

# Study Plan — Cloud Computing Security (User Story Cards)

Aligned to “Cloud Computing Security: Foundations and Challenges (2nd ed.)”

*One story card per chapter with example tasks and BDD acceptance criteria.*

---

## Contents

<b>1 Section I — Introduction (Ch. 1–5)</b>	<b>2</b>
---	----------

# 1 Section I — Introduction (Ch. 1–5)

## CCS-1 — Ch. 1 — Foundations & Essentials

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Cloud Foundations
<b>Business Value</b>	Establish shared vocabulary and ownership to reduce onboarding confusion and security drift.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Must SP: 3
<b>Persona</b>	Developer starting on a cloud project
<b>Dependencies</b>	Sandbox account, org security policy, provider docs
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Teams may interpret shared responsibility differently; risk of inconsistent defaults

### Story

*As a developer, I want to document cloud foundations and shared responsibility so that I make secure choices and keep main green.* **Non-Functional**

Security Reliability Accessibility **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Shared understanding is captured
<b>Given</b>	A sandbox and policy references
<b>When</b>	I create a one-page shared responsibility matrix and a glossary of essential characteristics
<b>Then</b>	The documents are linked in onboarding and referenced by future stories

*Definition of Ready:* Persona clear; AC drafted; Dependencies identified. • *Definition of Done:* Matrix and glossary committed; reviewed by AppSec; referenced in README. **Tasks**

- ☐ Write docs/shared-responsibility-matrix.md.
- ☐ Capture five essential characteristics of cloud with examples.
- ☐ Add link in README.md and onboarding checklist.
- ☐ Open issues for disagreements or unclear ownership.

## CCS-2 — Ch. 2 — Overview of Cloud Computing

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Cloud Foundations
<b>Business Value</b>	Reduce design churn by listing provider primitives and portability considerations.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Must SP: 3
<b>Persona</b>	Solution architect
<b>Dependencies</b>	Access to AWS, Azure, and GCP docs
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Feature parity differs; lock-in may be acceptable for value

*As a solution architect, I want a lift-and-shift bill of materials so that teams can compare provider primitives and portability risks.* **Non-Functional**

Performance Security Reliability **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Cross-provider comparison documented
<b>Given</b>	A reference three-tier app
<b>When</b>	I create a bill of materials for AWS, Azure, and GCP with security notes
<b>Then</b>	Tradeoffs and lock-in vectors are captured with mitigation ideas
<i>Definition of Ready:</i> Reference app defined; providers chosen. • <i>Definition of Done:</i> BOM spreadsheet checked in; reviewed by platform and security. <b>Tasks</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Produce <code>bom/cloud-bom.xlsx</code> with compute, storage, network, IAM.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Annotate security defaults and required hardening per service.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Note portability blockers and alternatives.	
<input type="checkbox"/> File follow-up ADR if a single provider is selected.	

## CCS-14 — Ch. 14 — Security Essentials & Reference Architectures

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Reference Architecture
<b>Business Value</b>	Provide a secure, repeatable pattern for web workloads.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Must SP: 5
<b>Persona</b>	Solutions architect
<b>Dependencies</b>	Diagramming tool, baseline modules
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Pattern must be simple yet adaptable
<b>Story</b>	
<i>As a solutions architect, I want a secure reference architecture so that teams can adopt consistent controls quickly.</i> <b>Non-Functional</b>	
<div>Security</div> <div>Reliability</div> <b>Acceptance Criteria (BDD)</b>	
<b>Scenario</b>	Reference published
<b>Given</b>	Common requirements for a web app
<b>When</b>	I include logging, monitoring, KMS, WAF, and CIEM
<b>Then</b>	The diagram and bill of materials are reviewed and adopted
<i>Definition of Ready:</i> Scope finalized. • <i>Definition of Done:</i> Drawio file and BOM committed; approval recorded. <b>Tasks</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Draw diagram with shared services.	
<input type="checkbox"/> List components and controls.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Map to controls framework.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Create adoption checklist.	

## CCS-15 — Ch. 15 — Architecture & Security Concepts

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Zero Trust & Immutable Infra
<b>Business Value</b>	Reduce lateral movement and configuration drift.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Should SP: 3
<b>Persona</b>	Platform architect
<b>Dependencies</b>	Image builder, autoscaling, CI/CD
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Rebuild cadence must align with release cycles

## Story

*As a platform architect, I want immutable images with micro-segmentation so that drift and attack paths are minimized.* **Non-Functional**

Security

Reliability

### Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

**Scenario**

Mutable to immutable migration

**Given**

A mutable VM pattern

**When**

I move to image-based deployments with autoscaling

**Then**

Patching occurs via rebuild and health checks stay green

*Definition of Ready:* Current pattern documented. • *Definition of Done:* New pattern deployed in staging;

runbook updated. **Tasks**

- ☐ Create hardened base image.
- ☐ Update pipeline for image promotion.
- ☐ Add health checks and rollbacks.
- ☐ Retire in-place patching runbooks.

## CCS-16 — Ch. 16 — Secure Cloud Architecture

**Epic / Feature**

Threat-Driven Design

**Business Value**

Align controls with threats and evidence.

**Priority / Estimate**

Priority: Must SP: 5

**Persona**

Security architect

**Dependencies**

Threat modeling tool, control catalog

**Assumptions / Risks**

Over-design if threats not prioritized

**Story**

*As a security architect, I want a threat model linked to controls so that architectural choices are justified.* **Non-Functional**

Security

Reliability

### Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

**Scenario**

STRIDE model created

**Given**

The reference architecture

**When**

I document threats and mitigations

**Then**

Missing controls generate backlog items with owners

*Definition of Ready:* Architecture stable. • *Definition of Done:* Threat model published; issues created and

prioritized. **Tasks**

- ☐ Run a STRIDE session.
- ☐ Map threats to controls.
- ☐ Create tickets for gaps.
- ☐ Review annually or after changes.

## CCS-29 — Ch. 29 — Regions, Zones, & Trust Boundaries

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Multi-Region Planning
<b>Business Value</b>	Improve resilience and clarify trust boundaries.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Should SP: 3
<b>Persona</b>	Site reliability engineer
<b>Dependencies</b>	Provider region matrix, latency data
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Cost vs availability tradeoffs
<b>Story</b>	

*As an SRE, I want a region selection ADR so that latency, compliance, and trust boundaries are explicit.* **Non-Functional**

Reliability Security **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Regions selected
<b>Given</b>	Latency and compliance constraints
<b>When</b>	I pick primary and failover regions
<b>Then</b>	ADR documents tradeoffs and dependencies

*Definition of Ready:* Constraints collected. • *Definition of Done:* ADR merged; DNS and data plans documented. **Tasks**

- ☐ Measure latency from users.
- ☐ Check data residency needs.
- ☐ Choose primary and secondary.
- ☐ Document dependencies and costs.

## CCS-3 — Ch. 3 — Security Baselines

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Baseline Security
<b>Business Value</b>	Create fast feedback on misconfigurations and reduce time to first fix.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Must SP: 5
<b>Persona</b>	Cloud security engineer
<b>Dependencies</b>	Sandbox account/project, Prowler or ScoutSuite, read-only creds
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Findings volume may be high; prioritize by risk
<b>Story</b>	

*As a cloud security engineer, I want to run a baseline scan so that we triage top risks and create a remediation backlog.* **Non-Functional**

Security Reliability Privacy **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Baseline executed and triaged
<b>Given</b>	Read-only scanner access
<b>When</b>	I run Prowler or ScoutSuite and export results
<b>Then</b>	Top ten findings have owners, due dates, and tickets

*Definition of Ready:* Scanner configured; scope agreed. • *Definition of Done:* Report stored; backlog created; first PR opened for a fix. **Tasks**

- ☐ Execute scan and export JSON plus HTML.

- ☐ Create `baseline-findings.md` with risk ranking.
- ☐ Open issues for top findings; tag teams.
- ☐ Document suppressions and rationale.

## CCS-4 — Ch. 4 — Privacy & Trust Baselines

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Data Protection
<b>Business Value</b>	Reduce regulatory risk through inventory, tagging, and residency controls.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Must    SP: 5
<b>Persona</b>	Data protection officer / privacy engineer
<b>Dependencies</b>	Data catalog access, tagging standard
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Unknown data flows; legacy datasets may be unlabeled
<b>Story</b>	

*As a privacy engineer, I want to inventory and tag datasets so that location, residency, and access are controlled.* **Non-Functional**

Privacy   Security   Reliability   **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Inventory completed for one workload
<b>Given</b>	Access to data catalog and cloud storage
<b>When</b>	I tag datasets by sensitivity and residency
<b>Then</b>	Policies and controls reference the tags for enforcement

*Definition of Ready:* Scope selected; tagging keys agreed.   •   *Definition of Done:* Inventory CSV committed; policies updated; gaps tracked. **Tasks**

- ☐ Export dataset list and classify sensitivity.
- ☐ Tag objects and databases by owner and residency.
- ☐ Map to retention and legal requirements.
- ☐ Open tasks to fix unlabeled datasets.

## CCS-6 — Ch. 6 — Risk & Trust Assessment Schemes

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Risk Management
<b>Business Value</b>	Make risk-driven decisions using a consistent scheme.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Must    SP: 3
<b>Persona</b>	Risk analyst
<b>Dependencies</b>	Risk register template, stakeholder access
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Disagreement on scoring methods
<b>Story</b>	

*As a risk analyst, I want a risk register using a simple method so that leaders can compare and prioritize risks.* **Non-Functional**

Security   Reliability   **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Register populated for one project
<b>Given</b>	A template and stakeholder interviews
<b>When</b>	I capture top risks with likelihood and impact
<b>Then</b>	Owners and treatments are assigned and accepted
<i>Definition of Ready:</i> Template chosen; scope set.   • <i>Definition of Done:</i> Register committed; review notes added; next review scheduled.	
<b>Tasks</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Create <code>risk-register.xlsx</code> .	
<input type="checkbox"/> Schedule 30-minute interviews with owners.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Draft KRIs for top items.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Publish review cadence.	

## CCS-7 — Ch. 7 — Managing Risk in the Cloud

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Risk Treatment
<b>Business Value</b>	Reduce probability or impact through concrete control choices.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Must   SP: 5
<b>Persona</b>	Security program manager
<b>Dependencies</b>	Control catalog, platform team availability
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Limited capacity; tradeoffs required
<b>Story</b>	
<i>As a security program manager, I want risk treatments tied to controls so that we see measurable reduction in risk.</i>	
<b>Non-Functional</b>	
Security	Reliability
<b>Acceptance Criteria (BDD)</b>	
<b>Scenario</b>	Treatments committed
<b>Given</b>	A prioritized risk list
<b>When</b>	I link risks to controls and create implementation tickets
<b>Then</b>	KRIs and due dates are visible on the roadmap
<i>Definition of Ready:</i> Owners identified; catalog agreed.   • <i>Definition of Done:</i> Tickets created; dashboard shows KRIs; exec summary published.	
<b>Tasks</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Map each top risk to controls and team.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Create epics with AC and success criteria.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Add KRI queries to dashboard.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Send monthly status note.	

## CCS-8 — Ch. 8 — Cloud Security Risk Management

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Policy as Code
<b>Business Value</b>	Prevent misconfigurations from merging to main.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Must   SP: 5
<b>Persona</b>	DevOps engineer
<b>Dependencies</b>	CI pipeline, IaC repo, OPA or Checkov
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	False positives can slow teams
<b>Story</b>	

*As a DevOps engineer, I want policy-as-code in CI so that insecure IaC cannot be merged.*

#### Non-Functional

Security

Reliability

#### Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

##### Scenario

CI blocks insecure patterns

##### Given

A repo with Terraform modules

##### When

I add checks for public buckets and wildcard IAM

##### Then

Failing PRs show clear messages and remediation links

*Definition of Ready:* Rules selected; threshold agreed. • *Definition of Done:* Checks enforced; docs added;

exceptions process documented. **Tasks**

- ☐ Add OPA or Checkov job to CI.
- ☐ Write two guardrails: storage public access and IAM wildcards.
- ☐ Add test fixtures that fail until fixed.
- ☐ Document remediation steps.

## CCS-9 — Ch. 9 — Risk Mitigation Methods

### Epic / Feature

Mitigation Patterns

### Business Value

Choose effective mitigations for data and perimeter.

### Priority / Estimate

Priority: Should SP: 3

### Persona

Security architect

### Dependencies

KMS, WAF, segmentation capability

### Assumptions / Risks

Cost and latency tradeoffs

### Story

*As a security architect, I want to compare mitigation options so that we pick the best fit per risk.* **Non-Functional**

Performance

Security

#### Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

##### Scenario

Decision record created

##### Given

Candidate mitigations and constraints

##### When

I evaluate tokenization, KMS, WAF, and micro-segmentation

##### Then

An ADR records the chosen approach and rationale

*Definition of Ready:* Alternatives listed; constraints known. • *Definition of Done:* ADR merged; next steps

filed as tickets. **Tasks**

- ☐ Draft ADR comparing options.
- ☐ Measure expected latency impact.
- ☐ Validate cost estimates.
- ☐ Get sign-off from stakeholders.



## CCS-10 — Ch. 10 — Access Policy Specification & Enforcement

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Identity and Access Management
<b>Business Value</b>	Reduce privilege and prevent policy sprawl.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Must    SP: 5
<b>Persona</b>	IAM engineer
<b>Dependencies</b>	Policy engine, repo access
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Legacy policies contain wildcards
<b>Story</b>	

*As an IAM engineer, I want least-privilege policies with automated checks so that access stays minimal and auditable.* **Non-Functional**

Security

Reliability

### Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

<b>Scenario</b>	Wildcards prevented
<b>Given</b>	Policy files in version control
<b>When</b>	I add a rule that fails "Action: *" or "Resource: *"
<b>Then</b>	PRs fail with a clear message and link to examples

*Definition of Ready:* Policy style guide drafted.    • *Definition of Done:* Rules enabled; examples published; old policies queued for refactor. **Tasks**

- ☐ Create policy lints for wildcards and unused permissions.
- ☐ Build reusable role templates.
- ☐ Add presubmit unit tests.
- ☐ Document escalation and exceptions.

## CCS-12 — Ch. 12 — Distributed Access Control

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Service Authorization
<b>Business Value</b>	Enforce consistent policies across microservices.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Should    SP: 3
<b>Persona</b>	Platform engineer
<b>Dependencies</b>	OPA sidecar or service mesh, K8s cluster
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Policy changes must be versioned and tested
<b>Story</b>	

*As a platform engineer, I want sidecar policy enforcement so that services follow the same authorization rules.* **Non-Functional**

Security

Reliability

### Acceptance Criteria (BDD)

<b>Scenario</b>	Policy enforced at runtime
<b>Given</b>	A sample API deployed on Kubernetes
<b>When</b>	I deny requests lacking a required claim
<b>Then</b>	Access logs and metrics confirm policy decisions

*Definition of Ready:* Sidecar pattern approved.    • *Definition of Done:* Policy repo created; sample deployed; dashboards live. **Tasks**

- ☐ Deploy OPA sidecar with Rego bundle.
- ☐ Write allow/deny rule based on JWT claim.

- ☐ Emit decision logs to SIEM.
- ☐ Add rollout and rollback steps.

## CCS-11 — Ch. 11 — Cryptographic Key Management

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Data Encryption
<b>Business Value</b>	Protect sensitive data at rest and in transit with managed lifecycle.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Must    SP: 5
<b>Persona</b>	Security engineer
<b>Dependencies</b>	KMS, secrets store, CI access
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Rotation can disrupt apps if not coordinated

### Story

*As a security engineer, I want envelope encryption with automated rotation so that key compromise risk is minimized.* **Non-Functional**

Security Reliability Privacy **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Rotation executed without downtime
<b>Given</b>	Apps using KMS for envelope encryption
<b>When</b>	I rotate keys and re-encrypt materials in staging
<b>Then</b>	Metrics show no errors and runbooks are updated

*Definition of Ready:* Apps instrumented; staging ready.    • *Definition of Done:* Rotation proved in staging;

prod schedule approved; runbook linked. **Tasks**

- ☐ Implement envelope encryption example.
- ☐ Add rotation job and alarms.
- ☐ Create decrypt fallback and test.
- ☐ Publish runbook with rollback plan.

## CCS-13 — Ch. 13 — User-Side Key Controls

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Client-Side Encryption
<b>Business Value</b>	Reduce provider breach blast radius.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Should    SP: 3
<b>Persona</b>	Client app developer
<b>Dependencies</b>	Crypto library, performance test tool
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	UX latency and key handling complexity

### Story

*As a client developer, I want to encrypt data before upload so that exposure risk is reduced.*

### Non-Functional

Performance Security Privacy **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Client-side encryption prototype
<b>Given</b>	A demo dataset and upload path
<b>When</b>	I enable client encryption and measure overhead
<b>Then</b>	Latency impact and throughput are documented with limits

*Definition of Ready:* Test dataset ready.    • *Definition of Done:* Prototype merged; thresholds set; backlog

items filed. **Tasks**

- ☐ Build client encryption function.
- ☐ Add perf test for 1 MB and 10 MB files.
- ☐ Document key custody options.
- ☐ Decide thresholds and guardrails.

## CCS-5 — Ch. 5 — IaaS Focus

**Epic / Feature** Compute, Storage, Network Hardening  
**Business Value** Prevent common misconfigurations at the IaaS layer.  
**Priority / Estimate** Priority: Must SP: 5  
**Persona** Platform engineer  
**Dependencies** Terraform repo, VPC/VNet, KMS, IAM  
**Assumptions / Risks** Breaking changes if defaults tighten without comms  
**Story**

*As a platform engineer, I want least-privilege IAM and default-deny networking so that IaaS resources are secure by default.* **Non-Functional**

Security

Reliability

**Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

**Scenario** Secure defaults enforced  
**Given** A Terraform baseline module  
**When** I add network policies and least-privilege roles  
**Then** New resources inherit secure defaults and tests verify enforcement  
*Definition of Ready:* Module owners onboard; tests planned. • *Definition of Done:* Module released;

pipelines pass; docs updated. **Tasks**

- ☐ Harden security groups and route tables to default deny.
- ☐ Create least-privilege role for compute and storage access.
- ☐ Add unit tests for denial of wildcard permissions.
- ☐ Publish module usage guide.

## CCS-17 — Ch. 17 — Locking Down Cloud Servers

**Epic / Feature** Host Hardening  
**Business Value** Reduce attack surface of compute instances.  
**Priority / Estimate** Priority: Must SP: 5  
**Persona** Systems engineer  
**Dependencies** CIS benchmark, Ansible, osquery  
**Assumptions / Risks** Compatibility issues with legacy apps  
**Story**

*As a systems engineer, I want hardened server images validated by scans so that host-level risk is reduced.* **Non-Functional**

Security

Reliability

**Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Hardened image baseline
<b>Given</b>	A base operating system image
<b>When</b>	I apply Ansible hardening and validate with osquery
<b>Then</b>	Compliance score meets target and drift alerts are enabled
<i>Definition of Ready:</i> Baseline chosen. • <i>Definition of Done:</i> Image published; score documented; rollout plan approved. <b>Tasks</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Build Ansible role for hardening.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Add osquery pack for controls.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Measure compliance score.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Define rollout and fallback.	

## CCS-30 — Ch. 30 — Availability, Recovery, & Auditing

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	DR Runbook and Evidence
<b>Business Value</b>	Prove recoverability and auditing across sites.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Must SP: 5
<b>Persona</b>	SRE lead
<b>Dependencies</b>	Backup system, failover tooling, logging
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Testing may cause temporary disruption
<b>Story</b>	
<i>As an SRE lead, I want a game day failover with evidence so that RPO and RTO are validated.</i>	
<b>Non-Functional</b>	
Reliability	Security
<b>Acceptance Criteria (BDD)</b>	
<b>Scenario</b>	Game day executed
<b>Given</b>	A DR runbook and staging environment
<b>When</b>	I fail over traffic and restore data
<b>Then</b>	RPO/RTO targets are met and audit artifacts stored
<i>Definition of Ready:</i> Runbook drafted; window approved. • <i>Definition of Done:</i> Postmortem completed; evidence archived; action items filed. <b>Tasks</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Dry-run backup restore.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Switch traffic in staging.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Collect logs and screenshots.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Write postmortem with follow-ups.	

## CCS-18 — Ch. 18 — Third-Party Provider Integrity

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Vendor Security
<b>Business Value</b>	Reduce supply-chain risk by verifying provider controls.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Should SP: 3
<b>Persona</b>	TPRM analyst
<b>Dependencies</b>	Vendor portal, questionnaire, evidence store
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Evidence may be incomplete or outdated
<b>Story</b>	

*As a TPRM analyst, I want to evaluate a SaaS vendor so that integrity and compliance claims are validated.* **Non-Functional**

Security Privacy **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

**Scenario** Vendor assessed  
**Given** A completed questionnaire and shared evidence  
**When** I review SOC 2, ISO certs, pen test summaries  
**Then** Gaps and compensating controls are recorded with owners  
*Definition of Ready:* Vendor identified. • *Definition of Done:* Assessment logged; renewal date tracked;

follow-ups filed. **Tasks**

- ☐ Collect attestations and reports.
- ☐ Map to our control set.
- ☐ Record gaps and compensations.
- ☐ Schedule next review.

## CCS-19 — Ch. 19 — Negotiating Security Requirements

**Epic / Feature** Security Addendum  
**Business Value** Contractualize minimum controls and reporting duties.  
**Priority / Estimate** Priority: Must SP: 3  
**Persona** Security lead / legal partner  
**Dependencies** Contract template, DPA, counsel review  
**Assumptions / Risks** Negotiations may extend timelines  
**Story**

*As a security lead, I want measurable security clauses so that vendor obligations are enforceable.*

**Non-Functional**

Security Privacy **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

**Scenario** Addendum executed  
**Given** A vendor contract in negotiation  
**When** I add breach notice timing, logging, crypto, and SRT clauses  
**Then** The executed contract contains measurable commitments  
*Definition of Ready:* Template aligned with legal. • *Definition of Done:* Signed addendum archived;

obligations tracked. **Tasks**

- ☐ Draft 10 key clauses.
- ☐ Align with DPA terms.
- ☐ Review with counsel.
- ☐ Track obligations in register.

## CCS-20 — Ch. 20 — Legal Compliance for Personal Data

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Privacy Compliance
<b>Business Value</b>	Demonstrate lawful processing and accountability.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Must SP: 5
<b>Persona</b>	Privacy engineer
<b>Dependencies</b>	ROPA template, data map, DPO review
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Data lineage unknown for some fields
<b>Story</b>	

*As a privacy engineer, I want a record of processing and DFD so that obligations and flows are clear.* **Non-Functional**

**Privacy** **Security** **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	ROPA completed
<b>Given</b>	Access to systems and owners
<b>When</b>	I capture purposes, lawful basis, retention, and transfers
<b>Then</b>	Data flows and controls are documented and approved
<i>Definition of Ready:</i> Scope bounded; owners engaged. • <i>Definition of Done:</i> ROPA and DFD in repo; review sign-off captured. <b>Tasks</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Build <code>privacy/ropa.xlsx</code> .	
<input type="checkbox"/> Draw data flow diagram.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Validate retention policies.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Add cross-border transfer notes.	

## CCS-27 — Ch. 27 — Government Certification & Accreditation

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	FedRAMP Readiness (example)
<b>Business Value</b>	Understand inheritance and required artifacts.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Should SP: 3
<b>Persona</b>	Compliance lead
<b>Dependencies</b>	Control catalog, SSP template
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Scope must be tightly defined
<b>Story</b>	

*As a compliance lead, I want a control inheritance map so that authorization scope and responsibilities are clear.* **Non-Functional**

**Security** **Reliability** **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Inheritance mapped
<b>Given</b>	A SaaS in scope
<b>When</b>	I mark provider vs customer controls
<b>Then</b>	The SSP references the map and gaps are tracked
<i>Definition of Ready:</i> Boundary defined. • <i>Definition of Done:</i> Matrix committed; SSP section drafted; gaps logged. <b>Tasks</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Build inheritance matrix.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Tag inherited controls.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Draft SSP outline.	

- ☐ Create gap tickets.

## CCS-28 — Ch. 28 — Government Regulations & Compliance Risks

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Regulatory Risk Log
<b>Business Value</b>	Avoid surprise obligations and penalties.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Should SP: 3
<b>Persona</b>	Compliance analyst
<b>Dependencies</b>	Legal counsel, records policy
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Regulations evolve; periodic review needed
<b>Story</b>	

*As a compliance analyst, I want a regulatory risk log so that export, retention, and sector rules are addressed.* **Non-Functional**

Privacy Security **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Risks recorded with treatments
<b>Given</b>	A list of applicable regulations
<b>When</b>	I log risks and proposed mitigations
<b>Then</b>	Owners and deadlines are tracked

*Definition of Ready:* Sources identified. • *Definition of Done:* Log published; review cadence set; items assigned. **Tasks**

- ☐ List applicable regs per region.
- ☐ Identify records and retention needs.
- ☐ Document export-control flags.
- ☐ Assign owners and dates.

## CCS-21 — Ch. 21 — Integrity Assurance for Data Outsourcing

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Data Integrity
<b>Business Value</b>	Detect tampering and ensure recoverability.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Should SP: 3
<b>Persona</b>	Storage engineer
<b>Dependencies</b>	Object lock, versioning, checksum pipeline
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Immutability might affect lifecycle costs
<b>Story</b>	

*As a storage engineer, I want object immutability and verification so that outsourced data integrity is assured.* **Non-Functional**

Reliability Security **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Immutability and verification enabled
<b>Given</b>	A critical bucket
<b>When</b>	I enable object lock and periodic checksum verification
<b>Then</b>	Evidence of integrity is logged and alerts fire on mismatch

*Definition of Ready:* Bucket identified. • *Definition of Done:* Policies active; verification job scheduled; alerts tested. **Tasks**

- ☐ Turn on versioning and object lock.
- ☐ Create checksum job.
- ☐ Store proofs and logs.
- ☐ Test corruption scenario.

## CCS-22 — Ch. 22 — Secure Computation Outsourcing

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Confidential Computing
<b>Business Value</b>	Protect workloads from host compromise.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Should    SP: 3
<b>Persona</b>	Platform engineer
<b>Dependencies</b>	Confidential VM or enclave offering
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Limited tooling; higher cost
<b>Story</b>	

*As a platform engineer, I want to deploy a confidential VM demo so that sensitive code and data run in a protected environment.* **Non-Functional**

Security Performance **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Demo deployed
<b>Given</b>	Access to confidential VM/Enclave service
<b>When</b>	I run a sample workload with attestation
<b>Then</b>	Attestation evidence is captured and documented

*Definition of Ready:* Service quota available.    • *Definition of Done:* Demo works; evidence stored; decision matrix written. **Tasks**

- ☐ Launch confidential instance.
- ☐ Run attestation example.
- ☐ Capture measurements and logs.
- ☐ Write decision matrix.

## CCS-23 — Ch. 23 — Computation Over Encrypted Data

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Searchable Encryption / FHE Survey
<b>Business Value</b>	Enable limited queries without decrypting data.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Could    SP: 2
<b>Persona</b>	Research engineer
<b>Dependencies</b>	Sample dataset, library support
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Performance and complexity constraints
<b>Story</b>	

*As a research engineer, I want to prototype encrypted search so that feasibility and limits are documented.* **Non-Functional**

Security Performance **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**



<b>Scenario</b>	Prototype results recorded
<b>Given</b>	A text dataset
<b>When</b>	I run encrypted keyword search
<b>Then</b>	Latency, correctness, and limits are summarized
<i>Definition of Ready:</i> Dataset ready. • <i>Definition of Done:</i> PoC code and report committed; go/no-go noted.	
<b>Tasks</b>	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Choose library and scheme.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Index and query dataset.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Measure latency and size.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Summarize findings.

## CCS-24 — Ch. 24 — Trusted Computing Technology

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Platform Trust
<b>Business Value</b>	Validate boot and workload integrity.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Should SP: 3
<b>Persona</b>	Platform engineer
<b>Dependencies</b>	vTPM, secure boot, measurement service
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Hardware support varies by provider
<b>Story</b>	
<i>As a platform engineer, I want to verify secure boot and vTPM so that platform trust is established.</i> <b>Non-Functional</b>	
<b>Security</b>	<b>Reliability</b>
<b>Acceptance Criteria (BDD)</b>	
<b>Scenario</b>	Attestation enabled
<b>Given</b>	A VM image and policy
<b>When</b>	I enable secure boot and verify measurements
<b>Then</b>	Evidence is stored and non-compliant boots alert
<i>Definition of Ready:</i> Image pipeline documented. • <i>Definition of Done:</i> Attestation evidence archived; alert tested.	
<b>Tasks</b>	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Enable secure boot and vTPM.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Capture PCR measurements.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Store evidence in repo.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Add alert for failures.

## CCS-25 — Ch. 25 — Trusted Security Tech: Survey & Gaps

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Capability Heatmap
<b>Business Value</b>	Identify maturity and gaps for trusted tech.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Could SP: 2
<b>Persona</b>	Security architect
<b>Dependencies</b>	Stakeholder input
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Divergent views on maturity
<b>Story</b>	

*As a security architect, I want a capability heatmap so that prioritization of trust tech investments is clear.* **Non-Functional**

Security Reliability **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

**Scenario** Heatmap published  
**Given** A list of capabilities  
**When** I score maturity and document gaps  
**Then** Roadmap items and owners are assigned

*Definition of Ready:* Capabilities enumerated. • *Definition of Done:* Heatmap slide shared; roadmap updated. **Tasks**

- ☐ Define scoring rubric.
- ☐ Collect scores from owners.
- ☐ Aggregate and visualize.
- ☐ File roadmap items.

## CCS-26 — Ch. 26 — Trusted Computing Proposals

**Epic / Feature** End-to-End Trust Chain  
**Business Value** Prove device to workload trust with attestations.  
**Priority / Estimate** Priority: Could SP: 2  
**Persona** Security engineer  
**Dependencies** Attestation service, identity provider  
**Assumptions / Risks** Complexity of chain-of-trust proofs  
**Story**

*As a security engineer, I want an attestation flow design so that trust decisions can be automated.* **Non-Functional**

Security Reliability **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

**Scenario** Flow documented  
**Given** Components for device, boot, and workload  
**When** I design sequence of attestations  
**Then** Verification steps and failure modes are defined

*Definition of Ready:* Components inventoried. • *Definition of Done:* Sequence diagram and notes committed. **Tasks**

- ☐ Draft sequence diagram.
- ☐ List verification artifacts.
- ☐ Define failure responses.
- ☐ Review with platform team.

## CCS-31 — Ch. 31 — Advanced Security Architecture

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Service Mesh and Zero Trust
<b>Business Value</b>	Strong identity boundaries between services.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Should SP: 3
<b>Persona</b>	Platform engineer
<b>Dependencies</b>	Istio or Linkerd, PKI
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	mTLS introduces complexity
<b>Story</b>	

*As a platform engineer, I want mTLS via a service mesh so that service-to-service trust is explicit and auditable.* **Non-Functional**

Security Reliability Performance **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Mesh policy enforced
<b>Given</b>	A cluster and sample services
<b>When</b>	I require authenticated identities for calls
<b>Then</b>	Unauthorized calls fail and metrics show encrypted traffic
<i>Definition of Ready:</i> PKI ready; cluster available. • <i>Definition of Done:</i> Policies applied; dashboards in place; rollback steps documented. <b>Tasks</b>	

- ☐ Install mesh and issue certificates.
- ☐ Enforce mTLS and authZ policy.
- ☐ Expose metrics and logs.
- ☐ Document rollout plan.

## CCS-32 — Ch. 32 — Side-Channel Attacks & Defenses

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Side-Channel Awareness
<b>Business Value</b>	Reduce risk from timing and cache leakage.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Could SP: 2
<b>Persona</b>	Security researcher
<b>Dependencies</b>	Benchmark harness, controlled environment
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Synthetic tests may not reflect production
<b>Story</b>	

*As a security researcher, I want to measure a simple timing side-channel and mitigation so that risk is understood.* **Non-Functional**

Security Performance **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Signal measured and reduced
<b>Given</b>	A controlled test harness
<b>When</b>	I demonstrate a cache-timing signal and apply a mitigation
<b>Then</b>	The signal-to-noise ratio decreases per target threshold
<i>Definition of Ready:</i> Harness prepared. • <i>Definition of Done:</i> Notebook and results committed; mitigation guidance added. <b>Tasks</b>	

- ☐ Implement timing measurement.
- ☐ Capture baseline signal.

- ☐ Apply mitigation and remeasure.
- ☐ Document recommendations.

## CCS-33 — Ch. 33 — Critical Analysis of Threat Models

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Meta Threat Modeling
<b>Business Value</b>	Expose assumptions about control planes and multi-tenancy.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Should SP: 3
<b>Persona</b>	Red team lead
<b>Dependencies</b>	Access to assumptions and architecture docs
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Sensitive topics require careful handling
<b>Story</b>	

*As a red team lead, I want to challenge threat model assumptions so that blind spots in cloud control planes are addressed.* **Non-Functional**

Security Reliability **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Assumptions documented and tested
<b>Given</b>	An existing threat model
<b>When</b>	I write a red-team hypothesis targeting meta-control plane risks
<b>Then</b>	Detection ideas and mitigations are proposed and tracked

*Definition of Ready:* Model available. • *Definition of Done:* Hypothesis published; action items filed; follow-up scheduled. **Tasks**

- ☐ List explicit assumptions.
- ☐ Draft hypothesis and tests.
- ☐ Propose mitigations and detections.
- ☐ Track actions to closure.

## CCS-34 — Ch. 34 — Future Directions, Risks & Challenges

<b>Epic / Feature</b>	Forward-Looking Roadmap
<b>Business Value</b>	Prepare for PQ crypto, confidential ML, and SBOM/SLSA.
<b>Priority / Estimate</b>	Priority: Could SP: 2
<b>Persona</b>	Security strategist
<b>Dependencies</b>	Crypto inventory, CI pipeline, artifact signing
<b>Assumptions / Risks</b>	Changing standards and vendor support
<b>Story</b>	

*As a security strategist, I want a forward-looking roadmap so that the program is ready for emerging risks and controls.* **Non-Functional**

Security Reliability **Acceptance Criteria (BDD)**

<b>Scenario</b>	Roadmap published
<b>Given</b>	Current state inventory
<b>When</b>	I add PQ readiness, confidential ML, and SLSA milestones
<b>Then</b>	Owners and dates are assigned with review cadence

*Definition of Ready:* Inventory complete. • *Definition of Done:* Roadmap committed; review dates on calendar; scorecard added. **Tasks**

- ☐ Build crypto inventory and PQ plan.
- ☐ Define model confidentiality needs.
- ☐ Add SBOM and SLSA targets.
- ☐ Create quarterly scorecard.