CYBERSECURITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Hybrid Meeting
Wednesday, August 28, 2024, 2:00 PM
In-Person at the NM Gaming Control Board
4900 Alameda Blvd., NE, Albuquerque, NM 87113

1. WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER
Ms. Gutierrez called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting. She reviewed general procedures for the Zoom meeting.

2. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT
Raja Sambandam, Chair	Kenneth Abeyta
Cassandra Hayne (Logan Fernandes)	Clinton Nicely
Dr. Lorie M. Liebrock	Josh Rubin
Jason Johnson	Phillip Zamora
Seth Morris	Danielle Gilliam
Ray Tafoya`	Cecilia Mavrommantis
Todd Ulses	

MEMBERS ABSENT
Robert L. Benavidez

OTHERS PRESENT
Melissa Gutierrez, Cybersecurity Project Mgr.
Renee Narvaiz, DoIT, PIO
Todd Baran, DoIT General Counsel
Dan Garcia (DoIT), Flori Martinez (DoIT), Rick Comeau (Deloitte), Will Campos (Deloitte), Todd Glanzer (Deloitte), Joshua Yadao (Deloitte), Cassandra Lynn Brown, Gavin Lujan (NMGDF), Robert Wise (PED), Bryan Brock, Peter Mantos, Del Ameko, Robert del Plain (IT Dir. City of Las Cruces)

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
MOTION: Ms. Gutierrez called for a motion to approve the Agenda. Dr. Liebrock so moved, seconded by Mr. Ulses. There being no discussion or opposition, the Agenda was approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES
MOTION: Ms. Gutierrez called for a motion to approve the minutes of the March 7, 2024 meeting. Mr. Ulses so moved, seconded by Ms. Gilliam. There being no discussion or opposition the minutes were approved.

5. Open Meeting Resolution Discussion/Adoption
Ms. Gutierrez requested to turn this item over to Mr. Baran for discussion. However, as Mr. Baran had not yet joined the meeting, Ms. Gutierrez screen shared the Resolution which had been sent out to Committee members in advance of today's meeting. She explained that annually, pursuant to the Open Meetings Act, a Resolution must be adopted by the Committee. She noted that pursuant to the statute the Committee must have a meeting every other month, which in the past has been the first Thursday, every other month, and then the Chair or a

majority of the Committee members can call for any additional meetings. She explained that the notice of a regular meeting has been changed from ten days' notice to three days' notice in advance of a meeting. Other items she reviewed were that if the regular meeting day falls on a holiday there will be no meeting, and again, a special meeting can be called by the Chair or a majority of the Committee members with 72 hours' notice, emergency meetings no longer require public notice but information is to be given to the Department of Justice after the meeting occurs, and these meetings must meet the requirements of an emergency meeting set by the DOJ. She stated that all other items were the same as the previous Resolution with the exception of her email domain, which has been updated. She then asked if there were any questions or if any further information was needed. There was none.

MOTION: Ms. Gutierrez stated that if this Resolution is acceptable to the Chair she would entertain a motion to adopt this Resolution. Mr. Johnson so moved to adopt the Open Meetings Resolution changes as presented today by Ms. Gutierrez, seconded by Dr. Liebrock. There being no discussion or opposition this Open Meeting Resolution was adopted. Ms. Gutierrez thanked the Chair and Committee members.

6. **Updates from the State Chief Information Security Officer – Raja Sambandam**
Mr. Sambandam reported that the six additional full-time employees for the Office of Cybersecurity which were requested during the last legislative session have been approved and allocated, and the Office is actively working through the recruitment process. He noted that there were also some additional vacancies, but he is happy to inform the Committee that three new employees will be starting in the next couple of weeks.

7. **Cybersecurity Grant Update – Rick Comeau, Deloitte**
Mr. Comeau asked Ms. Gutierrez is she would like to begin this discussion based on the information provided to the Cybersecurity Planning Committee last week, relative to the new process for project recommendations from the Engagement Subcommittee to the full Committee.

Ms. Gutierrez noted that what Mr. Comeau is referring to is the development process of the Cybersecurity Planning Committee, which has adopted a new subcommittee, a Procurement Subcommittee. This Subcommittee will develop scope of works and make recommendations of vendors to the Planning Committee for all of the federal grant projects, not just year one, but for all of the following years. This Subcommittee will be working to decide which vendors they will recommend to the larger Committee to start work on the year one, FY22 grant fund. Ms. Gutierrez asked Mr. Comeau if there was anything else he would like her to review. Mr. Comeau stated he could provide the brief for other items involved.

Mr. Comeau screen shared a slide covering items related to the SLCGP, including the state cost-share waiver for year two which was submitted by DHSEM on 08/14/2024 to the FEMA Preparedness Officer for Region 9. He noted that if this waiver is approved it will save the State approximately $1.3 million in required State cost-share. The Preparedness Officer has indicated that it might take some time for this and they could not put a time estimate on this, however, it was good to go ahead and submit this.

He noted the information relative to FY24 or year three of the SLCGP, according to people at the MS-ISAC who had been in a briefing with FEMA and CISA, is that FEMA has indicated the goal for releasing the year three NOFO is the first or second week of September, which is only a couple of weeks away. For comparison, this is approximately one month later than the year

two NOFO was released, which was 08/07/2023.

Mr. Comeau added that there was some additional information on this slide relative to the requirements for projects being submitted for year two, FY23 of the SLCGP, and for year two the NOFO states that an applicant in the State of New Mexico is required to focus on and basically submit projects within its grant application for projects that meet objectives two through four, and reviewed those objectives in detail. He noted that he was not able to attend the most recent Engagement Subcommittee meeting and asked Secretary Sambandam if there had been discussion of some of these items in that meeting.

Ms. Gutierrez commented that some of the information noted by Mr. Comeau will be discussed further under Item 9, Subcommittees, on today's Agenda.

Secretary Sambandam agreed that more of this will be discussed under Item 9 today. He added that these topics were discussed in the recent Engagement Subcommittee meeting with further discussions regarding the level of continuity which should be provided on existing projects initiated in year one. The Engagement Subcommittee agreed to investigate this and bring that information to the full Committee, then hopefully the details can be discussed and questions answered.

Dr. Liebrock added that the Subcommittee was particularly concerned about continuity because there are new people and new organizations interested in the services from year one, in the interest survey for year two, so taking away services that have been established as the highest priority to the Engagement Subcommittee in particular did not seem to make sense.

Secretary Sambandam agreed that this is a good point and was a concern that had been brought up, as well as how to continue expansion of the scope or scaling of services currently offered in the portfolio, and how to heed the requests sent out for year two and how this will all align.

Secretary Sambandam noted he had nothing additional to share.

8. **Annual Cybersecurity Report Due October 30, 2024**
   a. Review Report Subcommittee Membership
   Ms. Gutierrez screen shared a slide showing the current membership of this Committee. She noted that Ray Tafoya was just asked to join the meeting today, so he will be added to the list, however, a member of the tribal community with experience in cybersecurity is being sought to fill this seat.

   Dr. Liebrock gave a correction that she is not a Municipal League appointee. Ms. Gutierrez stated that for the purposes of this Committee she is, but on the Planning Committee Dr. Liebrock is a direct Governor appointee, but there was a vacancy in one of the Municipal League positions, so to help meet requirements of the federal NOFO the Municipal League agreed for Dr. Liebrock to fill one of their positions on this Committee.

   Mr. Ulses noted that he is no longer the IT Affiliate Chair and that Mr. Abeyta is now in that position. Mr. Ulses stated that he is now the Vice-Chair and Mr. Abeyta is the Chair. Ms. Gutierrez thanked him for that information and she will make those changes.

   Ms. Gutierrez stated that there are advisory members of this Committee, most notably,

Secretary Sambandam is the Chair of this Committee, but is not a voting member, and under statute additional advisory members could be added, but this has not been done so far.

Ms. Gutierrez reviewed the membership of the Report Subcommittee, noting that the Committee has the ability to have six members. The current membership is; Jason Johnson, Clinton Nicely, Kenneth Abeyta, Todd Ulses and Robert Benavidez.

She stated that this Subcommittee met earlier in the week and she will let Deloitte go into the details of that meeting and any plans moving forward.

b. Discuss Process for the 2024 Report – Deloitte – Will Campos
Mr. Campos screen shared a slide of the timeline they have proposed for the development of the 2024 Advisory Report. As stated by Ms. Gutierrez there was a meeting to discuss the development of this report which started with a baseline developed by Deloitte based on the known updates available and included all the key sections which included the Cybersecurity Office, cybersecurity across the nation and the State of New Mexico, and concluded with the updates and next steps from this Committee. That version of the report is in the Subcommittee folder at this time with the intent to refine it more based on key inputs they would like to include, and he described these areas in detail. They are currently working within the 08/22/24 to 09/13/24 window for getting these key updates put into the report, with the intent of presenting the draft version of the report to the larger Committee by 09/13/24. This would be the period to actively work on the report, providing feedback for the Subcommittee to address, with the goal to provide a complete and updated draft by the 27th, for a second round of review. The aim is to have a solid report complete by 10/11/24, which will be in a nearly complete state, with perhaps minor changes in order to present the final report to this Committee between the 11th and 18th of October, for approval by the Committee on 10/18/24. He stated that this is a representative timeline and could be condensed if the Committee would like a little more time before the report is due on 10/31/24.

Secretary Sambandam asked if they would be keeping the year one report at the baseline and then specifically call out the accomplishments or objectives that were met with year one, and then indicate the efficiencies surrounding those year one initiatives, leading into what the year two initiatives are, or what the thought process is here.

Mr. Campos stated that there should be a continuity of those items which were stated to be next steps; and gave the example of the next steps stated in the 2023 report and giving an update of the key accomplishments achieved in the last year.

Secretary Sambandam asked if there were any other questions or comments.

Mr. Glanzer added, for the new Committee members, that this report is one of the requirements in the statute establishing this Committee.

Secretary Sambandam asked if there were any recommendations, additions or guidelines that the Committee should be aware of that were followed in the Report last year and should be continued or extended into this year's Report.

Mr. Glanzer noted that the key is the timeline accomplishments and progress and to make note of where the direction lies moving forward. This is part of the tracking with this Committee as well as the Planning Committee in order to move forward with the overall Cybersecurity Plan

and the statewide progress toward improving the baseline cybersecurity efforts.

Mr. Johnson noted the importance of keeping everyone informed.

Secretary Sambandam asked if the Committee should make use of this opportunity to get sufficient attention to any other risks or emerging risks that this Subcommittee should consider and other elements that should be captured in the Report.

Mr. Glanzer stated he believed this was one of the key elements of the definition of what the Report should contain, and that it would be imperative to include the recognition of risks identified and progress made, even gaps that have been identified through the continuing evolution of cybersecurity to help inform the focus of the Committee as well as the State on certain elements of cybersecurity that may have changed from last year's focus areas.

Secretary Sambandam asked if there would be value in gathering information from the recipients of services or awards to see what may have changed with respect to identifying any gaps or risks that still require attention.

Mr. Glanzer agreed that they should entertain input for the report as well as feedback to help inform other activities, which could involve the Engagement Subcommittee and others.

9. **Subcommittee**
   a. Establish

   Ms. Gutierrez screen shared and reviewed the composition of the two current Cybersecurity Committees and their respective Subcommittees. She reviewed the Cybersecurity Planning Committee, with their newly developed Procurement Subcommittee, their Engagement Subcommittee, which recently took on the task of project recommendations for the future years of the grant, and then their Plan Subcommittee. She then reviewed the Cybersecurity Advisory Committee, which currently has only the Report Subcommittee, which develops the annual Cybersecurity Report.

   She referred back to Mr. Campos' report, which described the need for policy development and prioritization related to the federal grants or to what this Office and the State is doing for cybersecurity. She noted that this was done with the Cybersecurity Planning Committee in year one, but after reviewing the approved projects and starting to scope these out for procurement the need was found for the Procurement Subcommittee, but direction is also needed from a policy standpoint to understand what the top policy priorities are and how those are being developed. She asked Dr. Liebrock to address the importance of policy and the creation of policies, not only for the Planning Committee but also for the Advisory Committee.

   Dr. Liebrock stated that the foundation for almost all good cybersecurity practices starts with a policy, determining the priorities, and those priorities come into play as project selection progresses. Updated policies are critical as they prioritize the largest risks and threats to the state as a whole for the statewide plan, but also the organizations within the state, potentially based on the organization type. This also ties in with the Engagement Subcommittee and the different subgroups they have been working with. She stated her belief that it is critical to have a Policy Subcommittee in some form to look at the high-level view of how to handle cybersecurity from a statewide perspective.

Ms. Gutierrez then described two options that have been developed for the Advisory Committee to consider.

i) Option one would be to create a new Policy Subcommittee consisting of members from the Advisory Committee and collaborating with two Subcommittees from the Planning Committee, the Procurement Subcommittee and the Engagement Subcommittee. She then described the reasoning for this.

ii) Option two would be to appoint Advisory Committee members to serve as advisory members on the Engagement Subcommittee of the Planning Committee. The Engagement Subcommittee has undertaken a lot of work with outreach surveys and interest forms already in circulation, in an effort to understand what communities need and what is available to meet those needs. Advisory Committee members appointed to the Engagement Subcommittee would help develop, prioritize and propose policies and projects to the Advisory Committee.

Alternatively, joint subcommittees could be established for these purposes, which would allow inter-connective collaboration between the two larger Committees.

Ms. Gutierrez then asked Mr. Baran to comment.

Mr. Baran thanked Ms. Gutierrez for her description and that she has captured well the mechanics of this, how it would look and how it relates back to the mission of this Committee. Mr. Baran stated that this Advisory Committee is responsible for the development of policy for the whole of state, not just for the grant program. So, if the full Committee feels that the discussion and development of those policies is best left for full Committee meetings then a dedicated Subcommittee to work on those policies would not be necessary, however, having a presence and a collaborative relationship with the Planning Committee for matters related to the grant program and the implementation of the State Cybersecurity Plan is a virtual necessity; finding a way to bridge these two Committees is almost an imperative. This is really just a question of mechanically how to do this and examining the benefits and limitations of each path. Simply having a collaborative relationship by having members of this Committee engage with the Engagement Subcommittee and the Procurement Subcommittee would not foster or create an opportunity for the kind of policy making that this Advisory Committee would want to engage in; for example if the Advisory Committee wanted to develop a set a rules to govern some aspect of cybersecurity that did not directly relate to the grant program that is work that would most logically be delegated to a policy subcommittee, but not necessarily to one that collaborates with the Engagement Subcommittee, so if that is the vision of how this Committee is going to function, option #1 makes the most sense, having its own subcommittee that can interact with the Planning Committee and simultaneously, or in series, focus on the work of this Committee. Conversely, if this Committee is going to do its substantive work in the full Committee process, which could become cumbersome, option 2, where you simply collaborate informally with the Planning Committee members, is an option. He noted that option 2 creates a lot of administrative efficiencies, which are important, however, the most important issue is to make sure that this Committee gets its work done in the most substantively effective manner.

Ms. Gutierrez thanked Mr. Baran for his comments. She then shared information about the Engagement Subcommittee, if the Committee does select option 2. She noted that there are

some representatives who are members of both Committees, in particular Mr. Benavidez and Dr. Liebrock, who are already members of this Committee as well as the Engagement Subcommittee. She added if advisory members from this Committee were to be added to the Engagement Subcommittee those would be limited to four, because of this, to avoid a quorum issue. She then asked Secretary Sambandam to open things up for questions, recommendations, etc.

Secretary Sambandam thanked Ms. Gutierrez and Mr. Baran for the explanations, clarification and the work up. He then opened the discussion for Committee members.

Dr. Liebrock added that the Engagement Subcommittee has recently taken on the task of project proposal analysis because the Engagement Subcommittee has been collecting all of the data on what client organizations want to participate in SLCGP, and what they need, what are their risks from the risk analyses being done, what are their views of the threats and what is important to them. This necessitates good communication between the Engagement Subcommittee and the Advisory Committee on policy, however this is organized. She stressed that this collaboration and communication will be critical.

Secretary Sambandam thanked Dr. Liebrock for her comment and agreed that communication is the key due to the number of parties involved and the various segments being communicated with.

Mr. Ulses had a question about who should participate or be excluded in the activities of the Engagement Subcommittee, if that Subcommittee is involved with approving projects being funded through the grant.

Mr. Baran stated that the Subcommittees of both larger full Committees have no authority to take any kind of binding action, they only have authority to do research analysis and propose solutions to the larger Committees. Any final decision, such as a funding decision or project selection, will go to the full Committee that is responsible for that type of decision. If there is a situational conflict of interest then a member of a Subcommittee can recuse themselves, but that would not prevent them from participating in areas and on subjects where they do not have that conflict.

Secretary Sambandam thanked Mr. Ulses and Mr. Baran for their comments.

Mr. Glanzer had a question about the duties and responsibilities of the Advisory Committee, specifically related to policy development, and whether this was a function of the charter of the Committee.

Mr. Baran stated that the Advisory Committee was established by statute, and development of statewide policy for cybersecurity was delegated to the Committee by statute.

Mr. Glanzer stated that he thought the statute placed the responsibility for development of policy on the Office of Cybersecurity, not to the Advisory Committee.

Mr. Baran explained that the Advisory Committee establishes policy and the Office of Cybersecurity implements the policy with respect to State agencies and can offer support to all other state entities; the Office of Cybersecurity does not have authority over those entities but can offer support for those entities. So, when it comes to policy creation the Office of

Cybersecurity can advise and inform the Advisory Committee as part of their deliberative process, but the Advisory Committee is the group which decides what is in the best interest of the State with respect to cybersecurity, the premise being that the Advisory Committee is composed of stakeholders which come from very diverse backgrounds and have diverse constituents, with representatives from the educational sector, municipal governments, cities, counties, etc., and the reasoning behind this type of structure is that these representatives can collectively advocate for their interests, for the interests of their constituency, because there will always be limited resource pools, so allocating those resources and determining the best place for these resources to be used is the function of the larger group and not a single office.

Secretary Sambandam thanked Mr. Glanzer for his question and Mr. Baran for his response.

Mr. Baran stated that if the Advisory Committee wants to establish its own Subcommittee it will need to; a) take a vote to establish that Subcommittee and specify what its charter or mission will be, what it will be delegated to do and then b) there will be a separate vote to appoint members of that Subcommittee. If the decision is to just collaborate with the Planning Committee and not establish a separate Subcommittee, then it would just be a process of getting volunteers and taking a vote to appoint those volunteers to be part of the collaboration.

Mr. Johnson asked if the options were; 1) create the Subcommittee and let them work directly with the other Subcommittees from the Planning Committee, or 2) take this on as a whole body and have just the Advisory Committee in these meetings. He then asked what the pros and cons of each were administratively and he also questioned the ability of another Subcommittee to meet and make decisions due to everyone's busy schedules, asking, "Does the Committee believe it is better to operate in the smaller Subcommittee for effectiveness and efficiency or is it better to keep it all members?", and asked for opinions from Committee members.

Secretary Sambandam commented that with the work already accomplished over the last year or two a good professional working relationship has been created with various participants in the Committee, and with a larger group of perhaps 13 to 15 it is more time consuming to converge a larger group and arriving at consensus. He noted that by breaking into smaller work groups or Subcommittees it was easier to arrive at meaningful objectives which could be brought to the larger group with an explanation of the decision making process and the options considered, which simplifies decision making for the larger group. He added that this was the process used in developing the Statewide Strategic Cybersecurity Plan and the Report, as well as selection of some of the services being extended. He commented that he would prefer a "breakdown structure", to work on smaller portions and make that available to the larger group for final decisions, in order to gain some efficiencies. He offered for others to comment who had participated in the groups he mentioned.

Mr. Johnson asked how many members could this Subcommittee have?

Ms. Gutierrez stated for the new Subcommittee it would be a total of six members.

Mr. Johnson asked if Dr. Liebrock and Mr. Benavidez could sit on both Subcommittees?

Ms. Gutierrez stated they could serve on both. She then shared information from the Cybersecurity Planning Committee meeting pertaining to the creation of the Procurement Subcommittee and its mission/function. She noted that this recommendation before the Advisory Committee came about because two of the members on the existing Engagement

Subcommittee would like to participate in the FI-3 committee to develop policies and they are unsure if they have the time to participate on another committee or subcommittee, to accomplish this. The members she is referring to are Dr. Liebrock and Mr. Benavidez. She noted that option 2 would work best to allow individuals more flexibility, but they could still participate if there were additional volunteers to make up a new Subcommittee.

Mr. Johnson asked how the OMA would affect the frequency of meetings if the whole Committee participated.

Mr. Baran stated if a Subcommittee is established and the number of members participating on that Subcommittee is fewer than the amount needed to constitute a quorum of the full Committee, which he believed currently is six, so six or fewer, this Subcommittee could meet at will and not be subject to OMA. These meetings could be open to the public, or not, they could be noticed, or not. This is the reason that many committees subject to OMA form subcommittees, so they can do the work that requires nimbleness outside of the OMA restrictions.

Dr. Liebrock restated, for clarification, if the entire Advisory Committee is having these discussions these would be subject to the OMA, and would require the advance notice, etc.

Mr. Baran confirmed this.

Mr. Johnson asked for further clarification about the flexibility of the two options.

Mr. Baran stated that as long as the number of participants in a "conversation" does not exceed the number that would constitute a quorum of one of the other Committees, they can meet when they want and not have to comply with OMA. However, when there is a collection of individuals participating in a conversation that would constitute a quorum for one Committee or the other everything would be subject to OMA. He gave the example of seven members of the Advisory Committee attending an Engagement Subcommittee meeting, that Subcommittee meeting would then be subject to OMA.

Mr. Johnson asked if there is expressed interest of the members of this Committee who would be like to be part of a Subcommittee. If that is so then option 1 would be a viable option. However, if everyone is too busy then option 2 may be best, and option 2 could also keep the scope wider.

Secretary Sambandam commented that engagement takes a lot of time, communicating with counties, municipalities, educational institutions, tribal entities, or any other new sectors identified. He added that one of the goals of SLCGP is to have a statewide SOC, which can only be accomplished when all these sectors/groupings are provided the necessary telemetry to a single source to react to in order to provide the support of a SOC function. This has been accomplished on the Executive side, but this is still to be decided for the larger group. He stated that having the larger pool of resources available to do some of this work and having a number of volunteers from both sides looks more appealing to him, providing a common resource pool between the Advisory Committee and the Planning Committee. He shared his concern about overworking Committee members.

Mr. Johnson thanked Secretary Sambandam for this input.

Secretary Sambandam asked if there were any further comments, questions or suggestion.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Baran if a meeting is convened to discuss policy using option 2, which would engage all of the Advisory Committee members, would this meeting go into closed session to allow those conversations?

Mr. Baran replied that if a regular meeting or a special meeting of this Committee is called for collaboration with the Engagement Subcommittee, the meeting could only be closed if it fell within the cybersecurity sensitive information exception. The default would be that it is an open meeting, subject to an exception for cybersecurity sensitive information.

Mr. Johnson stated he was not sure that would be an issue but wanted to be clear on this in advance, related to policy discussions.

Dr. Liebrock commented that this would only be a concern if a subject is discussed prioritizing things based on what specific participants have identified in their organizations.

Mr. Baran stated it could be broader than that, if there is a resource allocation, the fact that funds are going to solution "A" or entity "A" and not solution "B" or entity "B", suggests that there is a weakness in option speak.

Mr. Abeyta stated this was also a concern of his with respect to policies concerning IRPs or looking at their information or safety structure detail, etc., which could expose a vulnerability.

Mr. Baran noted he would like to offer a third option. He stated that there were a lot of benefits to the subcommittee structure; the lack of needing to comply with OMA and the freedom that comes with that. He explained that there is nothing to prevent this Committee from designating some members to begin the collaborative process and if the process evolves to a point where it is clear an official Subcommittee is needed, that could then be established.

Mr. Johnson asked what the frequency of these discussions would be, is there a timeline? He asked Mr. Comeau for his input regarding this with respect to meeting the deadlines for the next wave.

Mr. Comeau asked if Mr. Johnson is referring to year two?

Mr. Johnson confirmed this, and that his question pertained to establishing policy and project selection, etc.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if she could share some additional information at this point and Mr. Comeau agreed for her to do so. Ms. Gutierrez shared that she is unsure how often this Subcommittee would need to meet to get this work accomplished. She added that there are some other areas in which guidance is needed and priorities established. She explained that the Procurement Subcommittee is developing scopes of work for projects identified for the first year of funding. These scopes of work cannot move forward until the Advisory Committee has put some of those priorities in place. She gave an example where a project might involve the development of training and there would need to be a policy related to training before the Procurement Subcommittee could move that project forward. In order to develop these scopes of work there need to be priorities established. She added that this therefore needs to move rather quickly, perhaps not with a formal document, but establishing priorities needs to be

addressed with this first year of funding. She yielded then to Mr. Comeau.

Mr. Comeau thanked Ms. Gutierrez for this explanation. He screen shared and reviewed slides showing the Periods of Performance specified in the NOFO along with the reporting milestones. He noted that each year's funding has a two year time frame for expenditure, with a four-year Period of Performance for every grant year, which gives a great deal of flexibility.

Mr. Johnson stated he understands and appreciates the extension of the funding, however, there is the need to impact the state security posture as quickly as possible.

Mr. Comeau agreed with Mr. Johnson's assessment. He added that CISA and FEMA do allow a staggered approach, and described this process.

Secretary Sambandam thanked Mr. Comeau and Mr. Johnson for their comments. He expressed his hope that the Committee could make a decision and select a process. He asked Mr. Baran about the third option he mentioned.

Mr. Baran explained that the third option would be to simply go with option 2, which is the collaboration without establishing a separate Subcommittee, then re-evaluate how this is working over the next couple of months and if there is an indication that having a formal Subcommittee would facilitate some function of this Committee, then that Subcommittee could be established at that time. He noted that this interim process would not prevent implementing option 1 at a later time.

Mr. Johnson moved that the Committee adopt option 2, as presented to get things going, and then if it is later determined that a Subcommittee is needed that can be done.

Secretary Sambandam asked if Mr. Johnson was referring to option 3.

Mr. Johnson replied that it if he understood Mr. Baran, the Committee would start with option 2 and in the process, at any point in time the Committee could pivot to option 1. He asked if he had stated this correctly.

Mr. Baran confirmed, this is correct.

MOTION: Mr. Johnson moved to adopt option 2, to begin the process and begin to work with the Planning Committee's Engagement Subcommittee, as needed, as a whole body, and if the need arises then pivot to forming a Subcommittee. Mr. Abeyta and Ms. Gilliam seconded this motion. Mr. Abeyta offered comment regarding his reasoning for support of the motion.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if there was any further discussion of the motion. There was none.

Ms. Gutierrez asked if there was any opposition to the motion. There was none.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that hearing and seeing no opposition the group will work with the Engagement Subcommittee of the Planning Committee under option 2 to develop and prioritize these policies.

Mr. Baran suggested establishing the membership of this working group to avoid the risk of having too many Committee members participating and running the risk of establishing a

quorum.

Ms. Gutierrez stated this was to be her next item, to ask for volunteers.

Dr. Liebrock noted that she and Mr. Benavidez would seem to be default members as they are already members of the Engagement Subcommittee.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that Dr. Liebrock is correct, so that would place a limit of four additional members from this Committee.

Secretary Sambandam asked for clarification, that there would be four more volunteers needed.

Ms. Gutierrez confirmed. She stated that there is no requirement to have four, this is just the maximum there can be.

Mr. Johnson asked Ms. Gutierrez to screen share the list of the Committee members and the areas they represent. He commented that there should be a good cross-section of representation in this working group.

Secretary Sambandam agreed that this is a good point. He asked if there were any additional volunteers. He recognized Mr. Robert del Plain, IT Director for the City of Las Cruces.

Mr. del Plain volunteered to serve on the working group, even though he is not a member of the Advisory Committee.

Secretary Sambandam thanked Mr. del Plain for volunteering and will check into whether this would be appropriate and let Mr. del Plain know.

Mr. Abeyta stated he is unsure about volunteering as Mr. Benavidez already represents the counties.

Mr. Johnson encouraged Mr. Abeyta to volunteer and if the need arises to make room for a representative from a different entity that could be addressed later.

Mr. Abeyta volunteered.

Mr. Tafoya shared a message from the Secretary that they are working on a recommendation from the tribal sector.

Secretary Sambandam thanked Mr. Tafoya for that update, noting that there are some items coming up on the calendar, such as updating the Report, year two, year three NOFO, etc.

Mr. Johnson also volunteered.

Secretary Sambandam asked for confirmation that this makes three volunteers with one to be confirmed.

Ms. Gutierrez stated there is no minimum requirement just a maximum, so if there are no other volunteers this will be sufficient, currently with four members representing the Advisory

Committee.

Secretary Sambandam asked if Mr. del Plain could still be considered.

Ms. Gutierrez confirmed this.

Mr. Johnson added this will get things moving and others could be considered later.

Secretary Sambandam thanked Mr. Johnson for his comment. He then asked Ms. Gutierrez to proceed.

Ms. Gutierrez asked Mr. Baran if this working group membership should be confirmed by vote of the Committee.

Mr. Baran stated that yes, a motion is needed to appoint these members to collaborate with the Engagement Subcommittee of the Planning Committee and the general scope of the topics they can engage in.

MOTION: Dr. Liebrock moved to address the policy development and the prioritization, seconded by Mr. Johnson. There being no further discussion and no opposition. The motion was adopted.

10. **Public Comment:**
Secretary Sambandam asked if there was any public comment. There was none.

11. **ADJOURNMENT:**
MOTION: Mr. Johnson moved to adjourn seconded by Mr. Abeyta and Dr. Liebrock. There being no opposition and no further business before the Committee the meeting was adjourned at 3:43 p.m.

DocuSigned by:

437214FBE82C453...

Raja Sambandam, Committee Chair, State CISO