

SafePaaS

Steering Committee Decision Worksheet

Extend, Replace, or Federate?

Use this worksheet to decide whether the right next move for identity governance is to extend the current IGA, replace it, or add a federated identity governance control plane on top.

The goal is not to pick the most familiar tool path; it is to choose the option that can improve coverage, shorten time-to-coverage, and govern non-human identities with the least delivery risk.

How To Use This Worksheet

Complete the worksheet as a group with the CISO, CIO, Identity/GRC lead, Enterprise Architect, and Procurement lead in the room. Score the current state honestly first; then discuss which option—extend, replace, or federate—best fits the evidence.

1 = strongly no / high concern

3 = mixed / unclear

5 = strongly yes / low concern

Section 1: Coverage Gaps

Q1. What percentage of SOX-in-scope and business-critical applications are under real identity governance today—not just behind SSO, but under policy, monitoring, and review?

Score: ___ / 5

Q2. Can the current model govern access consistently across ERP, SaaS, custom applications, and critical integrations?

Score: ___ / 5

Q3. Are high-risk actions—such as payments, approvals, master-data changes, privileged configuration changes, and changes to supplier bank accounts or customer credit limits visible and governed across the estate?

Score: ___ / 5

Interpretation:

- **Mostly 4–5:** Extension may still be viable.
- **Mostly 1–2:** Federation becomes more compelling because the gap is architectural, not just operational.

Section 2: Time-To-Coverage

Q4. How quickly can a new ERP module, SaaS app, or automation be brought under governance to an auditable standard?

Score: ___ / 5

Q5. Does onboarding the next application follow a repeatable pattern, or does it still become a bespoke connector and workflow project?

Score: ___ / 5

Q6. Are architecture and operations teams confident they can govern the next 25–50 critical systems without changing the core model?

Score: ___ / 5

Interpretation:

- **Mostly 4–5:** Current architecture may be extendable.
- **Mostly 1–2:** If every system still feels like a first-time integration, replacement or federation should be considered; federation is usually lower risk if the current IGA still works in core systems.

Section 3: Non-Human Identity Exposure

Q7. Are service accounts, integration users, bots, API keys, and AI agents included in the governance model with named owners and review patterns?

Score: ___ / 5

Q8. Can the current architecture show which non-human identities can execute high-risk actions across critical systems?

Score: ___ / 5

Q9. Are non-human identities treated as first-class governance objects rather than exceptions handled locally?

Score: ___ / 5

Interpretation:

- **Mostly 4–5:** Extension may still be plausible.
- **Mostly 1–2:** A human-only governance model is now misaligned with the real risk surface; federation usually fits better because it brings human and non-human identities into one control plane.

Section 4: Organisational Readiness

Q10. Can central teams define policies, guardrails, and evidence standards while application and platform owners handle local decisions?

Score: ___ / 5

Q11. Is there enough clarity on ownership—through RACI or a similar model—to support federated execution?

Score: ___ / 5

Q12. Is the organisation ready to evaluate governance success by coverage and time-to-coverage, not just by number of connectors or campaigns?

Score: ___ / 5

Interpretation:

- **Mostly 4–5:** Federation is operationally realistic.
- **Mostly 1–2:** Even a strong federated architecture may stall unless the operating model changes alongside it.

Option Fit Summary

Add the 12 scores together.

Total Score: _____ / 60

Likely Fit

- 48–60:** **Extend or federate**, depending on where the weak spots cluster.
- 30–47:** **Federate is often the strongest option** because the current stack likely has value, but the architecture and operating model are constraining coverage.
- 12–29:** **Replace or federate**, depending on whether the core IGA is broken or simply too narrow; if core workflows still work in major systems, federation usually offers lower delivery risk than full replacement.

Final Steering Questions

Before making a decision, answer these five questions directly.

1. Are we trying to fix a platform problem, a coverage problem, or a centralisation problem?
2. Which option improves coverage fastest without creating a multi-year detour?
3. Which option gives us the clearest path to governing non-human identities?
4. Which option preserves the most value from current investments?
5. Which option can procurement, architecture, and risk leaders all defend in the same room?

Decision Direction

Use this space to record the steering committee's conclusion.

Preferred option:

Extend Replace Federate

Why this option fits:

Key risks to manage:

90-day next steps:

If the scores are mixed or disagreement remains, the next step is an architecture and operating-model review using this worksheet as the starting point. That conversation should map current coverage, time-to-coverage, non-human identity exposure, and readiness for federation before budget or vendor decisions are finalised.