TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT / EXAMPLE 01

01

ILLUSTRATIVE CONTENT · NOT AN ACTUAL CLIENT REPORT

Technical Readiness Review

A concise, evidence-led assessment layout with a decision statement, severity-ranked issue register, delivery analysis and stakeholder questions.

PREPARED BY
Carlo Hennsa

DOCUMENT REFERENCE
EX-TR-001

VERSION / DATE
1.0 · 14 October 2026

CONTEXT
Aster (fictional programme) · **Illustrative example**

01

DOCUMENT SECTION

Executive position

Decision first, detail second

ASSESSMENT / SAMPLE

The integration boundary must be proven before the programme enters a fixed delivery commitment.

The fictional Aster Identity Platform is ready for a bounded technical proof of concept. It is **not yet ready for a production delivery baseline** because three external interfaces and the recovery model have not been confirmed.

This is an example of a clear personal assessment. It deliberately separates a judgement from evidence and states which decision is needed.

06
Sample findings

03
External interfaces

02
Decision gates

Scope: integration readiness | Status: conditional | Unverified interfaces

02

DOCUMENT SECTION

Scope and evidence

Keep verified facts and assumptions visibly separate

INPUTS REVIEWED / FICTIONAL

Available evidence

- Solution outline, draft v0.8
- Integration catalogue, revision 03
- Workshop notes from three simulated teams
- Prototype screenshots and an API contract proposal

NOT YET DEMONSTRATED

Outstanding evidence

- Provider test environment and sample payloads
- Credential lifecycle and failure-mode ownership
- Restore test and retention approval
- Named operational acceptance authority

EVIDENCE STANDARD

In a real assessment, cite source identifiers, versions, authors and exact evidence references. Do not convert assumptions into facts simply because they appear in a design document.

03

DOCUMENT SECTION

Issue and decision register

Use one owner, one question and one next action per item

ID	Priority	Finding	Required decision / evidence	Owner
R-01	CRITICAL	**Identity token expiry** Offline client may hold credentials beyond their accepted lifetime	Approve token validity and degraded-mode rules	Security
R-02	CRITICAL	**Revocation propagation** No demonstrated worst-case delivery bound	Define and test revocation consistency	Platform
R-03	HIGH	**Unverified vendor interface**	Obtain sandbox and contract examples	Integration

ID	Priority	Finding	Required decision / evidence	Owner
R-04	HIGH	**Disaster recovery**	Perform restore rehearsal with acceptance evidence	Operations
R-05	HIGH	**Audit data ownership**	Approve retention and visibility matrix	Governance
R-06	HIGH	**Release acceptance**	Nominate sign-off authority	Sponsor

04

DOCUMENT SECTION

Technical implications

Unresolved edges drive delivery risk

BOUNDARY 01

Identity provider

Confirm refresh, revocation and device failure behaviour before any client implementation.

BOUNDARY 02

Event delivery

Define duplicate handling and event ordering for replayed messages.

BOUNDARY 03

Audit evidence

Test immutable event recording and traceability from request to outcome.

Illustrative acceptance conditions

1. A complete access decision can be reproduced from the event trail.
2. Revocation is enforced within an explicitly approved service-level target.
3. Interrupted event delivery resumes without silently dropping a decision.
4. Recovery is demonstrated from a fresh deployment using documented backup material.

05

DOCUMENT SECTION

Delivery approach

Use evidence gates rather than an unsupported date

Illustrative six-week feasibility period

Example sequence; not a project commitment



GATE A

Requirements

All access decisions and failure states are approved.

GATE B

Technical proof

Integration, replay and recovery tests pass.

GATE C

Commitment

Only then estimate and approve implementation.

06

DOCUMENT SECTION

Questions requiring response

Give stakeholders actionable questions

Decisions requested

1. Who is the final authority for an access or revocation rule?
2. Which source system is authoritative for identity status and revocations?
3. What is the maximum acceptable delay between revocation and enforcement?
4. Which supplier interfaces have been exercised against a test environment?
5. What evidence is needed for operational acceptance?

RECOMMENDED NEXT ACTION

I recommend approving the technical validation scope and assigning an accountable owner to each unresolved interface before discussing a fixed implementation date.

07

DOCUMENT SECTION

Document control

Reusable attribution and revision record

Field	Value
Author	Carlo Hennsa
Document type	Independent technical assessment · fictional example
Reference	EX-TR-001
Version	1.0
Issued	14 October 2026
Distribution	Demonstration / reuse
Evidence status	Illustrative only; no external claims