

## Meeting Notes Project 2010-INT-05 CIP-002-1 Requirement R3 for Duke Energy

December 5, 2011 | 1:00–3:00 p.m. ET  
Teleconference and Webinar

### Administrative

1. **Participants were read the NERC Compliance Guidelines; there were no questions**
2. **Attendance and Quorum**
  - a. Members: Scott Miller (Chair), MEAG; David Dockery, AECl; Summer Esquerre, NextEra Energy; Michael Mertz, PNM Resources; Hong Tang, Centerpoint Energy; Scott Mix, NERC Staff; Steven Noess; NERC Staff
  - b. Observers: Amanda Mullenix, Duke Energy; Brian Newell, American Electric Power; Clayton Stooshnoff, FortisBC; Matt Dale, FERC

### Summary

1. **Issues and Discussion**
  - a. The team reviewed and approved, with minor changes, the following documents associated with the interpretation: strawman responses to comments and proposed comment form. There was no change to the interpretation since the previous meeting.
  - b. Some discussion surrounded the notion of functionality in determining essentiality, and whether the interpretation could or should address it. The team noted the limitations of an interpretation drafting team (vs. a standards drafting team) from the NERC Guidelines for Interpretation Drafting Teams. They discussed that the concept of “functionality,” within the context of the Request for Interpretation, should not be part of their response.
  - c. There was discussion about whether the interpretation addresses redundancy. The team reviewed the concepts in FERC Order No. 706, paragraph 256 (the N-1 discussion). The team agrees that redundancy is not a reason to preclude a Cyber Asset from identification as a Critical Cyber Asset, and that the interpretation they developed is not contrary to that concept.
  - d. The team also reviewed FERC Order No. 706, paragraphs 259 and 270, and other related paragraphs related to “data”. The team noted that they are not within the scope of this interpretation.

- e. The team finalized the interpretation, the comment form, and the responses to comment. The documents will be submitted to NERC for Quality Review (“QR”), after which the interpretation will be posted for formal comment and initial ballot.

## **2. Action Items**

Submit interpretation and related documents to NERC for QR.

## **3. Future Meetings**

To be determined. After the QR, the team will need to consider the QR input and make any necessary changes before posting.