
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
CC: [REDACTED]
Sent: 1/28/2021 11:49:28 AM
Subject: RE: System Hardening Mitigation Decision Tree - Meeting Request
Attachments: SH Project Approvals_WGC_1.28.2021.pptx

Is it too late to add two more jobs?

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2021 11:06 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: System Hardening Mitigation Decision Tree - Meeting Request

*******CAUTION: This email was sent from an EXTERNAL source. Think before clicking links or opening attachments.*******

Thanks [REDACTED] if we want to go ahead and include the EC tag indicator for today, I've revised the slides to reflect the recommended language from [REDACTED] (see attached). I made an assumption about whether the EC tag count influenced the recommendation based on the data available, so **please validate** (I only assumed the Clayton job).

Best,
[REDACTED]

kpmg
[REDACTED] | KPMG LLP
Manager, Strategy
[REDACTED]
Mobile [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2021 12:45 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: System Hardening Mitigation Decision Tree - Meeting Request

I don't think we need to change the purpose of the project to ECOP, but it is a good idea to see the number of EC tags that would be addressed by the project. Maybe something like "Does the volume of EC tags result in a recommendation of a more timely mitigation method?" Or something that says that if we go with a solution that takes years to implement, we would have to correct the EC tags first.

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2021 9:31 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: System Hardening Mitigation Decision Tree - Meeting Request

*******CAUTION: This email was sent from an EXTERNAL source. Think before clicking links or opening attachments.*******

[REDACTED]

My understanding was not that you would reclassify any CWSP projects to ECOP. More so, to explicitly call out a step where a project is identified as "higher" risk due to the EC tag count. For the committee, this would help them understand if a recommendation was chosen for expediency. For example, the Hybrid recommendation on the fulton job last week was ultimately supported based on the argument you made on the increased risk due to EC tags (at least for some members).

Ultimately, this is just trying to reflect the concern [REDACTED] raised. If it's not something we want to add in, we may just have to justify that to the committee this afternoon as we review.

Best,

kpmg

[REDACTED] | KPMG LLP

Manager, Strategy

Mobile [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2021 11:15 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: System Hardening Mitigation Decision Tree - Meeting Request

We include EC tags within every hardening project. If the project is being considered as a risk driven project first (CWSP); is it necessary to change it to EC optimization driven and name in ECOP? This does not change the way we scope, design, or execute the project.


[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: Thursday, January 28, 2021 8:00 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: System Hardening Mitigation Decision Tree - Meeting Request

*******CAUTION: This email was sent from an EXTERNAL source. Think before clicking links or opening attachments.*******

[REDACTED] provided some additional feedback on the decision tree, based on guidance from [REDACTED]. The request is to include a question around EC tags, with the threshold being whether the concentration make the job an ECOP project. With that in mind, see below for a draft of how that gets looped into the decision tree:

System Hardening Decision Tree (2 of 2)



Please let me know if you guys have any additional feedback (e.g., would like to frame it differently, or in a different place on the decision tree). If you're good with it as is, I can integrate the change into the subsequent slides and send a revised copy of the full deck to you ahead of the noon meeting.

Thanks,

kpmg

| KPMG LLP

Manager, Strategy

Mobile

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, January 27, 2021 10:51 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: System Hardening Mitigation Decision Tree - Meeting Request

Attached is the updated decision tree (based on updates from last night), looped into the presentation materials for Thursday.

General flow is:

- What is the decision tree and how will it be used
- Individual project reviews:
 - Decision tree result (**Please validate – I took an initial pass based on the data available on the slide**)
 - Would this come to the committee as an inform or decision (**Please validate – At first glance, only the Clayton job seems to be an edge / exception case**)
 - Mitigation comparison
 - Decision / vote on mitigation
- We'd close with a final decision / vote on whether to adopt the decision tree

Let me know if you guys have any additional thoughts,

kpmg

[REDACTED] | KPMG LLP

Manager, Strategy

[REDACTED]@kpmg.com

Mobile [REDACTED]

-----Original Appointment-----

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 11:03 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Subject: [EXTERNAL] System Hardening Mitigation Decision Tree - Meeting Request

When: Tuesday, January 26, 2021 5:30 PM-6:00 PM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).

Where: Microsoft Teams Meeting

Subject: System Hardening Mitigation Decision Tree - Meeting Request

Objectives:

Review the System Hardening Mitigation Decision Tree (attached)

Align on any potential revisions to that framework or thresholds

Status check on materials for the Thursday night review with the WFRG Committee

Attendees:

[REDACTED]

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Or call in (audio only)

[REDACTED] United States, San Francisco

Phone Conference ID: [REDACTED]

[Find a local number](#) | [Reset PIN](#)

Need Help with Teams? Click on the Help option in this invite to connect you directly to our Teams at PG&E Training site!

[Learn More](#) | [Help](#) | [Meeting options](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside KPMG. Do not click links, open attachments or forward unless you recognize the sender, the sender's email domain and you know the content is safe. Forward suspicious emails as an attachment to US-KPMG SPAM Collection Mailbox (spam@KPMG.com).

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee.

PGE-DIXIE-NDCAL-000001169

Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. When addressed to our clients any opinions or advice contained in this email are subject to the terms and conditions expressed in the governing KPMG client engagement letter.

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. When addressed to our clients any opinions or advice contained in this email are subject to the terms and conditions expressed in the governing KPMG client engagement letter.

The information in this email is confidential and may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the addressee. Access to this email by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying, distribution or any action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it, is prohibited and may be unlawful. When addressed to our clients any opinions or advice contained in this email are subject to the terms and conditions expressed in the governing KPMG client engagement letter.
