable ☐ Investigate ☐ Fail

OVERALL DECISION FRAMEWORK

How section ratings add up.

Once every section is scored, this framework converts the ratings into one of four overall outcomes. Apply it before moving to the Overall Creator Score on the next page.

SECTION PROFILE	OVERALL OUTCOME
6 Strong	Excellent creator – high confidence recommendation to proceed
4–5 Strong, remainder Acceptable	Good creator – proceed with noted observations
3+ Acceptable, no Fails	Acceptable creator – proceed with clear brief and monitoring plan
Any Investigate	Requires further due diligence before decision
Any Fail in Sections 1, 2, or 5	Strong recommendation to deprioritise – fraud, audience mismatch, or brand safety risk
Any Fail in Sections 3, 4, or 6	Significant concern – proceed only with clear mitigation plan

☐ **Proceed**
Creator meets standards across all sections.

☐ **Proceed with conditions**
Noted flags to monitor or address in the brief.

☐ **Further investigation required**
Specific sections need resolution before decision.

☐ **Do not proceed**
One or more fail ratings in critical sections.

Overall Creator Vetting Score

Transfer your section ratings here.

REQUIRED

01 – Engagement Authenticity	☐ Strong	☐ Acceptable	☐ Investigate	☐ Fail
02 – Audience Quality	☐ Strong	☐ Acceptable	☐ Investigate	☐ Fail
03 – Content Quality & Consistency	☐ Strong	☐ Acceptable	☐ Investigate	☐ Fail
04 – Sponsored Content Performance	☐ Strong	☐ Acceptable	☐ Investigate	☐ Fail
05 – Brand Safety & Values Alignment	☐ Strong	☐ Acceptable	☐ Investigate	☐ Fail
06 – Commercial Readiness	☐ Strong	☐ Acceptable	☐ Investigate	☐ Fail

Notes and observations

Use this space to record any flags raised, conversations to have, or conditions to attach to the partnership...

DECISION MADE BY

DATE

QUICK REFERENCE

Red flags at a glance.

Print or bookmark this page for fast reference during creator review sessions. The left column lists immediate deprioritise signals; the right column lists yellow flags that warrant further investigation before deciding.

**IMMEDIATE RED FLAGS –
DEPRIORITISE**

- ✗ Audience authenticity score below **70%**
- ✗ Engagement rate more than **50% below** platform benchmark
- ✗ Multiple unexplained follower growth spikes
- ✗ Active public controversy or unresolved brand safety incident
- ✗ Unwillingness to share audience data
- ✗ Unwillingness to sign a contract or comply with disclosure
- ✗ Direct competitive brand partnership within the last 90 days

**YELLOW FLAGS – INVESTIGATE
FURTHER**

- ! Engagement rate **30–50%** below benchmark
- ! Sponsored content engagement below **50%** of organic rate
- ! Geographic audience concentration misaligned with target market
- ! Significant recent shift in content niche or aesthetic
- ! Inconsistent posting frequency in the last 30 days
- ! Above-benchmark rate without clear justification

A note on flags. Yellow flags are not rejections. They are questions to ask. The vetting framework's role is to surface those questions *before* the contract – at a stage where they cost a conversation, not a campaign.



"Read every line. Then file it with the campaign record."

PRE-DECISION CHECKLIST

Ten checks before sign-off.

A positive checklist — read each line and confirm. If any line is missing, the checklist is not ready to be filed.

PRE-DECISION · TEN CHECKS

- ☐ **01** · Creator basic information is complete
- ☐ **02** · All six sections have a Pass / Flag / Fail mark on every item
- ☐ **03** · Section scores are tallied and a section rating is recorded
- ☐ **04** · Third-party authenticity data has been consulted
- ☐ **05** · Geographic and demographic data has been verified
- ☐ **06** · Sponsored content engagement rate has been calculated
- ☐ **07** · Competitive partnership history checked for last 90 days
- ☐ **08** · Public profile search completed using all four search terms
- ☐ **09** · Notes and observations recorded for any flags raised
- ☐ **10** · Overall decision marked and signed by the decision-maker



Defensible decisions, made before the contract — not after the campaign.

ABOUT LMG MEDIA

Where Quality Brands Meet **Iconic Influence.**

LMG Media is an influencer marketing agency working with brands across **fashion, beauty, luxury, fitness, gaming, ecommerce, and tech** — in markets including London, New York, Dubai, Los Angeles, Miami, and Paris.

If you would like support building a vetted, high-performing creator programme for your brand — from

initial creator sourcing through audience-authenticity analysis, brand-safety review, brief, contract, and reporting — get in touch.

This checklist is provided as a practical framework for creator evaluation. It does not constitute a guarantee of creator performance. All vetting decisions remain the responsibility of the commissioning brand or agency.

[Start Your Campaign →](#)

[Get in Touch](#)

lmg.media

HOW WE WORK WITH BRANDS

Vetting as a working programme, not a one-off check.

If you would like support at any point in the vetting-to-campaign-to-report process, we work as an end-to-end agency partner or on a single-stage basis. Most of our clients begin with creator sourcing and vetting, and expand into the rest of the workflow over time.

01**Creator sourcing**

Active networks across fashion, beauty, luxury, fitness, gaming, ecommerce, and tech in six global markets.

02**Audience & brand-safety vetting**

Third-party authenticity analysis, brand-safety review, sponsored-content drop-off check — completed before any brief is issued.

03**Brief, contract, approval**

All three template families (Resources 11, 12, and this one) run as a working operating system, not loose documents.

04**Performance reporting**

7-day and 30-day post-live reporting, against the vetting-stage benchmarks recorded in this document.

[Start Your Campaign →](#)[Get in Touch](#)[lmg.media](#)



*Where Quality Brands
Meet **Iconic** **Influence**.*

Vet

| *Brief*

| *Contract*

| *Report*
