CONTROL TESTING PERSPECTIVE

What a change ticket cannot tell you.

An illustrative walkthrough from a closed workflow to the evidence behind a control.

DOCUMENT	PREPARED FOR	PREPARED BY	REVIEWED
Perspective	Credit union audit and security leaders	HardCastle InfoSec, Inc.	October 14, 2026

01

A closed ticket is the beginning of the question.

A change record marked complete may show that someone closed a workflow. It does not, by itself, establish that the right person approved the change before deployment, that the approved change matches what was deployed, or that testing addressed the relevant risk.

The following is an illustrative testing approach. It describes no actual client, institution, system, examination, or finding. It contains no confidential employer information.

02

Define the control objective.

Start with the institution's policy and risk context. For this illustration, the objective is that changes to production systems should be authorized, tested, and traceable to the deployed result.

The objective determines the evidence to request. A ticket status is useful context, but testing should establish what happened beyond that field.

03

Follow the change across the records.

QUESTION	ILLUSTRATIVE EVIDENCE
What was requested?	Change description, affected service, and risk assessment.
Who approved it?	Approval record and the approver's authority.
When was it approved?	Approval timestamp compared with deployment records.
What was tested?	Test scope, results, and disposition of exceptions.
What reached production?	Deployment record tied to the approved change.
What happened afterward?	Validation, incident information, or a rollback record.

04

Distinguish an exception from an unsupported conclusion.

A missing link between records is a reason to investigate. It is not, on its own, proof that a change was unauthorized or that an incident occurred.

Clarify the applicable requirement, the evidence available, and the explanation from the control owner. Document the limitation when the evidence cannot support a conclusion.

05

Make the finding useful.

A useful issue description separates the control expectation, observed condition, supporting evidence, and significance. Recommendations should address the actual gap, not simply ask for more documentation.

The goal is a conclusion that can be understood, challenged appropriately, and acted on. An IT audit and control-testing engagement can be scoped around a defined control question.

Equal footing.

Technical depth on your side of the table.

WHERE THIS APPLIES

- Audit and examiner readiness
- IT audit and control testing
- Assessment and test oversight
- Third-party and cloud risk
- Cybersecurity assessment
- Security program advisory

START WITH THE QUESTION

info@hardcastleinfosec.com

Messages are answered within one business day.

Scope, responsibilities, timing, fees and information handling are agreed in writing before work begins. No audit or examination outcome is guaranteed.

PRESIDENT AND CEO

A clear read on exposure, before the examiner gives you one.

VP OF AUDIT

Testing and evidence that hold up to the audit committee.

VP OF INFORMATION SECURITY

Expert eyes on your evidence, before anyone else grades it.

THREE QUESTIONS WORTH ASKING

01

Is the right thing being tested?

Scope decides what a report can possibly find.

02

Does the evidence hold?

A finding is a conclusion drawn from something.

03

Is it actually fixed?

A closed ticket records an intention, not a control.

HARDCASTLE INFOSEC, INC. A NORTH CAROLINA CORPORATION HARDCASTLEINFOSEC.COM

© 2026 HardCastle InfoSec, Inc. For use inside your institution with attribution; not for resale or republication. General information only, not legal, regulatory, or audit advice, and no client relationship is created by its use. Not affiliated with or endorsed by NCUA, FFIEC, or any regulator. Full terms at hardcastleinfosec.com/terms/.