



Evaluation Checklist:

# Unified Data & AI Platform

A practical guide for evaluating platforms that unify data engineering, analytics, governance, and AI

Pre-RFX Supplement | 2026

# ✓ How To Use This Checklist

This checklist helps you run structured market research and vendor evaluation without writing a full, formal RFX. It delivers many of the same decision-support inputs procurement teams typically build during RFX intake: clear requirements, evidence requests, evaluation criteria, and a documented decision trail.

If you later choose to run a formal RFX, you can use the outputs from this checklist as a plug-in for your requirements attachment, vendor demo script, and scoring rubric.

## Step 1.

**Start with outcomes and constraints.** Capture mission outcomes, risk boundaries, and required timelines before comparing features.

## Step 2.

**Run a structured vendor screen.** Share this checklist in advance and ask vendors to respond in writing (short, direct answers).

## Step 3.

**Hold at least one focused screening call per vendor (we recommend about 60 minutes).** Use the “Minimum bar” items in each section to eliminate poor fits early. If needed, schedule a second deep-dive session for the short list.

## Step 4.

**Require proof for the requirements that matter most.** For high-risk or complex requirements, ask for a demo, architecture evidence, or a reference that confirms the claim. Use judgment on lower-impact items.

## Step 5.

**Score what matters.** Weight governance, security, and implementation realities more heavily than “nice to have” capabilities.

## Step 6.

**Translate into procurement language.** Use the “Evidence to request” lines to build an RFX addendum or requirements attachment.

**What “done” looks like:** You can explain, in plain language, why the selected platform is the best value and/or lowest-risk way to deliver trusted enterprise search and answers across your environment, within your timeline and compliance boundaries.

# 1. Mission Fit and Modernization Approach

## Modernization Philosophy

- ☐ Can deliver value without forcing a rip-and-replace of mission systems in year one
- ☐ Supports incremental modernization (prove value on one workload, then expand)
- ☐ Makes it realistic to reduce the cost and risk created by duplicated data, brittle pipelines, and disconnected tools

## Workload Alignment

- ☐ Clear support for your priority workloads (batch ETL, streaming, BI, data science, GenAI)
- ☐ Demonstrates how the platform handles both structured and unstructured data (documents, logs, images, etc.)
- ☐ Can map platform capabilities to mission outcomes, not just technical activities

## Evidence To Request

- A sample 90-day plan that starts with one workload and shows measurable outcomes
- Two examples of modernization programs that expanded from an initial pilot

## Red Flags

- Time and materials-based “big bang” migrations presented as the default path
- The platform story depends on replacing multiple existing systems before value shows up

## 2. Platform Architecture and Operating Model

### Managed Services vs. In-Environment Operations

- ☐ Can explain what is managed by the vendor versus what runs in your environment
- ☐ Supports deployment patterns appropriate to your environment (including restricted networks and compliance zones)
- ☐ Demonstrates how data stays under your control (identity boundaries, storage boundaries, and network boundaries)

### Open Architecture and Portability

- ☐ Uses open formats and interfaces to avoid hard lock-in
- ☐ Provides a clear data portability and exit approach (export, migration, or multi-platform coexistence)
- ☐ Can operate across one or more clouds as needed (or explain limitations clearly)

### Evidence To Request

- Reference architecture diagram for a regulated environment
- Written explanation of where metadata, logs, governance enforcement, and audit records reside

### Red Flags

- Vague answers about where data, metadata, or governance enforcement lives
- No credible exit or portability story

## 3. Data Ingestion, Processing, and Reliability

### Batch and Streaming Fundamentals

- ☐ Supports both batch and streaming pipelines with consistent operational visibility
- ☐ Provides mechanisms for data quality checks and validation before data is used downstream
- ☐ Can demonstrate how pipeline failures are detected, triaged, and remediated

### Engineering Reliability and Operational Burden

- ☐ Can show how the platform reduces “3 AM pager duty” dynamics through monitoring and automation
- ☐ Provides repeatable patterns for building production-grade data products, not just one-off pipelines
- ☐ Can demonstrate performance tuning and cost controls for common workloads

### Evidence To Request

- Live demo: a broken pipeline scenario with alerts, logs, and remediation steps
- Example runbooks and an SRE-style operating model for data pipelines

### Red Flags

- Reliability is treated as an afterthought or “handled by your team”
- Observability exists only at the infrastructure layer, not the data pipeline layer

## 4. Data Governance, Lineage, and Auditability

### Governance is Enforced, Not Documented

- ☐ Governance controls are built into the platform, not dependent on policy binders and manual processes
- ☐ Role-based controls can be enforced across data engineering, analytics, and AI workflows
- ☐ Supports consistent enforcement for sensitive data (row/column-level controls where applicable)

### Lineage & Traceability

- ☐ Can trace data from source through transformations to dashboards and AI outputs
- ☐ Supports audit trails for access, changes, and policy enforcement events
- ☐ Can explain how governance scales as data sources, users, and models increase

### Evidence To Request

- Demo: lineage graph from a metric or model output back to raw sources
- Sample audit log exports suitable for oversight or audit requests

### Red Flags

- Lineage is partial, manual, or only available for certain tools
- Governance controls break when workloads move between analytics and ML

## 5. Security, Compliance, and Risk Posture

### Baseline Security Controls

- ☐ Encryption at rest and in transit, with clear key management options

---

- ☐ Clear identity and access integration patterns (including how changes propagate)

---

- ☐ Network controls appropriate for restricted environments (private connectivity options, segmentation)

---

### Compliance Readiness

- ☐ Can describe the compliance approach relevant to your environment (authorizations, audits, and evidence production)

---

- ☐ Provides clear logging, retention, and eDiscovery/legal hold considerations (where relevant)

---

- ☐ Can explain how sensitive data is protected in analytics and AI workflows

---

### Evidence To Request

- Security architecture overview and shared responsibility model
- Sample compliance evidence package (controls mapping, audit artifacts)

### Red Flags

- “Trust us” security posture with minimal documentation
- Inability to explain how AI features inherit security and governance controls

## 6. Analytics and Decision Support

### BI and SQL Performance

- ☐ Supports SQL analytics at scale with predictable performance and operational controls
- ☐ Can demonstrate concurrency patterns and governance of shared compute
- ☐ Supports semantic consistency so different teams do not generate conflicting truths

### Compliance Readiness

- ☐ Can show how analytics outputs connect to real operational decisions (not just dashboards)
- ☐ Enables near-real-time or event-driven analytics where mission needs require it

### Evidence To Request

- Demo: governed SQL analytics on representative datasets with a performance discussion
- Examples of how the platform supports consistent definitions and “single source of truth” semantics

### Red Flags

- Analytics is treated as separate from governance, engineering, and AI
- Performance claims without workload-specific proof

## 7. AI and GenAI Readiness

### Responsible AI foundation

- ☐ AI capabilities are grounded in governed data, with traceability back to sources
- ☐ Clear controls for model access, data access, and output logging
- ☐ Can explain how the platform supports model lifecycle management and monitoring

### From Prototype to Reduction

- ☐ Demonstrates a clear path from experiments and prototypes to production deployments
- ☐ Monitoring exists for model performance, drift, and operational stability
- ☐ Can support GenAI applications in a way that keeps data under agency control

### Evidence To Request

- Demo: end-to-end workflow from governed data to model training or GenAI app evaluation and monitoring
- Example policy: what is logged, who can access logs, and how outputs are reviewed

### Red Flags

- AI is positioned as “magic” without a concrete governance and monitoring model
- No clear operational story once models move beyond pilots

## 8. Data Sharing, Federation, and Interoperability

### Federation and Cross-Estate Access

- ☐ Can query or analyze data across the estate without creating unnecessary copies

---

- ☐ Can explain when federation is appropriate versus when consolidation is necessary

---

- ☐ Supports secure sharing patterns that do not require complicated ETL or replication

---

### Interoperability

- ☐ Integrates cleanly with your current tools and existing investments

---

- ☐ Provides APIs and extensibility that allow you to standardize without blocking teams

---

### Evidence To Request

- A reference architecture for federated access across two or more data domains
- A security model for sharing datasets, models, or outputs with internal and external partners

### Red Flags

- “Sharing” requires full duplication of data or weak governance boundaries
- Vendor cannot explain the tradeoffs and limits of federation in plain language

## 9. Implementation, Enablement, and Operational Ownership

### Time-to-Value

- ☐ Can be operational on a defined scope in weeks, not quarters
- ☐ Provides a phased rollout plan (pilot, expand, standardize)
- ☐ Clearly defines what you need to provide (people, access, environments, data readiness)

### Enablement and Sustainability

- ☐ Includes training, documentation, and knowledge transfer
- ☐ Provides clear operational roles: what your team owns versus vendor responsibilities
- ☐ Has a support model and SLAs that match mission criticality

### Evidence To Request

- Implementation plan with milestones, acceptance criteria, and deliverables
- Reference calls that include both technical and executive stakeholders

### Red Flags

- Implementation depends on hard-to-staff specialist roles with no enablement plan
- Vendor cannot commit to clear milestones and acceptance criteria

# 10. Commercials, Procurement, and Value Validation

## Pricing Clarity and Cost Controls

- ☐ Transparent pricing model with clear cost drivers (compute, users, workloads, features)
- ☐ Ability to forecast and control spend under real usage patterns
- ☐ Contract terms align with budget cycles and procurement realities

## Proof of Value

- ☐ Offers a pilot with measurable success criteria
- ☐ Provides a measurement plan for “time-to-insight,” reliability gains, and governance improvements
- ☐ Can quantify reduction of data duplication, integration overhead, and operational burden over time

## Evidence To Request

- Pilot plan with success metrics, data requirements, and an executive readout format
- Three references that can discuss outcomes and tradeoffs, not just deployment

## Red Flags

- Opaque pricing and no credible forecasting method
- Value case depends on soft benefits without operational metrics

# How To Apply This Checklist

## Initial Screening

Use Sections 1, 2, 4, and 5 to eliminate poor fits.

## Technical Deep Dive

Use Sections 3, 6, 7, and 8 to validate architecture and workload reality.

## Pilot Design

Use Sections 9 and 10 to define a pilot with measurable outcomes and an executive readout.

## Procurement Translation

Convert checked items and evidence requests into a requirements attachment, evaluation rubric, and demo script.

## Final Guidance

The best platforms will welcome scrutiny. If a vendor cannot explain tradeoffs, show traceability, or demonstrate how governance and security are enforced across analytics and AI, that is a signal.

A unified data and AI platform should reduce integration burden, increase auditability, and make it easier to deliver reliable analytics and responsible AI without destabilizing mission systems.



**REDLEIF**