

## Meeting Agenda — AECC Offices, Little Rock, AR Cyber Security Order 706 — Project 2008-06

Date and Time	WebEx Details	Conference Call Details
November 12, 2008 1–5 p.m. Central	WebEx Number: 713 030 769 Meeting Password: standards	Dial-in Number: 866-289-4175 Conference Code: 6310586983
November 13, 2008 8 a.m.–5 p.m. Central	WebEx Number: 715 639 395 Meeting Password: standards	Dial-in Number: 866-289-4175 Conference Code: 6310586983
November 14, 2008 8 a.m.–noon Central	WebEx Number: 714 186 394 Meeting Password: standards	Dial-in Number: 866-289-4175 Conference Code: 6310586983

### Wednesday, November 12, 2008

- 1:00 p.m. Welcome and Opening Remarks — Jeri Domingo-Brewer and Kevin Perry
- 1:05 Roll Call — Harry Tom
- 1:10 Review NERC Antitrust Compliance Guidelines — Harry Tom
- 1:15 Adopt October 22 Meeting Notes and Review of Meeting Objectives — Bob Jones
- 1:20 Organizational Issues — Stuart Langton
- Review of Workplan
  - Adopting the SDT Consensus Guidelines
  - SDT Purpose Statement
- 2:00 Phase I Products — Review
- 3:00 Break
- 3:15 Phase I Products — Review
- 5:00 Observer Comments and Suggestions
- 5:15 Adopting the Phase 1 Products — Straw Poll on Phase 1 Products
- 5:30 Recess

### Thursday, November 13, 2008

- 8:00 a.m. Welcome and Agenda Review
- 8:10 Phase I Products — Refinements
- 9:30 Additional Straw Polls
- 10:00 Break

---

10:15	Adoption of Phase I Products
11:00	Phase II Work plan Review and Discussion — Review of Concept(s) Submitted and Strawman
noon	Working Lunch
1:00 p.m.	Phase II — NIST and CIP- 002 — Discussion
3:00	Break
3:15	Continue Discussion of NIST and CIP 002
5:00	Summary of Day Two Outcomes and Review of Day Three Agenda
5:15	Recess

### Friday, November 14, 2008

8:00 a.m.	Welcome and Agenda Review
8:10	NIST and CIP 002
10:00	Break
10:15	CIP 003-009 Review
11:30	Assignments, Next Steps, and Review of Work plan
noon	Adjourn

## Cyber Security Order 706 Standard Drafting Team

### DRAFT CONSENSUS GUIDELINES

#### CONSENSUS DEFINED

Consensus is a **process, an attitude and an outcome**. Consensus processes can produce better quality more informed products.

**A. Consensus is a problem solving process** in which all members:

1. Jointly distinguish their concerns
2. Educate each other
3. Jointly develop alternatives and then
4. Adopt recommendations everyone can embrace or at least live with.

In a consensus process, members can honestly say:

- I believe that other members understand my point of view
- I believe I understand other members' points of view
- Whether or not I prefer this decision, I support it because it was arrived at openly and fairly and because it is the best solution for us at this time

**B. Consensus as an attitude** provides that each member commits to work toward agreements that meet their own and other member needs and that all can support the outcome.

**C. Consensus as an outcome** means that agreement is reached by all members or by a significant majority of members. The level of enthusiasm for the agreement may not be the same among all members on any issue, but on balance all should be able to live with the overall package. **Levels of consensus** can include:

- Participants strongly support the solution
- Participants can "live with" the solution
- Some participants do not support the solution but agree not to veto it.

#### DRAFT CONSENSUS GUIDELINES

The Cyber Security Order 706 Standard Drafting Team (Team) will seek consensus on its recommendations for any revisions to the CIP standards.

General consensus is a participatory process whereby, on matters of substance, the members strive for agreements which all of the members can accept, support, live with or agree not to oppose. In instances where, after vigorously exploring possible ways to enhance the members' support for the final package of recommended revisions, and the team finds that 100 percent acceptance or support of the members present is not achievable, final consensus recommendations will require at least 75 percent favorable vote of all members present and voting. This super majority decision rule underscores the importance of actively developing consensus throughout the process on substantive issues with the participation of all members. In instances where the team finds that even 75 percent acceptance or support is not achievable, the team's report will include documentation of any differences as well as the options that were considered for which there was greater than 50 percent support from the team.

The team will develop its recommendations using consensus-building techniques with the leadership of the Chair and Vice Chair and the assistance of the facilitators. Techniques such as brainstorming, ranking and prioritizing approaches will be utilized. The team's consensus process will be conducted as a facilitated consensus-building process. Team members, NERC staff, and facilitators will be the only participants seated at the table. Only team members may participate in consensus ranking or vote on proposals and recommendations. Observers and members of the public are welcome to speak when recognized by the Facilitator and all written comments submitted on the comment forms will be included in the team and facilitators' summary reports.

The team will make decisions only when a quorum is present. A quorum shall be constituted by at least 51 percent of the appointed members being present (simple majority). The team will utilize Robert's Rules of Order (*as per the NERC Reliability Standards Development Procedure*), as modified by the team's adopted procedural guidelines, to make and approve motions; however, the 75 percent supermajority voting requirement will supersede the normal voting requirements used in Robert's Rules of Order for decision making on substantive motions and amendments to motions. In addition, the team will utilize their adopted meeting guidelines for conduct during meetings. The team will make substantive recommendations using their adopted facilitated consensus-building procedures, and will use Robert's Rules of Order only for formal motions once a facilitated discussion is completed.

Either the presiding chair or Facilitator of the SDT, in general, should use parliamentary procedures set forth in Robert's Rules of Order, as modified by the team's adopted procedural guidelines.

To enhance the possibility of constructive discussions as members educate themselves on the issues and engage in consensus-building, members agree to refrain from public statements that may prejudice the outcome of the team's consensus process. In discussing the team process with the media, members agree to be careful to present only their own views and not the views or statements of other participants and/or may direct such inquiries to the team Chair and Vice Chair. In addition, in order to provide balance to the team process, members agree to represent and consult with their stakeholder interest group.

## **MEETING GUIDELINES FOR PARTICIPANTS**

### **Participants' Role in Meetings:**

- Explore possibilities.
- Listen to understand (Respect) (limit sidebar conversations).
- Be focused and concise. (Avoid repetition. No need to offer comments in "strong agreement.")
- Focus on issues, not personalities.
- Offer options to address others' concerns.
- No sidebars.

### **Facilitators and Staff role in Meetings:**

- Assist the Chair and Vice Chair in helping the team stay on task.
- Help the group follow agreed upon ground rules.

- Design the meeting and problem solving process in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair.
- Facilitate discussion participation of the team and other participants.
- Prepare agenda packets and reports.

## CONSENSUS BUILDING TECHNIQUES

- **Brainstorming (green light thinking — not judgmental).** At certain points, the facilitator may ask the group to suspend judgment and get ideas onto the table before debating.
- **Name Stacking in Team Discussions** (use of name tents to seek attention)
- **Acceptability Consensus Ranking Scale**
  - Use a consensus acceptability scale to help focus discussion and test support in reviewing substantive issues.
  - Use to guide and focus discussion and as a poll to see where the team stands, not used as a voting mechanism.
  - Must be prepared to offer refinements and suggestions to address serious concerns.

4 = Proposal is acceptable as it is  
3 = Proposal is acceptable; I can live with it but there are minor concerns to address  
2 = Proposal is not acceptable. Proposal may be acceptable if the major concerns are addressed  
1 = Proposal is not acceptable
- **Consensus Ranking Scale**
  4. Comfortable — I support proposal as is ♥♥♥♥
  3. Minor Reservations — I can live with this; but would like to see changes as follows♥♥♥ Be prepared to offer specific refinements or changes to address your concerns.
  2. Major Reservations — I can't support this unless following changes are addressed to meet my serious concerns ♥♥ Be prepared to offer specific refinements or changes to address your concerns.
  1. Fatal Flaws — I can't support this ♥ Be prepared to offer alternatives and options that would address your own as well as other's concerns.
- **Robert's Rules of Order and Facilitated Consensus Building Procedures**

The Council will make substantive recommendations using their adopted facilitated consensus-building procedures, and will use Robert's Rules of Order only for formal motions once a facilitated discussion is completed.

  - Any voting member may make a motion when a quorum is present.
  - A second is required to discuss the motion.

- If a motion is seconded, the Chair or Facilitator opens the floor for discussion.
- The Chair or Facilitator will recognize members wishing to speak on the motion.
- The Chair or Facilitator will, if time permits, recognize other participants wishing to speak on the motion.
- The Chair or Facilitator may elect or be requested by the member making the motion to take a “straw poll” on the motion.
- The member making the motion may accept friendly amendments to the motion.
- After completing discussion, the Chair or Facilitator will call the discussion to a close and restate the motion, with any friendly amendments, and call for a vote.
- If the motion receives a 75 percent favorable vote of the members present and voting it will be approved.

**CYBER SECURITY ORDER 706 STANDARD DRAFTING TEAM DRAFT  
 PURPOSE STATEMENT**

The team is serving in the public interest throughout North America *to protect the critical cyber assets (including hardware, software, data, and communications networks) essential to the reliable operations of the bulk power system.*

The overall purpose of the Cyber Security Order 706 Standards Development Team is to work together to build consensus on a technically sound and complete package of revised draft cyber security standards and realistic implementation plan that is responsive to and consistent with the scope of the Standard Authorization Request (SAR), the FERC Order 706 and the ANSI process.

*(Italics from the SAR “purpose” statement)*

	<i>4=acceptable</i>	<i>3= minor reservations</i>	<i>2=major reservations</i>	<i>1= not acceptable</i>
<i>Initial Ranking</i>	_____	_____	_____	_____
<i>Revised/Amend</i>				

*Comments*

**TITLE: REVISIONS TO CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION STANDARDS  
 (REVISIONS TO CIP-002 THROUGH CIP-009)**

*Request Date: March 1, 2008, Revision Date: June 9, 2008  
 Approved by Standards Committee for standard development on July 10, 2008*

**July 15 Announcement for Nominations to SAR (excerpt):**

“For this drafting team, the Standards Committee is looking for a variety of expertise, with the possibility of having the team subdivide itself into smaller teams based on expertise.”

**Team Purpose:** To protect the critical cyber assets (including hardware, software, data, and communications networks) essential to the reliable operations of the bulk power system.

**Industry Need:**

Implement Changes to the following Cyber Security Standards as indicated in FERC Order 706:

- CIP-002-1 — Critical Cyber Asset Identification
- CIP-003-1 — Security Management Controls
- CIP-004-1 — Personnel & Training
- CIP-005-1 — Electronic Security Perimeter(s)
- CIP-006-1 — Physical Security of Critical Cyber Assets
- CIP-007-1 — Systems Security Management
- CIP-008-1 — Incident Reporting and Response Planning
- CIP-009-1 — Recovery Plans for Critical Cyber Assets

**Brief Description:**

This set of revisions in this project includes:

- Modifying the standards so they conform to the latest approved versions of the ERO
- Rules of Procedure as outlined in the Standard Review Guidelines identified in Attachment 1.
- Addressing the directives issued by FERC, in Order 706 relative to the approved Cyber Security Standards CIP-002-1 through CIP-009-1. Refer to <http://www.ferc.gov/whats-new/comm-meet/2008/011708/E-2.pdf> for the complete text of the final order. Specific requirements from the Order are identified in Attachment 2.
- Emphasis on Order 706 directive for NERC to address revisions to the CIP standards considering applicable feature of the NIST Security Risk
- Management Framework among other resources.
- Incorporating clarifications from the Interpretation of CIP-006-1 Requirement 1.1.