**ENTERPRISE CYBER SECURITY**RUBRIC

Teams should keep a back-up copy of each rubric they complete. Team should then copy contents from the back-up to the Aropa system.

**Objectives**

Do the authors of the report outline clear cyber security goals or objectives? If so, state the cyber security objectives.

*The authors outline that their concern is cyber security in cloud based environments, specidically cloud based storage, but fail to outline clearly the goals or objectives of the report. The context of the client and the question asked in the specification is barely mentioned at the outset and never clearly defined for the reader. While the authors go on to lay out the client's four key concerns through paragraph topic sentences, this is not clear at the beginning of the report.*

**Assessment of Cyber Risk**

How would you rate the overall quality of the assessment of cyber risk within the report?

 very poor



 poor(\*)



 fair



 good



 very good



 excellent



 exceptional



Do the authors thoroughly consider the context of risk assessment? If so, state the aspects of context considered. If not, state what the authors should improve.

*The authors are clear in discussion of storage of data, freedom of information, collusion concerns and extensibility and accessibility being the main sources of cloud cyber security risk. However, the authors consistently appear to misunderstand or disregard the specific context of the question asked, and do not address these issues as relating specifically to employee use of their own personal clouds for business purposes. Authors also consistently fail to convert solid, thorough and well-researched discussion to proper risk assessment, with the exception of discussion of collusion concerns.*

Do the authors appropriately identify cyber risks? If so, state the sources of evidence and process to determine relevancy. If not, state what sources of evidence the authors should consider.

*To an extent the authors make appropriate identification of cyber risks. However, as above, they consistently mistake the core question that was posed, and often appear to discuss the issues they identify in the frame of the business making use of third party cloud storage methods as an enterprise, so to that extent the relevance of the authors' risk identification is somewhat weak in parts. The evidence gathered by the authors is however very thorough, but needs consideration in proper context.*

How would rate the analysis of the identified cyber risks?

 too heavy



 about right



 too light(\*)



How would rate the evaluation of the identified cyber risks?

 too heavy



 about right(\*)



 too light



**Policy**

Does the policy appear to communicate a strategy for dealing with perceived cyber risks?

 Yes



 No(\*)



 Don't know



Does the policy demonstrate an understanding of the asset(s) to be protected? If so, state the asset(s) you perceive the policy is attempting to protect. If not, state the asset(s) the authors may want to consider.

*The authors' risk assessment table in their appendix shows clear thought being put into the different levels of value and risk assosciated with different data. However, their policy fails to provide anything actionable on all bar one point. The authors do not appear to have understood what is expected in policy detail. The consideration of assets at risk is very narrow within the policy and does not seek to comprehensively deal with risks identified or assessed.*

Does the policy reflect consideration of domain best practice, rules and regulation?

 Yes



 No(\*)



 Don't know



**Metrics**

Do the authors attempt to understand what the success of the intervention would look like? If so, state how they determine the success of the intervention. If not, suggest how the authors could determine the success of the intervention.

*The authors largely discuss how their policy could be implemented. Discussion of the intervention's effect is sparse and does not contain any real reference to observable effects over any timeframe, or any discussion of the likelihood of success.*

Do the authors attempt to understand the implication of any suggested interventions? If so, state how they explain the implication of any intervention. If not, suggest how the authors could better understand and explain the implication of intervention.

*The authors appear to misunderstand the aim of the intervention or the authority their suggested policy would hold. The authors would be well served to review their findings and identify actionable policy to address the risks they have identified and assessed, before properly evaulating the impact that implementation of these policies might have. Furthermore, the authors would be benefitted by better understanding the authority that corporate policy can weild and the extent to which the senior management can enforce policy on its employees.*

**Communication**

Does the policy communicate directives in a clear and concise manner to all stakeholders? If so, indicate how the policy communicates effectively. If not, indicate how the authors could improve clarity of communication.

*The policy is clearly defined in its scope, however, beyond this it fails to achieve clarity in its directives. The authors should aim for more concise policy and remove the extended discussion which is seen in their current policy.*

How would rate the number of references in the report?

 too heavy



 about right(\*)



 too light



One-page review

The one-page review should have 1-inch margins all around, A4-size, 12-point font and be in PDF format. The one-page should prioritise areas of improvements for the authors. Teams may want to consider the questions within the interactive rubric when they create their one-page review. In the review, teams should support other teams in improving their drafts, by

* advising the authors what they should **start** demonstrating in the report that is currently missing or incomplete, e.g. proper identification of cyber risks.
* advising the authors what they should **stop** doing within the report itself, e.g. what is not working or is causing confusion. ·
* advising the authors  what they should **continue** doing within the report itself, e.g. referencing strong evidence that cements arguments.

Teams should view the review as opportunity to prioritise to authors what would dramatically improve the draft report. Team members may think there are many areas of improvement, but they should demonstrate that they have prioritised key areas of improvement. Teams are encouraged to discuss and decide the key areas of improvement. Teams should offer advice on how to improve the draft, even if the draft itself is sparse, lacks content or has taken the wrong direction.