

Secure code review evidence (SAMPLE)

Fernbrook Systems

Period	Q2 2026, 1 April 2026 to 30 June 2026
Produced	31 August 2026 by the sample report
Export reference	sample-q2
Named detail	Open: named per-person detail is included for the roles entitled to it.
Plan	Team

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 branch, its commits and the changes a reviewer would actually open, written to look like ordinary feature work.

Each weakness in those changes is recorded by hand, with a reviewer identifier, the exact lines, and a written explanation.

Grading runs on the server against a prepared answer that is never sent to the browser. The reviewer submits one finding at a time, the lines they flagged and the weakness they think it is, and each is marked as it is submitted. The score is worked out on the server, so a submission cannot be forged.

A weakness is found when the reviewer's selection overlaps the lines it sits on and the weakness they name is the answer's own, an alternative the answer accepts or one in the same family. Each weakness is worth 10 points, so a challenge with three weaknesses is out of 30.

Every wrong try costs 1 point: a try on lines with nothing wrong in them, or on the right lines naming the wrong weakness. The score is the points for the weaknesses found less what the wrong tries cost, and never below nought. A weakness never found scores nothing. In an assessment, a weakness closes after 3 tries on its lines that name the wrong weakness, and scores nothing from then on.

A challenge is passed at 80 per cent of its full marks, rounded up to whole points: 24 of 30 with three weaknesses. The score recorded for it is the percentage of its full marks it reached.

Assessment work is kept separate from training in the database. Everything in this report comes from assessments an administrator set. Practice a person 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 are off unless an administrator switched them on, which is stated on each row. No assessment shows a walkthrough or a video, whatever its switches say.

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 changes were 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 licence 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
2	18	20	18
In progress	Not started	Not completed in window	Reviews recorded
0	0	2	82
Team catch rate	Team median score		
66%	Not published		

Withheld: 18 people have graded work in this period, counting anyone part way through an assessment. A median needs 20.

An aggregate is only published when at least 10 people are in it, and a median when at least 20 are, because with fewer than that you could work out who is who.

Coverage by CWE category

Dimension	People	Findings	Caught	Missed	Catch rate
Business logic	10	40	28	12	70%
Request forgery	10	40	26	14	65%
Access control	10	30	19	11	63%

3 further values are not listed, because fewer than ten people are behind each of them and an average over fewer than ten identifies people.

Coverage by language

Dimension	People	Findings	Caught	Missed	Catch rate
TypeScript	10	110	73	37	66%

2 further values are not listed, because fewer than ten people are behind each of them and an average over fewer than ten identifies people.

Track records

Person	Licence	Submitted	Caught	Missed	Catch rate	Find the fix	Median score	Status	Last submission
Vikram Chellappa	Yes	4	6	3	67%	Not asked	56.5	Well below	26 June 2026
Emeka Nwosu	Yes	4	7	2	78%	Not asked	97.5	Passed	24 June 2026
Ottoline Featherstone	Yes	4	4	5	44%	Not asked	47.5	Well below	23 June 2026
Gareth Whitcombe	Yes	4	7	2	78%	Not asked	78	Needs work	22 June 2026
Sigrid Halvorsen	Yes	4	5	4	56%	Not asked	52.5	Well below	19 June 2026
Ines Barreto	Yes	4	8	1	89%	Not asked	98	Passed	18 June 2026
Yusuf Demirtas	Yes	4	5	4	56%	Not asked	56	Well below	17 June 2026
Malika Zhanbolat	Yes	4	6	3	67%	Not asked	75.5	Needs work	15 June 2026
Bea Ottershaw	Yes	5	7	1	86%	Not asked	56	Well below	4 June 2026
Hamza Bettaieb	Yes	5	5	2	45%	Not asked	45	Well below	3 June 2026
Sinead Fallon	Yes	5	8	3	73%	Not asked	60	Well below	2 June 2026
Chidera Okonjo	Yes	5	6	5	55%	Not asked	50	Well below	1 June 2026
Nadia Kowalczyk	Yes	5	10	1	91%	Not asked	100	Passed	29 May 2026
Lukas Berent	Yes	5	8	3	73%	Not asked	95	Passed	27 May 2026
Terrence Boakye	Yes	5	9	2	82%	Not asked	95	Passed	26 May 2026
Wren Tallowfield	Yes	5	4	7	36%	Not asked	30	Well below	25 May 2026
Freya Sandiford	Yes	5	7	4	64%	Not asked	66	Needs work	22 May 2026
Arjun Rathore	Yes	5	9	2	82%	Not asked	95	Passed	21 May 2026

Status is the product's own grade, on the same pass mark it uses for every submission: a median score of 80 or more is a pass. Below the mark reads Needs work, and Well below where the score is also under the median of the people listed here. That median is for this table only; a published team figure needs a larger cohort before the report states one. Somebody who has not finished their assessment is not graded yet: they read In progress, or Not finished once its window has closed, with their figures so far.

No retake was granted or sat in this period. Every figure above is a first sitting.

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.

Results

Each challenge submitted in this period, with the score and grade it was given. These are the results the figures above are taken from.

Person	Assessment	Challenge	Score	Grade	Caught	Submitted
Arjun Rathore	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A follow another page can post for you	100	Passed	2 of 2	18 May 2026
Arjun Rathore	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A settings form another site can submit	50	Needs work	1 of 2	18 May 2026
Arjun Rathore	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A block list the browser is asked to honour	66	Needs work	2 of 3	19 May 2026
Arjun Rathore	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A basket total recomputed in the browser	95	Passed	2 of 2	20 May 2026
Arjun Rathore	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	An order status the buyer can set	95	Passed	2 of 2	21 May 2026
Bea Ottershaw	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A follow another page can post for you	50	Needs work	1 of 2	29 May 2026
Bea Ottershaw	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A settings form another site can submit	100	Passed	2 of 2	30 May 2026
Bea Ottershaw	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A block list the browser is asked to honour	56	Needs work	2 of 3	1 June 2026
Bea Ottershaw	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A basket total recomputed in the browser	0	Needs work	0 of 2	2 June 2026
Bea Ottershaw	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	An order status the buyer can set	100	Passed	2 of 2	4 June 2026

Person	Assessment	Challenge	Score	Grade	Caught	Submitted
Chidera Okonjo	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A follow another page can post for you	50	Needs work	1 of 2	27 May 2026
Chidera Okonjo	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A settings form another site can submit	90	Passed	2 of 2	28 May 2026
Chidera Okonjo	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A block list the browser is asked to honour	33	Needs work	1 of 3	30 May 2026
Chidera Okonjo	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A basket total recomputed in the browser	0	Needs work	0 of 2	31 May 2026
Chidera Okonjo	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	An order status the buyer can set	95	Passed	2 of 2	1 June 2026
Emeka Nwosu	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A deploy key principal into the building	0	Needs work	0 of 2	20 June 2026
Emeka Nwosu	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A token level in the sample environment	100	Passed	2 of 2	22 June 2026
Emeka Nwosu	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A ledger signature checked after the write	100	Passed	3 of 3	23 June 2026
Emeka Nwosu	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	Statement references a customer can count up	95	Passed	2 of 2	24 June 2026
Freya Sandiford	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A follow another page can post for you	100	Passed	2 of 2	18 May 2026
Freya Sandiford	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A settings form another site can submit	0	Needs work	0 of 2	19 May 2026
Freya Sandiford	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A block list the browser is asked to honour	66	Needs work	2 of 3	20 May 2026
Freya Sandiford	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A basket total recomputed in the browser	90	Passed	2 of 2	21 May 2026
Freya Sandiford	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	An order status the buyer can set	50	Needs work	1 of 2	22 May 2026

Person	Assessment	Challenge	Score	Grade	Caught	Submitted
Gareth Whitcombe	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A deploy key printed into the build log	50	Needs work	1 of 2	19 June 2026
Gareth Whitcombe	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A token left in the sample environment file	90	Passed	2 of 2	20 June 2026
Gareth Whitcombe	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A ledger signature checked after the write	66	Needs work	2 of 3	21 June 2026
Gareth Whitcombe	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	Statement references a customer can count up	100	Passed	2 of 2	22 June 2026
Hamza Bettaieb	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A follow another page can post for you	45	Needs work	1 of 2	29 May 2026
Hamza Bettaieb	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A settings form another site can submit	0	Needs work	0 of 2	30 May 2026
Hamza Bettaieb	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A block list the browser is added to honeypot	3	Needs work	2 of 3	1 June 2026
Hamza Bettaieb	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A secret total recomputed in the browser	0	Needs work	0 of 2	2 June 2026
Hamza Bettaieb	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	An order status the buyer can set	90	Passed	2 of 2	3 June 2026
Ines Barreto	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A deploy key printed into the build log	100	Passed	2 of 2	14 June 2026
Ines Barreto	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A token left in the sample environment file	45	Needs work	1 of 2	16 June 2026
Ines Barreto	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A ledger signature checked after the write	96	Passed	3 of 3	17 June 2026
Ines Barreto	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	Statement references a customer can count up	100	Passed	2 of 2	18 June 2026
Lukas Berent	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A follow another page can post for you	100	Passed	2 of 2	22 May 2026

Person	Assessment	Challenge	Score	Grade	Caught	Submitted
Lukas Berent	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A settings form another site can submit	0	Needs work	0 of 2	23 May 2026
Lukas Berent	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A block list the browser is asked to honour	96	Passed	3 of 3	24 May 2026
Lukas Berent	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A basket total recomputed in the browser	50	Needs work	1 of 2	26 May 2026
Lukas Berent	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	An order status the buyer can set	95	Passed	2 of 2	27 May 2026
Malika Zhanbolat	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A deploy key printed into the build log	0	Needs work	0 of 2	11 June 2026
Malika Zhanbolat	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A token left in the sample environment file	95	Passed	2 of 2	12 June 2026
Malika Zhanbolat	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A ledger signature checked against the ledger	56	Needs work	2 of 3	14 June 2026
Malika Zhanbolat	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	Statement references a customer can count up	100	Passed	2 of 2	15 June 2026
Nadia Kowalczyk	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A follow another page can post for you	100	Passed	2 of 2	23 May 2026
Nadia Kowalczyk	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A settings form another site can submit	100	Passed	2 of 2	24 May 2026
Nadia Kowalczyk	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A block list the browser is asked to honour	63	Needs work	2 of 3	26 May 2026
Nadia Kowalczyk	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A basket total recomputed in the browser	95	Passed	2 of 2	27 May 2026
Nadia Kowalczyk	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	An order status the buyer can set	100	Passed	2 of 2	29 May 2026
Ottoline Featherstone	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A deploy key printed into the build log	45	Needs work	1 of 2	19 June 2026

Person	Assessment	Challenge	Score	Grade	Caught	Submitted
Ottoline Featherstone	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A token left in the sample environment file	0	Needs work	0 of 2	21 June 2026
Ottoline Featherstone	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A ledger signature checked after the write	60	Needs work	2 of 3	22 June 2026
Ottoline Featherstone	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	Statement references a customer can count up	50	Needs work	1 of 2	23 June 2026
Sigrid Halvorsen	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A deploy key printed into the build log	100	Passed	2 of 2	16 June 2026
Sigrid Halvorsen	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A token left in the sample environment file	0	Needs work	0 of 2	17 June 2026
Sigrid Halvorsen	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A ledger signature checked after the write	60	Needs work	2 of 3	18 June 2026
Sigrid Halvorsen	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	Statement references a customer can count up	45	Needs work	1 of 2	19 June 2026
Sinead Fallon	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A follow another page can post for you	50	Needs work	1 of 2	27 May 2026
Sinead Fallon	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A settings form another site can submit	45	Needs work	1 of 2	29 May 2026
Sinead Fallon	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A block list the browser is asked to honour	60	Needs work	2 of 3	30 May 2026
Sinead Fallon	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A basket total recomputed in the browser	100	Passed	2 of 2	1 June 2026
Sinead Fallon	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	An order status the buyer can set	100	Passed	2 of 2	2 June 2026
Terrence Boakye	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A follow another page can post for you	95	Passed	2 of 2	20 May 2026
Terrence Boakye	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A settings form another site can submit	95	Passed	2 of 2	21 May 2026

Person	Assessment	Challenge	Score	Grade	Caught	Submitted
Terrence Boakye	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A block list the browser is asked to honour	63	Needs work	2 of 3	23 May 2026
Terrence Boakye	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A basket total recomputed in the browser	100	Passed	2 of 2	25 May 2026
Terrence Boakye	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	An order status the buyer can set	50	Needs work	1 of 2	26 May 2026
Vikram Chellappa	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A deploy key printed into the build log	45	Needs work	1 of 2	22 June 2026
Vikram Chellappa	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A token left in the sample environment file	50	Needs work	1 of 2	24 June 2026
Vikram Chellappa	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A ledger signature checked after the write	63	Needs work	2 of 3	25 June 2026
Vikram Chellappa	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	Statement reference a customer account	100	Passed	2 of 2	26 June 2026
Wren Tallowfield	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A new another page can post for you	0	Needs work	0 of 2	20 May 2026
Wren Tallowfield	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A settings form another site can submit	95	Passed	2 of 2	22 May 2026
Wren Tallowfield	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A block list the browser is asked to honour	30	Needs work	1 of 3	23 May 2026
Wren Tallowfield	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	A basket total recomputed in the browser	50	Needs work	1 of 2	24 May 2026
Wren Tallowfield	The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	An order status the buyer can set	0	Needs work	0 of 2	25 May 2026
Yusuf Demirtas	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A deploy key printed into the build log	90	Passed	2 of 2	13 June 2026
Yusuf Demirtas	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A token left in the sample environment file	0	Needs work	0 of 2	14 June 2026

Person	Assessment	Challenge	Score	Grade	Caught	Submitted
Yusuf Demirtas	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	A ledger signature checked after the write	66	Needs work	2 of 3	16 June 2026
Yusuf Demirtas	The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	Statement references a customer can count up	50	Needs work	1 of 2	17 June 2026

Assessment records

Assessment	Set on	Switches	Assigned	Submitted	Window
The second quarter secrets review for the platform squad	8 June 2026	On: the number of findings	8	8	Closed 30 June 2026
The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	14 May 2026	On: the number of findings	12	10	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's own record, written when the sitting was opened, or from the assessment as set where a sitting predates that record. The number of findings is taken from the assessment as set, which cannot change once anybody has started it. A walkthrough or video switch is recorded as it was set. No assessment shows a walkthrough or a video, so the person saw neither.

Assignments still outstanding

Assessment	Name	Email	State	Assigned	Licence held
The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	Domhnall Kearney	domhnall.kearney@fernbrook.example	Not completed in window	18 May 2026	Yes
The second quarter business logic review for the client applications squad	Hakim Ferhat	hakim.ferhat@fernbrook.example	Not completed in window	18 May 2026	Yes

Licence integrity

Licences bought today	Assigned now	Held a licence in period	Assignments and releases
50	48	51	4 and 3

A licence is given to a named person and can move to someone else once a calendar month. 50 licences are paid for as things stand today, and 51 different people held one during this period, counted from the licence assignments and releases in the audit log. A number well above the number bought means licences were 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 known 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(3)

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 person caught and missed is the kind of evidence of competence clause 7.2 asks for.

EU AI Act (EU) 2024/1689, Article 4, as replaced by Regulation (EU) 2024/6144

Providers and deployers of AI systems “shall take measures to support the development of AI literacy of their staff and other persons dealing with the operation and use of AI systems on their behalf”. The article adds: “This obligation does not require providers or deployers to guarantee any specific level of AI literacy of any individual.” 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.