Proportionality note

Reason the depth of control per business model, size, complexity and proven dependence.

Legal entity, function and scope

Determine the date, performance and role of responsibility with the own verification identifier.

Evidence of decision

Capture observation, scope and evidence per test step. Clear each open result before release.

What facts and evidence do the decision bear?

Select the information relevant to your criterion. Note version, location and reference to your own process for each document.

Own decision and open order

A verifiable proportionality note with alternatives and reassessment occasions.

Transfer the sample case to the own holding

A small investment firm operates a business-critical external identity service.

Example check	Documented status
Scale	The essential dependence leads to a proven level of control despite the small size of the company.
Observation	A flat-rate size note underestimates an unreplaceable platform.
Reasoned follow-up	Evaluate the specific function, examine the simplified framework separately and set the resubmission.

Keeping your own deviation and expected effect

What acceptance changes your decision? Determine which own sample and what proof clarify the open question.

Connect test documents, findings and acceptance

Link each sample with a unique identifier. In case of a different activity, replace the criterion by the test position relevant to your job.

Proportionality of the technical framework

2024/1774 · Art. 1 · Check whether a growing central service triggers a reassessment of the existing control scope.

Observation and evidence

Specify the observed result, location and status.

Supporting governance of the simplified framework

2024/1774 · Art. 28 · Check a documented resource decision with an ICT risk impact.

Observation and evidence

Specify the observed result, location and status.

Correction, follow-up date and release

Determine the finding, the correction responsible, the post-test and the decision with date.