



Power & Energy Society®

PSCC Subcommittee TF S10 Meeting Minutes

Designation: TF S10		Name: Utility & Municipality Challenges on Analyzing and Implementing Cybersecurity Standards and Best Practices			
Meeting Location: Jacksonville, FL		Meeting Time: 9:20 A.M.	Meeting Date: 2020/01/13	Minutes Revised:	Minutes Approved: 2020/05/04
PAR Output: N/A	PAR Output: N/A	PAR Approval Date: N/A	PAR Expiration Date: N/A	Target Sponsor Ballot Date: N/A	Target Completion Date: N/A
Presiding Officer: Jeff Pack, Chair		Recorded by: Jeff Pack, Chair		Draft Number: [1.1]	
Attendance:					
Name	Affiliation	Attending via Phone (P) / Web (W) or Local (L)		M/CM/G	
Jeff Pack	POWER Engineers, Inc.	L		M	
James Formea	Eaton	L		G	
Nicholas Kreamer	NuGrid Power	L		G	
Chris Huntley	SEL	L		G	
Jay Anderson	ComEd	L		G	
Mike Dood	SEL	L		M	
Anthony Montoya	Centauri	L		G	
Herb Falk	OTB Consulting	L		G	
Jeff Shiles	Southern California Edison	L		G	
Anthony Johnson	Southern California Edison	L		M	
Steven Kunzman	ABB	L		M	
Scott Short	Doble	L		G	
Josh Walker	Black and Veatch	L			
Shane Haveron	Ametek	L		G	
Priyanka Nadkar	SEL	L		G	
Nahum Michel	UNF/BES	L			
Yurt Luskind	CyBeats	L		G	
Rudi Schubert	IEEE SD	L		G	
Mario Jardim	Schneider Electric	L		G	
Didier Giarrantano	Schneider Electric	L		G	
Jason Lombardo	S&C Electric	L		G	
Scott Mix	PNNL	L		M	
Kyujung Son	Myoriyji University	L		G	
Adrian Tvarych	Power Grid Engineering	L		G	
Dinesh Baradi	ABB	L		G	
Kevin Easley	NEI Engineering	L		G	
Jake Gentle	INL	L		G	
Michael Doak	Mitsubishi Electric	W		G	
M:Member CM: Corresponding Member G: Guest					

Minutes of meeting (continued)

Page 2 of 4

Item no.	Notes	Action by
CALL TO ORDER	Called to order by the chair at 9:22 a.m. EST	Pack
INTRODUCTIONS AND QUORUM	Initial TF meeting – new roster.	Pack
CALL FOR PATENTS AND COPYRIGHT	Patent slides and copyright slides presented to group as a new TF for discussion.	Pack
CHAIR'S REMARKS	WG meeting last met in September 2019 to discuss the transition of this group to a Task Force. Jeff Pack and Steve Mark volunteered to be new leadership for the Task Force. Jeff will serve as the chair and Steve will serve as the vice-chair.	Pack
AGENDA APPROVAL	Agenda was presented with no specific comments.	Pack
APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES	Minutes from September meeting did not have attendee list but it was determined that since this is now a Task Force, there is no need to approve the previous minutes.	Pack
Review TF10 Title, Scope, Purpose	<p>The group reviewed the purpose of the group. Kunsman shared that the original driver for this effort started in 2017 with the SmartGrid meeting. An attendee from a municipal utility in Florida asked about where can they get started – he is responsible for a lot of different areas and really needs some guidance to help them know what's important and where to start. The public power trade associations may have some of this in place already and there is no need for IEEE to repeat this. The goal would be to provide references to existing resources.</p> <p>There was also discussion in identifying liaisons from existing organizations or associations to provide input to the report. Montoya volunteered to do some research on identifying potential liaisons.</p> <p>Mix noted that the purpose of the group does not discuss what the result of the effort will be. The chair will add the deliverable to the purpose of the group.</p>	Pack

Minutes of meeting (continued)

Page 3 of 4

Item no.	Notes	Action by
Why is this important?	<p>The chair presented a summary of a Wall Street Journal article from November 2019 that indicated several smaller utilities were targets of a spearphishing attack associated with critical infrastructure targeting. The intent is to establish a position at smaller utilities to avoid detection and gather additional intelligence for further attacks.</p> <p>Falk indicated that security is no better than the weakest link and this attack is an example of this concept.</p> <p>Haveron noted that this issue is not limited to the U.S. and we should not be limited to the U.S. in our review. Falk noted that CIGRE may be doing similar work in this area.</p> <p>Haveron stated that one of the questions that he continues to hear is "Is your product compliant?". The overall response is that for most regulations, products do not make the utility compliant, but the overall program, including governance and processes is required.</p> <p>Falk mentioned IEC discussion of protocols might be a good place for reference. Mix said that ISA may have some plant controls also.</p> <p>Giarrantano discussed the European Union parameters for security regulations, including interconnections of more than 3 GW impact on grid. Overall they are taking more of a risk-based approach than NERC CIP. Falk asked if the EU has a cybersecurity policy. Giarrantano responded that there was and it focuses more on grid interfaces and risk – the goal is trying to focus more on processes than technology.</p> <p>Anderson asked what the audience was for this effort. Formea stated that there is not a specific target, but the audience can take what they need from the report. Mix said that smaller utilities need help setting priorities – what do I do first.</p>	Pack
Survey Status	<p>Kunsman noted that there was only one utility attendee at SmartGrid Security Workshop in Atlanta in December 2019. At this meeting there are three utility members out of approximately 30 attendees. We will need to develop better relationships with smaller utilities in order to get their input into the process. The chair will reach out to trade associations for input.</p> <p>Johnson mentioned that determining a base set of standards was important for smaller utilities not subject to NERC CIP, including CIP-013 for supply chain security. The chair mentioned that he had encountered that issue with clients in the past.</p>	

Minutes of meeting (continued)

Page 4 of 4

Item no.	Notes	Action by
Discuss Approach	<p>The chair presented a list of items that the report should include. Mix mentioned that the trade associations may already have the governance models covered. The chair said that the report should reference any existing sources that provide guidance in areas that we deem important.</p> <p>Kunzman mentioned the maturity model and it will be important to provide guidance for smaller utilities how to improve over time.</p> <p>Johnson discussed that NERC CIP cybersecurity requirements originally written from a substation view – might consider looking at C37.240 for a smaller utility. Kunzman echoed this thought; it's about good cyber posture and best practices.</p> <p>Anderson said that they need to address low impact from NERC CIP. The chair said that the bullet is meant to indicate that the utility may grow and be subject to medium impact and that they need to be prepared for that. Mix said that the utilities should strive for medium even if they aren't required to meet medium requirements.</p> <p>Montoya said we should change NERC to best practices and the chair agreed. Mix said to include requirements and best practices, Kreamer said to focus on best practices. Kunzman stated that C37.240 has a good approach for this area. Mix mentioned that we need to be cautious of "best practice" from a legal standpoint – may not be proper use. Kreamer mentioned that utilities need to find a "value point" in balancing risk and investment. Haveron mentioned the difference between what is needed and what is wanted.</p> <p>Falk discussed the need for utilities to do periodic reassessment of their program. Kunzman said that this is where the maturity model comes into view. Falk mentioned that bad events usually trigger a reassessment, so we should address what is needed vs. what is driven by events.</p> <p>Kunzman stated that this report is not meant for executives – they need the business case for cybersecurity. This report should not be static but should reflect best practices over time. Mix stated that tech refresh may require cyber evaluation.</p>	
ITEMS REPORTED OUT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION	N/A	
TIME OF FINAL ADJOURNMENT	10:37 a.m. EST	
NEXT FACE TO FACE MEETINGS	May 2020 - Nashville	
FUTURE MEETING ROOM REQUIREMENTS	Room Size: 40 Projector: Yes Web Meeting: Yes Conflicts: All PSCC S	