



With You Today



JAMEY LOUPE

Assurance Market Leader Risk Advisory Services BDO USA

> 713-407-3935 jloupe@bdo.com



TIM SEIGLER

Assurance Principal Third Party Attestation BDO USA

770-560-9752 tseigler@bdo.com



Learning Objectives

NIST CSF 2.0 Overview and the changes from NIST 1.1 to NIST 2.0 2

Impact of Third-Party Service providers and cybersecurity to have "layers" of security to reduce risk 3

Internal Audit's role in responding to business email compromises





Agenda for Today

A History and Overview of NIST



Need for NIST 2.0



Differences between NIST 1.1 and NIST 2.0



Detailed Insight into new NIST 2.0 Function



Leveraging NIST 2.0 to Address Third Party Risk (Defense in Depth)



A Legacy of Excellence

NIST AND ITS CONTRIBUTION

- Established in 1901 by the U.S. Department of Commerce
- Focuses on scientific and technological research and standards development
- Plays a vital role in promoting cybersecurity best practices globally





NIST Cybersecurity Framework (CSF) 1.0

THE GENESIS

- Introduced NIST CSF v1.0 in 2014 following Executive Order 13636
- Provided a voluntary, risk-based approach to cybersecurity
- Offered a core framework with five functions: Identify, Protect, Detect, Respond, and Recover
- Geared towards critical infrastructure sectors initially



Evolution of the NIST Cybersecurity Framework (CSF)

UPDATES AND IMPROVEMENTS

- Engage with industry, academia, and government stakeholders for continuous improvement
- Increase and facilitate international adoption and integration with other Standards
- Released NIST CSF v1.1 in April 2018 with major addition addressing Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management
- Improve usability and relevance through clarifications and enhancements across the framework





The Everchanging Landscape

THE NEED FOR NIST CSF 2.0

- Evolving cyber threats demanded a broader and more adaptable framework
- Increased focus on risk management for all organizations, regardless of size or sector
- Recognition of the growing importance of governance in cybersecurity strategy



Introducing NIST CSF 2.0

A CLOSER LOOK

- Expands the core framework to include a sixth function: Govern
- Offers comprehensive guidance with the use of implementation examples
- Continues to offer a voluntary, risk-based approach
- Provides a flexible framework that can be customized based on organizational needs
- Emphasizes the importance of continuous improvement
- Improves ease of use and accessibility (open source, material, different languages)



| Framewor | |
|----------|--|
| Core | |
| Changes | |

NIST CSF V1.1 **TO V2.0:**

| CCE | v1 | 1 |
|-----|-----|---|
| CJF | VT. | - |

- Functions 5
- Categories 23
- 108 Subcategories

CSF v2.0

- 6 Functions
- Categories 22
- Subcategories 106

| Function | Category | ID |
|----------|--|-------|
| IDENTIFY | Asset Management | ID.AM |
| | Business Environment | ID.BE |
| | Governance | ID.GV |
| | Risk Assessment | ID.RA |
| | Risk Management Strategy | ID.RM |
| | Supply Chain Risk Management | ID.SC |
| PROTECT | Identity Management and Access Control | PR.AC |
| | Awareness and Training | PR.AC |
| | Data Security | PR.DS |
| | Information Protection Processes and Procedures | PR.IP |
| | Maintenance | PR.MA |
| | Protective Technology | PR.PT |
| DETECT | Anomalies and Events | DE.AE |
| | Security Continuous Monitoring | DE.CM |
| | Detection Processes | DE.DP |
| RESPOND | Response Planning | RS.RP |
| | Communications | RS.CO |
| | Analysis | RS.AN |
| | Mitigation | RS.MI |
| | Improvements | RS.IM |
| RECOVER | Recovery Planning | RC.RP |
| | Improvements | RC.IM |
| | Communications | RC.CO |

| Function | Category | ID | |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| GOVERN | Organizational Context | GV.OC | |
| (GV) | Risk Management Strategy | GV.RM | |
| | Roles, Responsibilities, and Authorities | GV.RR | |
| | Policy | GV.PO | |
| | Oversight | GV.OV | |
| | Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk | GV.SC | |
| | Management | | |
| IDENTIFY | Asset Management | ID.AM | |
| (ID) | Risk Assessment | ID.RA | |
| | Improvement | ID.IM | |
| PROTECT | Identity Management, Authentication and | PR.AA | |
| (PR) | Access Control | | |
| | Awareness and Training | PR.AT | |
| | Data Security | PR.DS | |
| | Platform Security | PR.PS | |
| | Technology Infrastructure Resilience | PR.IR | |
| DETECT | Continuous Monitoring | DE.CM | |
| (DE) | Adverse Event Analysis | DE.AE | |
| RESPOND | Incident Management | RS.MA | |
| (RS) | Incident Analysis | RS.AN | |
| | Incident Response Reporting and | RS.CO | |
| | Communication | | |
| | Incident Mitigation | RS.MI | |
| RECOVER | Incident Recovery Plan Execution | RC.RP | |
| (RC) | Incident Recovery Communication RC.CO | | |



Applying NIST CSF to Mature your Cybersecurity Control Environment





Source: The NIST Cybersecurity Framework (CSF) 2.0

REPEAT ...



Applying NIST CSF to Mature your Cybersecurity Control Environment

- CSF Organizational Profile describes organization's current or target cybersecurity posture in alignment with the CSF Core (Functions, Categories, and Subcategories)
 - **Current Profile** = Core outcomes currently achieved
 - **Target Profile** = Desired outcomes
- Scope defines facts and assumptions on which Organizational Profile(s) are based
 - Scope of Organizational Profile can cover entire organization or may be limited to division, business unit, program, system(s), etc.

- Information gathered to create profiles should be relevant to scope
 - **CSF Tiers** can be used to inform on Current and Target Profiles (i.e., rating) by NIST CSF Categories and Subcategories
- Gaps exist where differences between Current and Target Profiles are identified, and should be prioritized for resolution via formal action plans (e.g., POA&M)
- Implement action plans and update Organizational Profile as needed



Source: The NIST Cybersecurity Framework (CSF) 2.0 ►

Applying NIST CSF

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Organizations should leverage NISTCSF 2.0 Resources including:
 - NIST CSF 2.0 Reference Tool Allows download of NIST CSF 2.0 Core (Functions, Categories, Subcategories) with implementation examples
 - Quick Start Guides Organizational Profile templates and guidance on integrating CSF with ERM, applying CSF tiers to create Organizational Profiles, using CSF to improve C-SCRM processes, and specific considerations for small businesses

- Organizations may also integrate NIST CSF 2.0 with other frameworks, models, and practices including:
 - CMMI (for alternative maturity scoring view)
 - NIST SP 800-30 Guide for Conducting Risk Assessments
 - NIST SP 800-37 Risk Management Framework (RMF)
 - NIST Privacy Framework and Privacy Risk Assessment Methodology (PRAM)
 - NIST SP 800-161 Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management Practices



Applying NIST CSF

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

Scoring Methodology

- Determine scores (i.e., ratings) at the NIST CSF Subcategory level
- May aggregate scores at NIST CSF Category or Function level
- May customize scoring criteria by applying additional factors with weighting based on importance (e.g., process, policy, documentation, automation)
- Methodology should be applied consistently

Risk Considerations

- Risk may be used to inform determination of Target Profile
- Risk determination may be based on results of previous internal risk assessments or third-party assurance audits or assessments (using NIST or other frameworks)
- Risk should also be considered when prioritizing corrective actions to address gaps



Source: The NIST Cybersecurity Framework (CSF) 2.0 ►

Applying NIST CSF Scorecard Example

| | NIST CSF Function | NIST CSF Tier | CMMI Level | NIST CSF Category | Current Profile | Target Profile | Risk Impact |
|---|----------------------|---------------|------------|---|--------------------|-------------------|-------------|
| | GOVERN (GV) | Tier 2: | Level 2: | Organizational Context (GV.OV) | 2.5 | 3.0 | Moderate |
| | | Risk Informed | Managed | Risk Management Strategy (GV.RM) | 3.0 | 3.5 | Low |
| | | | | Roles, Responsibilities, and Authorities (GV.RR) | 2.5 | 3.0 | Moderate |
| | | | | Policy (GV.PO) | 3.0 | 3.5 | Low |
| | | | | Oversight (GV.OV) | 3.0 | 4.0 | Moderate |
| | | | | Cybersecurity Supply Chain Risk Management (GV.SC) | 2.0 | 3.5 | High |
| | IDENTIFY (ID) | Tier 2: | Level 2: | Asset Management (ID.AM) | 2.5 | 3.5 | Moderate |
| | | Risk Informed | Managed | Risk Assessment (ID.RA) | 2.5 | 3.0 | Low |
| | | | | Improvement (ID.IM) | 2.0 | 4.0 | High |
| | PROTECT (PR) | Tier 2: | Level 2: | Identity Management, Authentication, and Access Control (PR.AA) | 2.2 | 3.0 | Moderate |
| | | Risk Informed | Managed | Awareness and Training (PR.AT) | 2.75 | 4.0 | Moderate |
| | | | | Data Security (PR.DS) | 2.75 | 3.0 | Low |
| | | | | Platform Security (PR.PS) | 1.9 | 3.0 | Moderate |
| | | | | Technology Infrastructure Resilience (PR.IR) | 2.2 | 4.0 | High |
| | DETECT (DE) | Tier 2: | Level 2: | Continuous Monitoring (DE.CM) | 2.5 | 3.0 | Low |
| | | Risk Informed | Managed | Adverse Event Analysis (DE.AE) | 2.75 | 4.0 | High |
| | RESPOND (RS) | Tier 3: | Level 3: | Incident Management (RS.MA) | 3.25 | 4.0 | Moderate |
| | | Repeatable | Defined | Incident Analysis (RS.AN) | 2.75 | 3.0 | Moderate |
| | | | | Incident Response Reporting and Communication (RS.CO) | 3.0 | 3.0 | Low |
| | | | | Incident Mitigation (RS.MI) | 3.0 | 3.5 | Moderate |
| _ | RECOVER (RC) | Tier 2: | Level 2: | Incident Recovery Plan Execution (RC.RP) | 2.75 | 3.0 | Low |
| | | Risk Informed | Managed | Incident Recovery Plan Communication (RC.CO) | 2.25 | 3.0 | Moderate |



Cyber Assessment Methodology

Offering comprehensive cyber risk assessments, we help organizations understand the current state of its cyber program, identify potential gaps and risks, remediate those gaps and risks, and ultimately implement an effective cybersecurity framework.



PROJECT DEFINITION

- Identify scope of work with client
- Development of SOW and client negotiations

PROJECT PREPARATION

- Kick-off presentation
- Validate and customize questionnaire/ evidence request list
- Identify individual(s) that will complete self-assessment questionnaire
- Identify department(s)/ individual(s) to interview as part of data gathering

Risk analysis based on observations and relevant industry

Modification and updates based on client feedback

DATA GATHERING

 Self-assessment questionnaire collection

DATA ANALYSIS



- Observe strengths and gaps based on data gathered
- Validation of control implementation through guided workshops

RISK VALIDATION

- Current state report
- Combined state report

FINDINGS PRESENTATION

- Presentation of the findings within the assessments

Initial development of remediation options

Scoring subcategories and categories

Identify risk level by categories

Evidence request collection

Key personnel interviews

threats



NIST 2.0 GOVERN Function Control Application

| Category | Subcategory ID | Subcategory Description | Implementation Examples |
|--|-------------------|--|--|
| GV.RM: Risk Management Strategy The organization's priorities, constraints, risk tolerance and appetite statements, and assumptions are established, communicated, and used to support operational risk decisions | GV.RM-04 | Strategic direction that describes appropriate risk response options is established and communicated | 1st: 1st Party Risk Ex1: Specify criteria for accepting and avoiding cybersecurity risk for various classifications of data Ex2: Determine whether to purchase cybersecurity insurance Ex3: Document conditions under which shared responsibility models are acceptable (e.g., outsourcing certain cybersecurity functions, having a third party perform financial transactions on behalf of the organization, using public cloud-based services) |
| | GV.RM-05 | Lines of communication across the organization are established for cybersecurity risks, including risks from suppliers and other third parties | 1st: 1st Party Risk 3rd: 3rd Party Risk Ex1: Determine how to update senior executives, directors, and management on the organization's cybersecurity posture at agreed-upon intervals Ex2: Identify how all departments across the organization - such as management, operations, internal auditors, legal, acquisition, physical security, and HR - will communicate with each other about cybersecurity risks |



NIST 2.0 GOVERN Function Control Application

| Category | Subcategory ID | Subcategory Description | Implementation Examples |
|---|-------------------|--|--|
| GV.RM: Risk Management Strategy The organization's priorities, constraints, risk tolerance and appetite statements, and assumptions are | GV.RM-06 | A standardized method for calculating, documenting, categorizing, and prioritizing cybersecurity risks is established and communicated | 1st: 1st Party Risk Ex1: Establish criteria for using a quantitative approach to cybersecurity risk analysis, and specify probability and exposure formulas Ex2: Create and use templates (e.g., a risk register) to document cybersecurity risk information (e.g., risk description, exposure, treatment, and ownership) Ex3: Establish criteria for risk prioritization at the appropriate levels within the enterprise Ex4: Use a consistent list of risk categories to support integrating, aggregating, and comparing cybersecurity risks |
| established, communicated, and used to support operational risk decisions | GV.RM-07 | Strategic opportunities (i.e., positive risks) are identified and included in organizational cybersecurity risk discussions | 1st: 1st Party Risk Ex1: Define and communicate guidance and methods for identifying opportunities and including them in risk discussions (e.g., strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats [SWOT] analysis) Ex2: Identify stretch goals and document them Ex3: Calculate, document, and prioritize positive risks alongside negative risks |



NIST 2.0 GOVERN Function Control Application

| Category | Subcategory ID | Subcategory Description | Implementation Examples |
|---|-------------------|--|--|
| GV.OV: Oversight Results of organization-wide cybersecurity risk management activities and performance are used to inform, improve, and adjust the risk management | GV.OV-01 | Cybersecurity risk management strategy outcomes are reviewed to inform and adjust strategy and direction | 1st: 1st Party Risk Ex1: Measure how well the risk management strategy and risk results have helped leaders make decisions and achieve organizational objectives Ex2: Examine whether cybersecurity risk strategies that impede operations or innovation should be adjusted |
| | GV.OV-02 | The cybersecurity risk management strategy is reviewed and adjusted to ensure coverage of organizational requirements and risks | 1st: 1st Party Risk Ex1: Review audit findings to confirm whether the existing cybersecurity strategy has ensured compliance with internal and external requirements Ex2: Review the performance oversight of those in cybersecurity-related roles to determine whether policy changes are necessary Ex3: Review strategy in light of cybersecurity incidents |
| | GV.OV-03 | Organizational cybersecurity risk management performance is evaluated and reviewed for adjustments needed | 1st: 1st Party Risk Ex1: Review key performance indicators (KPIs) to ensure that organization-wide policies and procedures achieve objectives Ex2: Review key risk indicators (KRIs) to identify risks the organization faces, including likelihood and potential impact Ex3: Collect and communicate metrics on cybersecurity risk management with senior leadership |



Cybersecurity to Have "Layers" of Security to Reduce Risk

IMPACT OF THIRD-PARTY SERVICE PROVIDERS

Impact of Third-Party Service Providers on Cybersecurity



Increased Attack Surface

- Dependency on Third Parties
- Supply Chain Attacks



Data Privacy and Compliance

- Data Handling
- Compliance Risks



Security Practices and Policies

- Varying Security Standards
- Due Diligence



Incident Response and Recovery

- Coordination
- Responsibility and Accountability



Importance of Having "Layers" of Security (Defense in Depth)



Multiple Barriers

- Redundancy
- Complexity for Attackers



Comprehensive Protection

- Diverse Threats
- Holistic Approach



Examples of Security Layers

- Physical Security
- Network Security
- Endpoint Security
- Application Security
- Data Security
- User Security



Resilience and Recovery

- Incident Containment
- Business Continuity



Responding to Business Email Compromises

BEC is a type of cybercrime where attackers gain access to a business email account and use it to deceive the company or its employees.

HOW DO COMPROMISES OCCUR?

- Phishing Attacks
- Malware

- Email Spoofing
- Social Engineering

IMPACT ON THE ORGANIZATION

- Financial Loss
- Reputational Damage

- Operational Disruption
- Legal Consequences

TIME TO IDENTIFY COMPROMISE

- Average Time: It typically takes organizations 77 days to identify a BEC attack
- Detection Challenges: Difficulty in recognizing fraudulent emails and the sophisticated nature of attacks contribute to delayed detection



INTERNAL AUDIT'S ROLE IN THE GOVERN AND IDENTIFY FUNCTION

- Asset Management: Ensure all email systems and related assets are identified and documented
- **Business Environment:** Understand the organization's role in the supply chain and its exposure to BEC
- Governance: Evaluate policies, procedures, and governance structures related to email security
- **Risk Assessment:** Conduct regular risk assessments focusing on email systems and potential BEC threats



INTERNAL AUDIT'S ROLE IN THE DETECT AND PROTECT FUNCTION

- Access Control: Verify that access to email systems is restricted and monitored
- Awareness and Training: Ensure employees are trained on recognizing and responding to BEC attempts
- Data Security: Assess the implementation of encryption and other data protection measures
- Maintenance: Review the patch management process to ensure email systems are up-todate
- Anomalies and Events: Monitor for unusual email activity that could indicate a BEC attempt
- Continuous Monitoring: Ensure continuous monitoring tools are in place and effective
- Detection Processes: Evaluate the effectiveness of detection processes and tools
- Security Testing: Conduct regular penetration testing and vulnerability assessments



INTERNAL AUDIT'S ROLE IN THE RESPOND AND RECOVER FUNCTIONS

- **Response Planning:** Ensure there is a clear, documented response plan for BEC incidents
- **Communications:** Verify that communication protocols are in place for notifying stakeholders
- Analysis: Review the incident analysis process to ensure root causes are identified
- Mitigation: Assess the effectiveness of actions taken to mitigate the impact of BEC incidents
- Recovery Planning: Ensure recovery plans are in place and regularly tested
- Improvements: Verify that lessons learned from BEC incidents are used to improve processes
- **Communications:** Ensure there are plans for communicating recovery efforts to stakeholders
- **Recovery Activities:** Review the effectiveness of recovery activities and their alignment with business continuity plans



SUMMARY

- **Proactive Role:** Internal Audit plays a critical role in identifying, protecting, detecting, responding to, and recovering from BEC incidents
- Continuous Improvement: Regular assessments and improvements are essential to stay ahead of evolving threats
- **Collaboration:** Effective response to BEC requires collaboration across the organization







