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SUMMARY
On February 29, 2016, the Snohomish County Public Utility District (SnoPUD) and the Department of Energy’s (DOE) Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) co-hosted the third annual Washington State Cybersecurity Summit, bringing together industry leaders and policymakers to review what is being done in the state of Washington and engage in a dialogue about how to build a better defense network, combat cyberattacks, and train next-generation cyber professionals. The goal of the summit was to broaden the state’s perspective by hearing from public and private experts on cybersecurity and examining both the newest cyber technologies and what is needed to create more resilient systems.

The meeting began with welcome remarks from Jessica Matlock (SnoPUD) and Bjong “Wolf” Yeigh (University of Washington) who highlighted the workshop’s goal to bring together a cross section of public and private experts to examine challenges, opportunities, and solutions. This was followed by a video presentation from Senator Patty Murray, who reflected on the state’s unique opportunity to be a leader in cybersecurity education, research, and technology.

Major General Bret Daugherty (Washington State National Guard) spoke briefly about the potentially drastic impacts of a cyberattack to the region and the need to think holistically about solutions then introduced the keynote speakers.

Featured guest speakers Scott Charney (Microsoft Corporation) and Patricia Hoffman (DOE Office of Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability) discussed the future of cybersecurity from both a private and public perspective.

PANELS
The keynote speakers were followed by a series of presentations and panels addressing the following focus area and questions:

Emerging threats and response
» What are the threats and how do we protect our assets against rapidly evolving cyber threats?
» What is needed during these types of events and are we getting what we need?

Trends in cyber detection and protection
» What are the trends in cyber detection and protection?
» What is the future looking like?
» What are the new tools and processes that are emerging?

Privacy, public disclosure, and information sharing
» How can we ensure information sharing occurs between the organizations and infrastructure while still addressing some of the public disclosure and privacy concerns?

Workforce development and education
» What are the challenges with growing the cybersecurity workforce for critical infrastructure?
» How do we develop needed faculty?
» How do we work with industry to reflect their needs?
» Do universities need to integrate programs more closely with industry, particularly in this field?
» How do we motivate universities to embrace needed changes?
» What does the ideal world look like for us?

OUTCOMES
This report summarizes the presentations, discussions, and outcomes from the workshop. This and previous cybersecurity summit reports are available at http://www.snopud.com.
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INTRODUCTION

On February 29, 2016, the Snohomish County Public Utility District (SnoPUD) and the Department of Energy’s (DOE) Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) co-hosted the third annual Washington State Cybersecurity Summit, bringing together industry leaders and policymakers to review what is being done in the state of Washington and engage in a dialogue about how to build a better defense network, combat cyberattacks, and train next-generation cyber professionals. Building on the previous summits, the goal of the event was to broaden the state’s perspective by hearing from public and private experts on cybersecurity and examining both the newest cyber technologies and what is needed to create more resilient systems.

WELCOME REMARKS

Speakers

» Jessica Matlock, Director, Government Relations, SnoPUD
» Chancellor Bjong “Wolf” Yeigh, University of Washington
» Senator Patty Murray, U.S. Senator, Washington

Jessica Matlock (SnoPUD) welcomed participants to the third annual cybersecurity summit, providing highlights from the previous years’ meetings and reiterating the goal for the event: to foster engaging discussion about how to enable more resilient cybersecurity.

Chancellor Bjong “Wolf” Yeigh (University of Washington [UW]) shared information highlighting the UW’s growing cybersecurity education and research, including work at its Tacoma, Seattle, and Bothell campuses. Wolf reported that the school is currently ranked 10th in best places in the country to study cybersecurity. He also reported that the Tacoma campus will be hosting a cyber symposium later in 2016.

Wolf was followed by a video presentation from Senator Patty Murray (U.S. Senate), whose opening remarks reflected on the state’s unique opportunity as a regional leader in cybersecurity education, research, and technology. Senator Murray praised the state’s growth in cybersecurity leadership and underpinned the importance of convening stakeholders to pioneer the next bold and innovative step forward.

"Washington State is uniquely positioned to emerge as a national and global hub for cybersecurity."

Senator Patty Murray
Major General Bret Daughtery shared insight into the potential and drastic impact a cyberattack could have on public infrastructure. Major General Daughtery is the senior official for responding to a major cyber event and homeland security advisor to Governor Jay Inslee. Major General Daughtery highlighted recent advances by the Washington State Military Department to advance security efforts and the forming of a Washington State infrastructure protection subcommittee charged with advising himself and the governor on emergency preparedness. An annual report on statewide cybersecurity readiness is due in the fall.

Scott Charney walked the audience through the historical evolution of cyberattacks, from the early days of young hackers exploring networks to today’s forward-looking complexities facing the nation as the Internet of Things (IoT) becomes more prevalent and as militarization of cyberspace continues. He noted that the IoT is here, and with it comes 5 billion assets to secure, and yet many of the IoT devices will not be built by companies with cybersecurity experience.

To that end, Scott showcased Microsoft’s “Trustworthy Computing 2.0” model, built around the following:

- Secure operations (national and international certifications, operational security assurance)
- Secure ecosystems (cybersecurity collaboration, cybercrime prevention, cyber norms)
- Secure development (security development lifecycle, software integrity policies).

Scott responded to questions regarding the challenges of investing in cybersecurity solutions, noting that hardware roots of trust are being leveraged to address authentication of both devices and individuals. Additionally, it is critical to implement domain isolation, separating critical systems that must be more highly protected. He also noted that since all attacks will not be prevented, there is a need to focus on infrastructure resilience, exploring how to contain an attack to a certain area, how to reconstruct the environment, and how to validate the integrity of data.

Patricia Hoffman focused on utility infrastructure and workforce management and how to strengthen the ability to respond cohesively. Patricia noted the need for a tactical approach that addresses infrastructure, enterprise risk strategy, asset management, and access management as well as supply chain and workforce management. She emphasized that as the...
As the cyber landscape evolves, there is a growing need to integrate control systems into major functions as well as education, challenging that more control systems should be brought into major fields. Patricia also emphasized the importance of recovery and the need to focus on it in the coming years.

During the question and answer (Q&A) session, speakers addressed current trends and challenges including:

- The importance of information sharing
- How utilities can use backup servers and redundancies in systems
- Advancing federal standards and how states address utilities
- Hardware risks and prevention solutions
- Integrating cybersecurity into basic education
- The human-computer division of work in industry.

The panel opened with a presentation from Scott Aaronson (Edison Electric Institute), who presented “Industry-Government Partnerships for Critical Infrastructure Security.” Scott described the threat landscape relative to the likelihood of an attack versus its consequence. He then outlined current industry-government collaboration and the Electric Sector Coordinating Council (ESCC) efforts in overseeing industry-government coordination, leveraging infrastructure and research and development, sharing threat information, and coordinating across sectors.

“If we don’t get cybersecurity at scale from a critical infrastructure point of view, we are going to have a great hurdle to overcome. How do we share and incorporate those capabilities?”

Patricia Hoffman, DOE Office of Electricity, Delivery & Energy Reliability

EMERGING THREATS AND RESPONSE

This panel explored emerging threats, what is working and not working, and what is needed to better protect our assets against rapidly evolving cyber threats.

Panelists:

- **Facilitator:** Phillip B. Jones, Commissioner, Washington Utilities and Transportation Committee
- **SnoPUD/National Guard:** Benjamin Beberness, Chief Information Officer, SnoPUD

Benjamin Beberness (SnoPUD) presented on the National Guard Penetration Test, an operation in which cybersecurity professionals from the Washington National Guard and a series of industry experts tested the cyber defenses of SnoPUD. The friendly but life-like hack featured a realistic-looking work email disseminated to employees. Benjamin described the challenges and benefits of the effort, explaining that it took support from all ranks and organizational levels to coordinate the successful operation. While a table-top exercise is great, an operation is even better, he said. Benjamin also highlighted the Electricity Sector Information Sharing and Analysis Center (ISAC). The Electricity ISAC, in collaboration with the DOE and the ESCC, serves as the primary security communications channel for the electricity subsector and enhances the subsector’s ability to prepare for and respond to cyber and physical threats, vulnerabilities, and incidents.

“You can’t protect everyone from everything. Protection of critical infrastructure is a shared responsibility.”

Scott Aaronson, Edison Electric Institute
Darla Montgomery-Sherrell (Navy Facilities Engineering Command Northwest [NAVFAC NW]) presented “NAVFAC NW Cybersecurity Challenges,” describing efforts to work with the critical infrastructure community and lend expertise and capabilities to advance coordinated training. The effort seeks to advise and assist by leveraging a coordinated response, situational awareness, organizational mapping, and security remediation. Darla highlighted challenges, risks, and constraints facing the Northwest and described NAVFAC NW’s efforts to build and maintain sustainable facilities, deliver utilities and services, and provide Navy expeditionary combat force capabilities. She highlighted efforts to build on existing successful partnerships with a goal to apply the lessons learned to future collaborations with industry and vendors.

Robert Ezelle (Washington Military Department’s Emergency Management Division) discussed how Washington State, both generally and from a military perspective, would respond to a cyber event. Within the last decade, the cyber threat and the potential consequences have come forward in the state’s Emergency Management Division response thinking, he said. He cited the SnoPUD exercise as a positive example of the state’s response capabilities. Robert emphasized the need for unified coordination and partnerships, from the governor directing state entities to state emergency and outreach centers developing action plans, allocating resources, and facilitating interagency resolution of priorities and conflicts.

“The [National Guard/SnoPUD] cyber operation made us a little more humble and made my staff rethink cybersecurity and rethink our response.”

Benjamin Beberness, Snohomish County Public Utility District

“Cybersecurity is much more than an IT issue—we see it as a matter of public safety.”

Robert Ezelle, Washington Military Department’s Emergency Management Division

Panelists discuss emergency threats and response.
Robert also noted future efforts with the Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency, and the National Guard to enhance cyber resource typing and training. He shared how the National Guard is working with the critical infrastructure community to lend their expertise and capabilities to enable coordinated response, situational awareness, and organizational mapping.

TRENDS AND PERSPECTIVES IN CYBER DEFENSE

Panelists provided industry and government perspectives on emerging trends and tools in cyber defense.

**Panelists:**

- **Facilitator:** Gordon Matlock, Cyber Practice Lead, Bridge Partners
- **PNNL:** Troy Thompson, Chief Information Security Officer
- **Neoprime Solutions:** Craig Schultz, CEO

Troy Thompson (PNNL) began the panel discussion with a presentation on the conventional cybersecurity landscape and the role of national laboratories. He shared how laboratories balance mission needs with cybersecurity demands along with risk tolerance, training, and awareness. Troy noted the importance of considering differing perspectives (adversary versus defender) across the physical, human, and digital domain.

“The challenge is how quickly can we cycle through and understand mission priorities, what we’re doing to detect, respond, recover, and measure effectiveness.”

Troy Thompson, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

Craig Schultz (Neoprime Solutions) focused on the changing economics of attack and defense, the cost of an attack versus the cost of defense. He also reflected on his experiences abroad understanding attackers’ views in emergency security and technology control.

During the discussion, Troy and Craig explored the rising challenges and opportunities as people grow more connected across all fronts—at home, at work, in medical technologies, in their cars, etc. They highlighted trends in security products and their lifecycle and compared current-to-emerging next-generation security control models.
During the Q&A session, the audience asked how to protect the local account as attacks continue to escalate. The speakers discussed typical measures such as account lockout, aggressive scanning, and password policies, but reiterated the need for behavior-based approaches, emphasizing the need for new models of user training and awareness.

“Trends in security products and their lifecycle are making it more dynamic in how security has to be put into place—you can’t be static anymore.”

Craig Schultz, Neoprime Solutions

**Privacy, Public Disclosure, and Information Sharing**

Panelists discussed information sharing among and between critical infrastructure providers and how to address public disclosure and privacy concerns.

**Panelists:**

» **Facilitator:** Ann Lesperance, Director, Northwest Regional Technology Center, PNNL

» **American Public Power Association:** Joy Ditto, Senior Vice President, Legislative and Political Affairs

» **National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center U.S. Department of Homeland Security:** Mike Roskind, Deputy Director, National Coordinating Center for Communications

» **Microsoft:** Aaron Kleiner, Director, Industry Assurance and Policy Advocacy


“Trends in security products and their lifecycle are making it more dynamic in how security has to be put into place—you can’t be static anymore.”

Craig Schultz, Neoprime Solutions

A trend in security products and their lifecycle is making it more dynamic in how security has to be put into place—you can’t be static anymore.”

Craig Schultz, Neoprime Solutions

Joy said that Congress has honed in on the concepts regarding with whom information is being shared, encouraging certain information to be unclassified, giving liability protection to the private sector, and facilitating rapid sharing of information. Implementation of the bills passed in 2015 by the Department of Homeland Security, DOE, and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission will be important to monitor and engage in where appropriate.

"What you’ve seen all day long about resilience and response—that is where we’re working to make improvements."

Joy Ditto,
American Public Power Association

Mike Roskind (National Coordinating Center for Communications [NCC]) presented on the NCC Communications ISAC. Mike provided an overview of the NCC programs and operations as well as activities to develop a common operating picture for coordinated and local response to ensure communications, protect national security, and enable emergency preparedness.

Mike also highlighted how the Communications ISAC, as a function of the NCC, is facilitating voluntary collaboration and information sharing.

“You have to be able to create the environment from the high levels of management, to clear the deck so the action officers can do their job to develop strategies and implement.”

Mike Roskind, National Coordinating Center for Communications

To that end, Ann Spangler (SnoPUD) spoke briefly on the state’s Public Records Act, noting that there are no specific exemptions for critical infrastructure or privacy, except for vulnerability assessments and emergency response plans.

Aaron Kleiner (Microsoft) presented “Cybersecurity Information Sharing: Foundational Element of Risk Management,” defining key elements for building an effective and sustainable information sharing program. These building blocks include a
detailed understanding of the methods, models, and mechanisms of exchange; actors involved; scope and purpose; and types of information involved. Kleiner provided a series of recommendations for developing an information sharing network. More information is available in the white paper titled, “A Framework for Cybersecurity Information Sharing and Risk Reduction.”

Mike Hamilton (Critical Informatics) emphasized the need for incoming talent to get first-hand exposure to life in the cyber trenches and the need for industry and government to integrate to develop solutions along with mutual aid. He cited several existing opportunities such as the Washington Technology Industry Coalition Tech Apprenticeship, which was established in 2015 and is set to train and place 600 registered apprentices over the next five years. He also highlighted PISCES, the Public Infrastructure Security Collaboration and Exchange System, through which local government can share information and provide rich telemetry.

“We need new models for user training and awareness. We need new clever approaches that provide the awareness, the training, the so what for our user community.”

Mike Hamilton, Critical Informatics

Jill Sterrett (UW Department of Urban Design and Planning) discussed major changes affecting infrastructure and requiring the attention of managers and planners, focusing on cybersecurity, climate change/climate instability, and sustainability. Jill noted that all three of these factors are rapidly changing our infrastructure systems and demand approaches other than just hard engineering. Jill urged for solutions that are holistic and integrated across multiple disciplines, solutions that are based on future-casting for an ever-changing world (not forecasting based on trend lines from the past), and solutions that consider lifecycle costs of construction, operations, and maintenance over the full life of the system, including benefits and costs to the full community (not just monetary expenditures). These are all planning and management issues that require a broad understanding of the integration of multiple infrastructures, knowledge of the challenges and threats we face, and awareness of how they interface with the wider community. She also noted the need for universities to integrate with industry to develop professionals to bridge the gaps as the workforce and industry change.

“We need people who are able to understand those effects of climate change and sustainability across multiple sectors and how sectors can work together.”

Jill Sterrett, UW Department of Urban Design and Planning
Matt Boehnke (Columbia Basin College [CBC]) discussed efforts to bring military into cybersecurity education and how basic training could require students to think tactically, operationally, and then strategically. The effort aims to ensure students are “shovel ready” with qualified skillsets. He discussed CBC’s partnering with PNNL to provide vibrant, dynamic opportunities for students. PNNL supports CBC’s Cybersecurity Bachelor of Applied Science Program and welcomes numerous cybersecurity interns to its team annually.

“Support has to come from the top. Utilities need to look at access management and controls. Security cannot be static; it must be dynamic. Key approaches include diversion deception techniques, cloaking, decoys, and moving toward zero administrators or specific use access. You need to know the specific risk or your risk tolerance. We can build walls higher but real change requires behavioral change. We need to look at critical infrastructure as a holistic state. Cybersecurity should be incorporated into basic education. University and colleges need to hear what companies need to structure their programs. Observe legislation regarding pre-emption issues of the Sunshine Laws. States should enable protections for critical infrastructure.”

WRAP-UP

Jessica Matlock (SnoPUD) concluded the day’s discussions with a recap of the recurring themes and ideas the participants will continue to explore in the future. These included:

» Information sharing, resiliency, and collaboration are important as ever.

During the Q&A session, speakers discussed opportunities to more effectively leverage better curriculum along with more cutting-edge and less state-centric approaches for workforce development, noting the need for a compelling and challenging working environment as being key to success. They were also asked to identify key skills they see as most important for incoming talent, to which they collectively responded with 1) communications and 2) the ability to work on a team.

“Support has to come from the top. Utilities need to look at access management and controls. Security cannot be static; it must be dynamic. Key approaches include diversion deception techniques, cloaking, decoys, and moving toward zero administrators or specific use access. You need to know the specific risk or your risk tolerance. We can build walls higher but real change requires behavioral change. We need to look at critical infrastructure as a holistic state. Cybersecurity should be incorporated into basic education. University and colleges need to hear what companies need to structure their programs. Observe legislation regarding pre-emption issues of the Sunshine Laws. States should enable protections for critical infrastructure.”

NEXT STEPS

Looking forward, participants from the workshop will continue to engage and explore opportunities for research and development to address key challenges defined during the summit:

» Building informal public-private partnerships
» Defining a framework for cyber recovery
» Assessing an entity’s risk and determining what to spend on cyber
» Building response and recovery plans that protect against vulnerabilities
» Enabling capabilities at scale and informing investment strategies
» Building next-generation cybersecurity professionals

Results from the workshop will be shared with participants and made available on the SnoPUD website (http://www.snopud.com).
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The Third Annual Cybersecurity Summit brings together industry leaders and policymakers to identify how we can build a better defense network, combat cyberattacks, and train next generation cyber professionals. This summit will broaden the state's perspective by hearing from public and private experts on cybersecurity and examine the newest cyber technologies and what we need to create more resilient systems.

### AGENDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Check in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Welcoming Remarks</td>
<td>Jessica Matlock, Director, Government Relations, Snohomish County PUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bjong “Wolf” Yeigh, University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10 a.m.</td>
<td>Opening Remarks (video)</td>
<td>Senator Patty Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Charney, Corporate Vice President for Trustworthy Computing at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Microsoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Hoffman, Department of Energy, Assistant Secretary, Office of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Electricity Delivery &amp; Energy Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 a.m.</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:40 a.m.</td>
<td><strong>What are the threats and how do we protect our assets against rapidly evolving cyber threats?</strong>&lt;br&gt;What is needed during these types of events and are we getting what we need?&lt;br&gt;What is working and not working and where do we need assistance from policymakers and the federal government?</td>
<td><strong>Facilitator:</strong> Phillip B. Jones, Commissioner, Washington Utilities and Transportation Committee (UTC)&lt;br&gt;<strong>SnoPUD/National Guard:</strong> Benjamin Beberness, Chief Information Officer, Snohomish County PUD&lt;br&gt;<strong>Edison Electric Institute:</strong> Scott Aaronson, Managing Director, Electric Sector and National Infrastructure Protection&lt;br&gt;<strong>Washington Military Department's Emergency Management Division:</strong> Robert Ezelle, Director&lt;br&gt;<strong>United States Navy:</strong> Darla Montgomery-Sherrell, Command Information Officer, NAVFAC NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>BOX LUNCH</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>What are the trends in cyber detection and protection?</strong>&lt;br&gt;What is the future looking like?&lt;br&gt;What are the new tools and processes that are emerging? (from industry and government/regulator perspective)</td>
<td><strong>Facilitator:</strong> Gordon Matlock, Cyber Practice Lead, Bridge Partners&lt;br&gt;<strong>Pacific Northwest National Laboratory:</strong> Troy Thompson, CISO&lt;br&gt;<strong>Neoprine Solutions:</strong> Craig Schultz, CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>Privacy, Public Disclosure and Information Sharing – Finding the Balance</strong>&lt;br&gt;Information sharing among and between critical infrastructure providers is paramount to rapidly addressing cybersecurity threats. How can we ensure information sharing occurs between the organizations and infrastructure while still addressing some of the public disclosure and privacy concerns?</td>
<td><strong>Facilitator:</strong> Ann Lesperance, Director, Northwest Regional Technology Center, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory&lt;br&gt;<strong>American Public Power Association:</strong> Joy Ditto, Senior Vice President, Legislative and Political Affairs&lt;br&gt;<strong>National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>US Department of Homeland Security:</strong> Mike Roskind, Deputy Director, National Coordinating Center for Communications&lt;br&gt;<strong>Microsoft:</strong> Aaron Kleiner, Director, Industry Assurance and Policy Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>What are the challenges we have with growing the cybersecurity workforce in the State of Washington for critical infrastructure?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do we develop needed faculty?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do we work with industry to reflect their needs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do universities need to integrate programs more closely with industry, particularly in this field?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do we motivate universities to embrace needed changes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What does the ideal world look like for us?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitator: <strong>Barbara Endicott-Popovsky</strong>, Ph.D., Professor, University of Washington Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‣ <strong>T-Mobile Corporation</strong>: Bill Boni, Vice President &amp; Corporate Information Security Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‣ <strong>Critical Informatics</strong>: Mike Hamilton, CEO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‣ <strong>University of Washington Department of Urban Planning</strong>: Jill Sterrett, Lecturer and Leadership Advisor, MIPM Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‣ <strong>Columbia Basin College</strong>: Matt Boehnke, Assistant Professor Computer Science/Cyber Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>Wrap-up and next steps, follow-up actions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESENTATIONS

» The Evolution of Attacks (Microsoft)
» Industry-Government Partnerships for Critical Infrastructure Security (Edison Electric Institute)
» Cybersecurity Challenges (NAVFA CW)
» Trends & Perspectives in Cyber Defense (PNNL, NeoPrime)
» Cybersecurity Information Sharing: Foundational Element of Risk Communication (Microsoft)
Industry-Government Partnerships for Critical Infrastructure Security (Edison Electric Institute)

UW Cyber Summit Panel
February 29, 2016

Scott Aaronson
Edison Electric Institute

The Threat Landscape
ESCC Committee Structure

Industry-Government Coordination

Leveraging Infrastructure / Research & Development

ESCC Leadership

Threat Information Sharing & Processes

Cross-Sector Coordination
The Edison Electric Institute (EEI) is the association that represents all U.S. investor-owned electric companies. Our members provide electricity for 220 million Americans, operate in all 50 states and the District of Columbia, and directly employ more than 500,000 workers.

With $100 billion in annual capital expenditures, the electric power industry is responsible for millions of additional jobs. Reliable, affordable, and sustainable electricity powers the economy and enhances the lives of all Americans.

EEI has 70 international electric companies as Affiliate Members, and 270 industry suppliers and related organizations as Associate Members.

Organized in 1933, EEI provides public policy leadership, strategic business intelligence, and essential conferences and forums.

For more information, visit our Web site at www.eei.org.

January 2016
Cybersecurity Challenges (NAVFAC NW)

NAVFAC NW
Cybersecurity Challenges

2/29/2016
UNCLASSIFIED

Navy Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC)

- **Mission**: NAVFAC is the Naval Shore and Expeditionary Systems Command that:
  - Plans, builds, and maintains sustainable facilities
  - Delivers environmental, utilities, and other base services
  - Acquires and manages expeditionary combat force systems and equipment
- **World-wide organization**
  - 18,000 + employees
  - $12 + Billion in business
- **The Systems Command (SYSCOM)** that builds and maintains sustainable facilities, delivers utilities and services, and provides Navy expeditionary combat force capabilities
- **NAVFAC Northwest** is the subordinate command that handles this mission in the Pacific Northwest
NACFAC NW Area of Responsibility

**Installations:**
- NAVBASE Kitsap (Bangor, Bremerton, Keyport, Manchester)
- NAVSTA Everett (Jim Creek, Smokey Point, Pacific Beach)
- NAVAIRSTA Whidbey Island (Ault Field, Seaplane Base)
- NAVMAG Indian Island

**Navy Operational Support Centers (14) in 11 states:**
- Alaska, Idaho, Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, Wyoming
- **Two Special Areas:** Lakhoure, ND; Omaha, NB

**Geographic Challenges:**
- Most inter-installation travel requires ferry
- Traffic congestion and pre-ferry wait times
- Time and expense to command

NAVFAC’s Cybersecurity Responsibility

- NAVFAC is the SYSCOM for Cybersecurity and Information Technology of Control Systems (CS) Ashore, per Secretary of the Navy (SECNAV) Instruction 5400.15c
- Life-cycle support including research and development, design, procurement, testing, etc...
- More than execution - Technical Authority
Challenges / Constraints in the Northwest

- Recruiting and retaining qualified employees and planning for attrition
- NW has four years execution over corporate
- No current policy ensuring CIO involvement in project acquisition - planning, development, and execution
- Design to implementation timelines
  - Installation technology can quickly become obsolete or obsolescent by the time it’s implemented
- Procurement difficulties
- Lots of systems and no standardization between them
- Articulating the requirements across industry and vendors since some of the Navy language is different or not aligned with industry standard

- Use of technologies that are not developed with Cybersecurity as a design imperative
- Disparate Transport Systems
- Inheritance of unsecured wireless technologies
- Volume of networked and IP connected sensors and devices
- To date we’ve seen that most OT is typically developed in a vacuum with a very specific mission and little or no consideration to logical security
Where are DoN Control Systems?

EVERYWHERE

READINESS - PERFORMANCE - SUSTAINABILITY
Trends & Perspectives in Cyber Defense (PNNL, NEOPRIME)

Trends & Perspectives in Cyber Defense

People ↔ Process ↔ Technology

CRAIG SCHULTZ  
TROY THOMPSON

Washington State Cyber Summit III  
February 29, 2016  
Seattle, WA

Cyberspace is rapidly evolving
... more complex, merged and dynamic!

Information Security
IT Security
OT Security
IoT Security
Physical Security

You
Home
Auto
Work
Cybersecurity
Digital Security
Cyberspace and your medical technology...

**Wireless Implantable Medical Devices**
- Deep Brain Neurostimulators
- Cochlear Implants
- Gastric Stimulators
- Cardiac Defibrillators/Pacemakers
- Foot Drop Implants
- Insulin Pumps

Cyberspace and your home...

**Smart Home**
- Smart House
- Thermostat
- Refrigerator
- Security System
Cyberspace and your car...

The Freightliner Inspiration's Highway Pilot system
The driver controls the truck until it is safely on the highway, then activates the autonomous driving system. Driver must override the system to change lanes or leave the highway.

Stereo camera
Recognises road markings and controls steering to keep truck in lane

Front radar
Consists of two sensors:
- Short-range
  Detects vehicles in a wider area which could merge into lane in front of the truck
- Long-range
  Detects vehicles ahead at a distance

Adaptive cruise control and brake assist systems
Use data from the radar to maintain separation from other vehicles

Source: company, FT research

Trends of Security Products and their Lifecycle

Attacker Industry Actively Shortening Performance Curves (multiple years to less than a year)

Security Product Performance

Introduction Growth & Maturity Maturity Decline

Time (years)
Companies at High Risk Moving to Adopt Early, Adopt Often

Next Generation Security Controls Moving Towards Active Defense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Model</th>
<th>Emerging Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signatures</td>
<td>Sandboxes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>Isolation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detection</td>
<td>Diversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>“Virtual”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static</td>
<td>Dynamic &amp; Deceptive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Comprehensive protection requires an adaptive protection process integrating predictive, detective and response capabilities.”

Neil MacDonald and Peter Frishbrook,
Gartner National Harbor Conference, June 23, 2014
Differing Perspectives...  
Adversary vs. Defender

My Approach...  
From static to dynamic to Machine-speed

- **Physical**
  - Mission
  - Protect
  - Detect
  - Respond
  - Recover
  - Measure

- **Human**
  - Mission
  - Protect
  - Detect
  - Respond
  - Recover
  - Measure

- **Digital**
  - Mission
  - Protect
  - Detect
  - Respond
  - Recover
  - Measure

**Business Objectives**
- Awareness Training
- Continuous Monitoring
- Threat Analysis
- Planning Training

**Risk Tolerance**
- Dynamic Decoys
- Denial & Deception
- Containment Mitigation
- Training Awareness

**Priorities**
- Budget

- **MISSION**
- **PROTECT**
- **DETECT**
- **RESPOND**
- **RECOVER**
- **MEASURE**
"The goal would be to deter future cyber attacks by changing the adversary's cost-benefit calculations."
- Center for a New American Security, Feb 2013
Active Defense: Bringing the House of Stanton to Cyber

Chess Risk Gaming Analysis
- Opponent’s Skill, Methods, Objectives
- Opportunity to Capture King
- Risk of Loss to Your King

Cyber Risk Gaming Analysis
- Opponent’s Skill, Methods, Objectives
- Opportunity to Prevent Movement
- Risk of Loss to Your Critical Asset

Chess is Hard Enough Against a Skilled Opponent!

Now Imagine...
The Game Board, Pieces, and Objectives Change Over Time

Expected $ Losses
- 2 Year: $10,500,250
- 1 Year: $7,500,000

Next Best Move?
- Security Control Measure
- Security Process
- Organizational Change
- Communication Plan

Emerging Technology Still Face Strong Challenges

Technology
1. Sandboxing and Detonation
2. Containment and Isolation
3. Diversion and Obfuscation
4. VM based HIDS
5. Analytics and Threat Intelligence

Challenges
- Short duration testing
- Unrealistic environment
- Lateral Propagation is key
- Cannot determine Intent
- Currently Web Applications
- Cannot determine Intent
- Visible HIDS shut down by attackers
- Standard VM images are give away
- Need for clean baseline and data
- Understanding propagation tactics
Defending your cyberspace...
Washington State Cybersecurity Summit 3: A Comprehensive Approach to Grid Security

Privacy, Public Disclosure and Information-Sharing—Finding the Balance

Joy Ditto, SVP Legislative & Political Affairs
American Public Power Association
February 29, 2016

PUBLIC POWER REACH

Public power’s share of the U.S. electricity market

- 10% of generation
- 10% of transmission
- 16% of distribution
2,012 public power utilities provide electricity to 48 million people* in 49 states and 4 U.S. territories

1 in 7 electricity customers in the U.S. are served by public power

*Based on U.S. Census Bureau stats of 2.54 people per household/meter

Electricity customers served by

- 68% public power utilities
- 15% investor-owned utilities
- 13% rural electric cooperatives
- 4% power marketers

Mostly in Texas
**History of Info-Sharing & Grid Security Legislation**

- **December 2006** – Idaho Nation Lab Test of “Aurora” vulnerability
- **Early 2007** – some in industry alerted to vulnerability, but told to not share broadly
- **Spring 2007** – alert more broadly disseminated to industry, but info not “actionable”
- **September 2007** – CNN shows video of Aurora vulnerability test
- **Fall 2007** – hearings on Capitol Hill question new NERC mandatory reliability standards regime
- **Fall 2007** – establishment of electric sector “cyber-coalition” (now grid security coalition)

**History of Info-Sharing & Grid Security Legislation (Cont.)**

- **Fall 2007** – legislation developed in the House known as the GRID Act would have imposed additional standards on electric sector overriding the framework of Section 215. One piece industry supported was additional authority for FERC or DOE to use during presidentially declared emergency.
- **2010** – Despite industry opposition, GRID Act passes House, but not Senate.
- **2011-2012** – Cyber-security legislation developed in Senate giving DHS additional regulatory authority across industry sectors and duplicative of NERC standards. Electric sector opposed. Failed on the Senate floor in summer and fall 2012.
History of Info-Sharing & Grid Security Legislation (Cont.)

- **2012-2015** – Cyber-security information-sharing legislation revisited and gaining support. Managed primarily via Intelligence Committees. Broad industry coalition -- including electric sector, and led by U.S. Chamber -- supports.

- **December 4, 2015** – President signs into law the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, which includes several grid security provisions, including emergency authority for DOE.

- **December 18, 2015** – Cybersecurity Act included in Division N of H.R. 2029, the Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY 2016, signed into law on this date.

Cybersecurity Act of 2015

- **Title I of the Cybersecurity Act** incorporates the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015, and is relevant to electric sector. Key provisions include:
  - Mandatory development of procedures for sharing of cyber threat indicators (CTIs) and defensive measures (DMs) across the government and with industry.
  - Mandatory development of procedures for federal government to be able to receive information about CTIs and DMs.
  - Authorization for industry to share or receive information about CTIs and DMs with each other and with the federal government.
  - Limited liability protection for industry to share such information.
Grid Security Provisions of FAST Act

- Defines critical electric infrastructure (CEI)
- Defines critical electric infrastructure information (CEII)
- Directs FERC, in consultation with DOE, to establish a process for designating and protection CEII
- Defines grid security emergency and grants DOE additional emergency authority to protect CEI.
- Exempts CEII disclosure under state sunshine laws.
- Directs DOE to explore development of strategic transformer reserve.

Implementation of Laws

- Electric sector already working together on implementation.
- New territory on information-sharing.
- Process for designating CEI & CEII at FERC important.
Cybersecurity Information Sharing: Foundational Element of Risk Communication (Microsoft)

Information sharing: what is it?

**Incidents**
Details of attempted and successful attacks that may include a description of information lost, techniques used, intent, and impact. The severity of an incident could range from a successfully blocked attack to a serious national security situation.

**Threats**
Yet to be understood issues with potentially serious implications; indicators of compromise, such as malicious files, stolen email addresses, impacted IP addresses, or malware samples; or information about threat actors. Threat information can help operators detect or deter incidents, learn from attacks, and create solutions that can better protect their own systems and those of others.

**Vulnerabilities**
Vulnerabilities in software, hardware, or business processes that can be exploited for malicious purposes.

**Mitigations**
Methods for remedying vulnerabilities, containing or blocking threats, and responding to and recovering from incidents. Common forms of such information include patches to plug vulnerabilities, antivirus updates to stop exploitation, and directions for purging malicious actors from networks.

**Situational awareness**
Information that enables decision-makers to respond to an incident and that may require real-time telemetry of exploited vulnerabilities, active threats, and attacks. It could also contain information about the targets of attacks and the state of critical public or private networks.

**Best practices**
Information related to how software and services are developed and delivered, such as security controls, development and incident response practices, and software patching or effectiveness metrics.

**Strategic analysis**
Gathering, distilling, and analyzing many types of information to build metrics, trends, and projections. It is often blended with projections of potential scenarios to prepare government or private sector decision-makers for future risk.

Who should share information?
- What should be shared?
- When should it be shared?
- What is the quality and utility of what is shared?
- How should it be shared?
- Why is it being shared?
- What can be done with the information?
Information sharing: sustainable building blocks

Aactors involved in information sharing

- Government
- Business Enterprise
- IT Security Firms
- Critical Infrastructure
- IT Companies
- Security Researchers
Scope and purpose of exchange

Geographic Scope
- International
- Regional
- National

Operational Purpose
- Common Interest
- Common concern
- Sector Specific

Information Sharing Foundations

Types of information exchanged

Strategic Analysis
- Information is built on a variety of perspectives from incidents, proofs of concepts, doctrines and risk assessments

Situational Awareness
- Data is often derived from an aggregate of the previous four types

Threats
- These four types of data can be shared with different groups and even publically.

Mitigations

Incidents

Vulnerabilities

Information Formats
- Open Response
- Unique Information Sharing
- Structured Information Sharing
Models of information exchange

Voluntary Exchange Models
- The richest and most valuable exchange that exists in the cybersecurity ecosystem.
- The most effective scenarios for sharing information are be company-to-company exchanges, in addition to the collective responses to large incidents or threats.
- Governments must consider how to deepen trust, provide a collective benefit while minimizing reputational risk, and respond to a clearly articulated national incident.

Mandatory Disclosure Models
- Mandatory incident reporting is inherently one-directional and does not, on its own, improve operational security or response.
- Governments increasingly require the disclosure of security event information to regulators and other government authorities, investors, or impacted individuals.
- It is critical that governments do not conflate incident reporting or their own need for situational awareness with information sharing between trusted parties.

Principles for Incident Reporting Policies
1. Should be aligned to clearly defined outcomes, such as public safety, response coordination, or improving security defenses.
2. Should be flexible and commercially reasonable and should leverage commonly accepted approaches and international standards, where possible, avoiding incompatibility.
3. Should also balance the risks and benefits associated with publishing incident details.
4. Timelines for reporting incidents should be mapped to specific outcomes and not arbitrarily chosen.
5. Should be supported with research and development in both the public and private sectors.

Methods of information exchange

Formalized exchanges
Security clearance-based exchanges
Trust-based exchanges
Ad hoc exchanges
## Recommendations for developing an information sharing framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment, trust, cooperation, and a clear sense of value required.</th>
<th>Develop an overarching strategy for information sharing and collaboration.</th>
<th>Spur voluntary information sharing by building interpersonal relationships.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design with privacy protections in mind.</td>
<td>Require mandatory information sharing only in limited circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish a meaningful governance process.</td>
<td>Make full use of information shared, by conducting analyses on long-term trends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus sharing on actionable threat, vulnerability, and mitigation information.</td>
<td>Encourage the global sharing of best practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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