

● TECHNICAL CONTENT AUDIT

Noma Security Audit

A practical review of how Noma's platform and AI Agent Security pages support technical buyers today, and where the content could better help security leaders bring finance, legal, procurement, and executive sponsors into the decision.

ASSET REVIEWED

Platform Page + AI Agent
Security Solution Page

REVIEWED BY

Pratik Soren, Soreng & Co.

DATE

May 2026

The One-Page View


Noma's platform and AI Agent Security pages are strong technically. The main gap is what happens after a technical buyer is interested and needs to explain the investment internally.


Noma Security has clearly done the hard work of explaining a technical and still-emerging category. The pages are clean, easy to follow, and show real depth around AI and agentic security.


The opportunity is not to make the content more technical. It is to make it easier for a security leader to carry the story into the rest of the company. A Head of AI or security engineer may understand the risk quickly. A finance leader, legal stakeholder, procurement team, or executive sponsor will usually need a different layer of explanation: business risk, urgency, implementation effort, and cost of waiting.


Noma already has strong market signals, including funding, fast ARR growth, and enterprise customer proof. The product is clearly getting traction. The content can now do more of the internal selling work that currently falls on the champion and the sales team.

FOUR PRIMARY GAPS

 **Limited financial framing.** The pages explain the risk well, but they do not yet make the business cost of unmanaged AI agents easy to understand.

 **Urgency could be sharper.** The risk is clear, but the page does not yet give a non-technical buyer a strong reason to act this quarter instead of later.

 **The page is carrying too much.** It explains the category, the platform, and the risk all in one place. That makes it harder to serve each stakeholder clearly.

 **Not enough champion support.** There is very little that a security leader can quickly forward internally to help finance, legal, or leadership understand the case.

What Noma's Content Does Well

These strengths matter. The issue is not that the current content is weak. It is that it can work harder in the parts of the buying process where deals usually slow down.

01

Lifecycle Coverage Is Clear and Compelling

✓ Strong

Discover → Secure → Protect is simple and useful. It gives security teams a clear way to think about AI risk maturity without forcing them into a dense technical explanation too early.

02

Social Proof Is Unusually Strong for a Series B Company

✓ Strong

The named CISO quotes and third-party recognition are strong. A lot of companies at this stage rely on vague logos or anonymous proof. Noma has real credibility to work with.

03

The Agentic Risk Map Is a Strong Category Asset

✓ Strong

The "blast radius" framing is useful because it turns a complex AI security risk into something concrete. That kind of language can travel inside an organization better than a purely technical explanation.

04

Integration Breadth Is Well-Positioned

✓ Good

"80+ integrations, no code changes required" is a strong point because it addresses deployment friction early. For security buyers, this matters because a good platform can still stall if implementation looks heavy.

05

The Growth Metrics Signal Credibility

✓ Good

The funding, ARR growth, and Fortune 500 customer signals are useful credibility markers. The issue is that they could be framed more clearly as buyer confidence signals, not just company momentum.

Where the Content Loses Buyers

These are the places where a strong technical story may still create extra work for the internal champion.

● HIGH PRIORITY

No Financial Framing Anywhere

The page explains what agentic AI risk is, but it does not show enough of the business cost behind that risk. There is no simple cost-of-inaction frame, operational impact example, or ROI logic that a security leader could reuse in a budget conversation. The UBS agent adoption stat is useful, but it needs to connect to what unmanaged adoption could cost.

● HIGH PRIORITY

The Platform Page Has No Clear Audience

The page is trying to define the category, explain the platform, and support executive evaluation at the same time. That creates friction because each reader is looking for different information. A CISO wants coverage, control, and defensibility. Finance wants the cost of doing nothing. Procurement and legal want risk, compliance, and implementation confidence.

● HIGH PRIORITY

Urgency Is Missing

The threat section names the right risks: prompt injection, blind spots, compliance gaps, and agent complexity. What is missing is a stronger timeline. The reader understands that the problem is real, but not why it needs to move above other security priorities now. A short incident-style narrative or consequence example would make the urgency feel more practical.

● MEDIUM PRIORITY

Social Proof Is Underworked

The customer quotes are credible, but they mostly validate trust rather than outcomes. Phrases like "dramatically increased visibility" are useful, but they would carry more weight if paired with one specific result: time to value, risks surfaced, coverage gained, or manual effort reduced.

● MEDIUM PRIORITY

No Internal Champion Toolkit

A security leader who wants to bring Noma into an internal budget or board conversation needs something easy to forward: a one-pager, risk summary, or executive brief. From the reviewed pages, that kind of champion-facing asset is not obvious. That means the champion has to translate the case themselves.

Five Ways to Improve the Narrative

These are practical changes that would make the existing content more useful inside an enterprise buying process.


-
- | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| R1 | Build a Dedicated Executive Brief | IMPACT
High |
| <p>Keep the platform page technical, but add a short executive brief for people who will not read the full product narrative. The brief should explain the business risk, why this matters now, what changes when agents are unmanaged, and what Noma helps the organization control.</p> | | |
| <hr/> | | |
| R2 | Add a Quantified Cost-of-Inaction Section | IMPACT
High |
| <p>The UBS adoption point is a good start. The next step is to connect adoption to cost. Noma could use credible third-party data, internal platform findings, or anonymized customer insights to show what unmanaged AI agent adoption creates: exposure, investigation time, compliance risk, or operational drag.</p> | | |
| <hr/> | | |
| R3 | Turn Customer Quotes into Outcome Evidence | IMPACT
High |
| <p>The named testimonials are already valuable. The next version should try to add one outcome anchor to each one. It does not need to be a full case study. Even one detail time to value, number of risks surfaced, coverage gained, or workflow improvement would make the proof easier to use in procurement and finance conversations.</p> | | |
| <hr/> | | |
| R4 | Produce an Agentic Risk Threat Intelligence Report | IMPACT
High |
| <p>Noma already appears to have useful raw material across its blog and education content. Those ideas could be packaged into one stronger report: agentic risk patterns, common failure modes, emerging attack paths, and practical guidance mapped to known frameworks. That would give the sales team something more substantial than a blog link to share with serious evaluators.</p> | | |
| <hr/> | | |
| R5 | Create a Board-Ready Champion Enablement Kit | IMPACT
Med |
| <p>Give the internal champion a simple two-page asset they can forward to finance, legal, or leadership. It should answer the basic questions non-technical stakeholders ask: what is the risk, why now, what happens if we wait, how hard is this to deploy, and what should we expect to improve.</p> | | |

The Rewrite in Practice

Two examples of how the same technical message could be made more useful for an internal business conversation.

 CURRENT | PLATFORM PAGE HERO

"Secure AI, Agents, And Whatever Comes Next. Noma discovers, governs, and protects AI and Agents across the enterprise, from homegrown AI to SaaS agents and coding assistants."

 SAMPLE DIRECTION | ADD BUSINESS STAKES

"Every AI agent deployed across the business creates a new layer of access, permissions, and potential exposure. Noma helps security teams see and govern that activity before unmanaged agents turn into business risk."

Why this works better: The original line explains what Noma does. The revised direction makes the business risk easier to understand. That matters because a CISO often needs language that can survive outside the security team, especially when finance or leadership asks why this should be funded now.

 CURRENT | CISO TESTIMONIAL (UIPATH)

"With Noma Security seamlessly deployed across our AI stack, we've gained dramatically increased visibility into all of our AI and ML infra, models, and their associated security and compliance risks."

 SAMPLE DIRECTION | ADD AN OUTCOME ANCHOR

"After deployment, Noma helped us identify previously unknown AI assets and risk areas across our environment. Our product and security teams now have a clearer shared view of where AI risk exists and what needs to be governed."

Why this works better: The current quote is credible, but broad. For a buying committee, one concrete detail would make it stronger: what was discovered, how quickly value appeared, or what workflow improved. The point is not to overstate the result. It is to make the proof easier for others to repeat internally.

Who Reviews This | And What They Find

For a platform like Noma, the website is not only educating security teams. It is also helping a champion explain the investment to people who may not think about AI security every day.

STAKEHOLDER	THEIR CORE QUESTION	DOES THIS ASSET ANSWER IT?
CISO / Head of Security	Will this give me full coverage across every agent, and can I defend this spend to my board?	Partially
Head of AI / ML Platform	Does this integrate with our existing stack without slowing down our engineers?	Addressed
CFO / Finance Sponsor	What does it cost if we deploy AI agents without this, and what is the ROI case?	Gap
VP of Sales / CRO	Could stronger AI security controls reduce friction in customer, partner, or enterprise risk reviews?	Gap
Procurement / Legal	Is this SOC 2, ISO 27001, HIPAA compliant? How does it compare to Gartner alternatives?	Partially
Executive Sponsor / CEO	Why should this move up the priority list now, instead of waiting another quarter?	Gap

The pattern: The content works best for the people closest to the technical problem. That is a strong starting point. The next improvement is to make the same story easier for a champion to carry into finance, procurement, legal, and executive conversations. Right now, too much of that translation is left to the sales team or the internal buyer.

Where to Focus First

Ranked by where the content would most likely reduce friction in evaluation and internal approval.

IMPROVEMENT AREA	PRIORITY	EXPECTED IMPACT	EFFORT
Executive Brief / CISO-to-Board Narrative	High	High	● ● ● ●
Cost-of-Inaction / Financial Framing	High	High	● ● ● ●
Customer Testimonials Outcome Quantification	High	High	● ● ● ●
Threat Intelligence Report (Agentic Risk)	High	High	● ● ● ●
Internal Champion Enablement Kit	Medium	High	● ● ● ●
Sales Enablement Content (AE Talk Tracks)	Medium	Medium	● ● ● ●

Effort scale: One dot = low effort · Two = moderate · Three = significant · Four = heavy lift. The first three items are the most practical starting points because they improve the business case without requiring a full content rebuild.

What a Stronger Narrative Unlocks

Noma already has product traction. The question is whether the content can remove more friction before and after the demo, especially when the conversation moves outside the security team.

At this stage, the challenge is less about proving that Noma is a serious product and more about helping every stakeholder understand why this risk matters, why the timing matters, and why the investment is justified.



Shorter Sales Cycles

Executive-ready content gives the champion clearer language to use when finance or leadership asks why this should be funded.



Higher Win Rates vs. Status Quo

In emerging security categories, delay is often the real competitor. Financial framing helps buyers understand what waiting could cost.



AE Enablement at Scale

A threat report and executive brief would give the sales team stronger follow-up assets after discovery, demo, and security review conversations.



Category Leadership Reinforcement

A recurring Agentic AI Security Benchmark Report could help Noma become a reference point in the category, not only a vendor explaining its own platform.



Inbound Lead Quality Improvement

Deeper reports tend to attract buyers who are already trying to understand risk, not just browsing. That can improve lead quality when the asset is tied to the right follow-up process.



Partner Co-Sell Content

The Databricks integration and broader partner ecosystem could support stronger co-sell content. A practical joint guide would give partner teams something useful to share beyond a standard integration mention.

Where to Go From Here

This audit is only useful if it turns into clearer buyer-facing assets. The next step is choosing which content gap is slowing evaluation the most.

If this matches what you are seeing in enterprise conversations, we should compare notes.

Soreng & Co. helps cybersecurity and fintech companies turn technical depth into content that security leaders can actually use in enterprise sales conversations. The work usually starts with a simple question: where is the buyer getting stuck, and what does each stakeholder need to see before the deal can move forward?

→ Technical White Papers

→ Threat Intelligence Reports

→ Executive Briefs

→ Benchmark Reports

→ Sales Enablement Kits

→ Messaging Frameworks