

AMI-SEC Team Teleconference

Wednesday, May 14, 2008.

Daren Highfill, Chair

Please find Security AMI Security Architectural Description attached.

Summary

The AMI-SEC meeting was hosted via teleconference and web-conference using GoToMeeting.

Documents

System Security Architectural Description version 0.19

Technical Discussion

The chair announced that the next face-to-face meeting has been confirmed to be held at Entergy, New Orleans on June 25th. Other UCAIug meetings will be held Jun 23rd and 25th. Additional information was disseminated via email.

Review of Architectural Description (AD) document was discussed for the majority of the meeting. Recommendation was made to put the AMI System Security Requirements document on hold at the version 1.0 state until the Architectural Description document is more complete. The system security requirements have been difficult to define without a better understanding of the architecture.

The chair recommended that Bobby Brown deal with the front matter of the AD to aid in keeping a cohesive voice. If members wish to contribute to the first section please forward those comments to Bobby or Darren Highfill.

The question was asked, "Is cost of deployment a concern to stakeholders?" A responding statement was made that there may be need for an explicit callout in stakeholder concerns including cost of operation and maintenance of security over time. It was also mentioned that the feasibility statement covers this concern.

The chair gave a synopsis of how we are using the IEEE 1471-2000 as an approach to developing the AD.

The Value Stream view was discussed next. The value stream was defined as the highest level asset that we are trying to protect. The Value Stream section describes the high level components required for implementing an AMI system. There is no intent for detail or arguments to justify the implementation of AMI.

Next the Business Function view as discussed. This view represents the function that the AMI system is designed to serve. The intent is that this list will serve as a superset of components deployed in AMI. These are the things that we want to design that the architecture will facilitate and allow.

Discussion continued with the Security Function view. This view was described as the mechanisms that assure that the AMI system is secure. The information was derived from a slide set that was discussed on the security service domain decomposition. These high-level functions will drive the security and implementation at the detail level. Functions include availability, integrity, confidentiality, access control and accounting. Dialog about whether a Governance view should be added was discussed. Conclusion was made that governance would be included in the descriptive section for AMI security, but not overall AMI.

The meeting continued with conversation about creating a Lifecycle viewpoint in order to describe how each phase will impact other phases. This viewpoint description could also weave throughout the other viewpoints. The team is going to investigate as to whether this viewpoint needs to be added. It was stated that TOGAF version 9 working group has lifecycle and governance view as could be used as a reference for these sections.

Next the Contextual viewpoint was explained by the chair. The External Interactions view of this section included a diagram showing external interaction of customer, utility and third parties with AMI. The Environments view consisted of a diagram to explain the relationship between environments (descriptive information is to be added later). The security U-model was discussed as being a candidate for this view. This model will be evaluated for potential use in the next iteration.

The team's discussions concluded with the Conceptual viewpoint and associated views. The Edge Services view was described as it is to date. The use cases used to model this view consist of queries, commands, and reports. Authentication, authorization, and auditing/accounting (AAA) were discussed as a means to secure this component. The team is not identifying a specific product for AAA, but rather the concept.

The Utility Operations view was explained as being a slice within the conceptual viewpoint diagram in contrast to the 'utility' that resides external to AMI. All communications for AMI discussed originate and end outside the conceptual viewpoint diagram. Remote assets may not necessarily be owned by the utility and could be owned by the customer or third party.

The team feels that they are on track with the development of the AD document. Recommendation has been made for those wishing to issue a complaint to also make recommendation to resolve the issue; otherwise the comments will be dismissed.

Upcoming Meetings

The next teleconference for AMI-SEC is scheduled to be held Wednesday, May 28th from 1-3 PM EDT. An email will be sent containing dial-in number and web-conference information prior to the next meeting.