

CYBERSECURITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Hybrid Meeting

Thursday, May 2, 2024, 2:00 PM

In-Person at the New Mexico Gaming Control Board
4900 Alameda Blvd. NE, Albuquerque, NM 87113

1. WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Renee Narvaiz called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting. She reviewed general procedures for the meeting including various functions within the Zoom platform.

2. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Raja Sambandam
Jason Johnson
Robert Benavidez
Kenneth Abeyta
Todd Ulises

Logan Fernandez for Cassandra Hayne
Seth Morris for Raul Burciaga
Josett Monette for James Mountain
Phil Zamora for Sarita Nair

OTHERS PRESENT

Renee Narvaiz, DoIT, PIO
Melissa Gutierrez, Cybersecurity Project Mgr.
Todd Baran, DoIT General Counsel
Will Campos (Deloitte), Todd Glanzer (Deloitte), Rick Comeau (Deloitte), Joshua Yadao, Bryan Brock, Flori Martinez, Jacqueline Lovato, Dans DoIT, Cassandra Lynn Brown

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: Ms. Narvaiz called for a motion to approve the Agenda as presented. Mr. Johnson so moved, seconded by Mr. Benavidez. There being no opposition, the Agenda was approved.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

MOTION: Ms. Narvaiz called for a motion to approve the minutes of the March 7, 2024 meeting. Mr. Ulises so moved, seconded by Mr. Benavidez. There being no opposition the minutes were approved.

5. Updates from the State Chief Information Security Officer – Raja Sambandam

Chair Sambandam referenced the recent Executive Order from the Governor, which was a stop-gap related to the situation regarding the legislative bill, with the primary concern being definition of the standards, which the Executive Order has now defined as NIST 800-53 moderate nothing below moderate, which is the latest update, including the CSF2.0, etc. He was also glad to see that the policy has been updated to meet the NIST standards, which reflects the work being done, in partnership with the federal government, to bring their own policies and compliance efforts in alignment with the NIST, even -53, or the NIST standards. The intention is to follow those standards either for the NIST framework or for the cybersecurity rural IT standards in terms of 5.0, or whatever the latest version is, along with recommendations for AI and things of that nature. The process has not yet been defined but there is active work ongoing toward what the process will look like for the Executive Branch agency and he will make this available for this Committee as well, as it will be more of an assessment of risk and then the agencies are expected to be in compliance.

He noted that he is still working toward getting an understanding of what updates to the laws can be expected in the next legislative session, to bring the laws into alignment with the NOFO and the adjustments necessary to achieve this. This process has not yet begun, but he will keep this Committee updated as this develops.

He offered caution with regard to AI, urging those moving in this direction to have good data governance, policies, principles and procedures, as well as classification in order to manage the process tightly to prevent sensitive information from getting out in the open.

He added that any transcribing or notetaking services should be appropriately controlled, as it may be unknown who authorizes these tools to access meetings, record them, transcribe them and store them in some location that the department does not have access to. He also described other issues with AI, such as joining a meeting unexpectedly or even initiating a meeting automatically, ahead of the scheduled time.

Mr. Johnson added that there are so many notetaking bots, with even browser plug-ins which facilitate this, it would be impossible to block them all. He noted that the State of Arizona has issued bulletins to their user-base advising them not to install these or utilize these, as this opens the possibility of a public record nightmare in terms of trying to track and maintain these files. Ultimately the best approach is to educate users as to why they should not use these.

Chair Sambandam commented to Ms. Gutierrez that he had received a communication from someone stating they could not find the calendar invite or meeting notice for the March 7th meeting. He asked if the frequency of the meetings could be posted so interested parties will know what to expect. Ms. Gutierrez replied that this Committee meets every other month and she will make sure the information is updated on the website.

6. State and Local Cybersecurity Grant Program (“SLCGP”) Update - Deloitte

Mr. Will Campos screenshared slides related to the Executive Summary and Modified Application Timeline. He gave details of the two different applications paths; one being for entities to apply for cybersecurity services to be provided by the state and the other path would allow entities to receive direct funding to implement these projects on their own. Originally these applications were to have been closed on April 30th, but the application for state provided services has been extended to May 14th, due to some dates that became evident after approval of the FEMA application, which means that the application period has closed for those opting out of state services. Over the next week the Planning Committee will be reviewing those applications with the first meeting scheduled immediately following this meeting. In the event an application for opting out of state provided services is rejected, the extension of the deadline for the application for state provided services to May 14th will give those entities the opportunity to then submit an application for state provided services.

He stated that notice has been received from DHSEM that the application from the state was approved, which began the 45 day pass-through requirement, and reviewed the details of this requirement, noting that this certification window will close on June 3rd and the State has until June 13th to notify FEMA that the it has met the certification pass-through requirement and is ready to move forward.

He added that 21 total applications have been received. He also gave details related to the rural pass-through requirement, which states that 25% of the total grant funds must go to rural entities with 80% of total funding going to local entities. Based on the applications received so far and the demographics available these thresholds have been exceeded with 67% on the rural pass-through and 90% for local entities. He also reported that 90% of applications received so far have opted in for state provided services, with only two applicants opting out, with those being reviewed by the Planning Committee, as previously noted.

He further reviewed slides demonstrating what projects have been applied for, such as vulnerability and attack surface management, risk assessment and cybersecurity training, as well as the different entity types of the applicants.

Further updates will be given following the decision by the Planning Committee with respect to the applications desiring to opt out of state services, as well as the final number of applications received by the application closure on May 14th.

Mr. Johnson had a question about the two entities seeking to opt out, if they are seeking outside funding. Mr. Campos confirmed that these two have stated they will be seeking direct funding. Mr. Campos restated that 90% of the applications opted in for the state provided application path.

Mr. Johnson asked what the timeline will be for applicants to begin receiving services; what the process will be. Mr. Campos stated that as far he knows Deloitte has not started tracking a timeline for delivery of services. Hopefully that will be developing in the upcoming Planning Committee meetings.

Mr. Glanzer added that the applications from the two entities who have chosen to opt out are for services that are available in the state-funded services, so after the application review and coordination there could be a path that will suggest that they will still be able to get the services through the state-provided pathway. With respect to the timeline of when services would be available he referred back to the June 13th certification window and the mechanics of that.

Mr. Ulses stated that his understanding is that the full package of state provided services has not been finalized yet, and asked for clarification of this.

Ms. Gutierrez stated that there are two parts of the answer to Mr. Ulses questions. The definition of the services to be provided has been established. The second part, which involves who will be providing these services, such as possible vendors, has not yet been determined.

Mr. Johnson clarified that his question pertained to when applicants could begin utilizing services, which now is obviously after the date when funding becomes available.

Ms. Gutierrez responded that conversations are in progress with established vendors in preparation for this.

Chair Sambandam asked if this was for Year One.

Mr. Gutierrez stated that this is correct. However, there is a matrix on other items which will go before the Planning Committee to discuss projects for Year Two funding and the first round of applications and first round of projects is just for Year One funding.

Mr. Comeau stated that the funding for first year projects is about \$1.8 million with Year Two being twice as much. He added that in meetings with the Engagement Subcommittee it had been agreed to close down this first grant application process and get things in motion for the Year One projects and then issue the interest form for Year Two projects, to avoid confusion.

Chair Sambandam added that the statewide pricing agreements for IT professional services have just recently been completed, and the number of participants in this has increased, which also plays a role, and these contracts can also be leveraged. He added that previously there had been approximately 40-50 vendors and at this time there are 106 vendors in various categories.

7. Public Comment

Mr. Ulses noted that at the upcoming meeting of the New Mexico Counties the IT affiliate has a potential opportunity to ask the Association of Counties to endorse legislation. He asked to be informed if there is any anticipated IT legislation for the 2025 legislative session so he might pass this along. This meeting is scheduled for June, so he would need information prior to that in order to present at this meeting.

Chair Sambandam asked for clarification if this is for the 60 day session in January 2025.


Mr. Ulses confirmed this.

Chair Sambandam assured Mr. Ulses that he would be informed if anything comes up in this regard.

Chair Sambandam asked anyone using Drop Box to catch up on the current issues, as the media is reporting that some components of this platform have been compromised. He did not have details regarding this and will be catching up on this himself, and that it is possibly their E-signature process which was compromised. He noted that some other states are investigating this as they use Drop Box to send and receive data to the federal government. He encouraged everyone to take a close look at whatever platforms they are using. Mr. Ulses had questions concerning this and Chair Sambandam stated he was not sure of the details yet himself.

8. Adjournment:

MOTION: Ms. Gutierrez entertained a motion to adjourn. Mr. Johnson so moved, seconded by Mr. Ulses. There being no opposition and no further business before the Committee the meeting was adjourned at 2:36 p.m.

DocuSigned by:

437214FBE82C453...

Raja Sambandam, Committee Chair, State CISO