

Security Forum Membership Survey

Report to Security Forum
Boston – July 2003

THE *Open* GROUP

Ian D Dobson
Director – Security Forum

Office: +44 (0)118 902 3041
Mobile +44 (0)7764 905748

i.dobson@opengroup.org

www.opengroup.org

THE *Open* GROUP

Intent of Survey

- ❑ To gather feedback and ideas from existing members on the value they consider they get from membership of the Security Forum
- ❑ To hear members views on how this value could be improved.
- ❑ The clear objective in each interview was to listen and record responses; it was not to debate, quiz, dispute, argue, or challenge responses, or use interviews as sales opportunities
- ❑ Survey responses are being used to establish:
 - what is our existing value proposition
 - what directions we could take to improve this value

Survey Responses

- ❑ 20 responses from 39 existing members.
- ❑ 10 of these 39 were Japanese members – our Japan Regional Partner did not respond.
- ❑ Of the 20 responses,
 - 11 were USA
 - 7 were European
 - 2 were rest of world.
- ❑ Also:
 - 30% were large vendors
 - 20% were small vendors
 - 20% were large customers & 0 were small customers
 - 30% were Government-funded or Consortia

Outcomes (1 of 5)

- ❑ Significant number of members who do come to meetings indicate that their motivation to do so stems from their personal enjoyment of what they get out of our meetings.
- ❑ No dissatisfaction among members with how we run our meetings and how we progress activities between meetings.
- ❑ Regular meeting attendees say that if the Security Forum did not exist they would seek to meet in some other way, to continue to receive the same networking benefits
- ❑ There is no other consortium where they can meet to get the same benefits.

Outcomes (2 of 5)

- All want more members attending meetings
 - particularly from other customers and vendors not currently represented in the Forum - finance/banking, insurance, telecoms, retail, were among those mentioned) who are not currently represented.
- Recognition that this means we all – members as well as Open Group staff – should actively support initiatives to recruit more members
- Benefits of membership lie not only in producing "n" document deliverables per year, but also in networking and sharing knowledge & experience, and engaging in vigorous debate to bring out the key issues, in a "safe" environment.

Outcomes (3 of 5)

- ❑ Members should be empowered to invite their personal contacts in non-member organizations to come to a meeting to sample for themselves the benefits of membership.
- ❑ Outreach to other consortia is important, to share complimentary strengths and avoid duplication of effort
- ❑ Increased visibility is important – through speaking opportunities

Outcomes (4 of 5)

- ❑ Members need to be able to show to their management tangible evidence of the value they get from membership.
 - Other Consortia usually do this through good-looking paper publication of their document deliverables, which appear on shelves and grow to form an impressive array.
 - We need to consider how we can meet this need within an acceptable cost - remembering that cheap-looking books are worse than no books at all.
- ❑ Our main strength is members' competence in information security technologies and understanding of the underlying business drivers, and enabling Security Forum members to listen to them argue and consort in their company
- ❑ Our main problem is selling this as high value to prospective members' management

Outcomes (5 of 5)

- Work areas scoring highly across the surveyed members include:
 - Risk Management
 - Identity Management
 - quantifying effectiveness and return-on-investment of security solutions
 - cost management of security
 - "trust" - perhaps the most problematic issue in security.
- No-one raised issues over intrusion detection and intrusion response