Validate the tools you already have

Sample discovery report 01 / Existing approval process

Fictional customer example | Authored guide, not a generated assessment or validated architecture | Version 1.0

Discovery summary

Determine whether an existing change-management process can support a bounded approval claim without buying new tooling.

Workflow: A service owner approves a change; an internal auditor later reviews the record.

Claim: A named, authorized owner approved the specific change before deployment.

Current tools: A change-management system with approval history and exportable records.

Impact: Missing or ambiguous approval evidence can delay an audit or leave a disputed change unresolved.

Declared position: No known evidence gap; independent review is needed. No physical capture or disconnected operation is required.

Unknowns: The auditor's acceptance criteria, retention period, export completeness and authority checks have not been validated.

What a useful result looks like

The reviewer can either evaluate the selected claim from the permitted evidence or name the exact missing information. This is a proposed acceptance measure, not a test already passed.

Read this example as a guide

Use the structure to prepare your own answers. Replace the fictional context with confirmed facts, keep unknowns explicit, and ask the proposed owners to review the recommendations. Do not copy example findings as evidence about your organization.

Actions and engagement path

1. Test a representative export

Choose one completed change. Ask the auditor to trace the deployed version, approval, approver authority and timing. Record what cannot be established.

Suggested owner: Evidence owner | Why: A declared absence of gaps is not proof that the export satisfies the reviewer.

2. Agree the minimum record

Define required identifiers, approval history, retention and authorized disclosure. Keep unrelated personal data out of the package.

Suggested owner: Records owner and auditor | Why: A bounded claim avoids collecting more data than the reviewer needs.

3. Assign unresolved decisions

Give each missing acceptance criterion an owner and decision date. Revisit tool selection only if a material gap remains.

Suggested owner: Service owner | Why: Resolve the actual requirement before considering a new product.

ETS relevance

Not indicated on the supplied facts. First demonstrate that the existing process meets the agreed claim and verifier needs.

Edge-device relevance

Not indicated. No physical capture or disconnected-operation requirement is declared.

Alternatives to evaluate

Retain the existing platform; improve its export configuration, record linkage or review procedure if the sample reveals a bounded weakness.

Architecture discussion

An architect can help define the claim, test the current evidence flow and decide whether a process change is sufficient. An ETS evaluation should follow a demonstrated gap, not precede it.

Bring to a discussion

A sanitized example approval record and export / The auditor's written acceptance questions / Known retention and access constraints

Scope and limits

All scenario inputs are illustrative declarations. No control, product, device or architecture has been independently verified. These examples do not assert compliance, certification, costs or quantified benefits. Manual-derived rules require approved source citations; none are asserted in these authored guides.