

1		I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>
2	Q.	PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME AND BUSINESS ADDRESS.
3	A.	My name is Chad D. Cowan and my business address is 526 South Church Street,
4		Charlotte, North Carolina 28202.
5	Q.	BY WHOM ARE YOU EMPLOYED AND IN WHAT CAPACITY?
6	A.	I am employed as Managing Director North American Electric Reliability Corporation
7		("NERC") Critical Infrastructure Protection ("CIP") Program by Duke Energy Business
8		Services LLC. Duke Energy Business Services LLC is a service company affiliate of
9		Duke Energy Indiana, LLC ("Duke Energy Indiana" or "Company").
10	Q.	WHAT ARE YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS MANAGING DIRECTOR NERC
11		CIP PROGRAM?
12	A.	My primary responsibility as Managing Director NERC CIP Program is to manage a
13		team of internal and external resources with responsibility to provide programmatic
14		oversight and strategic direction for the implementation of the NERC CIP standards for
15		Duke Energy.
16	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE YOUR EDUCATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL
17		BACKGROUND.

CHAD D. COWAN -1-

1	A.	I earned a Bachelor of Science Degree in Management Information Systems from the					
2		University of North Carolina Charlotte in 1999, and a Master of Business Administration					
3		from Queens University in 2009. I began work at Duke Energy in 1999 as an IT					
4		Applications Analyst, left in 2001 to pursue consulting opportunities and returned to					
5		Duke Energy in 2005 as a Senior IT Solutions Architect. From 2009 to 2014, I held					
6		various IT supervisory and management positions. In 2014, I was named Director,					
7		Enterprise Asset Management Portfolio; in 2016, I was named Director IT NERC CIP					
8		Compliance; and in 2017, I was named Director NERC CIP Program. In January of					
9		2019, I was named the Managing Director NERC CIP Program.					
10	Q.	WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR TESTIMONY IN THIS PROCEEDING?					
11	A.	The purpose of my testimony is to describe the CIP requirements that NERC has adopted					
12		and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ("FERC") has previously approved. I					
13		also will provide an update on the relevant standards and the status of Duke Energy					
14		Indiana's compliance activities. The purpose of this proceeding is to reconcile costs for					
15		2018 and 2019, as described in the testimony of Ms. Christa L. Graft. The Company is					
16		not requesting a new or modified Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity					
17		("CPCN") or any associated cost recovery in this filing.					
18	Q.	ARE YOU SPONSORING ANY EXHIBITS IN THIS PROCEEDING?					
19	A.	Yes. Petitioner's Exhibit 1-A (CDC) is the Petition filed in this proceeding and					
20		Petitioner's Exhibit 1-B (CDC) is the certification required by the Commission's June 25,					
21		2014 Order in Cause No. 44367.					

1		II. <u>PREVIOUS PROCEEDINGS</u>
2	Q.	PLEASE PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECTS PREVIOUSLY
3		APPROVED FOR COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERALLY MANDATED
4		REQUIREMENTS.
5	А.	In its Order in Cause No. 44367, dated June 25, 2014, the Commission approved the
6		Company's request for a CPCN for its projects and costs necessary to comply with
7		NERCCIP-003 Version 4 ("CIP v4") standards, pursuant to I.C. Ch. 8-1-8.4.
8		In subsequent orders, approved on October 7, 2015, June 28, 2017, and August 8,
9		2018, the Commission approved the Company's requests for modifications to the
10		previously approved CPCNs to recover costs associated with NERC CIP-003 Version 5
11		("CIP v5"), Generator Verification Reliability Standards MOD-026-1, "Verification of
12		Models and Data for Generator Excitation Control System or Plant Volt/Var Control
13		Functions" ("MOD 26") and MOD-027-1, "Verification of Models and Data for
14		Turbine/Governor and Load Control or Active Power/Frequency Control Functions"
15		("MOD 27"), and NERC CIP-003 Version 6 ("CIP v6").
16		Most recently, in FMCA 4, approved September 18, 2019, the Commission
17		approved a modification to the CPCN granted in FMCA 3 to include additional spending
18		on CIP IT Enterprise Tools and costs for compliance with NERC Reliability Standard
19		FAC-003 incurred after January 24, 2019.
20	Q.	PLEASE PROVIDE AN UPDATE ON THE CURRENT STATUS OF THE
21		PREVIOUSLY APPROVED FEDERALLY MANDATED PROJECTS.

1	A.	The Company was in compliance with CIP-003 v6 by the compliance deadline. This
2		included installation of physical and electronic security controls for the transmission
3		function, walkdowns of generation sites to validate the scope of the CIP-003 v6
4		compliance plan, and completion of resulting physical security perimeter projects at
5		generation sites. The IT Enterprise Tools projects, as approved to incorporate new CIP-
6		003 requirements as well as implement improvements in ongoing compliance for
7		multiple standards and requirements, have been completed. More specifically, the asset
8		management, compliance task management, and configuration monitoring projects were
9		deployed and completed as expected in 2020.
10		III. NERC CIP REQUIREMENTS SINCE LAST FILING
11	Q.	HAVE THERE BEEN NERC CIP REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED SINCE THE
12		FILING IN FMCA 4?
13	А.	Yes. Since our last filing, CIP-003 v8 went into effect, as well as CIP-013 v1, CIP-010
14		v3, and CIP-005 v6. I will describe the standards and the Company's actions to comply
15		below.
16	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE CIP-003 v8.
17	A.	This standard required that entities such as Duke Energy implement controls to mitigate
18		the risk of malicious code that could result from third party Transient Cyber Assets
19		("TCA").
20	Q.	WHAT WAS THE COMPLIANCE DATE FOR CIP-003 v8?
21	A.	The compliance date was April 1, 2020.

1	Q.	WHAT ACTIONS DID THE COMPANY UNDERTAKE TO COMPLY?
2	A.	The Company eliminated the use of third-party TCAs where possible and when not
3		possible, ensured that malware protection is installed, active, and regularly updated on all
4		third-party TCAs prior to use.
5	Q.	WERE ANY INCREMENTAL COSTS FOR COMPLIANCE ALLOCATED TO
6		DUKE ENERGY INDIANA?
7	A.	No. The Company's implementation plan required procedural controls to verify third-
8		party TCA malware controls are active prior to use. These procedural controls did not
9		require any significant additional cost to deploy.
10	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE CIP-013 v1.
11	A.	This standard required entities such as Duke Energy to document, implement, and
12		periodically review a supply chain cybersecurity risk management plan. The risk
13		management plan is required to include components such as risk evaluation of vendors
14		and products, notification of related vendor security incidents, coordination of response
15		to vendor security incidents, notification of when vendor access is no longer needed,
16		disclosure of known vulnerabilities in vendor products, and verification of vendor
17		software and patches. This standard applies to the procurement of equipment and
18		services used in High and Medium Impact Bulk Electric System ("BES") Cyber Systems.
19	Q.	WHAT WAS THE COMPLIANCE DATE FOR CIP-013 v1?
20	A.	The compliance date was October 1, 2020.

IURC CAUSE NO. 44367 FMCA 5 DIRECT TESTIMONY OF CHAD D. COWAN FILED DECEMBER 21, 2020

1 **Q**. WHAT ACTIONS DID THE COMPANY UNDERTAKE TO COMPLY WITH 2 CIP-013 v1?

3 A. The Company implemented a Supply Chain Risk Management Plan that satisfies all of 4 the elements required by CIP-013 v1. In addition, an industry-accepted risk assessment checklist was deployed for evaluating vendor risk, an enterprise procedure was 5 6 implemented for emergency and gray market purchases, and the enterprise credit card 7 policy was revised to prevent computer equipment from being purchased directly by 8 company-issued credit cards.

9 WERE ANY INCREMENTAL COSTS FOR COMPLIANCE ALLOCATED TO 0. 10 **DUKE ENERGY INDIANA?**

- 11 A. No. Existing resources were re-purposed to lead the implementation effort within the 12 Supply Chain organization. These resources are also responsible for ensuring ongoing 13 sustainment and continuous improvement of the Supply Chain Risk Management Plan.
- 14 **Q**.

PLEASE DESCRIBE CIP-010 v3.

15 A. This standard requires entities such as Duke Energy to ensure that any changes to 16 software used in High and Medium Impact BES Cyber Systems have originated from a verified software source and the integrity of the software change has been verified prior 17 18 to implementation.

- 19 WHAT WAS THE COMPLIANCE DATE FOR CIP-010 v3? **Q**.
- 20 The compliance date was October 1, 2020. A.

IURC CAUSE NO. 44367 FMCA 5 DIRECT TESTIMONY OF CHAD D. COWAN FILED DECEMBER 21, 2020

1	Q.	WHAT ACTIONS DID THE COMPANY UNDERTAKE TO COMPLY WITH
2		CIP-010 v3?
3	A.	The Company verified vendor patch sources for all software installed in High and
4		Medium BES Cyber Systems, established a central repository where any patches are
5		stored after download prior to implementation, and implemented procedures for
6		verification of patch integrity prior to application. The Company also implemented
7		procedures to ensure any new software is verified and validated prior to installation.
8	Q.	WERE ANY INCREMENTAL COSTS FOR COMPLIANCE ALLOCATED TO
9		DUKE ENERGY INDIANA?
10	A.	No. Changes were primarily procedural in nature and did not require any significant
11		additional cost to deploy.
12	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE CIP-005 v6.
13	A.	This standard requires entities such as Duke Energy to have one or more methods to
14		determine active vendor access to High and Medium BES Cyber Systems and have one
15		or more methods to disable vendor access to High and Medium BES Cyber Systems
16		when it is no longer required.
17	Q.	WHAT WAS THE COMPLIANCE DATE FOR CIP-005 v6?
18	A.	The compliance date was October 1, 2020.
19	Q.	WHAT ACTIONS DID THE COMPANY UNDERTAKE TO COMPLY WITH
20		CIP-005 v6?

IURC CAUSE NO. 44367 FMCA 5 DIRECT TESTIMONY OF CHAD D. COWAN FILED DECEMBER 21, 2020

1	A.	Duke Energy ensured that no external vendor connections existed to High and Medium
2		BES Cyber Systems and implemented procedures to ensure compliance approval and
3		review process prior to implementing any new vendor connections.
4	Q.	WERE ANY INCREMENTAL COSTS ALLOCATED TO DUKE ENERGY
5		INDIANA?
6	A.	No. Changes were primarily procedural in nature and did not require any significant
7		additional cost to deploy.
8	Q.	IS DUKE ENERGY INDIANA SEEKING A CPCN AND ASSOCIATED COST
9		RECOVERY FOR COMPLIANCE WITH THESE CIP STANDARDS?
10	A.	No. As these standards required changes in procedures, Duke Energy was able to
11		leverage existing resources to comply and did not incur any incremental costs.
12		IV. <u>FUTURE COMPLIANCE STANDARDS</u>
13	Q.	ARE THERE OTHER NERC CIP STANDARDS WITH FUTURE COMPLIANCE
14		DATES?
15	A.	Yes. CIP-008 v6 becomes effective on January 1, 2021 and CIP-012 v1 becomes
16		effective on July 1, 2022.
17	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE CIP-008 v6 AND THE ACTIONS THE COMPANY HAS
18		TAKEN TO COMPLY WITH THIS STANDARD.
19	A.	This standard requires Duke Energy and other entities to report to the Electricity
20		Information Sharing and Analysis Center ("E-ISAC") any cybersecurity incident that is
21		an attempt to compromise a High and/or Medium Impact BES Cyber System or its

.

1		associated electronic access control or monitoring system ("EACMS"). Duke Energy has
2		updated its Cybersecurity Incident Response Plan to ensure that the E-ISAC is notified
3		for a qualifying incident.
4	Q.	HAS THE COMPANY INCURRED ANY INCREMENTAL COSTS TO COMPLY
5		WITH CIP-008 v6?
6	А.	No. Changes were primarily procedural in nature and did not require any significant
7		additional cost to deploy.
8	Q.	PLEASE DESCRIBE CIP-012 v1 AND WHAT ACTIONS THE COMPANY WILL
9		NEED TO TAKE TO BE IN COMPLIANCE.
10	A.	This standard requires Duke Energy and other entities to implement and document a plan
11		to mitigate the risks posed by unauthorized disclosure and unauthorized modification of
12		real time assessment and real time monitoring data between control centers. Duke
13		Energy will identify all sources of real time assessment and monitoring data within
14		control centers and their associated data centers, determine which data links are already
15		secured (e.g., encrypted) and, where data links are not already adequately protected,
16		upgrade and/or replace equipment to ensure compliance.
17	Q.	WILL THE COMPANY INCUR ADDITIONAL COSTS TO COMPLY WITH
18		CIP-012 v1?
19	A.	Yes. We are in the process of scoping out required activities and will support a request
20		for a CPCN and associated cost recovery later in 2021.

1		V. <u>CONCLUSION</u>
2	Q.	IS DUKE ENERGY INDIANA CURRENTLY IN COMPLIANCE WITH ALL
3		NERC CIP REQUIREMENTS?
4	A.	Yes.
5	Q.	ARE YOU FAMILIAR WITH THE INFORMATION IN PETITIONER'S
6		EXHIBITS 1-A (CDC) AND 1-B (CDC)?
7	A.	Yes.
8	Q.	DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR PREFILED TESTIMONY AT THIS TIME?
9	A.	Yes.

STATE OF INDIANA

INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION

PETITION OF DUKE ENERGY INDIANA, LLCSEEKING (1) AN ADJUSTMENT TO ITSELECTRIC SERVICE RATES THROUGH ITSFEDERALLY MANDATED COSTADJUSTMENT FACTOR PURSUANT TO IND.CODE CH. 8-1-8.4 AND THE COMMISSION'SORDERS IN CAUSE NOS. 44367 AND 44367FMCA 1 THROUGH FMCA 4; (2) APPROVALTO RECONCILE PRIOR FMCA EXPENSES TOACTUAL FMCA EXPENSES AND PRIORFMCA REVENUES TO ACTUAL FMCAREVENUES FOR 2018 AND 2019; AND (3)	NO. 44367 FMCA 5
---	------------------

PETITION

Duke Energy Indiana, LLC ("Duke Energy Indiana"), by counsel, respectfully petitions the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission ("Commission") for:

(1) An adjustment to its electric service rates through its federally mandated cost adjustment factor pursuant to Ind. Code ch. 8-1-8.4 and the Commission's orders in Cause Nos.44367 and 44367 FMCA 1 through FMCA 4;

(2) The reconciliation adjustment for 2018 and 2019 revenue requirements, including return on investment, to amounts collected from customers via Rider 72 during 2018 and 2019; and

(3) The adjustment of retail electric rates via the proposed Rider 72 factors to include the revenue effect of such cost recovery.

In support of this FMCA 5 Petition, Duke Energy Indiana states as follows:

1. <u>Petitioner's Corporate and Regulated Status</u>. Duke Energy Indiana is an Indiana corporation with its principal office in the Town of Plainfield, Hendricks County, Indiana. Its address is 1000 East Main Street, Plainfield, Indiana 46168. It has the corporate power and authority, among others, to engage, and it is engaged, in the business of supplying electric utility service to the public in the State of Indiana. Accordingly, Petitioner is a "public utility" within the meaning of that term as used in the Indiana Public Service Commission Act, as amended, Indiana Code § 8-1-2-1, and is subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission in the manner and to the extent provided by the laws of the State of Indiana, including I.C. § 8-1-2-1 *et seq*. As such, Petitioner is also an "energy utility" as provided for in I.C. § 8-1-8.4-3. As of April 3, 2006, Petitioner is a second tier wholly-owned subsidiary of Duke Energy Corporation.

2. <u>Petitioner's Electric Utility Service</u>. Duke Energy Indiana owns, operates, manages, and controls plants, properties, and equipment used and useful for the production, transmission, distribution, and furnishing of electric utility service to the public in the State of Indiana. It directly supplies electric energy throughout its 22,000-square mile service area to more than 855,000 customers located in 69 counties in the central, north central, and southern parts of the State of Indiana, and supplies steam service to one customer from its Cayuga Generating Station. Petitioner also sells electric energy for resale to municipal utilities, Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc., Indiana Municipal Power Agency and to other public utilities that in turn supply electric utility service to numerous customers in areas not served directly by Petitioner.

3. <u>Background of Petitioner's Federally Mandated Cost Tracker</u>. Under I.C. Ch 8-1-8.4, an energy utility may petition the Commission for the recovery of compliance costs incurred pursuant to a federal mandate that the Commission "determines is imposed on an energy utility by the federal government" I.C. § 8-1-8.4-5. In Cause No. 44367, Petitioner requested

-2-

approval of costs incurred pursuant to federally mandated Critical Infrastructure Protection Compliance Projects to comply with North American Electric Reliability Corporation's ("NERC") cybersecurity standards ("CIP Compliance Projects"). Specifically, Petitioner requested a CPCN and the approval of the associated costs to comply with NERC's Infrastructure Protection and Reliability Standards Version 4 ("CIP 4"). In its Order in Cause No. 44367, dated June 25, 2014, the Commission approved Petitioner's request for a CPCN for its projects and costs necessary to comply with CIP v4 standards, pursuant to I.C. Ch. 8-1-8.4. Along with the CPCN, the Commission also approved timely recovery of eighty percent (80%) of the federally mandated costs necessary to comply with CIP v4 standards, an annual federally mandated cost rate adjustment mechanism pursuant to I.C. §§ 8-1-8.4-7 and 8-1-2-42 to recover those costs using the Company's FMCA Mechanism, and authority to defer twenty percent (20%) of the federally mandated costs, including carrying costs on all deferred federally mandated costs, until Petitioner's next general rate proceeding.

In subsequent orders, approved on October 7, 2015, June 28, 2017, August 8, 2018, and September 18, 2019, the Commission approved Petitioner's requests for modifications to the previously approved CPCNs to recover costs associated with NERC CIP-003 Version 5 ("CIP v5"), Generator Verification Reliability Standards MOD-026-1, "Verification of Models and Data for Generator Excitation Control System or Plant Volt/Var Control Functions" ("MOD 26") and MOD-027-1, "Verification of Models and Data for Turbine/Governor and Load Control or Active Power/Frequency Control Functions" ("MOD 27"), NERC CIP-003 Version 6 ("CIP v6") and NERC Reliability Standard FAC-003.¹ In each proceeding, the Commission also approved timely recovery of eighty percent (80%) of the federally mandated costs necessary to comply with the

¹ As to this standard, the Commission limited cost recovery to those costs incurred after January 24, 2019.

federal mandates at issue via the FMCA Mechanism, and authority to defer twenty percent (20%) of the federally mandated compliance costs, including carrying costs on all deferred federally mandated costs, until Petitioner's next general rate proceeding.

In the Final Order in Cause No. 45253, the Commission approved recovery of a return on the net book value (original cost investment less accumulated depreciation) of the capital costs associated with the federally mandated projects in base rates, along with the associated depreciation expense. The Commission also approved recovery of operation and maintenance ("O&M") costs associated with the federally mandated projects in base rates. This includes the eighty percent (80%) of in-service plant and expenses that were previously included in the FMCA Mechanism, as well as the twenty percent (20%) of in-service plant and expenses that were deferred for recovery in a subsequent rate case pursuant to the federal mandates statute. Reconciliations for periods prior to the implementation of new base rates are to be included in Rider 72 filings.

4. <u>Relief Sought by This Petition</u>. The purpose of this FMCA Mechanism is to present an ongoing review progress report and to reconcile forecasted costs for 2018 and 2019 to actual costs incurred for 2018 and 2019. The proposed FMCA factors are based on the reconciliation of forecasted FMCA expenses to actual FMCA expenses incurred for calendar years 2018 and 2019. As shown on Attachment 1 to this Petition, the approved estimated costs of compliance with the previously approved federally mandated projects are \$46,071,548 in capital and \$9,982,246 in O&M. As of December 31, 2019, \$28,572,408 has been spent for capital projects and \$8,538,552 has been spent in O&M.

The rate impact of the requested factors in this proceeding for an average residential customer using 1,000 kilowatt-hours is an increase of 6 cents (\$0.06) or approximately zero

-4-

percent (0.0%), from the current total bill (using rates effective as of October 1, 2020).

5. <u>Petitioner's Counsel</u>. The following attorneys are authorized to accept service on behalf of Petitioner:

Melanie D. Price, Atty. No. 21786-49 Andrew J. Wells, Atty. No. 29545-49 Duke Energy Business Services LLC 1000 East Main Street Plainfield, Indiana 46168 Telephone: (317) 838-6877 Fax: (317) 838-1842 Melanie, Frice@duke-energy.com Andrew.Welle@duke-energy.com

6. <u>Applicable Law</u>. Petitioner considers that I.C. §§ 8-1-8.4-1 *et. seq.*, 8-1-2-4; 8-1-2-39, and 8-1-2-42(a), among others, are or may be applicable to the subject matter of this proceeding.

7. <u>Proposed Procedural Schedule</u>. Pursuant to 170 IAC 1-1.1-9, Petitioner hereby provides notice to this Commission that the Parties reasonably anticipated to participate in this proceeding, Duke Energy Indiana and the Office of Utility Consumer Counselor ("OUCC"), are in agreement with the following Proposed Procedural Schedule:

December 21, 2020:	The date the Company is filing this Petition with the Commission.
December 21, 2020:	The latest date by which the Company shall prefile its Testimony and Exhibits supporting this Petition (and provide the OUCC with its applicable Workpapers).
March 30, 2021:	The latest date by which the OUCC or any Intervenor shall prefile its Testimony and Exhibits concerning this Petition.
April 13, 2021:	The latest date by which the Company shall prefile its Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibits.

Furthermore, the Parties have agreed that any response or objection to discovery requests shall be made within ten (10) calendar days of receipt of such request. Any discovery requests served after April 13, 2021 shall be responded to or objected to within five (5) business days. Any discovery served before January 1, 2021, shall be deemed received on January 1, 2021.

8. **Request for Public Hearing.** Consistent with the Proposed Procedural Schedule as outlined in Paragraph 7 above, Duke Energy Indiana respectfully requests that a date be set for the public hearing in this proceeding for the month of April.

WHEREFORE, Petitioner, by counsel, respectfully requests that the Commission approve the procedural schedule listed above; approve Petitioner's ongoing progress report of implementation of its federally mandated compliance projects; approve the adjustment of Petitioner's authorized net operating income to reflect any approved earnings associated with Rider 72 pursuant to I.C. § 8-1-8.4-7(c)(1) for purposes of I.C. § 8-1-2-42(d)(3); and grant Petitioner such further relief in the premises as may be appropriate and proper.

Dated as of the 21st day of December, 2020.

By: Melanie D Price Counsel for Duke Energy Indiana, LLa

Melanie D. Price, Atty. No. 21786-49 Andrew J. Wells, Atty. No. 29545-49 Duke Energy Business Services LLC 1000 East Main Street Plainfield, Indiana 46168 Telephone: (317) 838-6877 Fax: (317) 838-1842 Liebasse Price@dure-energy.com Andrew Wells@duke-energy.com

PETITIONER'S EXHIBIT 1-A (CDC) IURC CAUSE NO. 44367 FMCA 5 PAGE 7 OF 8

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Petition was electronically

delivered this 21st day of December, 2020, to the following:

Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor ATTN: Lorraine Hitz-Bradley PNC Center 115 W. Washington Street Suite 1500 South Indianapolis, IN 46204 LHitzBradley(genetingey inform<u>at@ouce.in.gov</u>

lanu DF By:

Counsel for Duke Energy Indiana, LLC

Melanie D. Price, Atty. No. 21786-49 Andrew J. Wells, Atty. No. 29545-49 Duke Energy Business Services LLC 1000 East Main Street Plainfield, Indiana 46168 Telephone: (317) 838-6877 Fax: (317) 838-1842 Melanic Price@duke-energy.com Androw Wells@duke-energy.com

Attachment 1 IURC Cause No. 44367 FMCA 5

Duke Energy Indiana, LLC Summary Status Update on Previously Approved Federally Mandated Projects

	Most Recently Approved Estimate (44367 FMCA 4)		Actual Spend Through 12/31/2019		Status <u>As of 12/31/2019</u>	
Transmission - Capital						
CIP V4	\$	516,352	\$	554,547	Complete	
CIP V5		1,551,522		1,869,581	Complete	
CIP V6		19,602,073		11,102,504	Complete	
NERC Transmission Line Vegetation Management ¹		891,576		703,600	Ongoing	
		22,561,523		14,230,232		
Transmission - O&M						
CIP V5		422,650		251,974	Complete	
CIP V6		907,947		428,262	Ongoing	
NERC Transmission Line Vegetation Management 1		3,217,149		2,239,717	Ongoing	
		4,547,746		2,919,953		
Production - Capital						
CIP V5		7,483,500		6,675,324	Complete	
CIP V6		885,880		517,760	Complete	
MOD 26 / MOD 27		5,777,554		750,441	In Progress ³	
		14,146,934		7,943,525		
Production - O&M						
CIP V5		2,141,041		509,221	Complete	
CIP V6		655,023		815,678	Ongoing	
MOD 26 / MOD 27		-		166,252	In Progress ³	
		2,796,064		1,491,151		
Enterprise - CIP V5/V6 Capital ²		9,363,091		6,398,651	In Progress	
Enterprise - CIP V5/V6 O&M ²		2,638,436		4,127,448	In Progress	
Total						
Capital		46,071,548		28,572,408		
0&M	<u></u>	9,982,246		8,538,552		
	\$	56,053,794	\$	37,110,960		

¹ Approved estimate amounts shown were reduced from what was originally submitted for approval in FMCA 4 filing (\$1,243,010 capital and \$6,494,410 O&M) in alignment with the Commission's order that these costs could be prospectively recovered from the date of the FMCA 4 petition.

² Enterprise scope includes program management and information technology.

³ Interim 2018 and 2020 compliance deadlines have been met.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA))	SS:
COUNTY OF MECKLENBURG)	

Critical Infrastructure Protection Certification

Keith G. Butler, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that I am the Senior Vice President and Chief Security Officer of Duke Energy Business Services LLC, a service company affiliate of Duke Energy Indiana, LLC ("Duke Energy Indiana"), an Indiana corporation; that as such Senior Vice President, I am responsible for North American Electric Reliability Corporation ("NERC") Critical Infrastructure Protection ("CIP") compliance. I attest that, to the best of Duke Energy Indiana's ability and with consideration given to ongoing activities and to the best of my knowledge, information and belief:

- 1) Duke Energy Indiana makes all reasonable efforts to be in compliance with all applicable federal and state CIP-related rules, regulations, and requirements;
- To date, Duke Energy Indiana has accomplished all necessary threat analysis and vulnerability studies with regard to its CIP facilities; and
- 3) Duke Energy Indiana will make itself available, under proper safeguards and with security in place, to answer questions of the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission and Indiana Office of Utility Consumer Counselor regarding CIP activities and the threat to or vulnerability of its assets.

PETITIONER'S EXHIBIT 1-B (CDC) IURC CAUSE NO. 44367 FMCA 5 PAGE 2 OF 2

Subscribed and sworn to before pme this <u>15th</u> day of <u>becauter 2019</u>. 2020

(Vicki M. Deriger Notary Public

My Commission Expires: August 4. 2024

My County of Residence: <u>Mecklen Dung</u> North Carolina

VICXI M DERRINGER Notary Public - North Carolina Mecklenburg County My Commission Expires Aug 4, 2024

VERIFICATION

I hereby verify under the penalties of perjury that the foregoing representations are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Signed: Chad D. Cowan

Dated: 12-21-20