

Comment Report

Project Name: 2016-02 Modifications to CIP Standards | FERC Order No. 843 (Malicious Code Example) SAR
Comment Period Start Date: 6/14/2018
Comment Period End Date: 7/13/2018
Associated Ballots:

There were 18 sets of responses, including comments from approximately 91 different people from approximately 68 companies representing 10 of the Industry Segments as shown in the table on the following pages.

Questions

1. Do you agree with the scope and objectives of this SAR? If not, please explain why you do not agree, and, if possible, provide specific language revisions that would make it acceptable to you.
2. Are you aware of any Canadian provincial or other regulatory requirements that may need to be considered during this project in order to develop a continent-wide approach to the standards? If yes, please identify the jurisdiction and specific regulatory requirements.
3. Are there any other concerns with this SAR that haven't been covered in previous questions?

Organization Name	Name	Segment(s)	Region	Group Name	Group Member Name	Group Member Organization	Group Member Segment(s)	Group Member Region
FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation	Aaron Ghodooshim	1,3,4	RF	FirstEnergy Corporation	Aaron Ghodooshim	FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation	4	RF
					Aubrey Short	FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation	1	RF
					Theresa Ciancio	FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation	3	RF
					Robert Loy	FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Solutions	5	RF
					Ann Ivanc	FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Solutions	6	RF
Florida Municipal Power Agency	Brandon McCormick	3,4,5,6	FRCC	FMPA	Tim Beyrle	City of New Smyrna Beach Utilities Commission	4	FRCC
					Jim Howard	Lakeland Electric	5	FRCC
					Lynne Mila	City of Clewiston	4	FRCC
					Javier Cisneros	Fort Pierce Utilities Authority	3	FRCC
					Randy Hahn	Ocala Utility Services	3	FRCC
					Don Cuevas	Beaches Energy Services	1	FRCC
					Jeffrey Partington	Keys Energy Services	4	FRCC
					Tom Reedy	Florida Municipal Power Pool	6	FRCC
					Steven Lancaster	Beaches Energy Services	3	FRCC

					Mike Blough	Kissimmee Utility Authority	5	FRCC
					Chris Adkins	City of Leesburg	3	FRCC
					Ginny Beigel	City of Vero Beach	3	FRCC
MRO	Dana Klem	1,2,3,4,5,6	MRO	MRO NSRF	Joseph DePoorter	Madison Gas & Electric	3,4,5,6	MRO
					Larry Heckert	Alliant Energy	4	MRO
					Amy Casucelli	Xcel Energy	1,3,5,6	MRO
					Michael Brytowski	Great River Energy	1,3,5,6	MRO
					Jodi Jensen	Western Area Power Administration	1,6	MRO
					Kayleigh Wilkerson	Lincoln Electric System	1,3,5,6	MRO
					Mahmood Safi	Omaha Public Power District	1,3,5,6	MRO
					Brad Parret	Minnesota Power	1,5	MRO
					Terry Harbour	MidAmerican Energy Company	1,3	MRO
					Tom Breene	Wisconsin Public Service Corporation	3,5,6	MRO
					Jeremy Voll	Basin Electric Power Cooperative	1	MRO
					Kevin Lyons	Central Iowa Power Cooperative	1	MRO
					Mike Morrow	Midcontinent ISO	2	MRO
BC Hydro and Power Authority	Patricia Robertson	1,3,5		BC Hydro	Patricia Robertson	BC Hydro and Power Authority	1	WECC
					Venkataramakrishnan Vinnakota	BC Hydro and Power Authority	2	WECC

					Pat G. Harrington	BC Hydro and Power Authority	3	WECC
					Clement Ma	BC Hydro and Power Authority	5	WECC
Northeast Power Coordinating Council	Ruida Shu	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10	NPCC	RSC no Dominion	Guy V. Zito	Northeast Power Coordinating Council	10	NPCC
					Randy MacDonald	New Brunswick Power	2	NPCC
					Wayne Sipperly	New York Power Authority	4	NPCC
					Glen Smith	Entergy Services	4	NPCC
					Brian Robinson	Utility Services	5	NPCC
					Alan Adamson	New York State Reliability Council	7	NPCC
					Edward Bedder	Orange & Rockland Utilities	1	NPCC
					David Burke	Orange & Rockland Utilities	3	NPCC
					Michele Tondalo	UI	1	NPCC
					Laura Mcleod	NB Power	1	NPCC
					David Ramkalawan	Ontario Power Generation Inc.	5	NPCC
					Helen Lainis	IESO	2	NPCC
					Michael Schiavone	National Grid	1	NPCC
					Michael Jones	National Grid	3	NPCC
					Michael Forte	Con Ed - Consolidated Edison	1	NPCC
					Peter Yost	Con Ed - Consolidated	3	NPCC

						Edison Co. of New York			
						Sean Cavote	PSEG	4	NPCC
						Kathleen Goodman	ISO-NE	2	NPCC
						Quintin Lee	Eversource Energy	1	NPCC
						Dermot Smyth	Con Ed - Consolidated Edison Co. of New York	1,5	NPCC
						Dermot Smyth	Con Ed - Consolidated Edison Co. of New York	1,5	NPCC
						Salvatore Spagnolo	New York Power Authority	1	NPCC
						Shivaz Chopra	New York Power Authority	6	NPCC
						David Kiguel	Independent	NA - Not Applicable	NPCC
						Silvia Mitchell	NextEra Energy - Florida Power and Light Co.	6	NPCC
						Caroline Dupuis	Hydro Quebec	1	NPCC
						Chantal Mazza	Hydro Quebec	2	NPCC
						Gregory Campoli	New York Independent System Operator	2	NPCC
						Paul Malozewski	Hydro One Networks, Inc.	3	NPCC
PSEG	Sean Cavote	1,3,5,6	NPCC,RF	PSEG REs		Tim Kucey	PSEG - PSEG Fossil LLC	5	NPCC
						Karla Barton	PSEG - PSEG Energy Resources and Trade LLC	6	RF
						Jeffrey Mueller	PSEG - Public Service Electric and Gas Co.	3	RF

					Joseph Smith	PSEG - Public Service Electric and Gas Co.	1	RF
Southwest Power Pool, Inc. (RTO)	Shannon Mickens	2	MRO,SPP RE	SPP Standards Review Group	Shannon Mickens	Southwest Power Pool Inc.	2	MRO
					Jim Williams	Southwest Power Pool Inc	2	MRO
					John Allen	City Utilities of Springfield, Missouri	4	MRO
					Louis Guidry	Cleco	1,3,5,6	SERC
					Matt Harward	Southwest Power Pool Inc	2	MRO
					Steven Keller	Southwest Power Pool Inc.	2	MRO
					Alan Wahlstrom	Southwest Power Pool Inc	2	MRO
					Kim Van Brimer	Southwest Power Pool Inc	2	MRO

1. Do you agree with the scope and objectives of this SAR? If not, please explain why you do not agree, and, if possible, provide specific language revisions that would make it acceptable to you.

Thomas Foltz - AEP - 3,5

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

AEP is concerned by the inclusion of the phrase “transient electronic devices”, as that would imply a scope broader than that of other CIP standards. In fact, it essentially creates an entirely new category of devices. Rather than this language, AEP suggests instead using the NERC defined terms Transient Cyber Assets and Removable Media as the obligations are further qualified.

It appears that these two proposed SARs would be applied to the project along with the existing SAR, bringing the total number of SARs for this project to three. AEP is not aware of any precedent of multiple, **concurrent** SARs governing a NERC project at a single point in time. A SAR helps set a project’s direction and scope, and while a project’s SAR may be revised over time, AEP does not believe Appendix 3A (Standards Process Manual) provides an allowance for multiple, concurrent SARs to govern a single NERC project. Rather, the SPM allows a project’s existing SAR to be revised to accommodate any changes believed to be necessary.

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Marty Hostler - Northern California Power Agency - 5,6

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

NCPA is concerned by the inclusion of the phrase “transient electronic devices”, as that would imply a scope broader than that of other CIP standards. In fact, it essentially creates an entirely new category of devices. Rather than this language, the NERC defined terms Transient Cyber Assets and Removable Media should be used.

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Dennis Sismaet - Northern California Power Agency - 5,6

Answer No

Document Name	
Comment	
<p>NCPA is concerned by the inclusion of the phrase “transient electronic devices”, as that would imply a scope broader than that of other CIP standards. In fact, it essentially creates an entirely new category of devices. Rather than this language, the NERC defined terms Transient Cyber Assets and Removable Media should be used.</p>	
Likes	0
Dislikes	0
Response	
Wendy Center - U.S. Bureau of Reclamation - 1,5	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
<p>Reclamation recommends incorporating all requirements for low impact BCS into existing standards in the table and part format. For example, low impact malicious code requirements would properly be added to CIP-007; low impact transient cyber asset requirements would properly be added to CIP-010</p>	
Likes	0
Dislikes	0
Response	
Patricia Robertson - BC Hydro and Power Authority - 1,3,5, Group Name BC Hydro	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
<p>Upon review of the proposed SAR, BC Hydro offers the following comments in support of the position that this SAR needs to be more specific.</p> <p>1. As the existing version of CIP-003-7 already specifies in its Section 5 of Attachment 1 mandatory prescriptions to implement “one or more plan(s) to achieve the objective of mitigating the risk of the introduction of malicious code” including third-party transient electronic devices (i.e. “Transient Cyber Asset(s) managed by a party other than the Responsible Entity” per Section 5.2), BC Hydro does not share FERC’s concern and recommends that the SAR provide more clarity on the scope and reasoning behind FERC’s requested modifications, i.e. “to include an explicit requirement that responsible entities implement controls to mitigate the risk of malicious code that could result from third-party transient electronic devices”. (P 39 on Page 24 of FERC Order No. 843)</p>	

2. BC Hydro would like to understand the value add of revising CIP-003-7 when very similar language is already there. BC Hydro notes that Requirement 4 of the CIP-010-2(3) reliability standard in regards to high and medium impact BES Cyber Systems, Attachment 1, Section 2 and sub-Section 2.2 also contains very similar language and is not being revised.

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Russell Martin II - Salt River Project - 1,3,5,6 - WECC

Answer

Yes

Document Name

Comment

SRP understands the main objective of the SAR is to clarify compliance expectations regarding third-party transient electronic devices. SRP also agrees with the scope of modifying CIP-003-7, Attachment 1, Section 5.

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Dana Klem - MRO - 1,2,3,4,5,6 - MRO, Group Name MRO NSRF

Answer

Yes

Document Name

Comment

The NSRF agrees with the scope of the SAR addressing FERC's directive by modifying Section 5 of Attachment 1 to CIP-003-7 to clarify that responsible entities must implement controls to mitigate the risk of malicious code that could result from the use of third-party transient electronic devices

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Aaron Cavanaugh - Bonneville Power Administration - 1,3,5,6 - WECC

Answer

Yes

Document Name

Comment

None

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Sean Cavote - PSEG - 1,3,5,6 - NPCC,RF, Group Name PSEG REs

Answer

Yes

Document Name

Comment

PSEG supports the proposed CIP-003-7 SAR because it provides sufficient scope and direction for the SDT to address the FERC Order No. 843 directive regarding third-party transient electronic devices.

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Aaron Ghodooshim - FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation - 1,3,4, Group Name FirstEnergy Corporation

Answer

Yes

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

David Ramkalawan - Ontario Power Generation Inc. - 5

Answer

Yes

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

David Jendras - Ameren - Ameren Services - 1,3,6

Answer Yes

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Andrew Gallo - Austin Energy - 1,3,4,5,6

Answer Yes

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Vivian Vo - APS - Arizona Public Service Co. - 1,3,5,6

Answer Yes

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Brandon McCormick - Florida Municipal Power Agency - 3,4,5,6 - FRCC, Group Name FMPA

Answer Yes

Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Warren Cross - ACES Power Marketing - 2,4,5,6 - WECC,Texas RE,SERC,RF	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Shannon Mickens - Southwest Power Pool, Inc. (RTO) - 2 - MRO, Group Name SPP Standards Review Group	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Ruida Shu - Northeast Power Coordinating Council - 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 - NPCC, Group Name RSC no Dominion	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	

Response

2. Are you aware of any Canadian provincial or other regulatory requirements that may need to be considered during this project in order to develop a continent-wide approach to the standards? If yes, please identify the jurisdiction and specific regulatory requirements.

Patricia Robertson - BC Hydro and Power Authority - 1,3,5, Group Name BC Hydro

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

At this time, this may change as the full scope of the SAR is developed.

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Brandon McCormick - Florida Municipal Power Agency - 3,4,5,6 - FRCC, Group Name FMPA

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

None that we are aware of.

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Aaron Cavanaugh - Bonneville Power Administration - 1,3,5,6 - WECC

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

None

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Ruida Shu - Northeast Power Coordinating Council - 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 - NPCC, Group Name RSC no Dominion

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Shannon Mickens - Southwest Power Pool, Inc. (RTO) - 2 - MRO, Group Name SPP Standards Review Group

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Warren Cross - ACES Power Marketing - 2,4,5,6 - WECC,Texas RE,SERC,RF

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Sean Cavote - PSEG - 1,3,5,6 - NPCC,RF, Group Name PSEG REs

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Vivian Vo - APS - Arizona Public Service Co. - 1,3,5,6

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Dana Klem - MRO - 1,2,3,4,5,6 - MRO, Group Name MRO NSRF

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Andrew Gallo - Austin Energy - 1,3,4,5,6

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

David Jendras - Ameren - Ameren Services - 1,3,6

Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes	0
Dislikes	0
Response	
David Ramkalawan - Ontario Power Generation Inc. - 5	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes	0
Dislikes	0
Response	
Aaron Ghodooshim - FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation - 1,3,4, Group Name FirstEnergy Corporation	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes	0
Dislikes	0
Response	
Wendy Center - U.S. Bureau of Reclamation - 1,5	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes	0

Dislikes 0

Response

Dennis Sismaet - Northern California Power Agency - 5,6

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Marty Hostler - Northern California Power Agency - 5,6

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Thomas Foltz - AEP - 3,5

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Russell Martin II - Salt River Project - 1,3,5,6 - WECC

Answer No

Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	

3. Are there any other concerns with this SAR that haven't been covered in previous questions?

Wendy Center - U.S. Bureau of Reclamation - 1,5

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Aaron Cavanaugh - Bonneville Power Administration - 1,3,5,6 - WECC

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

None

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Thomas Foltz - AEP - 3,5

Answer No

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Marty Hostler - Northern California Power Agency - 5,6

Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Dennis Sismaet - Northern California Power Agency - 5,6	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Aaron Ghodooshim - FirstEnergy - FirstEnergy Corporation - 1,3,4, Group Name FirstEnergy Corporation	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
David Ramkalawan - Ontario Power Generation Inc. - 5	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	

Dislikes 0

Response

David Jendras - Ameren - Ameren Services - 1,3,6

Answer

No

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Andrew Gallo - Austin Energy - 1,3,4,5,6

Answer

No

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Dana Klem - MRO - 1,2,3,4,5,6 - MRO, Group Name MRO NSRF

Answer

No

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Vivian Vo - APS - Arizona Public Service Co. - 1,3,5,6

Answer

No

Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Sean Cavote - PSEG - 1,3,5,6 - NPCC,RF, Group Name PSEG REs	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Ruida Shu - Northeast Power Coordinating Council - 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 - NPCC, Group Name RSC no Dominion	
Answer	No
Document Name	
Comment	
Likes 0	
Dislikes 0	
Response	
Russell Martin II - Salt River Project - 1,3,5,6 - WECC	
Answer	Yes
Document Name	
Comment	
<p>FERC Order 843, paragraph 34 states, "should a Responsible Entity find that a third party's processes and practices for protecting its transient electronic devices inadequate, the Responsible Entity must be required to take mitigating action prior to connecting third-party transient electronic devices to a low impact BES Cyber System." According to NERC, "failure to take mitigating action in this circumstance could result in a finding of</p>	

noncompliance with Section 5 of Attachment 1.” However, the SAR does not specify this to be the reasoning for the modification. The SAR should be revised to include this reasoning to better understand the intent behind the requested modification.

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Brandon McCormick - Florida Municipal Power Agency - 3,4,5,6 - FRCC, Group Name FMPA

Answer

Yes

Document Name

Comment

The purpose of the SAR is to address FERC Order No. 843 which uses the phrase “third-party transient electronic devices.” We would strongly urge the SDT to not use this phrase when modifying CIP-003-7 but instead use the NERC glossary defined term “Transient Cyber Asset”. It is our opinion that using the NERC defined term of Transient Cyber Asset will allow the SDT to satisfy the requirements of the FERC order without creating an entirely new and unbounded class of assets.

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Shannon Mickens - Southwest Power Pool, Inc. (RTO) - 2 - MRO, Group Name SPP Standards Review Group

Answer

Yes

Document Name

Comment

The SPP Standards Review Group (“SSRG”) understands the FERC order requires NERC address the narrowly defined issue related to risk of malicious code that could result from third-party transient electronic devices. Given the potential for other gaps within CIP-003-7 that relate to the mitigation of malicious code, the SSRG suggests the Standard Drafting Team consider utilizing this SAR to review the overarching issue of mitigating malicious code and explore whether additional changes are also appropriate to be included in proposed revisions to the standard.

Also, the Standards Drafting Team understands that changes to Section 5 of Attachment 1, as directed by FERC, will apply to Low Impact BES Cyber System Assets, which are by definition low risk. The Standards Drafting Team should ensure that the changes proposed to Section 5 of Attachment 1 do not inadvertently pull in other classifications of BES Cyber System Assets.

Finally, the SSRG recommends that Implementation Guidance should be developed.

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response

Warren Cross - ACES Power Marketing - 2,4,5,6 - WECC,Texas RE,SERC,RF

Answer Yes

Document Name

Comment

Likes 0

Dislikes 0

Response