



Lessons Learned from PRMA Assessments

Alex Gordon

Gabriel Helms

Peregrine Technical Solutions, LLC.





BLUF

- 1. The cybersecurity methodology for OT and ICS is stove-piped.
- 2. Mission Assurance considerations are often not integrated into cybersecurity assessments, methodology, or investments for OT/ICS
 - a) Current frameworks do not incorporate Mission Assurance dependencies outside of the system accreditation boundaries
 - b) Limited capabilities to continuously protect, detect, and respond to threats in near real time for OT/ICS
 - c) Decisionmakers lack the visibility or background on OT/ICS cybersecurity
 - d) Investment decisions are reactive and focused on addressing specific vulnerabilities verses strategic in nature based on prioritized Mission Assurance objectives.





An Integrated Approach to OT/ICS Security

Current OT/ICS Security calls for developing, coordinating and integrating independent efforts and frameworks for assessing OT/ICS, developing day to day situational awareness, threat detection, response and cyber-hygiene for OT/ICS, and Integrating threat-based analysis to identify near and long-term strategic investments, with mission assurance as the backbone of the construct providing an all-inclusive interdependent process for the protection of OT/ICS infrastructure.





Platform Resilience Mission Assurance (PRMA)

- Platform Resilience Mission Assurance (PRMA) assessments have provided key insights on cybersecurity vulnerabilities to DoD's Critical Infrastructure IT/OT and Control Systems.
- Peregrine was contracted by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations and Environment for to perform individual PRMA functions under three separate efforts.
 - a) Joint Mission Assurance Assessments (JMAA) 24 Assessments.
 - b) SME support to MOSAICS JCTD.
 - c) SME support to DoD cybersecurity Analysis and Review (DoDCAR).





Mission Assurance

DOD INSTRUCTION 3020.45 MISSION ASSURANCE (MA) CONSTRUCT

- a) Provides a framework for risk management across all protection and resilience programs.
- b) Accounts for the full range of threats and hazards to the capabilities and supporting assets, not just cyber threats.
- c) Mission Assurance considerations are often not integrated into Assessments, Protect, Detect, Respond and Recover methodology, and strategic cybersecurity investments for OT and IT systems.
- d) Traditionally not integrated with other frameworks.





Joint Mission Assurance Assessments (JMAA)

Joint Mission Assurance Assessments (JMAA)

- a) Assesses the cybersecurity of Critical Infrastructure legacy Control Systems (CS), Operational Technology (OT) and Industrial Control systems (ICS).
- b) Senior leadership tends to think about mission readiness in terms of airframes, bombs, missiles, ships, tanks etc., training and available funding.
- c) Most warfighters do not account for reliability of OT/ICS that are proving support activities.
- d) Overall Responsibility often in question.





Real-Time Situational Awareness

Situational awareness, continuous protection, detection, and response to all threats in near real-time for OT and ICS

- a) The MOSAICS JCTD validates the need for real-time response actions to disrupt operations.
- b) The implementation or integration of this capability into a MA construct is a challenge.
- c) No clear guidance on aligning this capability with the cybersecurity mission of the SOC versus the OT/ICS systems as they are mapped to the supported installation's mission.
- d) Must be aligned and mapped to Mission Assurance requirements to provide decision makers with real-time information and SA of mission impacts.





Threat-Based Assessment for OT/ICS

Threat based approach to cybersecurity for ICS

- a) DoD Cybersecurity Analysis and Review (DoDCAR) "MITRE ATT&CK" which is a threat-based, cybersecurity architecture for assessments.
- b) Provides leadership insight and knowledge to make well-informed, threat-prioritized cybersecurity investment decisions.
- c) Synchronize and balance cybersecurity investments, minimize redundancies, eliminate inefficiencies, and improve all-around mission performance.
- d) Enables dependable mission execution.
- e) Traditionally not integrated with other frameworks.





Risk Management Framework for OT/ICS

Risk Management Framework for ICS

- a) Originally Implemented for IT systems: DoD 9510 "Risk Management Framework (RMF) for DoD Information Technology (IT)".
- b) Focuses on protection of information processed and stored on an information system.
- c) OT/ICS systems do not process or store traditional Information.
- d) Mission owners are not part of the RISK Approval process.
- e) No formal mapping to mission essential task.
- f) Mission essential task vary based on service and organization.





Other Considerations

- 1. Integration of MA into Red Team and Blue Team exercises.
- 2. Defense industrial base priorities and facilities that support Warfighter METL.
- 3. Commercial service providers for installation OT/ICS priority of service based on installation METL.





Conclusion and Lessons Learned

- 1. Each effort and concept are successful and provide some level of protection individually.
- 2. Significant overlap with regards to the cybersecurity OT/ICS.
- 3. Should be tied together under one construct based on Mission Assurance and the Task Critical Assets they support.
- 4. OT/ICS systems must be weighed specifically to the mission supported.
- 5. Can be addressed through process and technology development.





Questions?



Dr. Leigh Armistead, President (CISSP) 114 Ballard Street, PO Box 520 Yorktown, VA 23690-0520 Larmistead@goldbelt.com Phone: (757) 234-6664

Cell: (757) 871-3949 Fax: (757) 234-6505

Peregrine 12 of 12