

## Standard Development Timeline

This section is maintained by the drafting team during the development of the standard and will be removed when the standard is adopted by the NERC Board of Trustees (Board).

### Description of Current Draft

This is the first draft of proposed standard for formal 45-day comment period.

Completed Actions	Date
Standards Committee approved Standard Authorization Request (SAR) for posting	February 20, 2019
SAR posted for comment	February 25 – March 27, 2019

Anticipated Actions	Date
45-day formal comment period with ballot	January – March 2020
45-day formal comment period with additional ballot	April – May 2020
45-day formal comment period with second additional ballot	July – September 2020
10-day final ballot	October 2020
Board adoption	November 2020

## A. Introduction

1. **Title:** Cyber Security — Electronic Security Perimeter(s)
2. **Number:** CIP-005-7
3. **Purpose:** To manage electronic access to BES Cyber Systems by specifying a controlled Electronic Security Perimeter in support of protecting BES Cyber Systems against compromise that could lead to misoperation or instability in the BES.
4. **Applicability:**
  - 4.1. **Functional Entities:** For the purpose of the requirements contained herein, the following list of functional entities will be collectively referred to as “Responsible Entities.” For requirements in this standard where a specific functional entity or subset of functional entities are the applicable entity or entities, the functional entity or entities are specified explicitly.
    - 4.1.1. **Balancing Authority**
    - 4.1.2. **Distribution Provider** that owns one or more of the following Facilities, systems, and equipment for the protection or restoration of the BES:
      - 4.1.2.1. Each underfrequency Load shedding (UFLS) or undervoltage Load shedding (UVLS) system that:
        - 4.1.2.1.1. is part of a Load shedding program that is subject to one or more requirements in a NERC or Regional Reliability Standard; and
        - 4.1.2.1.2. performs automatic Load shedding under a common control system owned by the Responsible Entity, without human operator initiation, of 300 MW or more.
      - 4.1.2.2. Each Remedial Action Scheme (RAS) where the RAS is subject to one or more requirements in a NERC or Regional Reliability Standard.
      - 4.1.2.3. Each Protection System (excluding UFLS and UVLS) that applies to Transmission where the Protection System is subject to one or more requirements in a NERC or Regional Reliability Standard.
      - 4.1.2.4. Each Cranking Path and group of Elements meeting the initial switching requirements from a Blackstart Resource up to and including the first interconnection point of the starting station service of the next generation unit(s) to be started.
    - 4.1.3. **Generator Operator**
    - 4.1.4. **Generator Owner**

**4.1.5. Reliability Coordinator**

**4.1.6. Transmission Operator**

**4.1.7. Transmission Owner**

**4.2. Facilities:** For the purpose of the requirements contained herein, the following Facilities, systems, and equipment owned by each Responsible Entity in Section 4.1 above are those to which these requirements are applicable. For requirements in this standard where a specific type of Facilities, system, or equipment or subset of Facilities, systems, and equipment are applicable, these are specified explicitly.

**4.2.1. Distribution Provider:** One or more of the following Facilities, systems and equipment owned by the Distribution Provider for the protection or restoration of the BES:

**4.2.1.1** Each UFLS or UVLS System that:

**4.2.1.1.1** is part of a Load shedding program that is subject to one or more requirements in a NERC or Regional Reliability Standard; and

**4.2.1.1.2** performs automatic Load shedding under a common control system owned by the Responsible Entity, without human operator initiation, of 300 MW or more.

**4.2.1.2** Each RAS where the RAS is subject to one or more requirements in a NERC or Regional Reliability Standard.

**4.2.1.3** Each Protection System (excluding UFLS and UVLS) that applies to Transmission where the Protection System is subject to one or more requirements in a NERC or Regional Reliability Standard.

**4.2.1.4** Each Cranking Path and group of Elements meeting the initial switching requirements from a Blackstart Resource up to and including the first interconnection point of the starting station service of the next generation unit(s) to be started.

**4.2.2. Responsible Entities listed in 4.1 other than Distribution Providers:**

All BES Facilities.

**4.2.3. Exemptions:** The following are exempt from Standard CIP-005-7:

**4.2.3.1.** Cyber Assets at Facilities regulated by the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission.

**4.2.3.2.** Cyber Assets associated with communication networks and data communication links between discrete Electronic Security Perimeters.

- 4.2.3.3. The systems, structures, and components that are regulated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission under a cyber security plan pursuant to 10 C.F.R. Section 73.54.
- 4.2.3.4. For Distribution Providers, the systems and equipment that are not included in section 4.2.1 above.
- 4.2.3.5. Responsible Entities that identify that they have no BES Cyber Systems categorized as high impact or medium impact according to the CIP-002 identification and categorization processes.

5. **Effective Date:**

See Implementation Plan for Project 2019-03.

6. **Background:** Standard CIP-005 exists as part of a suite of CIP Standards related to cyber security, which require the initial identification and categorization of BES Cyber Systems and require a minimum level of organizational, operational and procedural controls to mitigate risk to BES Cyber Systems.

Most requirements open with, “*Each Responsible Entity shall implement one or more documented [processes, plan, etc.] that include the applicable items in [Table Reference].*” The referenced table requires the applicable items in the procedures for the requirement’s common subject matter.

The term *documented processes* refers to a set of required instructions specific to the Responsible Entity and to achieve a specific outcome. This term does not imply any particular naming or approval structure beyond what is stated in the requirements. An entity should include as much as it believes necessary in its documented processes, but it must address the applicable requirements in the table.

The terms *program* and *plan* are sometimes used in place of *documented processes* where it makes sense and is commonly understood. For example, documented processes describing a response are typically referred to as *plans* (i.e., incident response plans and recovery plans). Likewise, a security plan can describe an approach involving multiple procedures to address a broad subject matter.

Similarly, the term *program* may refer to the organization’s overall implementation of its policies, plans, and procedures involving a subject matter. Examples in the standards include the personnel risk assessment program and the personnel training program. The full implementation of the CIP Cyber Security Standards could also be referred to as a program. However, the terms *program* and *plan* do not imply any additional requirements beyond what is stated in the standards.

Responsible Entities can implement common controls that meet requirements for multiple high and medium impact BES Cyber Systems. For example, a single training program could meet the requirements for training personnel across multiple BES Cyber Systems.

Measures for the initial requirement are simply the documented processes themselves. Measures in the table rows provide examples of evidence to show documentation and implementation of applicable items in the documented processes. These measures serve to provide guidance to entities in acceptable records of compliance and should not be viewed as an all-inclusive list.

Throughout the standards, unless otherwise stated, bulleted items in the requirements and measures are items that are linked with an “or,” and numbered items are items that are linked with an “and.”

Many references in the Applicability section use a threshold of 300 MW for UFLS and UVLS. This particular threshold of 300 MW for UVLS and UFLS was provided in Version 1 of the CIP Cyber Security Standards. The threshold remains at 300 MW since it is specifically addressing UVLS and UFLS, which are last ditch efforts to save the Bulk Electric System. A review of UFLS tolerances defined within regional reliability standards for UFLS program requirements to date indicates that the historical value of 300 MW represents an adequate and reasonable threshold value for allowable UFLS operational tolerances.

**“Applicable Systems” Columns in Tables:**

Each table has an “Applicable Systems” column to further define the scope of systems to which a specific requirement row applies. The CSO706 SDT adapted this concept from the National Institute of Standards and Technology (“NIST”) Risk Management Framework as a way of applying requirements more appropriately based on impact and connectivity characteristics. The following conventions are used in the “Applicable Systems” column as described.

- **High Impact BES Cyber Systems** – Applies to BES Cyber Systems categorized as high impact according to the CIP-002 identification and categorization processes.
- **High Impact BES Cyber Systems with Dial-up Connectivity** – Only applies to high impact BES Cyber Systems with Dial-up Connectivity.
- **High Impact BES Cyber Systems with External Routable Connectivity** – Only applies to high impact BES Cyber Systems with External Routable Connectivity. This also excludes Cyber Assets in the BES Cyber System that cannot be directly accessed through External Routable Connectivity.
- **Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems** – Applies to BES Cyber Systems categorized as medium impact according to the CIP-002 identification and categorization processes.
- **Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems at Control Centers** – Only applies to medium impact BES Cyber Systems located at a Control Center.
- **Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems with Dial-up Connectivity** – Only applies to medium impact BES Cyber Systems with Dial-up Connectivity.

- **Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems with External Routable Connectivity** – Only applies to medium impact BES Cyber Systems with External Routable Connectivity. This also excludes Cyber Assets in the BES Cyber System that cannot be directly accessed through External Routable Connectivity.
- **Protected Cyber Assets (PCA)** – Applies to each Protected Cyber Asset associated with a referenced high impact BES Cyber System or medium impact BES Cyber System.
- **Electronic Access Points (EAP)** – Applies at Electronic Access Points associated with a referenced high impact BES Cyber System or medium impact BES Cyber System.
- **Physical Access Control Systems (PACS)** – Applies to each Physical Access Control System associated with a referenced high impact BES Cyber System or medium impact BES Cyber System.
- **Electronic Access Control or Monitoring Systems (EACMS)** – Applies to each Electronic Access Control or Monitoring System associated with a referenced high impact BES Cyber System or medium impact BES Cyber System. Examples may include, but are not limited to, firewalls, authentication servers, and log monitoring and alerting systems.

## B. Requirements and Measures

- R1.** Each Responsible Entity shall implement one or more documented processes that collectively include each of the applicable requirement parts in *CIP-005-7 Table R1 – Electronic Security Perimeter*. [Violation Risk Factor: Medium] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning and Same Day Operations].
- M1.** Evidence must include each of the applicable documented processes that collectively include each of the applicable requirement parts in *CIP-005-7 Table R1 – Electronic Security Perimeter* and additional evidence to demonstrate implementation as described in the Measures column of the table.

CIP-005-7 Table R1 – Electronic Security Perimeter			
Part	Applicable Systems	Requirements	Measures
<b>1.1</b>	High Impact BES Cyber Systems and their associated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PCA</li> </ul> Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems and their associated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PCA</li> </ul>	All applicable Cyber Assets connected to a network via a routable protocol shall reside within a defined ESP.	An example of evidence may include, but is not limited to, a list of all ESPs with all uniquely identifiable applicable Cyber Assets connected via a routable protocol within each ESP.
<b>1.2</b>	High Impact BES Cyber Systems with External Routable Connectivity and their associated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PCA</li> </ul> Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems with External Routable Connectivity and their associated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PCA</li> </ul>	All External Routable Connectivity must be through an identified Electronic Access Point (EAP).	An example of evidence may include, but is not limited to, network diagrams showing all external routable communication paths and the identified EAPs.

CIP-005-7 Table R1 – Electronic Security Perimeter			
Part	Applicable Systems	Requirements	Measures
1.3	Electronic Access Points for High Impact BES Cyber Systems  Electronic Access Points for Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems	Require inbound and outbound access permissions, including the reason for granting access, and deny all other access by default.	An example of evidence may include, but is not limited to, a list of rules (firewall, access control lists, etc.) that demonstrate that only permitted access is allowed and that each access rule has a documented reason.
1.4	High Impact BES Cyber Systems with Dial-up Connectivity and their associated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PCA</li> </ul> Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems with Dial-up Connectivity and their associated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PCA</li> </ul>	Where technically feasible, perform authentication when establishing Dial-up Connectivity with applicable Cyber Assets.	An example of evidence may include, but is not limited to, a documented process that describes how the Responsible Entity is providing authenticated access through each dial-up connection.
1.5	Electronic Access Points for High Impact BES Cyber Systems  Electronic Access Points for Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems at Control Centers	Have one or more methods for detecting known or suspected malicious communications for both inbound and outbound communications.	An example of evidence may include, but is not limited to, documentation that malicious communications detection methods (e.g. intrusion detection system, application layer firewall, etc.) are implemented.



- R2.** Each Responsible Entity shall implement one or more documented processes that collectively include the applicable requirement parts, where technically feasible, in *CIP-005-7 Table R2 –Remote Access Management*. [Violation Risk Factor: Medium] [Time Horizon: Operations Planning and Same Day Operations].
- M2.** Evidence must include the documented processes that collectively address each of the applicable requirement parts in *CIP-005-7 Table R2 –Remote Access Management* and additional evidence to demonstrate implementation as described in the Measures column of the table.

CIP-005-7 Table R2 – Remote Access Management			
Part	Applicable Systems	Requirements	Measures
<b>2.1</b>	High Impact BES Cyber Systems and their associated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PCA</li> </ul> Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems with External Routable Connectivity and their associated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PCA</li> </ul>	For all Interactive Remote Access, utilize an Intermediate System such that the Cyber Asset initiating Interactive Remote Access does not directly access an applicable Cyber Asset.	Examples of evidence may include, but are not limited to, network diagrams or architecture documents.
<b>2.2</b>	High Impact BES Cyber Systems and their associated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PCA</li> </ul> Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems with External Routable Connectivity and their associated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PCA</li> </ul>	For all Interactive Remote Access sessions, utilize encryption that terminates at an Intermediate System.	An example of evidence may include, but is not limited to, architecture documents detailing where encryption initiates and terminates.

CIP-005-7 Table R2 – Remote Access Management			
Part	Applicable Systems	Requirements	Measures
2.3	<p>High Impact BES Cyber Systems and their associated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PCA</li> </ul> <p>Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems with External Routable Connectivity and their associated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PCA</li> </ul>	<p>Require multi-factor authentication for all Interactive Remote Access sessions.</p>	<p>An example of evidence may include, but is not limited to, architecture documents detailing the authentication factors used.</p> <p>Examples of authenticators may include, but are not limited to,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Something the individual knows such as passwords or PINs. This does not include User ID;</li> <li>• Something the individual has such as tokens, digital certificates, or smart cards; or</li> <li>• Something the individual is such as fingerprints, iris scans, or other biometric characteristics.</li> </ul>

CIP-005-7 Table R2 – Remote Access Management			
Part	Applicable Systems	Requirements	Measures
2.4	<p>1. High Impact BES Cyber Systems and their associated:PCA;</p> <p>2. PACS; and</p> <p>3. EACMS</p> <p>Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems with External Routable Connectivity and their associated:</p> <p>1. PCA;</p> <p>2. PACS; and</p> <p>3. EACMS</p>	<p>Have one or more methods for determining active vendor remote access sessions (including Interactive Remote Access and system-to-system remote access).</p>	<p>Examples of evidence may include, but are not limited to, documentation of the methods used to determine active vendor remote access (including Interactive Remote Access and system-to-system remote access), such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Methods for accessing logged or monitoring information to determine active vendor remote access sessions;</li> <li>• Methods for monitoring activity (e.g. connection tables or rule hit counters in a firewall, or user activity monitoring) or open ports (e.g. netstat or related commands to display currently active ports) to determine active system to system remote access sessions; or</li> <li>• Methods that control vendor initiation of remote access such as vendors calling and requesting a second factor in order to initiate remote access.</li> </ul>

CIP-005-7 Table R2 – Remote Access Management			
Part	Applicable Systems	Requirements	Measures
2.5	<p>High Impact BES Cyber Systems and their associated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. EACMS;</li> <li>2. PACS; and</li> <li>3. PCA</li> </ol> <p>Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems with External Routable Connectivity and their associated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. EACMS;</li> <li>2. PACS; and</li> <li>3. PCA</li> </ol>	<p>Have one or more method(s) to disable active vendor remote access (including Interactive Remote Access and system-to-system remote access).</p>	<p>Examples of evidence may include, but are not limited to, documentation of the methods(s) used to disable active vendor remote access (including Interactive Remote Access and system-to-system remote access), such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PCA or BES Cyber System Methods to disable vendor remote access at the applicable Electronic Access Point for system-to-system remote access; or</li> <li>• PCA or BES Cyber System Methods to disable vendor Interactive Remote Access at the applicable Intermediate System.</li> <li>• PACS or EACMS Methods to disable active vendor remote access either through electronic access point, an intermediate system or any other method of remote access</li> </ul>



## C. Compliance

### 1. Compliance Monitoring Process

- 1.1. Compliance Enforcement Authority:** “Compliance Enforcement Authority” (CEA) means NERC or the Regional Entity, or any entity as otherwise designated by an Applicable Governmental Authority, in their respective roles of monitoring and/or enforcing compliance with mandatory and enforceable Reliability Standards in their respective jurisdictions.
- 1.2. Evidence Retention:** The following evidence retention period(s) identify the period of time an entity is required to retain specific evidence to demonstrate compliance. For instances where the evidence retention period specified below is shorter than the time since the last audit, the CEAmay ask an entity to provide other evidence to show that it was compliant for the full-time period since the last audit.

The applicable entity shall keep data or evidence to show compliance as identified below unless directed by its CEA to retain specific evidence for a longer period of time as part of an investigation.

- Each applicable entity shall retain evidence of each requirement in this standard for three calendar years.
  - If an applicable entity is found non-compliant, it shall keep information related to the non-compliance until mitigation is complete and approved or for the time specified above, whichever is longer.
  - The CEA shall keep the last audit records and all requested and submitted subsequent audit records.
- 1.3. Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program:** As defined in the NERC Rules of Procedure, “Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement Program” refers to the identification of the processes that will be used to evaluate data or information for the purpose of assessing performance or outcomes with the associated Reliability Standard.

## Violation Severity Levels

R #	Violation Severity Levels			
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
R1.			The Responsible Entity did not have a method for detecting malicious communications for both inbound and outbound communications. (1.5)	<p>The Responsible Entity did not document one or more processes for <i>CIP-005-6 Table R1 – Electronic Security Perimeter</i>. (R1)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Responsible Entity did not have all applicable Cyber Assets connected to a network via a routable protocol within a defined Electronic Security Perimeter (ESP). (1.1)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>External Routable Connectivity through the ESP was not through an identified EAP. (1.2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Responsible Entity did not require inbound and outbound access permissions and deny all other access by default. (1.3)</p>

R #	Violation Severity Levels			
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
				<p>OR</p> <p>The Responsible Entity did not perform authentication when establishing dial-up connectivity with the applicable Cyber Assets, where technically feasible. (1.4)</p>
<b>R2.</b>	<p>The Responsible Entity does not have documented processes for one or more of the applicable items for Requirement Parts 2.1 through 2.3.</p>	<p>The Responsible Entity did not implement processes for one of the applicable items for Requirement Parts 2.1 through 2.3.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Responsible Entity did not have either: one or more method(s) for determining active vendor remote access sessions for PACS (2.4); or one or more methods to disable active vendor remote access for PACS (2.5).</p>	<p>The Responsible Entity did not implement processes for two of the applicable items for Requirement Parts 2.1 through 2.3;</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Responsible Entity did not have either: one or more method(s) for determining active vendor remote access sessions (including Interactive Remote Access and system-to-system remote access) (2.4); or one or more methods to disable active vendor remote access (including Interactive</p>	<p>The Responsible Entity did not implement processes for three of the applicable items for Requirement Parts 2.1 through 2.3;</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Responsible Entity did not have one or more method(s) for determining active vendor remote access sessions, excluding PACS, (including Interactive Remote Access and system-to-system remote access) (2.4) and one or more methods to disable active vendor remote access,</p>



R #	Violation Severity Levels			
	Lower VSL	Moderate VSL	High VSL	Severe VSL
			<p>Remote Access and system-to-system remote access) (2.5).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The Responsible Entity did not have one or more method(s) for determining active vendor remote access sessions for PACS (including Interactive Remote Access and system-to-system remote access) (2.4) and one or more methods to disable active vendor remote access for PACS (including Interactive Remote Access and system-to-system remote access) (2.5).</p>	<p>excluding PACS, (including Interactive Remote Access and system-to-system remote access) (2.5).</p>

**D. Regional Variances**

None.

**E. Associated Documents**

None.

## Version History

Version	Date	Action	Change Tracking
1	1/16/06	R3.2 — Change “Control Center” to “control center.”	3/24/06
2	9/30/09	Modifications to clarify the requirements and to bring the compliance elements into conformance with the latest guidelines for developing compliance elements of standards. Removal of reasonable business judgment. Replaced the RRO with the RE as a responsible entity. Rewording of Effective Date. Changed compliance monitor to Compliance Enforcement Authority.	
3	12/16/09	Updated version number from -2 to -3 Approved by the NERC Board of Trustees.	
3	3/31/10	Approved by FERC.	
4	12/30/10	Modified to add specific criteria for Critical Asset identification.	Update
4	1/24/11	Approved by the NERC Board of Trustees.	Update
5	11/26/12	Adopted by the NERC Board of Trustees.	Modified to coordinate with other CIP standards and to revise format to use RBS Template.
5	11/22/13	FERC Order issued approving CIP-005-5.	
6	07/20/17	Modified to address certain directives in FERC Order No. 829.	Revised
6	08/10/17	Adopted by the NERC Board of Trustees.	
6	10/18/2018	FERC Order approving CIP-005-6. Docket No. RM17-13-000.	
7	TBD	Modified to address directives in FERC Order No. 850	

## Guidelines and Technical Basis

*Note: The Guidelines and Technical Basis section and Rationale section has not been revised as part of Project 2019-03. A separate technical rationale document will be created to cover Project 2019-03 revisions. Future edits to this section will be conducted through the Technical Rationale for Reliability Standards Project and the Standards Drafting Process.*

### Section 4 – Scope of Applicability of the CIP Cyber Security Standards

Section “4. Applicability” of the standards provides important information for Responsible Entities to determine the scope of the applicability of the CIP Cyber Security Requirements.

Section “4.1. Functional Entities” is a list of NERC functional entities to which the standard applies. If the entity is registered as one or more of the functional entities listed in Section 4.1, then the NERC CIP Cyber Security Standards apply. Note that there is a qualification in Section 4.1 that restricts the applicability in the case of Distribution Providers to only those that own certain types of systems and equipment listed in 4.2. Furthermore,

Section “4.2. Facilities” defines the scope of the Facilities, systems, and equipment owned by the Responsible Entity, as qualified in Section 4.1, that is subject to the requirements of the standard. As specified in the exemption section 4.2.3.5, this standard does not apply to Responsible Entities that do not have High Impact or Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems under CIP-002-5’s categorization. In addition to the set of BES Facilities, Control Centers, and other systems and equipment, the list includes the set of systems and equipment owned by Distribution Providers. While the NERC Glossary term “Facilities” already includes the BES characteristic, the additional use of the term BES here is meant to reinforce the scope of applicability of these Facilities where it is used, especially in this applicability scoping section. This in effect sets the scope of Facilities, systems, and equipment that is subject to the standards.

#### Requirement R1:

CIP-005-6, Requirement R1 requires segmenting of BES Cyber Systems from other systems of differing trust levels by requiring controlled Electronic Access Points between the different trust zones. Electronic Security Perimeters are also used as a primary defense layer for some BES Cyber Systems that may not inherently have sufficient cyber security functionality, such as devices that lack authentication capability.

All applicable BES Cyber Systems that are connected to a network via a routable protocol must have a defined Electronic Security Perimeter (ESP). Even standalone networks that have no external connectivity to other networks must have a defined ESP. The ESP defines a zone of protection around the BES Cyber System, and it also provides clarity for entities to determine what systems or Cyber Assets are in scope and what requirements they must meet. The ESP is used in:

- Defining the scope of ‘Associated Protected Cyber Assets’ that must also meet certain CIP requirements.

- Defining the boundary in which all of the Cyber Assets must meet the requirements of the highest impact BES Cyber System that is in the zone (the ‘high water mark’).

The CIP Cyber Security Standards do not require network segmentation of BES Cyber Systems by impact classification. Many different impact classifications can be mixed within an ESP. However, all of the Cyber Assets and BES Cyber Systems within the ESP must be protected at the level of the highest impact BES Cyber System present in the ESP (i.e., the “high water mark”) where the term “Protected Cyber Assets” is used. The CIP Cyber Security Standards accomplish the “high water mark” by associating all other Cyber Assets within the ESP, even other BES Cyber Systems of lesser impact, as “Protected Cyber Assets” of the highest impact system in the ESP.

For example, if an ESP contains both a high impact BES Cyber System and a low impact BES Cyber System, each Cyber Asset of the low impact BES Cyber System is an “Associated Protected Cyber Asset” of the high impact BES Cyber System and must meet all requirements with that designation in the applicability columns of the requirement tables.

If there is routable connectivity across the ESP into any Cyber Asset, then an Electronic Access Point (EAP) must control traffic into and out of the ESP. Responsible Entities should know what traffic needs to cross an EAP and document those reasons to ensure the EAPs limit the traffic to only those known communication needs. These include, but are not limited to, communications needed for normal operations, emergency operations, support, maintenance, and troubleshooting.

The EAP should control both inbound and outbound traffic. The standard added outbound traffic control, as it is a prime indicator of compromise and a first level of defense against zero day vulnerability-based attacks. If Cyber Assets within the ESP become compromised and attempt to communicate to unknown hosts outside the ESP (usually ‘command and control’ hosts on the Internet, or compromised ‘jump hosts’ within the Responsible Entity’s other networks acting as intermediaries), the EAPs should function as a first level of defense in stopping the exploit. This does not limit the Responsible Entity from controlling outbound traffic at the level of granularity that it deems appropriate, and large ranges of internal addresses may be allowed. The SDT’s intent is that the Responsible Entity knows what other Cyber Assets or ranges of addresses a BES Cyber System needs to communicate with and limits the communications to that known range. For example, most BES Cyber Systems within a Responsible Entity should not have the ability to communicate through an EAP to any network address in the world, but should probably be at least limited to the address space of the Responsible Entity, and preferably to individual subnet ranges or individual hosts within the Responsible Entity’s address space. The SDT’s intent is not for Responsible Entities to document the inner workings of stateful firewalls, where connections initiated in one direction are allowed a return path. The intent is to know and document what systems can talk to what other systems or ranges of systems on the other side of the EAP, such that rogue connections can be detected and blocked.

This requirement applies only to communications for which access lists and ‘deny by default’ type requirements can be universally applied, which today are those that employ routable protocols. Direct serial, non-routable connections are not included as there is no perimeter or firewall type security that should be universally mandated across all entities and all serial communication situations. There is no firewall or perimeter capability for an RS232 cable run between two Cyber Assets. Without a clear ‘perimeter type’ security control that can be applied in practically every circumstance, such a requirement would mostly generate technical feasibility exceptions (“TFEs”) rather than increased security.

As for dial-up connectivity, the Standard Drafting Team’s intent of this requirement is to prevent situations where only a phone number can establish direct connectivity to the BES Cyber Asset. If a dial-up modem is implemented in such a way that it simply answers the phone and connects the line to the BES Cyber Asset with no authentication of the calling party, it is a vulnerability to the BES Cyber System. The requirement calls for some form of authentication of the calling party before completing the connection to the BES Cyber System. Some examples of acceptable methods include dial-back modems, modems that must be remotely enabled or powered up, and modems that are only powered on by onsite personnel when needed along with policy that states they are disabled after use. If the dial-up connectivity is used for Interactive Remote Access, then Requirement R2 also applies.

The standard adds a requirement to detect malicious communications for Control Centers. This is in response to FERC Order No. 706, Paragraphs 496-503, where ESPs are required to have two distinct security measures such that the BES Cyber Systems do not lose all perimeter protection if one measure fails or is misconfigured. The Order makes clear that this is not simply redundancy of firewalls, thus the SDT has decided to add the security measure of malicious traffic inspection as a requirement for these ESPs. Technologies meeting this requirement include Intrusion Detection or Intrusion Prevention Systems (IDS/IPS) or other forms of deep packet inspection. These technologies go beyond source/destination/port rule sets and thus provide another distinct security measure at the ESP.

### **Requirement R2:**

See Secure Remote Access Reference Document (see remote access alert).

## Rationale

### Rationale for R1:

The Electronic Security Perimeter (“ESP”) serves to control traffic at the external electronic boundary of the BES Cyber System. It provides a first layer of defense for network based attacks as it limits reconnaissance of targets, restricts and prohibits traffic to a specified rule set, and assists in containing any successful attacks.

**Summary of Changes:** CIP-005, Requirement R1 has taken more of a focus on the discrete Electronic Access Points, rather than the logical “perimeter.”

CIP-005 (V1 through V4), Requirement R1.2 has been deleted from V5. This requirement was definitional in nature and used to bring dial-up modems using non-routable protocols into the scope of CIP-005. The non-routable protocol exclusion no longer exists as a blanket CIP-002 filter for applicability in V5, therefore there is no need for this requirement.

CIP-005 (V1 through V4), Requirement R1.1 and R1.3 were also definitional in nature and have been deleted from V5 as separate requirements but the concepts were integrated into the definitions of ESP and Electronic Access Point (“EAP”).

**Reference to prior version:** (Part 1.1) CIP-005-4, R1

**Change Rationale:** (Part 1.1)

*Explicitly clarifies that BES Cyber Assets connected via routable protocol must be in an Electronic Security Perimeter.*

**Reference to prior version:** (Part 1.2) CIP-005-4, R1

**Change Rationale:** (Part 1.2)

*Changed to refer to the defined term Electronic Access Point and BES Cyber System.*

**Reference to prior version:** (Part 1.3) CIP-005-4, R2.1

**Change Rationale:** (Part 1.3)

*Changed to refer to the defined term Electronic Access Point and to focus on the entity knowing and having a reason for what it allows through the EAP in both inbound and outbound directions.*

**Reference to prior version:** (Part 1.4) CIP-005-4, R2.3

**Change Rationale:** (Part 1.4)

*Added clarification that dial-up connectivity should perform authentication so that the BES Cyber System is not directly accessible with a phone number only.*

**Reference to prior version:** (Part 1.5) CIP-005-4, R1

**Change Rationale:** (Part 1.5)

*Per FERC Order No. 706, Paragraphs 496-503, ESPs need two distinct security measures such that the Cyber Assets do not lose all perimeter protection if one measure fails or is misconfigured. The Order makes clear this is not simple redundancy of firewalls, thus the SDT has decided to add the security measure of malicious traffic inspection as a requirement for these ESPs.*

**Rationale for R2:**

Registered Entities use Interactive Remote Access to access Cyber Assets to support and maintain control systems networks. Discovery and announcement of vulnerabilities for remote access methods and technologies, that were previously thought secure and in use by a number of electric sector entities, necessitate changes to industry security control standards. Currently, no requirements are in effect for management of secure remote access to Cyber Assets to be afforded the NERC CIP protective measures. Inadequate safeguards for remote access can allow unauthorized access to the organization's network, with potentially serious consequences. Additional information is provided in ***Guidance for Secure Interactive Remote Access*** published by NERC in July 2011.

Remote access control procedures must provide adequate safeguards through robust identification, authentication and encryption techniques. Remote access to the organization's network and resources will only be permitted providing that authorized users are authenticated, data is encrypted across the network, and privileges are restricted.

The Intermediate System serves as a proxy for the remote user. Rather than allowing all the protocols the user might need to access Cyber Assets inside the Electronic Security Perimeter to traverse from the Electronic Security Perimeter to the remote computer, only the protocol required for remotely controlling the jump host is required. This allows the firewall rules to be much more restrictive than if the remote computer was allowed to connect to Cyber Assets within the Electronic Security Perimeter directly. The use of an Intermediate System also protects the Cyber Asset from vulnerabilities on the remote computer.

The use of multi-factor authentication provides an added layer of security. Passwords can be guessed, stolen, hijacked, found, or given away. They are subject to automated attacks including brute force attacks, in which possible passwords are tried until the password is found, or dictionary attacks, where words and word combinations are tested as possible passwords. But if a password or PIN must be supplied along with a one-time password supplied by a token, a fingerprint, or some other factor, the password is of no value unless the other factor(s) used for authentication are acquired along with it.

Encryption is used to protect the data that is sent between the remote computer and the Intermediate System. Data encryption is important for anyone who wants or needs secure data transfer. Encryption is needed when there is a risk of unauthorized interception of transmissions on the communications link. This is especially important when using the Internet as the communication means.

Requirement R2 Parts 2.4 and 2.5 addresses Order No. 829 directives for controls on vendor-initiated remote access to BES Cyber Systems covering both user-initiated and machine-to-machine vendor remote access (P. 51). The objective is to mitigate potential risks of a compromise at a vendor during an active remote access session with a Responsible Entity from impacting the BES.

The objective of Requirement R2 Part 2.4 is for entities to have visibility of active vendor remote access sessions (including Interactive Remote Access and system-to-system remote access) that are taking place on their system. This scope covers all remote access sessions with vendors. The obligation in Part 2.4 requires entities to have a method to determine active vendor remote access sessions. While not required, a solution that identifies all active remote access sessions, regardless of whether they originate from a vendor, would meet the intent of this requirement. The objective of Requirement R2 Part 2.5 is for entities to have the ability to disable active remote access sessions in the event of a system breach as specified in Order No. 829 (P. 52).

The scope of Requirement R2 in CIP-005-6 is expanded from approved CIP-005-5 to address all remote access management, not just Interactive Remote Access. If a Responsible Entity does not allow remote access (system-to-system or Interactive Remote Access) then the Responsible Entity need not develop a process for each of the subparts in Requirement R2. The entity could document that it does not allow remote access to meet the reliability objective.

The term *vendor(s)* as used in the standard is limited to those persons, companies, or other organizations with whom the Responsible Entity, or its affiliates, contracts with to supply BES Cyber Systems and related services. It does not include other NERC registered entities providing reliability services (e.g., Balancing Authority or Reliability Coordinator services pursuant to NERC Reliability Standards). A *vendor*, as used in the standard, may include: (i) developers or manufacturers of information systems, system components, or information system services; (ii) product resellers; or (iii) system integrators

**Summary of Changes:** This is a new requirement to continue the efforts of the Urgent Action team for Project 2010-15: Expedited Revisions to CIP-005-3.

**Reference to prior version:** (Part 2.1) New

**Change Rationale:** (Part 2.1)

*This is a new requirement to continue the efforts of the Urgent Action team for Project 2010-15: Expedited Revisions to CIP-005-3.*



**Reference to prior version:** (Part 2.2) CIP-007-5, R3.1

**Change Rationale:** (Part 2.2)

*This is a new requirement to continue the efforts of the Urgent Action team for Project 2010-15: Expedited Revisions to CIP-005-3. The purpose of this part is to protect the confidentiality and integrity of each Interactive Remote Access session.*

**Reference to prior version:** (Part 2.3) CIP-007-5, R3.2

**Change Rationale:** (Part 2.3)

*This is a new requirement to continue the efforts of the Urgent Action team for Project 2010-15: Expedited Revisions to CIP-005-3. The multi-factor authentication methods are also the same as those identified in the Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (HSPD-12), issued August 12, 2007.*