

Pentest Reporting QA Workflows

SUMMARY

Traditional pentest report quality assurance (QA) methods are not conducive to effective communication and collaboration. The QA often occurs in a separate system (such as Word) from the report which leads to multiple revisions and version conflict. Collaboration occurs via mistake-prone back-and-forth messaging. Communication updates are not automated, requiring progress recaps to be written and sent to stakeholders. Even with multiple reviewers, the final report often contains embarrassing errors. Ultimately, this messy process contributes to inferior deliverables.

PlexTrac drives efficiency and collaboration in the QA workflow by supporting each stage and unique process — leading to higher-quality reports and high client confidence. PlexTrac provides the framework for users to customize the workflow and automates communication between status updates. Report review assignments appear on the main dashboard for easy tracking.

| PROBLEM | SOLUTION |
|---|--|
| Inefficient and ineffective QA collaboration methods result in multiple document revisions and version conflicts. Back-and-forth emails about revisions waste time and often lack full context. | PlexTrac drives team collaboration and efficiency with a Google-like review, change tracking, and commenting experience for multiple review levels to take place. Cut QA time and improve report quality. Skip emails and keep all QA in one report version in one location for use by the entire team. |
| The lack of a central place to track and update assignments leads to inefficient workflow handoffs and communications between QA stages. No effective way to update team members or clients on the review process. Communication via email, etc., is not tracked within the report. | PlexTrac streamlines the workflow and eliminates external communications for tracking through QA/peer review stages. PlexTrac drives efficiency and keeps assigned operator(s) and reviewer(s) informed with automated emails of report status changes and the ability to access assignments for review from the main dashboard at login. |
| No efficient way to build less-experienced reviewers' skills. Hands-on methods require highly skilled/paid team members to train juniors on reviewing, etc. This is often deprioritized or put off due to workloads. | PlexTrac's change-tracking capabilities enable less-experienced members to review and add changes before a more senior reviewer approves, rejects, or adjusts them. Additionally, juniors benefit from senior-level feedback. |
| Errors occur in commonly used information, such as client name, start date, etc., as reports are copied and pasted together. Mistakes diminish the perceived quality of your work and erode client trust. | PlexTrac helps drive 100% accuracy and eliminates the need to QA reports for incorrect information. Shortcodes let users enter values into the client- and report-level fields to automatically pull information into the findings and narrative. |

QA Workflows in PlexTrac

Collaborate to Perfect Your Reports Directly in the Platform

| leport Narrative: Q1 Report | (D) (R) v |
|---|--|
| lients • Acme Corporation • Reports • Q1 Report • Narrative | Search & Replace Export V |
| eadout Details Narrative Findings Assets Artifacts Attack Path | • |
| EDIT NARRATIVE Report Templates: Add Narratives from Template | |
| | < 1of3 > |
| ii Title Introduction | EF Elyse F Today 08:23AM 🗸 🗸 |
| ⊖ Comment Track Changes Paragraph v B I U Ξ Ξ ¦= := 44 @ | Insert: "and Billy Smith" |
| | |
| Arme Industries contracted Purple Security Company to perform a security assessment. The assessment covers Acme's internal and external network. The purpose of this assessment is to surface strategic recommendations on how the company can improve it security posture. The assessment was executed by Bob Smith and Billy Smith and the Purple | < 2 of 3 > |
| Company can improve its security posture: The assessment was executed by door similaring and any similaria and the Purple Security Company penetration testing team from January February 5, 2023 to February 30, 2023. | EF Elyse F Today 08:27AM 🗸 🗸 |
| The following report covers strengths, areas of improvements, and vulnerabilities discovered during the assessment. It also includes details steps for reproducing and recommendations resolving the discovered risks. | Replace: "February" with "January" |
| During our assessment the team uncovered a total of 134 potential risks, 2 of which our team considers Critical. | |
| | < 3 of 3 > |
| Title Process and Scope \checkmark | EF Elyse F Today 08:23AM 🖉 🛍 |
| \bigcirc Comment Track Changes Paragraph \sim B $I \ \cup \ \equiv \ \vdots \ \vdots \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$ | Let's cover the risks in a later section, that way we can go into more detail. |
| | |
| | SV Sandy V Today 09:00AM |
| | Sounds good, I will move this down. |

- Management of client deliverable reports and doing proper peer review to deliver high-quality information was becoming unmanageable. PlexTrac allowed us to deploy a centralized reporting tool that had a finding database, allowed us to capture and template custom findings, and track the quality of the report. Deploying PlexTrac allowed our team to cut the reporting cycle by 65%."
 Matthew Puckett, Red Team, Hunt Team, Vulnerability Management Team Lead, Jacobs Engineering
- One of the basic problems we were having was how to centralize all these things, so we have records of customer interactions, questionnaires, and iterations in one place. That problem was solved immediately by adopting PlexTrac as a single tool."
 Jeremy Pierson, Secure Enterprise Program Architect, CompuNet





Learn More

Visit plextrac.com/solutions/mssp/ for more PlexTrac use cases.