

---

## Secure remote access to autonomous safety systems: A good practice approach

---

Martin Gilje Jaatun\* and  
Maria B. Line

Department of Software Engineering,  
Safety and Security SINTEF ICT,  
Trondheim NO-7465, Norway  
E-mail: Martin.G.Jaatun@sintef.no  
E-mail: Maria.B.Line@sintef.no  
\*Corresponding author

Tor Olav Grøtan

Department of Safety and Reliability,  
SINTEF Technology and Society,  
Trondheim NO-7465, Norway  
E-mail: Tor.O.Grotan@sintef.no

**Abstract:** Safety instrumented systems (SIS) as defined in IEC 61508 and IEC 61511 are very important for the safety of offshore oil and natural gas installations. Partly as a consequence of the evolving ‘integrated operations’ concept, a need is emerging for remote access to such systems from vendors external to the operating company. This access will pass through a number of IP-based networks used for other purposes, including the open internet. This raises a number of security issues, ultimately threatening the safety integrity of SIS. In this article, we present a layered network architecture that represents current good practice for a solution to ensure secure remote access to SIS. Also, a method for assessing whether a given solution for remote access to SIS is acceptable is described.

**Keywords:** offshore; process control; SIS; safety instrumented systems; secure remote access.

**Reference** to this paper should be made as follows: Jaatun, M.G., Line, M.B. and Grøtan, T.O. (2009) ‘Secure remote access to autonomous safety systems: A good practice approach’, *Int. J. Autonomous and Adaptive Communications Systems*, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp.297–312.

**Biographical notes:** Martin Gilje Jaatun received an MSc (siv.ing.) in Telematics from the Norwegian Institute of Technology (NTH) in 1992. He heads the Information Security Group in the Department of Software Engineering, Safety and Security, SINTEF ICT.

Maria B. Line received her MSc from the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) in 2002, and has since been employed as a Research Scientist at SINTEF ICT.

Tor Olav Grøtan holds an MSc in Engineering Cybernetics from the Norwegian Institute of Technology, and a Master of Management degree. Currently, he is a Senior Scientist at SINTEF Technology and Society.

## 1 Introduction

The concept of integrated operations (IO) is emerging as the preferred way of operating offshore oil and gas production facilities. Real-time cooperation between on- and offshore staff is required in order to optimise production, and this is enabled by new technologies and new work processes.

Commercial-off-the-shelf (COTS) hardware and software and internet connections are among the new technologies introduced, where ‘new’ means that they have not been widely used in the context of process control before. The application area is remote operation, which enables onshore staff to log on to, and perform operations on, process control systems (PCS) and safety and automation systems (SAS) offshore. This opens for a whole new set of threats related to information security that need to be considered.

Safety Instrumented Systems (SIS) are crucial subsystems offshore. According to the IEC 61508/61611 series of standards (*Functional Safety of E/E/PE Safety-Related Systems*, 1998) (*Functional Safety – Safety Instrumented Systems for the Process Industry Sector*, 2003) and the PDS method (*The PDS Webpage*, n.d.), they are of paramount importance for the safety of an offshore installation. SIS typically includes the Emergency Shutdown System (ESD), which often is the ultimate guarantor for fail-safe properties at such installations.

The use of new technologies must be trusted to not have any negative impact on SIS; that is, impact that could raise significant doubt on its claimed safety integrity level (SIL) (*Functional Safety of E/E/PE Safety-Related Systems*, 1998). This means that the communication channels used during remote operations must be technically secure, in the sense that they cannot be tampered with, misused or in other ways used to compromise SIS.

Information security is usually defined by the three terms confidentiality, integrity and availability (*Information Technology – Security Techniques – Information Security Management Systems – Requirements*, 2005). In this article, the scope is limited to integrity concerns for SIS, which means that the objective of the ‘good practice for remote access’ is to prevent unauthorised changes to SIS.

Industrial safety and information security issues are two related – but still rather different – fields of theory and practice (Line et al., 2006). In some application areas it is useful to seek to combine the two, and process control is an example of such an area. Combination will not be unproblematic, and some problems are already manifest in the mixed vocabulary that needs to be employed when we are addressing safety and security, respectively. Practitioners within both fields are concerned about this challenge. As further discussed in *Guide to Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) and Industrial Control Systems Security* (2006), combining these two approaches into a coherent whole is not achieved solely through a technical report, but a modest hope is that this paper may contribute to such a development.

In this article, a network topology for secure remote access to SIS is presented. The solution includes contractor’s network, operator’s office network and process control network and security mechanisms. Also, a method is described that can be used to assess whether a given network solution for remote access to SIS is acceptable. This article is based on results from the Secure Safety (SeSa) project, funded by the Norwegian Research Council and PDS Forum.

The remainder of this article is structured as follows: Section 2 refers to related work, and our research method is briefly described in Section 3. The good practice network topology is presented in Sections 4 and 5. The method for assessing the impact on SIL is described in Section 6. We give our conclusion in Section 8 and suggest further work in Section 9.

## 2 Background

The background and approach for the SeSa project was documented in Grøtan (2006). Line et al. (2006) discuss general challenges in considering both safety and security in a given situation. Schoitsch (2006) and Kosmowski et al. (2006) explore relationships between traditional ‘security’ assurance and ‘safety assurance’ as exemplified by SIL.

The UK Centre for the Protection of National Infrastructure (formerly NISCC) has published guidelines on security of SCADA systems in general (*NISCC Good Practice Guide – Process Control and SCADA Security*, 2005), and on firewall deployment in such networks in particular (Byres et al., 2005). The US National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) has also released a preliminary guide to SCADA security (*Guide to Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) and Industrial Control Systems Security*, 2006). Naedele (2005) presents insights on IEC standardisation efforts in industrial IT security, although it does not appear that the IEC today is any closer to a finalised standard.

The Norwegian Oil Industry Association (OLF) has published a set of Information Security Baseline Requirements (*OLF Guideline 104: Information Security Baseline Requirements for Process Control, Safety, and Support ICT Systems*, 2006), which all operators on the Norwegian Continental Shelf eventually will have to comply with.


The SeSa project has not significantly extended the good practices mentioned above but ventures to combine them into a coherent whole for the specific case of secure remote access to SIS.

## 3 Method

The SeSa project studied a small number of Norwegian offshore operators and contractors, and participated in two sessions of PDS Forum in 2006 (*The PDS Webpage*, n.d.). The PDS Forum meetings have a broad participation of experts from the Norwegian process control community.

The interviews and the PDS Forum discussions contributed to the survey on how the communication networks are implemented today within the process control domain. This includes the operator’s office network, the contractor’s network and their solutions for remote control, the PCS offshore and the security mechanisms in use. Possible improvements were then identified based on state-of-the-art and earlier experiences, regarding structure of the network topology and security mechanisms to be added or modified. The network topology presented in this article, therefore (in similarity with many other ‘good practice’ efforts), represents a synthesis of how it is actually implemented in the offshore industry today and the ideal solution (Figure 1).

**Figure 1** Layered network model for remote access (see online version for colours)



#### 4 Structuring the remote access path


A basis for ensuring secure remote operation is that the networks that constitute the remote access path are organised in a manner that adheres to the principle of ‘defence in depth’<sup>1</sup>, and that suitable access control mechanisms are employed.

##### 4.1 The ‘onion model’


The left side of Figure 2 depicts a layered access model from an operator’s point of view. This model is based on two demilitarised zones (DMZ); one serving as a buffer between the operator’s network and ‘the outside world’, while the other separates the operator’s administrative network (which may span several installations) from the process network (which typically is restricted to a single installation).

All contractors must be considered ‘external’ just like the rest of the internet, since the operator has no physical control over the contractor’s networks (operators may impose contractual restrictions with respect to how and with what equipment contractors are allowed to access the operators’ networks, but will have limited means of verifying these arrangements on a continuous basis).

**Figure 2** Layered model with allowed and rejected access attempts (see online version for colours)




**Figure 3** Layered network model on contractor side (see online version for colours)



The layered model of Figure 2 can be argued on several levels. Firstly, the separation of layers 1–3 from the surrounding is based on the requirement for SIS autonomy, as stated in *Forskrift om Styring I Petroleumsvirksomheten (Styringsforskriften)* (2004). Furthermore, the separation of the process network from the administrative network is as recommended in the NISCC good practice guide (*NISCC Good Practice Guide – Process Control and SCADA Security*, 2005). Finally, the outer DMZ protects against all external actors, with special mechanisms to allow authorised contractors to access the appropriate parts of the operator's network.

As the operator has no physical control over the contractors' networks, the latter are likely to differ from installation to installation (Figure 3). By contractual obligations, operators should mandate a minimum layering as illustrated in Figure 2, where equipment used to access the operator's network is placed in a zone separated from the general office network. Note that since access in this model, conceptually, always originates from the contractor, there is no need from our point of view for the contractor to have a DMZ<sup>2</sup> between its office network and the internet – a single barrier (i.e. firewall) is sufficient. This is also shown in Figure 4.

**Figure 4** Case for remote access (see online version for colours)

#### 4.2 Threats and countermeasures

As part of the SeSa method, we have compiled a list of common threats and countermeasures that are applicable to the access model in Figure 2. This list is based on sources like *IT Grundschrift Manual* (2004) and *NISCC Good Practice Guide – Process Control and SCADA Security* (2005). Space does not permit the reproduction of the full list here, but identified threats originating from ‘the outside’ (zone 7) are listed in Table 1. The physical configuration suggestion that is described in the following sections represents a response to the identified threats and necessary countermeasures.

We have as a rule described the threats as originating from an adjoining zone, but the ultimate goal for a given attack may be to traverse all interfaces to affect the innermost zone, for example, in order to illegitimately shut down an oil installation.<sup>3</sup> Note that no precompiled list of threats can ever be considered ‘complete’ for any real networked system; the threats we have identified must be treated as a starting point that as a minimum must be compared with the network to be studied. Threats that are found to be not applicable or irrelevant must be documented as such, and a site-specific analysis must be performed to uncover additional threats.

A conservative threat analysis must adhere to Kerckhoffs’ (1883) principle, and assume that an attacker has access to all pertinent information regarding a system (network topology, configuration) *except* passwords, encryption keys, etc.

**Table 1** Threats originating from zone 7

<i>From zone</i>	<i>To zone</i>	<i>Threat</i>	<i>Ultimate impact on zone</i>	<i>Countermeasure</i>
7	c1	Attack on contractor's zone 1	1	Configuration control, administrative measures (specifically: not allowed to access c1 from c2), firewalls and c1 tightly configured, hardened
		Malware planted in contractor's 'secure zone'	1	Configuration control and administrative measures
7	7	Manipulation of legitimate traffic	1	Encrypt and authenticate
7	6	Attack on firewall A	6	Firewalls must be tightly configured and patched
		Attack on other resource in zone 6	6	Do not have other resources in DMZ, Other resources that have to be in the DMZ must be tightly configured (hardened)
7	6	Attack on DMZ gateway	5	Tight configuration and hardening, strong authentication, restrict access to DMZ GW to predefined addresses

**Table 2** Access modes

I-1	Snapshots of SIS state (via 'information diode' – see Section 5.1). In principle, this is the equivalent of a CCTV transmission of the terminal display.
I-2	Real-time readout of SIS with possibility of specifying parameters.
II-1	Real-time data transmission between installations, for example, from a process station (PS) on one platform to a PS on another. This implies machine-machine communication without user intervention.
II-2	Interactive read/write access to SIS.

### 4.3 Access modes

If a substantial part of the need for remote access is to read status information without making any changes, it is strongly recommended to consider a technical solution that offers such 'read-only' access (see Section 5.1, Figure 5). A 'read-only' solution will in itself be easier to verify than a 'full' solution. If read-only and read-write solutions need to coexist, a 'double' solution will imply that the entry to the latter solution may be even more restrictive, thus increasing the chance for success in the '1st round' in Figure 6. Furthermore, a read-only solution may also potentially be reachable from a wider (looser) set of operational contexts on the vendor side, as indicated in Figure 2.

Hence, for a further reduction of complexity in solutions, we propose that remote access is divided into three coarse categories:

- 0 No access.
- I Read-only access.
- II Full read/write access to SIS.

These can be further refined as shown in Table 2.

#### 4.4 *Access examples*

The various access options described in Section 4.3 can now be mapped to the layered models as illustrated by the arrows in Figure 2, where it is assumed that ‘information diode’ functionality (see Section 5.1 for details) is available.

- 1 allowed access from contractor’s office network to DMZ (e.g. to read historical data from SIS)
- 2 allowed access from internet to DMZ
- 3 rejected (blocked) access from contractor’s office network to process network
- 4 rejected (blocked) access from internet to process network
- 5 allowed access from contractor’s protected network to process network (via broker function in DMZ).

Note that prevention of access from contractor’s office network cannot be done reliably by packet filtering alone. Also note that the outer DMZ will have additional access control mechanisms that are not explicitly described here.

#### 4.5 *Physical mapping*

An example of how the layered ‘onion’ models presented above may be translated into a physical network configuration is presented in Figure 4. Note that while the doctrine of ‘defence in depth’ mandates that each of the firewalls A–D should be implemented as separate units, a functionally equivalent configuration using only two units with three interfaces each is possible.

We repeat that although not shown explicitly, some sort of access control mechanism is assumed to be placed in the outer DMZ (zone 6).

#### 4.6 *Barriers between zones*

Barriers between zones 7–2 are implemented using firewalls A–E. Additionally, there is a manual ‘access approval’ application in the inner DMZ (zone 4), where an operator can grant (or deny) access attempts originating, for example, from onshore contractors. Technically, this may be implemented as part of a terminal server application. Good practice would in this case indicate that all such accesses should be in accordance with a formal work permit.

There is no separate barrier between safety and automation system (SAS) and SIS; this implies that the barrier(s) is (are) represented by the command interface offered by the units that straddle the zone boundary, for example, the ESD. To access the ESD user interface, a remote user must as a minimum authenticate to both the ‘access approval’ application, as well as conventional authentication to log onto the operator station.

If the protection against, that is, PCS access to the ESD is insufficient, accessing the PCS is also critical.

Firewall E is shown as a barrier between the process network (zone 3) and SAS (zone 2); it may also serve as a barrier between different SAS segments (if applicable).

#### *4.7 Security mechanisms in individual zones*

As a rule, equipment in the inner zones exhibit ‘special purpose’ properties to a greater extent than equipment in the outer zones. Thus, the equipment in the inner zones also generally has fewer configurable security mechanisms.

*SIS (Zone 1):*

- all PS units must be stripped of unnecessary functionality (‘system hardening’)

*SAS (Zone 2):*

- all PCS units must be stripped of unnecessary functionality (‘system hardening’)

*Process network (Zone 3):*

- all operator station (OS) units must be stripped of unnecessary functionality (‘system hardening’)
- logon verified by domain controller
- restricted traffic from this zone to zone 2 by firewall

*Inner DMZ (Zone 4):*

- strong authentication

*Administrative network (Zone 5):*

- domain controller for access to network resources
- general computer security measures (out of scope for this article)


*Outer DMZ (Zone 6):*

- Access control on various levels
  - the general public
  - guests/contractors
  - own employees.


#### *4.8 OPC Communication*

A common way of transferring process control information is by the use of the ‘OLE for process control’ protocol. OPC was designed for communication over local area networks, which has created a demand for OPC tunnelling solutions when OPC data needs to be transferred from one process network to another. OPC tunnelling is frequently merely a bundling–unbundling operation, in which case it has no added security value as such. Specifically, there is no confidentiality or integrity protection of the tunnelled data.

**Figure 5** Introduction of information diode for read-only access (see online version for colours)



**Figure 6** The SaSa method (see online version for colours)



Based on the dubious security property of OPC, we consider an OPC tunnel between two process networks to be an implicit interconnection of these two networks. Furthermore, it is important that the tunnel is protected against unauthorised modification or disclosure along the transmission path. This implies that the tunnel must be encrypted, and that the plaintext data must have a cryptographically strong message integrity check added before encryption.

Even though newer equipment frequently has incorporated OPC server/client functionality, a configuration that enables a PS to establish OPC communication with any PS in a different installation should be discouraged. This can be regulated using firewall E.

Since, it is not known beforehand where an OPC tunnel will go, it must be assumed (as a ‘worst case’) that it also passes through the open internet at some point between the two process networks.

## 5 Additional mechanisms

In the previous section, recommendations for structuring the remote access path were described. In certain situations, it may be possible to further mitigate a large number of threats by architectural choices. Two such options are described below.

### 5.1 Read-only status server

It is possible to configure a read-only status server, for example, by connecting a special device (which we can call ‘information diode’) between the Safety and Automation System and a status server in the inner DMZ. The information diode can be realised by sending UDP data enhanced with extra integrity checksum, ensuring that the receiver has significantly higher bandwidth capacity than the sender, etc. Since UDP does not acknowledge each packet, it is possible to create a device that physically only can transmit information in one direction, for example, by cutting the ‘receive’ wire on an Unshielded Twisted Pair (UTP) cable.<sup>4</sup> There are also commercially available products (e.g. *Whitepaper: Tenix Interactive Link Data Diode*, 2006) that offer this functionality.

The status server is here placed in the inner DMZ based on the premise that the operator will want to retain a certain control over who gets access to this information, and also takes into account that having a single centralised status server for all operations, is likely to introduce too long delays in the system. Having said this, technically there should be nothing to prevent the status server from being placed, for example, in a given installation’s administrative network (i.e. on the outside of Firewall D), if this is more in line with the operator’s requirements.

Ideally, the status server should receive every conceivable piece of data obtainable in the process/SAS/SIS networks. It must be determined whether this is practically possible, for example, a new unit may be introduced that is capable of querying every valve, sensor, etc., and push this information through the diode to the status server. The bandwidth requirements must be assessed based on the size of the total data to be monitored.

## 5.2 Inner DMZ proxy functionality

In addition to providing a read-only status server, a finer granularity in access control can be achieved by not granting full ‘remote desktop’ access to an operator station, but rather having a special purpose application running in the DMZ (e.g. on the terminal server) which contains options for executing specific operations on SAS (and SIS) devices. Taken to its ultimate conclusion, this idea would imply having a large number of distinct applications to which contractors would be granted time-limited access by use of the work permit access approval regime illustrated in Figure 4.

It would also be possible to create a single, big ‘granular access’ application, but that would require a separate interface for configuring access rights, and such a large application would be more difficult to verify for correctness.

## 6 The SeSa method

Use of the SeSa method on a given case is illustrated in the flow-chart of Figure 6. In short, the method comprises the following steps:

- 1 Establish overview of threats and known weaknesses.
- 2 Develop requirements specification of the ‘security value chain’ (Grøtan, 2006) for the remote access path.
- 3 Determine the impact on SIS/SIL through a HAZOP-oriented analysis.
- 4 If impact cannot be ruled out, try another round based on updated threat/weakness picture and additional requirements (first round).
- 5 If impact still cannot be ruled out, identify additional security functions within SIS, and assess through HAZOP whether this will provide sufficient protection versus the residual threat (second round). If confidence in security functions within the SIS perimeter is needed according to the previous step, assess whether the assurance level implicitly carried by the specified SIL level, is sufficient.
- 6 If ‘success’ is not achieved after the second round, the proposed solution should be discarded.

The Hazard and Operability Analysis (HAZOP) (*Hazard and Operability Studies (HAZOP Studies) – Application Guide*, 2001) technique is frequently used and well-established in industrial safety. In the SeSa method, we use HAZOP to identify threats and verify whether these threats are mitigated by the proposed design of the remote access path. The SeSa use of HAZOP means that if no ‘problem’ remains after all explicitly known possibilities have been examined exhaustively, the ‘conclusion’ must be that the proposed solution is per definition ‘secure’. However, there will always be a possibility that something is overlooked, or that new threats and vulnerabilities emerge or is revealed at a later time. The SeSa method cannot account for this type of (epistemic) uncertainty. Such potential ‘flaws’ in the judgement must be handled in retrospect, when they are revealed.

It may be difficult to gauge the assurance consequences of adding a COTS component to a system that has a given SIL. Kosmowski et al. (2006) argue for a

mapping between SIL and Common Criteria Evaluation Assurance Levels (EAL) (*Information Technology – Security Techniques – Evaluation Criteria for IT Security*, 2005). However, it should be noted that a given EAL only says something about our assurance that the mechanisms defined in the appropriate Protection Profile have been properly implemented; if these are insufficient to guarantee our desired SIL, a mapping between EAL and SIL is meaningless. On the other hand, if the mechanisms we rely on to provide our given SIL is included in the component's Protection Profile, we believe that the mapping proposed in (Kosmowski et al., 2006) may be applicable.


## 7 New challenges

The SeSa approach covers an important, but however limited part of the implications of IO in relation to SIS. From being primarily focussed on technology development and application, the development of IO now takes new directions (Grøtan et al., 2008):

- increased focus on challenges related to new work processes, integration of information throughout whole value chains, and ICT vulnerability
- wide recognition of the prime significance of human and organisational factors for the success of IO
- development of virtual plants comprised by onshore and offshore elements that are transformed into a fully integrated functional community.

This signifies the possibility of a number of fundamental changes in the operation of the oil and gas fields, that may eventually have impact on the operation of SIS which reach way beyond what can be depicted as a mere channel for remote access. To investigate these possible impacts, it will be necessary to employ a method that can capture a holistic picture of IO-related change encompassing a full MTO<sup>5</sup>-perspective, and transform these changes into new requirements to SIS, and (theoretically) by implication, to the PDS method. Figure 7 indicates such an extended scope, of which SeSa will be an integral, but limited part.

**Figure 7** Extended scope (see online version for colours)



## 8 Conclusion

In this article, we have presented good practice for secure remote access to SIS in an offshore PCS. Furthermore, we have introduced the *SeSa method* for assessing whether a given network solution is acceptable when it comes to ensuring the integrity of SIS.

The network solution presented complies with advice and guidance given by several actors in the industry. This fact contributes to assurance that the solution is acceptable and ensures an appropriate level of security for SIS.

This article has also indicated a possible extension of scope for working with the security, as well as the safety of SIS as an autonomous system.

## 9 Further work


Further work needs to be done along the following lines:

- 1 further trial of the method on 'real' cases
- 2 extending the scope to broader 'SAS' contexts
- 3 development of schemes to update 'approved' solutions in light of new knowledge of threats and vulnerabilities
- 4 operation and implementation of the 'value-chain' that is the result of a successful use of the SeSa method.

The latter is considered the most urgent. First, because of the limited scope of the SeSa method presented herein (providing a functional requirement specification), of which implementation and management across organisational borders is not included. Second, because a dynamic environment, both technically and organisationally, is expected to be a central characteristic of the Brave New World of IO. The 'value-chain' has to be reconstructed and updated rather frequently.

Figure 8 shows how the characteristics of this 'value-chain' may anticipated, as well as its consequences in relation to SIS. The IO change space can be based on Grøtan et al. (2008) and Grøtan and Albrechtsen (2008). From these, which are directed at a more general major accident scenario, specific SIS scenarios can be derived. From a safety perspective, the possible implications can be interpreted by the use of six perspectives on organisational accidents and resilient operations (Grøtan and Albrechtsen, 2008; Grøtan et al., 2008). These perspectives, namely

- the energy-barrier perspective
- the information breakdown perspective
- the decision perspective
- the normal accident perspective
- the high reliability organisation perspective
- the resilience engineering perspective.

**Figure 8** IO change space (see online version for colours)

jointly represents three approaches to interpreting the IO-effects on SIS:

- who/what may fail?
- what may go wrong despite the absence of failure?
- what may go right while encountering surprise and disturbance?

From a security perspective, a similar interpretation may be based on viewing SIS, as well as the information systems employed by different actors engaged in operating/using SIS, as a distributed information system.

## Acknowledgements

This article has presented results from the SeSa research project funded by the Norwegian Research Council and PDS Forum. We are grateful for the participation of Tor Onshus (NTNU), Knut Øien (SINTEF T&S), Stein Hauge (SINTEF T&S) and all PDS Forum attendees. Also thanks to Odd Nordland, SINTEF ICT, who made helpful comments on a previous version of this article.

## References

- Byres, E., Karsch, J. and Carter, J. (2005) 'Good practice guide – firewall deployment for SCADA and process control networks', Technical Report, British Columbia Institute of Technology, on behalf of NISCC, Available at: <http://www.cpmi.gov.uk/docs/re-20050223-00157.pdf>.
- Forskrift om Styring i Petroleumsvirksomheten (Styringsforskriften)* (2004) §1.
- Functional Safety – Safety Instrumented Systems for the Process Industry Sector*, (2003) IEC std 61511.
- Functional Safety of E/E/PE Safety-Related Systems* (1998) IEC std 61508.

- Grøtan, T.O. (2006) 'Secure safety in remote operations', *Proceedings of ESREL 2006*, Estoril, Portugal.
- Grøtan, T.O. and Albrechtsen, E. (2008) 'Risikokartlegging og analyse av Integreerte Operasjoner (IO) med fokus på a synliggjøre kritiske MTO aspek-ter [Risk identification and analysis of integrated operations concerning MTO aspects]', Technical Report STFA7085 SINTEF.
- Grøtan, T.O., Albrechtsen, E., Rosness, R. and Bjerkebask, E. (2008) 'The influence on organizational accident risk by integrated operations in the petroleum industry', *Proceedings of Working on Safety*.
- Guide to Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) and Industrial Control Systems Security* (2006) 'NIST special publication 800-82 (initial public draft)', Available at: <http://csrc.mst.gov/publications/drafts/800-82/Draft-SP800-82.pdf>.
- Hazard and Operability Studies (HAZOP Studies) – Application Guide* (2001) IEC std 61882.
- Information Technology – Security Techniques – Evaluation Criteria for IT Security* (2005) ISO/IEC std 15408, Available at: <http://www.commoncriteriaportal.org/>.
- Information Technology – Security Techniques – Information Security Management Systems – Requirements* (2005) ISO/IEC std 27001.
- IT Grundschutz Manual* (2004) Available at: <http://www.bsi.de/english/gshb/manual/>.
- Kerckhoffs, A. (1883) 'La cryptographie militaire', *Journal des Sciences Mil-itaires*, Vol. IX, pp.5–38.
- Kosmowski, K.T., Sliwinski, M. and Barnert, T. (2006) 'Functional safety and security assessment of the control and protection systems', *Proceedings of ESREL 2006*, Estoril, Portugal.
- Line, M.B., Nordland, O., Rostad, L. and Tondel, I.A. (2006) 'Safety vs security?', *Proceedings of PSAM 8*, New Orleans.
- Naedele, M. (2005) 'Standardizing industrial IT security – a first look at the IEC approach', *Proceedings of 10th IEEE Conference on Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation*, Vol. 2, p.7.
- NISCC Good Practice Guide – Process Control and SCADA Security* (2005) Technical Report PA Consulting Group on behalf of NISCC, Available at: <http://www.cpni.gov.uk/docs/re-20051025-00940.pdf>.
- OLF Guideline 104: Information Security Baseline Requirements for Process Control, Safety, and Support ICT Systems* (2006) Available at: <http://www.olf.no/935820.pdf>.
- Schoitsch, E. (2006) 'Design for safety and security of complex embedded systems: a unified approach', *Cyberspace Security and Defense: Research Issues*, Vol. 196 of *NATO Science Series II – Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry*.
- The PDS Webpage* (n.d.) Visited on 9 March 2007, Available at: <http://www.sintef.no/static/tl/projects/pds/www/>.
- Whitepaper: Tenix Interactive Link Data Diode* (2006) Visited on 16 March 2007, Available at: <http://www.tenixamerica.com/images/white-papers/TenixIL-DataDiode.pdf>.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>This is the opposite of the 'Maginot line' principle of relying on a single point of failure.

<sup>2</sup>The contractor may have other uses for a DMZ but this is outside the scope of this article.

<sup>3</sup>From a safety point of view, the threat would have been the reverse, that is, *preventing* a necessary shutdown from taking place

<sup>4</sup>Of course, there are a few more practical problems that must be solved in an implementation of this concept – which also explains why there are commercial alternatives available.

<sup>5</sup>Man–Technology–Organisation.