

Note: an Interpretation cannot be used to change a standard.

Request for an Interpretation of a Reliability Standard	
Date submitted:	02/06/09
Contact information for person requesting the interpretation:	
Name:	Daniel Marvin
Organization:	PacifiCorp
Telephone:	503.813.5375
E-mail:	daniel.marvin@pacificorp.com
Identify the standard that needs clarification:	
Standard Number (include version number):	CIP-006-1.R1.1
Standard Title:	CIP-006-1 --Cyber Security -- Physical Security
Identify specifically what needs clarification (If a category is not applicable, please leave it blank):	
Requirement Number and Text of Requirement:	CIP-006-1 R1.1
<p>R1.1 Where a completely enclosed (“six-wall”) border cannot be established, the Responsible Entity shall deploy and document alternative measures to control physical access to the Critical Cyber Assets.</p>	
Clarification needed:	
<p>If a completely enclosed border cannot be created, what does the phrase, “to control physical access” require? Must the alternative measure be physical in nature? If so, must the physical barrier literally prevent physical access e.g. using concrete encased fiber, or can the alternative measure effectively mitigate the risks associated with physical access through cameras, motions sensors, or encryption?</p>	
<p>Does this requirement preclude the application of logical controls as an alternative measure in mitigating the risks of physical access to Critical Cyber Assets?</p>	
Identify the material impact associated with this interpretation:	

Request for an Interpretation of a Reliability Standard

The material impact is potential non-compliance with the standard as written.

Other industry entities interested in the clarification requested above are:

- PacifiCorp
- Idaho Power
- Puget Sound Energy
- Platte River Power Authority
- Eugene Water & Electric Board
- Seattle City Light
- Arizona Public Service
- Bonneville Power Administration
- TransAlta
- Xcelenergy