

Contents

Published:

Comparison of cybersecurity and functional safety risk assessments



RESEARCH REPORT

VTT-R-00499-24



Comparison of cybersecurity and functional safety risk assessments

Authors:	Timo Malm, Josepha Berger, Risto Tiusanen, Antti Ranta, Ja Seppälä, Bilhanan Silverajan, and Hanning Zhao		
Confidentiality:	Public		
Version:	16.9.2024		

Def	finitio	ns and cla	assifications		
1	Introduction				
2	Materials and methods				
3	Cybersecurity requirements in EU legislation and international standards				
4	Comparison of cybersecurity and functional safety risk assessment processes				
	4.1 Parameters of functional safety and cyber security risks				
		Items related to cybersecurity and functional safety			
		4.1.2	Taxonomies of dependability and cybersecurity		
		4.1.3	Cyberattack effects on safety		
		4.1.4	Comparison of cybersecurity properties in IT and OT systems		
	4.2	Categor	izing cybersecurity and functional safety		
		4.2.1	Security levels		
		4.2.2	Safety Performance Levels		
	4.3	Compar	ison of risk assessment processes		
		4.3.1	Machinery safety and information security risk assessment		
		4.3.2	Information security and industrial automation security risk assessment		
		4.3.3	Functional safety and industrial automation security risk assessment		
		4.3.4	An example of risk assessment of a single safety function		
	4.4 Risk treatment		atment		
		4.4.1	General risk treatment options		
		4.4.2	Risk treatment methods		
		4.4.3	Possible conflicts between risk treatment measures		
		4.4.4	Defence in depth		
	4.5	Cyberse	ecurity and functional safety differences		
5	Cyb	ersecurity	risk assessment		
	5.1	Example	es of cybersecurity risk assessment methods		
		5.1.1	STPA-SEC		
		5.1.2	STPA-Sec + STRIDE		
		5.1.3	Security Threat Analysis (STA)		
		5.1.4	Uncontrolled Flows of Information and Energy (UFoI-E)		
	5.2 Risk assessment of System of Systems				
	5.3	Cyberse	ecurity perspective on risk assessment		
6	Discussions with companies				

"VTT-R-00499-24. Comparison of cybersecurity and functional safety risk assessments" :

.52 53

https://cris.vtt.fi/en/publications/comparison-of-cybersecurity-and-functional-safety-

8 Conclusions

References

beyond the obvious risk-assessment

Cybersecurity legislation – examples – sources of vulnerabilities





Some main differences between functional safety and cybersecurity



Topics	Safety viewpoint	Security viewpoint
Primary	Injury/accident prevention, health	Negative impacts like, service problems,
objectives	Safety integrity is related to the	confidential information leak, integrity,
	probability of specified	preventing or minimizing cyberattack
	performance.	effects.
Victims,	User (direct effect), bystanders	Asset owner, user, service provider,
stake		customers, etc.
holders,		
Important	Safety integrity (safety functions	OT systems:
attributes	operate as planned),	Availability, Integrity, Confidentiality
	Availability (safety function available as planned)	
		II systems:
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Confidentiality, Integrity, Availability

Mindmap of cybersecurity and functional safety and examples of their relation to specific subjects



Risk and risk reduction process parameters in safety and cybersecurity

28/03/2025



6

Sa	isk Cybersecurity				
Severity of harm that can result from the considered hazard	Probability of occurence of that harm Exposure of persons to the hazard the occurence of hazardous event the possibility to avoid or limit the harm	Possible negative that can result from considered threat	e impact m the	Likelihood of that negation in relation to existing vulnerabilities that can exploited by a threat	ve impact n be
Hazard Severity Probability	lazard identification	Threat Vulnerability Impact Likelihood	Circumsta Weaknes	ance or event effects s that can be exploited by th	nreat
Limits, properties R Protective measure	isk reduction related to use s → Residual risk	Assets, controls Countermeasu	Items that res → F	t have an effect on cybersed Residual risk	curity

Dependability and security taxonomy in programmable control systems





Ref. Algirdas Avizienis, Fellow, IEEE, Jean-Claude Laprie, Brian Randell, and Carl Landwehr. Basic Concepts and Taxonomy of Dependable and Secure Computing ISO/TR 22100-4 Guidance to machinery manufacturers for consideration of related IT-security (cyber security) aspects 7 IEC 27005:2018. Information technology. Security techniques. Information security risk management

Safety/security properties and risk analysis



Cyber-attack effects on safety



Risk assessment (machinery) safety/security

VTT





Ref. IEC 27005:2018

Risk assessment security

Information security risk assessment



Automation security risk assessment

ZCR 1: Identify the system under control

Initial cybersecurity risk assessment, identify worst case risks
Partitioning to zones and conduits,
Separate safety related assets,
Separate temporarily connected, external and wireless devices/networks
Compare risk to tolerable risk

5. Perform a detailed cyber security risk assessment Identify threats, vulnerabilities, Determine consequences and impacts Determine unmitigated likelihood Determine unmitigated cybersecurity risk Determine SL-T

Compare unmitigated risk with tolerable risk

Identify and evaluate existing countermeasures Reevaluate likelihood and impact, determine residual risk Compare residual risk with tolerable risk Identify additional cyber security countermeasures

6 Overall Cybersecurity documentation 7 Asset owner approval

IEC 62443-3-2:2020 Security for industrial automation and control systems - Part 3-2: Security risk assessment for system design

11

Ref. IEC 27005:2018

Security/safety steps to improve system with examples



Functional safety

Cybersecurity Machinery safety

ISO/TR 22100-4:2020. Relationship with ISO 12100 – Part 4: Guidance to machinery manufacturers for consideration of related IT-security (cyber security) aspects.

Several reasons, why safety and security analysis should be separate

- Objective is different: hazard/accident negative impact
- Different requirements, categories (SL, SIL/PL) risks, objectives
- May be different: stakeholders, experts, liability, analysis intervals (cybersecurity analysis more often), system to be analysed, defence methods
- Separate or unified analysis: In bottom-up approach laborious due to many initial items. In top-down approach the no essential difference.

However,

- Hazard/Threat/Vulnerability identification and risk reduction phase need cooperation.
- Cooperation in management and risk reduction methods

Conclusions

- Select risk assessment method according to the needs
- In hazard/threat/vulnerability identification phase apply as many methods as needed, apply checklists.
- Check that risk reduction methods do not cause cybersecurity or safety problems.

VTT

Thank you for your attention!

Questions?

28/03/2025

15

VTT

Tel. +358 20 722 3224 Email: timo.malm@vtt.fi

Senior Scientist, MSc. (Tech)

Timo Malm

System Safety

VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland Ltd Visiokatu 4, Tampere P.O. Box 1300

FI-33101 Tampere, Finland

www.vttresearch.com