DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
1322 PATTERSON AVENUE, SE, SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON NAVY YARD, DC 20374-5065

2620
Ser CHE/017
12 May 2020

From: Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Subj: INTERIM TECHNICAL GUIDANCE - APPLICATION OF RISK MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK TO FACILITY-RELATED CONTROL SYSTEMS

Ref: (a) DoDI 8500.01 of 14 March 2014
(b) DoDI 8510.01 of 12 March 2014
(c) U.S. Navy Risk Management Framework Process Guide, 10 October 2019
(d) NAVFAC Echelon II Risk Management Framework Business Rules for Facility-Related Control Systems, 4 October 2019
(e) UFGS 25 05 11 Cybersecurity for Facility-Related Control Systems

Encl: (1) UFGS 25 08 11.00 20 RISK MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK FOR FACILITY-RELATED CONTROL SYSTEMS

1. Purpose. This Interim Technical Guidance (ITG) provides the basic criteria guidance concerning the implementation of Risk Management Framework (RMF) for Facility-Related Control Systems (FRCS) for projects currently under design and design-build request for proposal development.

2. Background. A control system (CS) typically consists of network capable digital controllers and user interfaces that monitor and possibly control equipment. There are many types of CS ranging from building CS to manufacturing CS to weapon CS, all with different names and terminology. FRCS are a subset of CS that monitor and control equipment and systems, such as building CS, utility CS, electronic security systems, and fire and life safety systems. Per references (a) and (b), FRCS must be cybersecure.

a. The Department of Defense (DoD) follows a risk-based decision structure for the cybersecurity of FRCS called the RMF process. RMF is a six-step process that categorizes CS, selects, implements, and validates security controls, obtains an authorization, and performs continuous monitoring.

b. Enclosure (1) includes requirements for the construction contractor RMF process that must be included on Navy projects that have a FRCS requiring an Authority to Operate (ATO). The application of enclosure (1) is not sufficient alone to achieve an ATO as there are inherently governmental requirements to the RMF process outside of enclosure (1).

c. Enclosure (1) only applies to FRCS achieving an ATO and does not repeat the requirements in reference (e). Reference (e) includes the cybersecurity requirements for a CS and enclosure (1) includes the RMF requirements for a CS. These two specifications complement each other.

d. Enclosure (1) will require Command Information Office (CIO) support in the form of a ".mil" email address, a user account in eMASS, and reviews of artifacts/scans submitted.

3. Discussion. For projects currently under design and in design-build request for proposal development, ITG 2020-01 and Unified Facilities Guide Specifications (UFGS) 25 05 08.00 20 incorporate elements of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) RMF process per the requirements of references (c) and (d), into contract specifications for FRCS. These elements will facilitate achieving an ATO.

4. Technical Guidance. ITG 2020-01 and UFGS 25 05 08.00 20 will remain in effect until the UFGS 25 05 08.00 20 is posted on the Whole Building Design Guide (WBDG) in late fiscal year twenty. Until we post the SpecsIntact ".sec" file and required forms to the WBDG, obtain these documents from the point of contact listed below.

5. Action

a. This ITG applies to all projects including new construction, renovation, and repair projects of new and existing facilities where NAVFAC CIO and NAVFAC Public Works Business Line (PWBL) support the efforts of achieving an ATO for a FRCS. Enclosure (1) contains UFGS 25 05 08.00 20, which requires the construction contractor to complete portions of eMASS work and coordinates the construction schedule with Government performed validation. Coordinate requirements of this specification with other project specifications having FRCS as required by enclosure (1).

b. Incorporate the requirements of UFGS 25 05 08.00 20 for all current year projects where feasible and later Navy Military Construction projects where project execution is

c. In Design:

(1) Beyond 35 percent design and without Design Release.

(2) Between Design Release and Contract Award, (evaluate the impacts of a pre-award amendment versus a post-award modification).

6. Coordination. This document has been coordinated within NAVFAC CIO, the PWBL, and the Capital Improvements Business Line. NAVFAC Engineering Criteria and Programs Office publishes ITGs as part of the NAVFAC Criteria Program and they are available in PDF format on the WBDG at https://www.wbdg.org/ffc/navy-navfac/interim-technical-guidance-itg.

7. Points of Contact. The point of contact for this matter is David A. Gary, P.E. and he may be reached via phone at: DSN 262-8183, commercial: (757) 322-8183, or e-mail: david.a.gary@navy.mil.

CURFMAN.ROBERT.D.1229438278 Digitally signed by CURFMAN.ROBERT.D.1229438278 Date: 2020.05.13 15:12:22 -04'00'

R. DAVID CURFMAN, P.E.
Chief Engineer and
Assistant Commander for Capital Improvements

Distribution:
NAVFAC (CHE, CIBL, CIO, PWBL)
NAVFAC Atlantic (CIBL, CIO, PWBL)
NAVFAC Pacific (CIBL, CIO, PWBL)
NAVFAC Midlant (CIBL, CIO, PWBL)
NAVFAC Southeast (CIBL, CIO, PWBL)
NAVFAC Washington (CIBL, CIO, PWBL)
NAVFAC EURAFCENT (CIBL, CIO, PWBL)
NAVFAC Northwest (CIBL, CIO, PWBL)
NAVFAC Southwest (CIBL, CIO, PWBL)
NAVFAC Far East (CIBL, CIO, PWBL)
NAVFAC Hawaii (CIBL, CIO, PWBL)
NAVFAC Marianas (CIBL, CIO, PWBL)
NAVFAC EXWC (CIBL, CIO, PWBL)

Copy to:
HQ USMC (MCICOM)