
Why not all metrics are created equal

Pedro Jimenez-Hernandez
@spapjh

About Me*

- 4 years of DFIR Experience
 - 2 at a MSSP
- 2 years as a SOC Analyst
- Previous XP as a Compliance Analyst

- Outside of work:
 - FM & Liquid Football, Motorcycles, 3D Printing and Crafts

**The opinions expressed in this presentation and on the following slides are solely those of the presenter and not necessarily those of Michigan Medicine.*

What this talk is not -

- No “universal truth” POV
- Not a highly detailed technical dive

What this talk is

- Conversation/Reflections about blue team metrics/KPIs/OKRs or whatever else you want to call them
- Sparked from Taz Wake's twitter (or X, I guess) thread



Two usual POVs

FROM TAZ's THREAD AND MY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

TRADITIONAL METRICS

- **TOOL DRIVEN METRICS**
 - Vulnerabilities detected
 - Tickets over X days
 - Number of high alerts
- **CUSTOMER-ORIENTED METRICS**
 - Avg/Mean time to resolve a detection
 - Number of logs ingested in SIEM (lol)

COMPLETELY AGAINST METRICS

- *"I think most metrics are useless but I still track some of the traditional ones because the board/customer/senior leadership wants me to."*
- *"Metrics? Naaahhh..."*

The problem

WHY DO SO MANY BLUE TEAMERS FEEL SUCH APATHY TOWARDS METRICS

- Most traditional metrics do not give a full and clear picture of a security team/program maturity. Why?
 - Customer/Executive checkboxes
 - Worst Case Scenario:
 - Customer controls your team's maturity
 - Untold stories from tool telemetry
 - Is a high number of detections a good thing? Or a sign your tool needs tuning?
 - Is a high number of false positive a sign your tool needs tuning or that your analysts triaging is on point? Can also be used to inflate numbers for customers
 - Who is tracking false negatives?
-

The problem (II) -

- Most traditional metrics help spread blue teamer's burnout, which is already a widespread issue
 - Time-based metrics add on to existing pressure and do not take into account complexity or variance between incidents/detections
 - Traditional metric push analysts to not conduct thorough work and encourage other bad habits to just “get it done”
 - According to the 'Voice of the SOC' poll conducted by Tines, 71% of the 468 cybersecurity analysts polled admitted to experience burnout. National Institute of Health 2021 survey said 35% of police officers experienced burnout
-

My POV -

- This is far too young of an industry for everything to be set in stone
 - Many (too many) in senior leadership and mid-management are heavily reliant in Google results and traditional approach to metrics/KPIs/OKRs/+ due to not knowing any better (voluntarily or not)
 - We can ensure proper delivery to customers (internal and external) without leaving a team's quality of life and a program's maturity aside
 - A different or an additional approach involving **Quality of life (QOL) metrics** is crucial to the long term success of a security team/program, moving beyond day-to-day survival mode
-

Gitlab's Approach

CUSTOMER DRIVEN + TOOLS DRIVEN + QOL = GOOD

- **Items from a more traditional approach**
 - Includes third party assessments
 - *3P pentests, SOC1/SOC2 audits, etc.*
 - Includes business basics
 - *Planned budget vs actual*
 - Includes other industry-wide stats
(i.e. estimated cost of incident)
- **I get it, some traditional metrics are:**
 - Great info for board/execs
 - Great selling point for customers
 - Excelling in most of these can point to mature orgs/teams

Gitlab's Approach (II) -

- Tool-driven approach
 - Current vulnerability age
 - Full picture for analysts, mid-management, execs
 - Percentage of high risk/priority incidents
 - Can detect burnout
 - Can detect lack of proper incident prioritization
 - *Security incidents by category*
 - Full picture for analysts, mid-management, execs
- Let's note that:
 - No internal time-based tool metrics
 - Avg or mean time to perform X or Y

Gitlab's Approach (III)

- QOL metrics everywhere:
 - Team member on call volume
 - Helps detect burnout or identify insufficient staffing levels
69% of Analysts said they are short-staffed (*Voice of the SOC*)
 - Team member retention over rolling 12 month period
 - Highlights the impact attrition can have in teams
 - Average age of open positions
(incl. Time to hire and Time to Accept)
 - Highlights importance of filling open positions quickly
 - Treats candidates as external customers
 - Handbook update rate
(via API with python script to run against merge requests in path to handbook)
 - Addresses the known “ever-changing” landscaping

Gitlab's Approach (IV)

- QOL metrics everywhere (II):
 - Security Dpt discretionary bonus rate (manager nominated)
 - Encourages management to reward staff
 - Automation iteration average velocity
 - Targeted at solving 7 weighted issues or more every 2 weeks
 - Acknowledges the importance of automation to help ease burnout in cybersecurity teams
(66% of the 468 SOC Analysts of Times' Voice of the SOC believed that ½ of their workload could be automated)
 - Security Dpt promotion rate
 - Targeted at 12% in a rolling 12 month period

Gitlab's Approach (V) -

- Why is this a big deal?
 - All of these QOL metrics come with a target and corrective action plans should those targets not be met, just as with any other metric
 - Publishing their metrics in public adds a whole new level of accountability for Gitlab's leadership
 - Most, if not all of these QOL metrics are fairly easy to track. Not really an excuse to not track them
 - Leadership teams like this are pushing new standards that we ought to keep an eye on

QOL metrics can also
involve tools

More QOL metrics

FROM TAZ's THREAD AND MY OWN POV

- % of deviation from SOPs during incident or project work
 - Let's track the usual "one-offs" mid-incidents or mid project work. Approved and documented is best.
 - % of incidents/tickets where existing documentation was insufficient
 - Gaps in documentation, added stress on teams
 - % of incidents/tickets that is repeated work
 - Burn out, fatigue rate
 - % of incidents/tickets that is new work (manual escalation vs detection with existing solutions in place)
 - Gaps in detection, toll on team
-

TLDR -

- The majority of widely used blue team metrics **help continue to spread burnout**, promoting a culture of speed and quick fixes, over quality and long term mission. Surviving vs Thriving
 - While some of those metrics are somewhat necessary (executive summaries, customer facing business, etc.), a **balanced approach** using these traditional metrics AND **QOL metrics** is needed in order to address the burnout epidemic and for teams to retain top talent long term
 - QOL metrics are very easy to implement
 - **Not all metrics are created equal**, we must take into account the impact that implementing/standardizing metrics can have in our team.
-

You know your environment best, can you come up with more QOL metrics?

Takeaways

- **Senior Leadership / Execs**
 - You simply do not get to say you care about your teams without implementing QOL metrics
 - QOL metrics are likely easier and less expensive to implement than traditional metrics, no excuse
 - Lots of turnover lately? It is not all about the money; QOL metrics may give you the reason
 - **Mid-Management and Team Leaders**
 - Challenge leadership above you
 - Best case scenario: Create real impact on your team
 - Worst case scenario: Get to know sr. leadership doesn't care
 - Young industry, not everything is set in stone
 - **Analysts and those on the "trenches"**
 - Challenge leadership above you
 - At a minimum, track some of those QOL metrics, can reveal a very telling picture of the place you work at
-

One last thing

- We need your voice, submit CFPs
 - Slides: github.com/spapjh
 - Blog: www.flaksec.com
-