

Comparison: BOI FreeDa vs. in-house development

Criteria	BOI FreeDa	In-house development
→ Time-to-value	Can be introduced within a few weeks	Months to years for concept, implementation, and testing
→ Audit trail & compliance	Out of the box: audit trail, versioning, traceable changes including user and timestamps	Implement audit trails by yourself and document them in an audit-proof manner
→ Governance & roles	Fine-grained role and rights management	Setup, maintenance and administration of authorization policy
→ Maintenance processes	Standardized 2-, 4-, and 6-eye processes, including change view	Individual setup of concept and implementation
→ Database-level validation logic	Automatic assurance of database conformity for all changes	Write, test, and document tests individually
→ Table-level validation logic	User-configurable rules and validation mechanisms at the table level	Individual setup of concept, implementation, and testing
→ Excel integration	Seamless import/export workflows	Individual parsers, mappings, and error handling
→ Database connection	Supports all major relational databases	Usually suitable for only one database
→ APIs & integration	Standardized interfaces for automated processes	Implement interface design, versioning, and backward compatibility by yourself
→ UI/UX for operating departments	High usability of the user interface, optimized for table maintenance without database knowledge	Develop UI/UX concepts and all components by yourself, ensuring accessibility

Comparison: BOI FreeDa vs. in-house development

→ Scalability & performance	Stable architecture for large datasets (>10.000 tables) and many concurrent users (100+)	Additional safeguards against non-functional requirements (load, latency)
→ Operating system	Platform-independent	Mostly platform-dependent implemented because it's more cost-effective
→ Support & maintenance	Manufacturer support including regular product updates	Dedicated team for bug fixes, feature requests, on-call duty
→ Total-cost-of-ownership	Plannable: license + implementation + operation	Variable/increasing: development + maintenance + know-how retention
→ Risk	Low: production-tested, audit-proof, and stable	High: risks concerning schedule, budget, quality and staff absences
→ Flexibility	High configurability, extensibility via APIs	Maximum flexibility, but significant implementation effort