

Secure code review evidence (SAMPLE)

Fernbrook Systems

Period	Last 90 days, 2 June 2026 to 31 August 2026
Produced	31 August 2026 by the sample report
Export reference	sample-p90d
Named detail	Open: named per-person detail is included for the roles entitled to it.
Plan	Business

NOT EVIDENCE. This is a sample document produced from invented data so that a buyer can read one before paying. Every name, score and date in it was made up, and it is not recorded against any organisation.

What this is

Each exercise is a staged merge request against a working codebase: a browser, its commits and the diff a reviewer would actually open, written to look like ordinary feature work.

Findings are planted in that diff by hand, each with a CWE identifier, the exact lines, and a written explanation. Safe spots that reviewers commonly flag are planted to gauge the system, so false positives are measured too.

Grading runs on the server against a prepared answer that is never sent to the browser. The reviewer submits the lines they flagged and the weaknesses they think are in it, and the score is computed on the server, so a submission cannot be forged.

A finding is caught only when the lines match and the classification is right. The reviewer gets credit for the correct family as well as the exact weakness, and both are recorded.

Assessment work is kept separate from training in the database. Everything in this report comes from assessments an administrator set. Practice a developer does on their own account never reaches it.

The grading policy is published in full and does not change per customer. It is at justappsec.com/docs/how-a-review-works.

What this record does not establish

What this record establishes: that the account named against each result was signed in, submitted those findings in the window shown, and was marked on our server against a prepared answer the browser never receives. The exercise is never published, so it cannot be practised beforehand. Hints and walkthroughs are off unless an administrator switched them on, which is stated on each row.

What it does not establish: who was at the keyboard. The sitting is not invigilated. Nothing here shows whether the named person worked alone, whether someone was helping, or whether the diff was pasted into another tool. We only see what the product offered and what was submitted to it.

Read a result as evidence of work done under this account, in this window, under the stated settings. Where a role needs more than that, run the sitting under your own supervision and record that alongside this document.

Who is in this document: everybody who was assigned an assessment in the period and held a developer seat when they sat it. That is not necessarily everybody who writes code here. This record cannot say how many engineers the organisation has or how the people assigned were chosen. An auditor who needs that should ask for it.

Summary

Assessments	People assessed	Assignments	Submitted
4	37	43	37
In progress	Not started	Not completed in window	Reviews recorded
0	0	6	191
Team catch rate	Team median score		
69%	69		

Coverage by CWE category

Dimension	People	Findings	Caught	Missed	Catch rate
Access control	17	107	74	33	69%
Injection	12	96	69	27	72%
Authentication	14	56	39	17	70%
Sessions and cookies	14	42	31	11	74%
Data exposure	20	40	28	12	70%
AI safety	12	24	17	7	71%

4 further values are not listed, because fewer than 10 people are behind each of them and an aggregate over fewer than that is not anonymous.

Coverage by language

Dimension	People	Findings	Caught	Missed	Catch rate
Java	14	126	89	37	71%
TypeScript	17	103	69	34	67%
PHP	12	84	59	25	70%
Python	12	60	42	18	70%

2 further values are not listed, because fewer than 10 people are behind each of them and an aggregate over fewer than that is not anonymous.

Track records

Developer	Seat	Submitted	Caught	Missed	False pos.	Catch rate
Dmitri Ostrowski	Yes	6	9	5	0	64%
Kenji Muraoka	Yes	6	9	5	1	64%
Tomas Kudrna	Yes	6	10	4	2	71%
Nora Vasquez	Yes	6	7	7	3	50%

Developer	Seat	Submitted	Caught	Missed	False pos.	Catch rate
Idris Salaam	Yes	6	8	6	2	57%
Priya Narayan	Yes	6	13	1	0	93%
Grace Ntuli	No	6	5	9	2	36%
Hollie Bramwell	Yes	6	11	3	1	79%
Fiona Crabbe	Yes	6	10	4	1	71%
Marcus Vell	Yes	6	12	2	1	86%
Callum Threlfall	Yes	6	9	5	1	64%
Adeola Ibikunle	Yes	6	12	2	0	86%
Ruth Ellery	Yes	6	11	3	0	79%
Zeynep Aydogan	Yes	6	12	2	0	86%
Anja Vukovic	Yes	5	9	3	0	75%
Martina Selvaggi	Yes	5	7	5	2	58%
Rhys Pentreath	No	5	5	7	3	42%
Elena Rosu	Yes	5	10	1	0	83%
Hyun-Woo Jang	Yes	5	1	3	1	75%
Lena Hoffstadt	Yes	5	5	6	2	50%
Bethan Lloyd-Pryce	Yes	5	1	1	0	92%
Rafael Quintana	Yes	5	9	3	1	75%
Obinna Achebe-Ford	Yes	5	8	4	1	67%
Aoife Mullarkey	Yes	5	10	2	0	83%
Solomon Adeyemi	Yes	5	9	3	0	75%
Sam Tunde	Yes	5	8	4	2	67%
Vikram Chellappa	Yes	4	6	3	1	67%
Emeka Nwosu	Yes	4	7	2	0	78%
Ottoline Featherstone	Yes	4	4	5	2	44%
Gareth Whitcombe	Yes	4	7	2	1	78%
Sigrid Halvorsen	Yes	4	5	4	2	56%
Ines Barreto	Yes	4	8	1	0	89%
Yusuf Demirtas	Yes	4	5	4	1	56%
Malika Zhanbolat	Yes	4	6	3	1	67%
Bea Ottershaw	Yes	5	7	4	2	64%
Hamza Bettaieb	Yes	5	5	6	3	45%
Sinead Fallon	Yes	5	8	3	1	73%

Every attempt is recorded, and a retake replaces the attempt it followed only when the re-sit is submitted; the earlier sitting stays on that person's own record. One retake touched this period, granted or sat inside it: Grace Ntuli (The third quarter access control review).

The record for each person, broken down by CWE category and by language, is in the CSV exported alongside this document, one row per person per category and per language.

Benchmarks

Metric	Dimension	25th	50th	75th	Reviewers
assessment_catch_rate	all	0.54	0.67	0.79	1,240

Assessment records

Assessment	Set on	Switches	Assigned	Submitted	Window
The third quarter access control review	28 July 2026	Nothing switched on	16	14	Closed 17 August 2026
The third quarter injection review for the payments squad	6 July 2026	Nothing switched on	14	12	Closed 31 July 2026
The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	8 June 2026	On: walkthroughs	8	8	Closed 30 June 2026
The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	14 May 2026	Nothing switched on	5	3	Closed 5 June 2026

The switches are stated because they change what the score means: an assessment sat with hints available is not the same exercise as one sat without. They are taken from each sitting down record, written when the sitting was opened, or from the assessment as set where a sitting produces that record.

Assignments still outstanding

Assessment	Name	Email	State	Assigned
The third quarter access control review	Priti Raval	priti.raval@fernbrook.example	Not completed in window	3 August 2026
The third quarter access control review	Niamh Corrigan	niamh.corrigan@fernbrook.example	Not completed in window	3 August 2026
The third quarter injection review for the payments squad	Kwabena Mensah	kwabena.mensah@fernbrook.example	Not completed in window	13 July 2026
The third quarter injection review for the payments squad	Larissa Petrova	larissa.petrova@fernbrook.example	Not completed in window	13 July 2026
The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	Domhnall Kearney	domhnall.kearney@fernbrook.example	Not completed in window	18 May 2026
The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	Hakim Ferhat	hakim.ferhat@fernbrook.example	Not completed in window	18 May 2026

Seat integrity

Seats purchased Assigned now Held a seat in period Assignments and releases

50

48

49

4 and 2

A seat is assigned to a named individual. 50 were paid for and 49 different people held one during this period, counted from the seat assignments and releases in the audit log. A number well above the number purchased means a seat was passed between people, which changes what the results above cover.

Where this fits

This is one layer of an evidence pack, not the whole of one. It shows that named people were measured against planted weaknesses, on dated exercises, under stated settings, and how they did. It does not cover your policies, your pipeline controls, your penetration testing or your vulnerability management, and it is not a certification.

PCI DSS v4.0.1, 6.2.2 and 6.2.3.1

Software development personnel are to be trained at least annually in secure design and coding for the languages and tools they use, and bespoke code is to be reviewed before release by someone other than its author, knowledgeable in secure coding. The graded records here double as the training record 6.2.2 asks for, and evidence that reviewers can do what 6.2.3.1 requires of them.

DORA (EU) 2022/2554, Article 13(6), and the ICT risk management RTS, Article 16(1)

Financial entities are to run ICT security awareness programmes and digital operational resilience training for staff, and to apply secure coding practices with a proportionate review of the code they produce. This report evidences the second half of that: that the people writing the code were measured against real weaknesses.

ISO/IEC 27001:2022, clause 7.2 and Annex A 8.28

Clause 7.2 asks for competence to be determined, achieved and evidenced, and A.8.28 asks for secure coding principles to be applied. A dated, per-person record of what a developer caught and missed is the kind of evidence of competence clause 7.2 asks for.

EU AI Act (EU) 2024/1689, Article 17(4)

Providers and deployers are to take measures to ensure a sufficient level of AI literacy among staff dealing with AI systems. Where the exercises cover AI-assisted code and AI-specific weaknesses, this record speaks to that obligation.

Integrity of this file

NOT EVIDENCE. This is a sample document produced from invented data so that a buyer can read one before paying. Every name, score and date in it was made up, and it is not recorded against any organisation.

The underlying rows are exported alongside this document as a CSV, so the figures above can be recomputed.