

Notes

Project 2008-10 Interpretation of CIP-006-1

August 19, 2011 | 1:00–3:00 p.m. ET
Teleconference and Webinar

Administrative

1. **Participants were read the NERC Compliance Guidelines; there were no questions**
2. **Attendance and Quorum**
 - a. Members: Tim Conway (Co-Chair), NIPSCO; Scott Miller (Co-Chair), MEAG; Jeffrey Fuller, DPL/Payton Power and Light; Trevor MacCrae, Southern Company Transmission; Brian Newell, American Electric Power; Robert Ulmer, American Transmission Company; Steven Noess, NERC.
 - b. Observers: David Dockery, AECL; Amanda Mullenix, Duke Energy; Clayton Stooshnoff, FortisBC Inc.

Summary

1. **Review CIP-006-3c, Appendix 3, and its impact on this project**
 - a. The team reviewed the CIP-006-3c, Appendix 3 interpretation, which was from NERC Project 2009-13 (PacifiCorp). The team determined that the interpretation in Appendix 3 addresses the “alternative measures” when a fully enclosed (“six-wall”) border cannot be established. The latest revised interpretation in this project (2008-10) discussed this issue as well, but the team determined that such a discussion is outside the scope of the original request for interpretation. For this interpretation, the team should be responsive to the question of whether the requirement applies to aspects of wiring.
 - b. After determining that the scope of the interpretation should be limited to whether the requirement applies, the team discussed whether wiring is a “cyber asset” subject to the requirement. The definition of “cyber asset” includes communication network, but the team determined that it does not clearly include the communication medium (i.e., wire). Since wire is not a “cyber asset,” the requirement does not apply:
 - i. In determining that wire is not a cyber asset, the team considered that a communication network is typically a set of devices and a population of data, not the wire itself or any other underlying asset that the network (or cyber asset) uses (e.g., power, etc);

- ii. The team also discussed that if “wire” is a cyber asset, it is subject not only to CIP-006-1, but also to any other standard that applies to a “cyber asset.”;
 - iii. The team noted a distinction between the physical wire and data, and noted the protections required in CIP-005-1.
- c. The team discussed possibilities for the interpretation and the response to comments, and agreed that the interpretation should be revised to remain within the scope of the request for interpretation, and that the requirement does not apply to wire.

1. **Observer participation**

- a. Scott Miller discussed observer participation in the team’s work. In general, observer participation is welcome and encouraged, and the input from observers has been useful and constructive. Consistent with the open standards process that NERC uses, meetings are open to all interested parties. Mr. Miller noted there may be times, at the chair’s discretion, that observer participation may be limited to ensure efficiency and timeliness (e.g., intense team discussion).

3. **Action items**

- a. Scott Miller to prepare straw-man responses to comments for use in creating discussion prompts and starting points to aid in preparing final responses.
- b. Scott Miller and Tim Conway to develop straw-man interpretation revision based on consensus achieved to revise interpretation. Work to complete the interpretation and prepare it to send to the full CIP Interpretation Drafting team for review before sending to quality review.

4. **Future meetings**

- a. Teleconference August 26, 2011, 1:00–3:00 p.m. ET.
- b. Teleconference August 29, 2011, 1:00–3:00 p.m. ET.