

SafePaaS

7 Question Governance Architecture Scoring Worksheet

Use this worksheet to evaluate your current governance model or compare vendor proposals side-by-side.

Score each question honestly, then review your results to identify structural limitations in coverage economics, onboarding scalability, or operating model.

How to Score:

For each question, mark the response that best describes the capability:

- **Yes** — Clearly supported today, with evidence or working examples
- **Partly** — Theoretically possible, but manual, expensive, limited, or requires heavy customization
- **No** — Not realistically supported without significant re-engineering
- **Unknown** — Vendor has not demonstrated how it works or provided a credible implementation path

For each "Yes," capture the evidence. Do not score a roadmap promise as "Yes."

Vendor / Solution Name: _____

Date: _____

Evaluated by: _____

The 7 Questions

1. Does it change onboarding economics?

Will the cost and time to onboard application #50 drop significantly compared to application #10, or does every new system still require custom connector work, professional services, and months of effort?

Yes Partly No Unknown

Evidence / Notes:

2. Can it reach beyond pre-integrated systems?

Can it govern the long-tail SaaS, custom apps, acquired systems, and databases your vendor didn't pre-integrate, or are you limited to the 15–25 tier-1 applications they chose to support?

Yes Partly No Unknown

Evidence / Notes:

3. Does it eliminate custom transformation work?

Can application owners map source data into a common schema without writing code, or does every new onboarding project require custom ETL, developers, and ongoing engineering support?

Yes Partly No Unknown

Evidence / Notes:

4. Does it enable federated execution with centralized policy?

Can application and business owners make access decisions and run reviews within central guardrails, or does everything still route through central IT as the approval bottleneck?

Yes Partly No Unknown

Evidence / Notes:

5. Does it govern high-risk actions, not just logins?

Can it monitor and control sensitive transactions—payments, vendor changes, journal postings, configuration changes—or does it stop at identity entitlements and role assignments?

Yes Partly No Unknown

Evidence / Notes:

6. Does it bring nonhuman identities under the same model?

Can service accounts, integration users, bots, and agents follow consistent lifecycle and review patterns, or do they remain a separate problem outside formal governance?

Yes Partly No Unknown

Evidence / Notes:

7. Does it measure coverage and time-to-coverage?

Does it track the percentage of critical applications, identities, and high-risk actions actually under governance, or does it just count workflow metrics and pre-integrated systems?

Yes Partly No Unknown

Evidence / Notes:

Scoring Summary

| Question | Yes | Partly | No | Unknown |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Onboarding economics | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Beyond pre-integrated systems | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Eliminate custom transformation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Federated execution | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. High-risk actions | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Nonhuman identities | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Coverage metrics | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Totals | — | — | — | — |

Interpretation Guide

Strong Coverage Architecture (5–7 "Yes" responses, especially Q1–Q3)

This solution addresses the structural economics of onboarding and can realistically scale to full-estate coverage. Questions 1, 2, and 3 are critical—if a proposal scores "Yes" on all three, it has changed the fundamental math of governance expansion.

Moderate Risk (3–4 "Yes" responses, or "Partly" on Q1–Q3)

The solution may improve workflow automation or reporting, but coverage expansion will likely remain slow and expensive. Watch for heavy reliance on professional services, custom development, or centralized bottlenecks.

High Risk (0–2 "Yes" responses, or "No/Unknown" on Q1–Q3)

This is likely another reporting layer, not a structural coverage improvement. The proposal optimizes for dashboard consolidation or workflow efficiency, not for the economic and operating model changes needed to reach full-estate coverage. Expect coverage to stall after 30–50 applications.

Critical Warning Signs

A proposal is likely not solving the coverage problem if it depends on:

- Heavy professional services for every new application outside the pre-built connector list
- Custom code or custom ETL required for routine data normalization
- Central IT remaining in the critical path for all access decisions, workflows, and exceptions
- Strong demo with tier-1 systems but no credible plan for long-tail applications
- No way to govern service accounts, integration users, or nonhuman identities
- Metrics focused on workflow throughput (certifications, approvals) instead of coverage percentage

Next Steps

If your current model or proposal scored poorly:

1. **Identify the specific blockers:** Is it connectivity, transformation, operating model, or all three?
2. **Calculate the true cost:** How much are you spending per application onboarded today?
3. **Project your coverage trajectory:** At your current onboarding rate, when will you reach 50% coverage? 80%?
4. **Evaluate** whether incremental improvement is enough, or whether you need a different architectural approach

Questions to explore:

- How many critical applications are actually under governance today?
- How long does it take to onboard one new application from start to finish?
- How much custom work (connector development, ETL, workflow design) is hidden in each onboarding project?
- Can your current model realistically scale across long-tail SaaS, custom apps, and nonhuman identities?

For a deeper assessment, ask SafePaaS to calculate your current governance coverage, identify the applications, identities, and high-risk transactions outside control, and model how a federated governance architecture could reduce time-to-coverage.