

## UtiliSec Teleconference

Thursday, August 13, 2009

Darren Highfill, Chair

Matt Carpenter, Co-chair

Bobby Brown, Secretary

## Agenda

- Coordination of Work with NIST CSCTG
- Upcoming Work: Interoperability & Certification
- ASAP-SG Usability Analysis – Discussion of Objectives & Perspectives

## Documents

Meeting minutes.

## Discussion

### ***Coordination of Work with NIST CSCTG***

The Chair discussed the distinction between the work NIST CSCTG and UtiliSec is performing. Currently, NIST CSCTG's mission is higher level and its responsibility is broader than UtiliSec. UtiliSec is focused around vendor and utility space, whereas NIST is concerned about regulators, ISO/RTOs, and other parties covered as well. The UtiliSec has historically been utility-centric which includes vendor's ability to provide products and services. UtiliSec is also system specific.

There are currently six domains known as the "FERC 4+2" domains with interfaces being used by the CSCTG that include AMI. For AMI, the CSCTG is defining security concerns and controls from the DHS control catalog. The controls are high level. These controls can be met with a high array of implementations and do not require very much technical rigor or strength. UtiliSec wants to get into requirements that will have technical rigor and strength (for example, Travis Goodspeed's talk about use of keys and memory in the meter). UtiliSec would like to define a non-vendor specific means of how to address security requirements. The NIST CSCTG will not be able to define to this level with their guidance.

## ***Upcoming Work: Interoperability & Certification***

The Chair asked for input on how UtiliSec should approach interoperability and certification. A suggestion was made to begin by creating a library of existing certifications. The Chair stated that the UCAIug was created from the need to perform IEC 61850 testing. The UCAIug does not perform testing themselves, but works closely with IEC to determine testing requirements. The UCAIug certifies the certifiers; a lab that wants to certify 61850 has to meet requirements of the UCAIug sub-committee.

Scope of the certification process was discussed. The Chair stated that the certification process would grow too broad if not scoped properly. One approach could be to break down certification into security functionality indicating the testing methodology that UtiliSec would seek for this type of functionality. For example, if certified as a “Head-end system” the process would determine the security claims and then test against the claims.

A suggestion was to examine certifiers that perform this type of service today and model after them. Modeling after another entity would involve applying to electric power industry. Suggestion was made to examine the Common Criteria (CC), Hacker Net and other companies as a model. CC also examines security within a given configuration that is of concern to certification within a utility.

The Chair recommended forming a certification task force. The Chair requested proposals from members to form Chair, Vice-chair and Secretary roles and provide a quick write-up of how they want to approach problem. A more elaborate charter can be examined if members want to examine that that as well. The Chair strongly suggests a certification task force be established by the October face-to-face meeting. The task force would consist of at least one utility representative and one non-utility representative serving in either the Chair or Vice-chair roles.

## ***ASAP-SG Usability Analysis – Discussion of Objectives & Perspectives***

Daniel Thanos is leading the ASAP-SG Usability Analysis (UA) group. The Chair requested Daniel find a utility counterpart for Vice-chair and secretary and form a task force under UtiliSec to meet the need.

The ASAP-SG team would like feedback from the UA team and understand what the UA team is requiring from the ASAP-SG Architectural Team. The UA team is not a re-write or creation effort, but it is a review task. Most assistance is needed for the “usability” of the document – from a utility, vendor, regulator, and other stakeholder perspective. The UA team will examine how well the ASAP-SG team has achieved its goals; determine if steps are missing in the process; determine if there are holes that need to be filled in the documentation. Early on in the process the technical details of the controls doesn’t need to be examined, but focus on the process. ASAP-SG documentation is very immature at this stage, and review of the structure of the document is needed for correctness over content.

Daniel stated that stakeholders need to be present on the UA team and that enough good representation occur both present and future. The verification activity will be an iterative processes conducted early and often. The UA team should not be engaged in developing the document but looking at how it applies. It is important to have a Chinese wall. That is to say, that if a member participates on

the UA team then they shouldn't be a person that is drafting the document; maintain separation. The UA team is to publish a document on high-level criteria for in the UA.

The Chair stated that there is need to establish a formal dialog between the groups. The Architectural Team is meeting face-to-face next week and has made modifications to its process. The Architectural team anticipates having at least one use case example shortly after Tuesday of next week. At this point, members need to get into the process so that questions can be developed.

## **Upcoming Meetings**

### ***Teleconferences:***

Aug 27<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 PM EDT

Sep 10<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 PM EDT

Sep 24<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 PM EDT

Oct 8<sup>th</sup> at 2:00 PM EDT

### ***Face-to-Face:***

- October 20<sup>th</sup>-22<sup>nd</sup> hosted by EnerNex in Knoxville, TN
- January 5-7, 2010 hosted by FPL in Juno Beach, FL