

## CYBERSECURITY PLANNING COMMITTEE

Virtual Meeting  
Friday February 3, 2023 at 3:00 p.m.

### MINUTES

#### 1. Welcome & Call to Order

Ms. Narvaiz called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm and welcomed everyone to the meeting. Ms. Narvaiz called the roll and announced a quorum was present for conducting business by voicing those she did not see present.

#### 2. Roll Call –

##### Members Present:

Peter Mantos  
Willian Campos  
Raja Sambandam  
Dr Srinivas Mukkamala [later by phone]  
William A. York  
Carlos S. Lobato  
Cassandra Hayne  
Robert (Bobby) L. Benavidez  
Michael Good  
William (Tim) Pressley  
Nathan C. Brown

##### Members Absent

Sen. Michael Padilla  
Tracy Lopez  
Dr. Bradley K. Purdy  
General Miguel Aguilar

##### Others Present

Renee Narvais, DOIT  
Melissa Gutierrez, DOIT  
Todd Glanzer - Deloitte  
Bradley Crowe  
Caleb Raymer, NM EMNRD  
Vinod Brahma PURAM  
Thomas Flores  
Joshua Yadao  
Jeff Albright

#### 3. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Pressley moved, seconded by Mr. Sambandam, to approve the agenda as published. The motion was approved without objection.

#### 4. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Mr. Sambandam moved, seconded by Ms. Hayne, to approve the January 20, 2023 minutes as presented. The motion was approved without objection.

## **5. Subcommittee Reports**

### **a. Plan Subcommittee – Carlos Lobato**

Mr. Lobato reported the Plan Subcommittee has not met since the last Committee meeting. They will meet next Monday. He said the subcommittee had requested an agenda item that will be presented by Nathan Brown later on.

### **b. Engagement Subcommittee – Robert L. Benavidez**

Mr. Benavidez reported the Engagement Subcommittee met last Friday. They are moving forward with their standardized engagement contact list which has natured quite well over the last few weeks. They have potentially 330 contacts from ten different constituencies. Their next meeting will be next Friday morning and the agenda will focus on Trio Office from DoIT and work on the first communication and each survey they wish to send to all of the focus groups across local, tribal, and schools.

## **6. Update on IJA Grant Award and Next Steps**

Chair Mantos asked Raja Sambandam and Todd Glanzer to present an update on the IJA Grant Award.

Mr. Glanzer presented first. The award was presented to the State of New Mexico. The acceptance processes are in place and the back-end piece of working through what was provided to DHS as part of our package. In the package were the inputs into the survey, capabilities that exist as one required element of the plan. They put together an initial zero-dot survey based on the Committee's approved approach to use the Cybersecurity Framework guidance and the Performance Goals. They will then review that. Mr. Lobato spoke about the need to review those as part of the Subcommittee meeting next Monday and going through that process. The survey questions will be consolidated as part of the Engagement Subcommittee's update on other surveys to reduce the number of times people will be surveyed.

### **a. Survey – Content, design, and distribution plan.**

Mr. Sambandam reported that on Monday, the first of the required reports to Homeland Security, CISO, and FEMA. They have not used any of the money allocated to us. Thanks to Melissa, that was taken care of.

He now has a better understanding of the Legislative efforts and know we have 106 municipalities. He was still waiting for directions on the first phase, once the go ahead is

received from the Governor's Office and use that as leverage in notifications that are sent out to the target audiences – the 19 pueblos, the 31 higher education institutions, the 189 school districts, the 33 counties and now, 106 municipalities. Those are what we know today. We will begin reaching out to them.

Mr. Pressley asked him what was to be gained from the surveys.

Mr. Sambandam said they wanted first to know what protections they have in place for cybersecurity now, such as multi-factor access.

Mr. Pressley understood. His experience was that they were lucky if they got a 30% response. The responses can be unreliable and the only information received is on what was asked. They might be embarrassed by how little protection they have and will claim more.

Mr. Sambandam hoped for one hundred responses from the 300 contacts.

Mr. Pressley thought a better way to do it would be to actually talk to the people. They would gain a much better understanding of the work to be done.

Mr. Benavidez agreed meeting in person would be better but pointed out that it would require more people to volunteer to help with that approach.

Mr. Pressley said he would be glad to bring it to the Engagement Subcommittee.

Mr. Sambandam said they would meet in-person with the various groups in person which would require fewer people in the effort. Then they would send the survey out and have another meeting session or do other follow-up.

Chair Mantos agreed with that but was not sure we have the capability to accomplish it.

He also noted that some surveys were biased. It requires experts to take the bias out with open-ended questions. And the answers are self-selecting. But it would provide a starting point.

Mr. Sambandam pointed out that we have a defined objective – to meet the NOFO requirements. We don't want to deviate from that and don't have much time to get it done. He believed having a one-page survey would increase the response rate.

Chair Mantos urged the members to take advantage of all opportunities.

**b. Press release – Outline, responsibility, and distribution.**

Chair Mantos said press releases are needed so that people know we are moving.

Mr. Sambandam agreed and said he initiated that. As soon as got the green light, he would work with Renee to get it going.

Ms. Narvais added that she reached out to the Governor’s office to ask if they wanted to take part in it or take the lead on it. She noted that a change in personnel there might mean it will not be addressed as quickly.

**7. Legislative Update – Todd Baran**

**a. Senate Bill 269 – DoIT Act Changes**

Mr. Baran said SB 269 has sponsors and the bill has been filed. He spent the last few days working with State CIOs to improve it and make it work better for management of the IT functions for the State of New Mexico.

**b. Senate Bill 280 – Cybersecurity Act**

For SB 280, which would create a Cyber security Advisory Committee, and a Cybersecurity Office administratively attached to DoIT. He has also been working with the CIOs to improve on that and the draft is 95% complete now. He will converse with the sponsors about the changes and hope to see committee substitutes incorporating all the changes agreed upon.

The Cybersecurity Office would basically transfer with functions now performed by Raja over to that office. And the Cybersecurity Advisory Committee would take the place of this committee after that Committee completes the initial planning work.

**c. House Bill 232 – Disclosure of Certain Information**

HB 232 is the IPRA Cybersecurity Exemption Bill. It will allow all public entities to withhold any information request that would potentially disclose any vulnerabilities in an IT system or critical infrastructure system. In the DoIT rewrite it defines IT broadly. So it would be expansive protections for people dealing with cybersecurity information. He believed there was a lot of support for that Bill.

Mr. Sambandam recalled last time at the Committee meeting, there was a question whether this would apply to all statewide entities. The answer was “yes.” That Bill will provide the necessary protections for not disclosing sensitive information. It may have

other provisions in addition to IPRA.

Mr. Baran agreed but he didn't have enough information to share that one.

Chair Mantos said he met with the Governor this morning and agreed that is the case. There will be new sponsors and they would like this Bill to go early because their bill include the protections for cybersecurity issues in addition to other circumstances where such protections are needed, like children in abusive homes.

## **8. Roles and Responsibilities of State and Local Governments - Nathan**

Mr. Brown said this is an initiative to nail done roles and responsibilities for the Committee. Some of it has been taken on by SB 280. He shared his screen for the Committee. He developed three notional models that the State would follow. It would be a hybrid approach to SB 280 which develops an office and advisory committee. NOFO also requires that input is received from the local entities who would follow these roles and responsibilities. It is an opportunity for state and local entities to give feedback on what they think is appropriate for the cybersecurity plan.

The roles and responsibilities plan would not create any authorities or any direction over any entity. It is just to guide and hopefully include best practices. Those rules and responsibilities would have to be tied to the CESA template provided. He mentioned some examples.

He briefly described each of the three models and the differences in management. It appeared that SB280 would follow a hybrid model of management.

He asked for discussion on it.

Chair Mantos said we have a model in the Broadband efforts. The Connect New Mexico Council, however, is not just advisory. They have been slower in developing because they were forced to do rulemaking with public comment, etc. By making the Cybersecurity Advisory Council truly advisory, would eliminate that extra process.

Mr. Lobato noted one milestone due by end of the month was on rules and responsibilities. And now we have a bill to address it. He felt the hybrid model would be best and rely on help from Deloitte. So we can continue to check that milestone since we have that direction.

Chair Mantos agreed and saw the interest in the chat. He suggested thinking about this and see how the legislation develops.

Mr. Sambandam pointed out that the budget for this is quite small, so he favored Model 3 (local management) as the best model.

Mr. Brown agreed. We only have four years of funding so we need to have our entities use the funds for cybersecurity.

Ms. Hayne suggested including that as a survey question.

Chair Mantos thought it would be difficult to explain it in a survey.

## **9. Public Comment**

Ms. Hayne asked regarding HB 232, the Governor's intent to redesign a bill with additional changes. She asked who the sponsors might be.

Chair Mantos did not know but thought they might be the same sponsors and the Governor's Office would approach them to urge them to "use that."

Ms. Hayne said the Judiciary has also introduced a bill with suggested changes to IPRA and additional exclusions around security in the Court Conference. She felt it would make sense to coordinate those future changes. The sponsors are Nybert and Wirth. She agreed to push that through their legislative coordinator.

Mr. Crowe, knowing that in-person contacting would take a lot of person-power, offered to help in recruiting help to make it work.

## **10. Next Agenda Topics**

### **a. Challenges from others, e.g. K-12 phishing scams, Security Plus**

Chair Mantos noted this item has been carried for several meetings and asked what the Committee would like to do with it – legislative updates, any changes to the grant, etc. He asked if there were other things to discuss.

Dr. Liebrock mentioned that the K-12 course has been introduced in HB 256.

Chair Mantos asked Melissa to capture that. She agreed.

Mr. Sambandam said he would follow up on it too.

Dr. Liebrock announced the 2023 World Economic Forum warning of the global catastrophic cyber event is imminent within the next few years. It is critical that we are

doing this work and by 2025, cybercrime is expected to be a \$10.5 trillion industry impact coming after us. They are treating it as a huge crime syndicate.

**11. Adjournment**

Upon motion by Mr. Sambandam and second by Dr. Liebrock and second by Mr. Sambandam, the meeting was adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

DocuSigned by:  
*Peter Mantos*  
BA22C09B847E4DC  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Peter Mantos, Chair

3/17/2023  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date