

Filing Receipt

Filing Date - 2025-04-10 02:44:20 PM

Control Number - 57579

Item Number - 169

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-25-11558 PUC DOCKET NO. 57579

\$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$

APPLICATION OF CENTERPOINT ENERGY HOUSTON ELECTRIC, LLC FOR APPROVAL OF ITS 2026-2028 TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM RESILIENCY PLAN **BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE**

OF

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

OFFICE OF PUBLIC UTILITY COUNSEL'S ERRATA TO THE DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RONALD KEEN

The Office of Public Utility Counsel ("OPUC") submits this Errata to the Direct Testimony of Ronald Keen that was filed on April 8, 2025. This Errata makes the change below to Mr. Keen's Direct Testimony.

- 1. Page 14, Footnote 20: Adds context to CenterPoint's Responses to OPUC's Third RFI.
- 2. Page 15, lines 17-19: Notes a potential threat vector related to detailed security information.
- 3. Page 17, lines 12-13: Context added for a lack of detailed responses to certain questions.

Date: April 10, 2025

Respectfully submitted, Benjamin Barkley Chief Executive and Public Counsel State Bar No. 24092083

6 6

Connor Drysdale Assistant Public Counsel State Bar No. 24143982 Sharbel A. Sfeir Assistant Public Counsel State Bar No. 24071204 Justin Swearingen Senior Assistant Public Counsel State Bar No. 24096794 Chris Ekoh Deputy Public Counsel State Bar No. 06507015 1701 N. Congress Avenue, Suite 9-180 P.O. Box 12397 Austin, Texas 78711-2397 512-936-7500 (Telephone) 512-936-7525 (Facsimile) connor.drysdale@opuc.texas.gov (Service) sharbel.sfeir@opuc.texas.gov (Service) justin.swearingen@opuc.texas.gov (Service) chris.ekoh@opuc.texas.gov (Service) opuc_eservice@opuc.texas.gov (Service)

ATTORNEYS FOR THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC UTILITY COUNSEL

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-25-11558

PUC DOCKET NO. 473-25-11558 PUC DOCKET NO. 57579

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served on all parties of record in this proceeding on this 10th day of April 2025 by facsimile, electronic mail, and/or first class, U.S. mail.

h h

Connor Drysdale

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-25-11558 PUC DOCKET NO. 57579

APPLICATION OF CENTERPOINT	§	BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE
ENERGY HOUSTON ELECTRIC, LLC	Ş	
FOR APPROVAL OF ITS 2026-2028	§	OF
TRANSMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION	ş	
SYSTEM RESILIENCY PLAN	Ş	ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

RONALD KEEN

ON BEHALF OF THE

OFFICE OF PUBLIC UTILITY COUNSEL

APRIL 8, 2025 (REVISED APRIL 10, 2025)

ERRATA

- 1 taking into account the historical aggressiveness of adversaries, the resilience plan must be
- 2 as forward looking as possible without being unrealistic in the assessment of the threat.
- 3 CenterPoint's Response to OPUC'S Third Request for Information ("RFF")
- 4 Request No. OPUC-RF103-03 evidences the following:
- 5 **QUESTION**:
- 6 Admit or deny, if "resiliency" is defined as the ability "to prevent, 7 withstand, mitigate, or promptly recover from the risks posed" and 8 the company examines all risks which can potentially impact the 9 company's business and operations, then the company should 10 develop a Rumsfeld Matrix to determine all risks within each 11 quadrant. If deny, please explain.
- 13 ANSWER:
- 14The company does not use a Rumsfeld Matrix for this purpose;15however, the company does maintain a risk register which is used16by Cybersecurity to identify and rate the severity of risks to the17company's assets. 20

18 Q. ARE YOU SAYING A RUMSFELD MATRIX IS NECESSARY TO DETERMINE

19 THREATS AND VULNERABILITIES FRO RESILIENCE PLANS?

- 20 A. No. A Rumsfeld Matrix is simply an effective tool that requires the plan developer to
- 21 research and understand both past threats and vulnerabilities potentially at a forensic level
- as well as the current threat environment. Doing so allows the developer to understand the
- 23 adversary(s) and the trends used in past as well as current attacks. It gives the developer a
- 24 sense of the methodologies used and how those methodologies are evolving or, in some
- 25

12

cases, being disposed of in favor of new methodologies. It also potentially reveals

²⁰ CenterPoint Energy Houston Electric, LLC's Responses to Office of Public Utility Counsel Third Set of RFIs, Response to OPUC 3-3 (Mar. 26, 2025). ("CenterPoint's Response to OPUC's 3rd RFI"). <u>[On March 13, 2025, OPUC and the Company discussed security concerns as to detailed responses and agreed to modifying the RFIs.]</u>

ERRATA

1 2 "unknown knowns" or "unknown unknowns" – things the adversary knows about the company and its vulnerabilities and operations the company isn't aware of.²¹

3

Q. WHAT IS A THREAT VECTOR?

4 A A threat vector (or attack vector) is a method or mechanisms an adversary uses to gain illegal, unauthorized access to computer systems and networks.²² Threat vectors can be 5 classified as active or passive – understanding threat vectors develops an awareness of the 6 7 entry points into computer components, systems, and networks (boundary protection). Armed with this information, vulnerabilities within the company's business and operations 8 9 systems and components of those systems can be remediated and gaps closed. Interpreting 10 and understanding the magnitude of a threat vector also allows an appreciation of the scale of the attack surface - the company then can use that knowledge to eliminate or minimize 11 12 the vector.

13Taking a proactive approach to understanding threat vectors enables the14employment of effective measures to significantly reduce risk – most cyberattacks take the15path of least resistance and target known vectors that are often overlooked, especially those16unknown to the company.

17 <u>One such vector is access to detailed information about a company's security and</u> 18 <u>threat response procedures, which is why an agreement was reached for CenterPoint to</u> 19 provide general statements to certain RFI responses.

²¹ See <u>The Uncertainty Project – Rumsfeld Matrix</u> at *https://www.theuncertaintyproject.org/tools/rumsfeld-matrix*. (Last Visited Apr. 7, 2025).

²² See <u>SailPoint - What is a threat vector? Examples in cybersecurity</u> (May 14, 2023) at *https://www.sailpoint*. .com/identity-library/threat-vector. (Last Visited Apr. 7, 2025).

ERRATA

response except in overall generalized terms, it is difficult to assess whether all threats have
 been identified or the proper measures applied to defeat those threats, whether identified
 or not.

4 Q. CAN CENTERPOINT ARGUE THAT THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE 5 SRP RULE HAVE BEEN FULFILLED IF CENTERPOINT BELIEVES THEIR 6 TEAM HAS ADEQUATELY ADDRESSED ALL THREATS IN THE REGISTER?

7 A. If CenterPoint were funding this initiative from their own resources without requiring 8 additional funding from the ratepayer, I would agree. But, because the ratepayer is funding 9 these initiatives and it is the ratepayer who ultimately pays the cost if the adversary, in 10 some way, disrupts or shuts down CenterPoint operations, it is the ratepayer who must be assured that the Company has done everything possible to ensure its SRP is not just 11 12 adequate, but also forward looking. Because the Company, due to security concerns that 13 were shared with OPUC, will not share the details of the planning methodologies used 14 (except in broad brush terms) or data considered in developing the measures (especially 15 data dealing with prior attacks, including forensic and trend analysis data) to protect against 16 cybersecurity incidents, the doubt in the comprehensiveness is sufficient to cause concern. 17 Q. HAS CENTERPOINT PROVIDED ANY INFORMATION OR RESPONSE THAT

18 LEADS YOU TO BELIEVE THE COMPANY MAY NOT HAVE CONSIDERED

19

ALL THREAT VECTORS?

A. In its Response to OPUC'S Third RFI Request No. OPUC-RFI03-02, CenterPoint stated,
"The company examines all known risks which might reasonably be expected to impact