

From: [REDACTED] [via 800-171comments](#)
To: 800-171comments@list.nist.gov
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: [800-171 Comments] Comments on NIST SP 800-171r3 initial public draft
Date: Friday, July 14, 2023 11:53:46 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[sp800-171r3-ipd-comment-template.xlsx](#)

Dear Dr. Ross and Ms. Pillitteri,

Thank you for the opportunity to weigh in on NIST SP 800-171 Rev 3. Despite the large number of comments in the attached, we feel that Rev 3 is a great step forward and appreciate all of the effort you put into it. If there is an opportunity assist NIST in the Rev 3 or other, related efforts, or if any of the comments are “less than clear”, please do not hesitate to reach out.

Best Regards,

- Jim

James Goepel

Co-Founder

CMMC Information Institute

A nonprofit educational organization

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

<https://www.CMMCInfo.org>



Comment #	Submitted By (Name/Org) *	Type (General / Editorial / Technical)	Source (publication analysis/overlaid)	Starting Page #	Starting Line #	Comment (include rationale)*	Suggested Change*
1	Fe nardo Machado / Cybe sec Investments	Ed to al	Frequently Asked Questions	2	Unknown	In the "Frequently Asked Questions" in Initial Public Draft (IPD) NIST SP 800-171, Rev 3 on a document under question on "Why did NIST not address gain zat on-def ned pa amets s (ODPs) n selected secu ty equ ements? I states, "Fede al agenc es can elect to spec fy ODP's, o v de gu danc on select ng ODP's n nonfede al agenc es, o allow nonfede al agenc es to se l select ODP values."	I suggest NIST def ne the term "nonfede al agenc y" o co st to state "nonfede al o gan zat on" as def ned n the NIST SP 800-171 Glossa y.
2	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Gene al	Publ cat on	N/A	N/A	The discuss on of the elat onsh p w th 800-53 s g eat, but f most of those who w l ead th s document, t s clea v. W h NIST SP 800-171 m ay have s laly been n tten to d go s nment agenc es n establ sh ng equ ements fo p olect ng CUI n nonfede al systems, the ealy s th t 32 CFR 2002 establ shes th s publ cat on as the bas s fo p olect ng CUI. Thus, agenc y pe sonnel a la gely gno ant to ts equ ements. Instead, t s passed, n whole, to gove nment cont act s and othe nonfede al ent t es. NIST should the e take th s add t onal aud ence nto account n Rev 3. Fo example, the vast majo ty of the nonfede al ent t es w ll neve have had of, let alone have ead, NIST SP 800-53. But they MIGHT have had of the NIST CSF. NIST should nclude language, o a po nte to anothe document, that desc bes how the n NIST SP 800-171 fts n w th othe contextually relevant NIST publ cat on s lke the NIST CSF, N ST SP 800-30/37/39, FIPS 140, F PS 199, FIPS 200, etc. If NIST would l ke ass stance w t ng such a document, we would be glad to ass t.	
3	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Gene al	Publ cat on	N/A	N/A	NIST must recogn ze that th s publ cat on w ll make o b eak ca es s, cause gove nment cont act s to ex t the gove nment cont act ng ma ket, and even cause false cla ms and othe legal l ab ty fo cont act s. The efo e, consistency, cla ty, and p eck s on a e mpo tant as pa t of the ev sed publ cat on and the ev s on s to NIST SP 800-171A. Fo example, when a nonfede al ent ty s equ ed to pe fo an act, the only ope modal ve bs to use when desc bng the equ ement a e must o shall. Othe ve bs such as "should", can", and "may" a e pe m ss ve and the efo e do not c eate equ ements. NIST's use of "expected" w th respect to the NFO cont ols c eates s m l ssues. That ve b s gene ally pe m ss ve (t s d f ned as "e g ed as s kely ant c pated", and the efo e not equ ed), yet ead n context the desc pt on of the NFO cont ols could be ead as though NIST assumes there a e n place, mak ng them a equ ement. Th s amb gu ty w ll lead to l g at on that w ll h nde the adopt on of NIST SP 800-171 ac oss nonfede al agenc es. NIST should the e ave d the use of amb guous te ms such as "expected" and mo e clea y def ne whether o not the NFO cont ols a e equ ed.	
4	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Gene al	Publ cat on	N/A	N/A	NIST should establ sh a sco ng app each that allows agenc es to cont act the ove all eby cybe secu ty matu ty of two d ffe ent nonfede al ent t es when those agenc es a e mak ng nfo e comment desc on s. Examples nclude DoD's Assessment Methodology and the FAR and Above methodology developed by the CMMC Info mat on Inst tute and used by thousands of o gan zat on s who have downloaded and use ou f e e self-assessment tool/sp eedheet. We would be happy to sha e the nfo mat on w th NIST as and when app ope ate.	
5	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Gene al	Publ cat on	N/A	N/A	NIST should establ sh ecommended gap analy s and emed at on p o t es fo the va us cont ols. Fo example, many nonfede al ent t es w l beg n w th 3.1.1, wh ch s full of complex concepts and tends to be ve y n t m d ng. Recommendations th t the ent t es beg n the gap analy ses w th the phy cal secu ty and pe sonnel secu ty domas would allow them to beg n w th mo e st a ght w d d concepts and would l kely make the p ocess much eas e. Establ sh ng a ecommended POA&M emed at on o de would also g n f cantly benef t nonfede al ent t es. The CMMC Info mat on Inst tute has publ shed both ecommended gap analy s and POA&M emed at on o de unde C eate ve Commons l censes and would be happy to sha e them w th NIST as and when app ope ate.	
6	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Ed to al	Publ cat on	N/A	N/A	Most eads a e p eck ng up the document because t shows up as a equ ement n a cont act. They w l be unfam l a w th CUI, compl ance, laws, and many othe top cs. The Abst act s the ve y f st ng eads s ll see. They need mo e context than that s he e, even fo an abst act. Yes, they can ead fu the nto the document to get some of the nfo mat on, but you' e speak ng past them. St only ecommended add ng mo e context along the l nes of what s the Suggested Change.	
7	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Ed to al	Publ cat on	N/A	N/A	NIST should c eate a table of all ODPs, ensu e they a e nd v dually efo enable, and dedupl cate them fo consistency.	N/A
8	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Ed to al	Publ cat on	N/A	N/A	The po nte of NIST SP 800-171 s to p olect CUI. The language th oughout the publ cat on should, the efo e, be consistent w th the concepts embod ed n the CUI p ogram (e., EO 13556 and 32 CFR 2002). In many cases, the language s o ented a ound systems and oles, ather than the CUI and the natu e of the CUI. Fo example, as d scussed below, some cont ols focus on "need to know", wh ch s not the ght standa d fo establ sh ng r d ssem nat on autho ty, and othe s focus on l m t ng access by oth (wh ch suggests o gan zat on oles, such as eng nee ng manage r but not ll m e sons n a pu l cula o ll w ll have a lawful gove nment pu pose to access a pu l cula CUI.	CUI-o ented concepts f om 32 CFR 2002 and EO 13556 should be adopted and nco po ated th oughout the publ cat on.
9	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Ed to al	Publ cat on	1	21	It s unclear f om the text whether these bulle a e e ntended to be o ed by an and o an o .	We ecommended add ng the app ope ate conjunct on at the end of the second bullet (most l kely and).
10	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Ed to al	Publ cat on	1	22	32 CFR 2002.14(h)(2) states: "NIST SP 800-171 (nco po ated by efc enec, see 32 CFR 2002.2) def nes the equ ements necessa y to p olect CUI Bas c on non-fede al nfo mat on systems nacco danc w th the equ ements of th s pa t. Th s establ shes NIST SP 800-171 as the basel ne fo p olect ng CUI Bas c. That makes the equ ements n the publ cat on mo e n than the efo e emed at on s. They a e equ ements that all nonfede al ent t es must meet when hand ng CUI.	We ecommended eph as ng the pu pose of th s publ cat on s to p o v de fede al agenc es w th ecommended secu ty equ ements... to ead the pu pose of th s publ cat on s to p o v de fede al agenc es w th secu ty equ ements...
11	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Ed to al	Publ cat on	2	27	The way th s bullet s ph ased, t sounds as though, f a law, egulat on, o gove nment-w de pol cy c eates CUI Spec f ed nfo mat on, the equ ements n NIST SP 800-171 no longer apply to that nfo mat on and the nfo mat on must only be p olected as spec f ed n the law, egulat on, o gove nment-w de pol cy. That s not t e. Othe w se, fo example, nfo mat on that was des gnated as CUI unde 49 CFR 1520.11 would not be sub ect to the majo ty of the safegua d ng equ ements unde th s publ cat on. That s s mply log cal and ncons stent w th the nten of the CUI p ogram. Instead, the equ ements n the co espond ng law, egulat on, o gove nment-w de pol cy supplement and, n the event of a conf lct, eplace those n NIST SP 800-171.	We ecommended eph as ng th s to ead "Except and only to the extent that a law, egulat on, o Gove nment-w de pol cy lsted n the CUI eg ty fo the CUI category o subcategory o nfo mat on p e c bespec f c safegua d ng equ ements fo p olect ng the nfo mat on's conf dent al ty."
12	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Ed to al	Publ cat on	2	31	The empha zed o n th s sentence c eates confus on.	We ecommended eplc ng the o w th s as we l as
13	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Ed to al	Publ cat on	3	70	As d scussed above, "expected" s an amb guous te m and c eates unta nty that could have a s g n f cant mpact on the adopt on of NIST SP 800-171 by nonfede al ent t es.	F NIST nten ds the cont ols to be n place, th s should be mo e epl c t. Fo example, th s could be eph ased as: "Expected to always be mplemented by nonfede al o gan zat on s w thout spec f cat on by the Fede al Gove nment. o Always n place n nonfede al o gan zat on s w thout spec f cat on by the Fede al Gove nment. o Requ ed fo p olect on of a nfo mat on and the efo e mplemented w thout spec f cat on by the Fede al Gove nment. o Howe v, the bette app oach would be to nco po ate the NFO cont ols nto N ST SP 800-171 f they a e actually equ ed."
14	Fe nardo Machado / Cybe sec Investments	Ed to al	Publ cat on	4	79	Line 79 states, "These ODP's p o v de add t onal flex b l ty by allow ng fede al o gan zat on s to spec fy values fo the des gnated pa amets s, as needed."	I suggest co ect ng to state "fede al o gan zat on s nce the NIST SP 800-171 document s focused on the p olect on of cont o led unclass f ed nfo mat on n nonfede al systems and o gan zat on s."
15	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Gene al	Publ cat on	4	79	NIST should p o v de add t onal nfo mat on about wh ch o gan zat on should def ne the ODPs. A e these left fo the nonfede al ent t es to dete m ne, o should they be set by the agenc y?	
16	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Gene al	Publ cat on	4	79	NIST should establ sh ecommended ODP values o angles of values. Cu ently, the e s s g n f cant amb gu ty as to what s equ ed, and that leaves a lot of d sc et on to the agenc es o non-fede al ent t es. Gu danc f om NIST would help establ sh mo e consistency, educe the ove all bu den fo the nonfede al ent t es, and u t mately educe the cont act to taxpaye s to p olect CUI.	
17	Fe nardo Machado / Cybe sec Investments	Ed to al	Publ cat on	5	113	Line 113 states, "When used n the context of the equ ements n Sect on 3, the te m system means a nonfede al system that p ocesses, sto es, o t ansms t CUI."	I suggest nco po ng Pa ag ph 1.1 Pu pose and Appl cab l ty statement (ne 30) The secu ty equ ements n th s publ cat on a e only appl cabl e to components of nonfede al systems that ocess, sto e, o t ansms t CUI o that p o v de p olect on fo such components.
18	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Gene al	Publ cat on	5	120	The pu pose of NIST SP 800-171 s to p olect CUI. The language n the publ cat on should the efo e be mo e consistent w th 32 CFR 2002 and EO 13556. Fo example, we ecommended tyng the autho zed accounts to nd v duals w th lawful gove nment pu pose to access the spec f c CUI handled by that system. The discuss on should nclude a cla f cat on that nd v duals w th a lawful gove nment pu pose to access ce ta n CUI on one system may not have a lawful gove nment pu pose to access d ffe ent CUI on that same system.	
19	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Ed to al	Publ cat on	5	137	Th s equ ement efc enec s need-to-know, but that s not the ope standa d fo analyz ng whether autho zat on st ll ex sts. Unde 32 CFR 2002, the standa s "lawful gove nment pu pose."	We ecommended eph as ng th s to add e "When system usage changes o s, lawful gove nment pu pose to access spec f c CUI."
20	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Ed to al	Publ cat on	6	152	The te m "suppo t s used th oughout the publ cat on to efo to p o v ng b eak f x and othe ma ntance se v ces. The use of that same wo d n the ph ase _to suppo t t vel equ ements) could e eate confus on n the m nd of the eads."	We ecommended eplc ng _to suppo t t vel equ ements w th _to fac l late t vel equ ements
21	CMMC Info mat on Inst tute	Ed to al	Publ cat on	9	296	G grammat cal ssue	Add a comma ead _lockouts a e

* Indicate required f elds

Comment #	Submitted By (Name/Org) *	Type (General / Editorial / Technical)	Source (publication analysis/overlay)	Starting Page # *	Starting Line #*	Comment (include rationale) *	Suggested Change*
61	CMMC Information Institute	Editorial	Publication	60	2301	This requirement is overly broad. NIST SP 800-171 is designed to address the safeguarding of CUI, but this is written to address a much wider array of supply chain issues. It is conceptually a good idea, but it is outside of the bounds of NIST SP 800-171.	We suggest the following to read: A. Establish a process to identify and address weaknesses or deficiencies in the supply chain elements and processes which handle or secure CUI. B. Employ (Assignment or organization-defined supply chain controls) to protect against supply chain risks to, and limit the harm or consequences from supply chain related events to, CUI and the system, system component(s), or system services which handle or secure CUI.
62	CMMC Information Institute	Editorial	Publication	79	3011	As discussed above, expected is an ambiguous term and creates uncertainty that could have a significant impact on the adoption of NIST SP 800-171 by nonfederal entities.	We recommend assessing the approach to the NFO controls.