## A Policy and Harmonized Control Framework Reference Architecture

Each industry sector has it's own specifices that need to be addressed. whether Retail, Logistics, Healthcare, Banking & Finance, Insurance, or Manufacturing. This policy and harmonized control framework reference architecture cannot legitimately address all relevant specifics. Adapt this accordingly or modify to tailor based on a fit-for-purpose assessment.

A harmonized control framework groups and maps relevant controls across a broader spectrum of laws. standards, and control frameworks to reduce control bloat and duplication in a manner consistent with a company's industry sector and regulatory requirements. Therefore, a single control may be mapped to 2, 4, 6 or more other controls in order to have 1 control and not 2, 4, 6 or more duplicative controls.

Control mapping is seldom perfect and requires taking into account strategic, tactical, and operational controls within additional administrative people), operational (process), and technical (technology) controls. In this manner, don't include what is not contextually relevant to the organization.

The functional mapping with reduction n controls and duplication provides an audit many, evidence once perspective in addition to a key method for organizaiton and categorization across multiple functional areas.

## **Harmonized Control Framework Influences**

**NIST SP 800-53 NIST SP 800-171 NIST CSF CSA-Matrix** CIS Top 20 CSC COBIT ISO 27000 Series **PCI-DSS PA-DSS FFIEC Exams NERC-CIP** COSO **AICPA** SOC I. II. III **HITRUST** HIPAA/HITECH

This reference architecture uses the NIST 800-53 control families as a base to organize controls, policies, standards, quidelines, process, SOPs, etc. As an example it is not a definitive method. There may be a different perspective contextually and logically relevant for different organizations.

This is just one way of looking at it. The key is simplicity, consistency, and the ability maintain relevant categorization from controls to policies to standards to guidelines to process to SOPs, etc.

## **Harmonized Control Framework**

**Access Control** 

**Audit & Accountability** 

**Awareness & Training** 

**Configuration Management** 

**Contingency Planning** 

**Identification & Authentication** 

**Incident Response** 

**Maintenance** 

**Media Protection** 

**Personnel Security** 

**Physical & Environmental Protection** 

**Planning** 

**Privacy** 

**Program Management** 

**Risk Assessment** 

**System Authorization** 

**System & Services Acquisition** 

**System & Communications Protection** 

**System & Information Integrity** 

**Enterprise Security Architects can define Business Drivers tied** to Business Attributes from a core base of controls that are already categorized by Control Family. Likewise, ESA's can build requirements based on those same controls and control amilies

Because the control families tie to policies and standards they're defensible when someone asks to show where this is required.

**Least Specific** More Specific

Policy (mandatory)

Standards (mandatory)

Guidelines (optional)

**LoB Application Security Policies** 

**HR/ERP Application** 

**Azure Conditional Access Policy** 

**MS Teams Retention Policy** 

**Exchange Online DLP Policy** 

**SharePoint On-Prem Retention Policy** 

**SASE ACLs and Policies** 

**Cisco ISE Policies** 

**Application 7 Security Policy** 

**Appllication 8 Security Policy** 

**Application 9 Security Policy** 

**Application 10 Security Policy** 

**Application 11 Security Policy** 

**Application 12 Security Policy** 

**Application 13 Security Policy** 

**Application 14 Security Policy** 

**Application 15 Security Policy** 

**Application 16 Security Policy** 

**Application 17 Security Policy** 

**Application 18 Security Policy** 

Plans (mandatory)

Process (mandatory)

SOPs (mandatory)

Utilizing the control families from the

harmonized control framework allows for categorization logically to group simular items.

guidelines, process, SOPs, playbooks, and

Each can be grouped logically into similar

maintaining organizational relevance and

consistency within the overall capability of

In this example, Access Control standards do not

have to be broken into different on-prem, hybrid,

single Access Control standard. Ensuring content

consistency and not duplicating similar content

overlapping standards with the same content. A

or cloud standards they're all contained in a

between "different" standards or creating

secondary goal is the reduction in effort for

SOPs, etc. over the long-term.

maintain standards, guidelines, process, and

As a different perpective it means not having

for Azure, AWS, Google, and systems in an

sections not separate standards documents.

different overlapping Access Control standards

owned/leased datacenter. Focus on commonality

Standards, Guidelines, SOPs

**Access Control** 

**Audit & Accountability** 

**Awareness & Training** 

**Configuration Management** 

**Contingency Planning** 

**Identification & Authentication** 

**Incident Response** 

**Maintenance** 

**Media Protection** 

**Personnel Security** 

**Physical & Environmental Protection** 

Planning

**Privacy** 

as the basis and address uniqueness in separate

relevant areas. It's a simple method for

knowledge management and replication.

This delivers built-in organization for standards,

Guides (informational)

Playbooks/Runbooks (optional/mandatory)

runbooks.

Organziational policies are generally well understood as the rules of behavior defined in a manner that is enforceable across the ogranization consistently for all personnel and systems. Likewise, LoB Application Policies are understood to be the application or system level policies that support organizational policies, standards, and controls. LoB policies are generally configured within a platform or an application and organizational policies are documents found on an intranet portal.

In this example, Access Control policies do not have to be broken into different on-prem, hybrid, or cloud policies they're all contained in a single Access Control policy. Ensuring content consistency and not duplicating similar content between "different" policies or creating overlapping policies with the same content. A secondary goal is the reduction in effort for maintaining each organizational policy over the long-term.

As a different perspective it means not having different overlapping Access Control policies for Azure, AWS, Google, and systems in an owned datacenter. Focus on commonality as the basis and address uniqueness in separate sections not separate policy documents.

The below block diagram references a SABSA policy architecture modified to consider the control families as logical

Organizational Policies/Line of Business Application Security Policies **Overaching Operational Risk Management Policy** 

**Enterprise Security Policy** | Acceptable Use Policy | Business Continuity Policy

**CA and RA Security Policies** 

## **Infrastructure Security Policies**

**Access Control Audit & Accountability Awareness & Training Configuration Management Contingency Planning Identification & Authentication** 

**Incident Response Maintenance** 

**Media Protection** 

**Personnel Security** 

**Physical & Environmental Protection** 

**Planning** 

Privacy

**Program Management Risk Assessment** 

**System Authorization** 

**System & Services Acquisition** 

**System & Communications Protection System & Information Integrity** 

> **Security Rules, Practices, and Procedures Security Standards/Guidelines**

**Security Implementation Guides/Playbooks/Run Books** 

**SABSA Lavers** 

**Logical Layer** 

**Physical Layer** 

**Component Layer** 

**Service** 

**Management Layer** 

**Program Management** 

**Risk Assessment System Authorization** 

**System & Services Acquisition System & Communications Protection** 

**System & Information Integrity**