

**CYBERSECURITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND  
CYBERSECURITY PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Hybrid Meeting  
Wednesday, September 27, 2023, 2:00 PM**

**1. WELCOME and Call to Order**

Ms. Narvaiz called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm and welcomed everyone to the meeting. She reviewed general procedures for the Zoom meeting.

**2. Roll Call**

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

Raja Sambandam, Chair	Kenneth Abeyta
Logan Fernandez for Cassandra Hayne	Suzanne Begay
Robert Benavidez	Danielle Gilliam for James Kenny
Jason Johnson	Todd Ulses
Carnley Gauna for James Mountain	Mark Gullen for Raul Burciaga
Cecilia Mavrommantis for Wayne Propst	

**Members Absent**

Clinton Nicely  
Josh Rubin  
Sarita Nair

**PLANNING COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT**

Peter Mantos, Chair	Logan Fernandez for Cassandra Hayne
Raja Sambandam	Tracy Lopez
Bradley K. Purdy	William (Tim) Presley
Robert Benavidez	Senator Michael Padilla
Bill A. York	

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Nathan C. Brown	Brig. General Miguel Aguilar
Carlos Lobato	Dr. Srinivas Mukkamala
Michael W. Good	Dr. Lorie Liebrock

**Others Present**

Renee Narvaiz, DoIT, PIO  
Melissa Gutierrez, DoIT, Office of Cybersecurity Support Staff  
Todd Baran, State Atty. Gen. Staff  
Dan Garcia (DoIT), Joshua Yadao (DoIT), Todd Glanzer (Deloitte), Rick Comeau (Deloitte), Jeff Roth, Jacqueline Lovato, Flori Martinez, Blain Moffat, Brigette Buynak

**3. Approval of Agenda**

Ms. Narvaiz called for a motion to approve the Agenda.

**MOTION**

A motion was made by Mr. Johnson and seconded by Ms Lopez to approve the agenda as presented.  
There being no opposition, the motion passed.

**4. History of the Cybersecurity Planning Committee – Peter Mantos**

Welcomed all attendees to today’s meeting.

Gave a brief history of the Cybersecurity Planning Committee. This committee was formed by the Governor, by Executive Order, to take advantage of the offer from the federal government for cybersecurity funds and guidance. In the meantime, the President of the United States has endorsed a Cyber Plan for the entire nation. The Cybersecurity Planning Committee was charged with developing a very high-level plan to address cybersecurity at what is referred to as the “whole of state level”. This does not apply only to state government, but also includes other entities, such as local governments, counties, tribes, schools, the judiciary, etc. The Committee was able to compose and submit a plan, with help, as will be explained later. Much of the work on this plan has been done by the Subcommittees of the Planning Committee, as well as Deloitte, the contractor engaged in this work. He noted the significant contribution of Raja Sambandam to the security posture of state government as well as many other entities.

Mr. Mantos described the subsequent development of the Cybersecurity Advisory Committee and the new Office of Cybersecurity, due to the efforts of Senator Padilla, Representative Sarinana, Governor Lujan-Grisham, Mr. Sambandam and others, for the purpose of securing the “whole of state” from a cybersecurity perspective.

**5. Cybersecurity Planning Subcommittee Summary Updates**

Mr. Mantos asked Mr. Benavidez, the Chair of the Cybersecurity Planning Committee Engagement Subcommittee, to give some history of the work of this Subcommittee.

Benavidez – Engagement Subcommittee partnered with Deloitte and the Planning Subcommittee in the early stages to compile a set of contacts across the different stakeholder groups; state government, municipalities, counties, tribes, schools, etc. In this partnership an initial survey was developed to gather key contact information for each agency. The Engagement Subcommittee, Planning Subcommittee and Deloitte then worked to refine a Capabilities Assessment which was sent out to the respondents of the Initial Survey, and partnered with those respondents to foster further participation in the Capabilities Assessment to bring input from a larger stakeholder group into the development of the Plan as it moved forward; assessing needs, where organizations assessed themselves to be, etc., which would allow prioritization of steps within the Plan.

Mantos – Thanked Mr. Benavidez for his comments. In the absence of Mr. Lobato, Chair of the Plan Subcommittee, as well as Dr. Lorie Liebrock, who also served on this Subcommittee, Mr. Mantos as if Mr. Benavidez would like to speak to the work of the Planning Subcommittee, as Mr. Benavidez attended most if not all of that Subcommittee’s meetings.

Benavidez – Noted Mr. Sambandam had his hand raised in the Zoom meeting and deferred to him.

Sambandam – Suggested since Deloitte was involved in this process, and they are independent, he would like to them to address the planning process.

**6. New Mexico Cybersecurity Plan Overview – Todd Glanzer/Deloitte**

Mr. Glanzer gave a description of the Plan, how it was organized and the impact of these two Subcommittees as this Plan was developed.

Mr. Glanzer screen-shared and reviewed a presentation regarding the grant program and the Plan development, which was the major effort of the Planning Committee, as previously described. He noted that the State and Local Cybersecurity Grant Program (SLCGP) is a program initiated by the federal government, which came with a list of federal guidance and formatting which were required. He then gave a fairly detailed review of those requirements as well as a reminder that the Grant Program itself is a four year program and that the submitted and approved Cybersecurity Plan would be improved upon throughout the four years of the program.

He also described the development of the Initial Survey and the Capabilities Assessment through the work of the Plan and Engagement Subcommittees in conjunction with Deloitte, noting that there were 130 data points collected to complete the Assessment, which will continue to be expanded as things develop further.

He reviewed how the Planning Subcommittee mapped the 16 federally required elements to the four goals articulated in the State plan and how this will help prioritize the focus of available resources as well as informing the continuing process and evaluation of the statewide cybersecurity plan and other initiatives undertaken by the state.

He then reviewed the timeline of this process which has been ongoing for approximately a year now, including the initial submission of the draft plan to DHS, along with the other milestones within the Four-Year Program.

Johnson – When does the clock start ticking on the Four-Year Program?

Glanzer – This is Year One of the Four-Year Program. There are funds allocated in each of the four years for the States, however, it is not single-year funding. Funding allocated in Year One for New Mexico is a little over \$2 million and that funding can now, with the approval of the Plan, be reprogrammed to be expended over the next part of the program. Year-Two of the program comes with additional funding and an additional state match and those funds will be potentially distributed in the coming year and will also have the duration of the remaining three years of the program. This is a bit of a rolling execution but this is roughly a \$13 million overall program for the state with various matching included either in terms of hard dollars or associated soft, to show the level of effort to meet the match.

Johnson – Thanked Mr. Glanzer for this explanation. Is good that the funds roll so they do not expire, but by what date do they have to be expended by, just to make good use of the funding.

Glanzer – With a federal grant program there is oversight, tracking of expenditures and recording of meeting all those requirement within the program itself, very similar to a Homeland Security Grant Program.

Mantos – Thanked Mr. Glanzer. Recognized Ms. Lopez

Lopez – Is there any penalty for not spending funds? Or is it just lost?

Glanzer – Not aware of any penalty.

Mantos – Asked Mr. Sambandam to speak toward the strategy of not funding hundreds of schools directly or 32 counties or hundreds of municipalities, etc., that services will be provided

and all funds will be spent wisely.

Sambandam – Expressed thanks to participants of both committees for their valuable contributions to get to this point. Noted that Ms. Gutierrez, the project manager on the cyber team, had determined, based on preliminary assessment, a little over 440 hours have been invested toward this Plan, just in terms of meeting times. He stated that this is a significant investment from the IT/Cyber leaders in this gathering alone, toward a true State of New Mexico “whole of state” cybersecurity plan.

Asked Mr. Mantos to pose his question again for clarity.

Mantos – Please speak to the fact that \$13 million really does not go very far, and noted that the biggest benefit out of this was formalizing the structure and the Plan. Asked Mr. Sambandam to explain the strategy of providing services rather than funding.

Sambandam – Mr. Mantos is correct. The state will be receiving approximately \$13 million, just a little less than that, and an exact number is still not available as the program progresses year after year and over the four-year period this is not equally divided; 20% for Year One, 40% for Year Two, then 30% and 10%. Asked for clarification of this from Mr. Glanzer.

Glanzer – Yes, this is correct.

Sambandam – Based on all of the areas of investment the Plan, the Capabilities Assessment, etc., have identified, the state of New Mexico needs to provide the appropriate state portion of the investment to continue with this approach, with the necessary state support to substantiate and grow the necessary state match for the federal program to survive the four years and any further years needed to finalize and complete the projects, and he anticipates that it will take another year to complete with Year Four projects, thus extending into Year Five. All participants need to be mindful of this. Strategy number one will be to educate legislative leaders/policy makers and the Executive Branch policy makers that the state funding is part and parcel of this requirement, to make sure the necessary funding is available. Strategy number two: Given the number of entities in the universe, a little over 400; 30 +/- higher education institutions, 32 counties, hundreds of municipalities, 180+ school districts, 75+ agencies, boards and commissions, etc., if this \$13 million were to be distributed directly it would be a very nominal amount to any agency to make effective use of the available amount. So, the Planning Subcommittee agreed that the decision would be to provide services using the State’s procurement mechanism to gain the economies of scale and leverage that to make those cybersecurity related services available to all the participating entities in this universe. This will minimize their procurement processes, will save time and difficulty navigating the procurement processes and significantly reduce the lift-off going through the grant and the associated grant management compliance and financial reporting processes. Taking all of these elements into consideration it was decided the initial approach would be to provide as much as possible in terms of services so every entity in this universe can gain some benefit to improve their cybersecurity posture and improve their cybersecurity hygiene.

Will pause as he sees Senator Padilla has a question.

Mantos – Thanked Senator Padilla for joining the meeting today. Stated the Senator’s contributions to this endeavor were noted earlier in the meeting.

Padilla – Needs to know what the state’s needed investment will be and what that will look like

as soon as possible. He acknowledged that this will extend over a 3-4 year period, but assumes some funding will need to be approved in the 2024 Legislative session.

Sambandam – Minimum state match is 10%. Asked Mr. Glanzer to confirm.

Glanzer – Overall it will be a little more than that; 10% the first year, 20%, 30% then 40%. It does escalate.

Sambandam – Agrees. His intent was to indicate 10% for Year One. The total for this program to sustain and grow will be an amount equal to the federal grant to be able to continue beyond Year Five and Six, which would be \$13 million.

Padilla – Can discuss further offline to get additional documentation. Will this be anywhere in the Administration's Ask?

Sambandam – Will connect with the Senator offline on this particular aspect. This will be either a one-time or special ask in the Executive.

Padilla – Thanked Mr. Sambandam for the response. Acknowledged all the hard work that has gone into this effort. Very honored to create this office. Believes this is moving in the absolute right direction.

Sambandam – Did this answer Mr. Mantos' question?

Mantos – Presented this well and the reasons behind this. This is not a lot of funding and want to be able to utilize as best as possible and services is the way to do this.

## 7. **Potential Next Steps**

Mantos – Questions are: What are the roles of the Advisory Committee and do we need the Cybersecurity Planning Committee, given that it has set the Plan. Opened this up for discussion of potential next steps and invited Mr. Johnson to speak on this subject.

### **a. Cybersecurity Advisory Committee Report – Discussion – Jason Johnson**

Johnson – Appreciated hearing about all the work done toward developing the Plan. Noted the deadline for the report in November and that the Advisory Committee needs to get done right away, which prompted the Advisory Committee to request this meeting to learn what has already been done so they can then discuss how to move forward, integrating the work already done and the elements that have been gathered into this report. Would like to open the discussion up for the members of the Advisory Committee as to how to proceed. Time is of the essence and this needs to be expedited. Need to discuss what should be included in the report. Should be broad enough to ensure all entities have some level of inclusion, but also mindful to not expose areas of weakness, either accidentally or intentionally. Agreed that \$13 million does not go very far when trying to support two million people. What should be in the report to make the case for the best effort when presented to the Legislature and the Governor, including what areas are being addressed, why they are important and why they should continue to fund this.

### **b. Legal Requirements for each Committee – Legislative or MOU Solution? - Todd Baran**

Mantos – Asked Mr. Baran to explain what is required with respect to the ongoing status of the Planning Committee as it relates to the federal requirements and how a transition, if any, might occur.

Baran – The genesis of the Planning Committee was largely driven by the IJJA notice of funding opportunity (NOFO) for the Cybersecurity Grant Program. In this NOFO there was the requirement that a state, in order to qualify for grant funding, would have a Cybersecurity Planning Committee. The NOFO specified that that Planning Committee would have to have certain participants on it. The Governor’s order that stood up the Planning Committee met all terms of the NOFO. The Planning Committee has proceeded to do the work required in the NOFO. When SB280 was proposed the vision was for the work of the Planning Committee to transfer over to the Advisory Committee. As initially drafted the composition of the Advisory Committee would have also met the requirements of the NOFO. During the legislative session the composition of the Advisory Committee changed several times. Significantly, during the process the State CISO was made a non-voting member of the Advisory Committee and there was no designated seat for a position that would be involved in the healthcare community or in the educational community. Once the initial Plan is submitted and approved the question arose can the hand-off be done as contemplated to the Advisory Committee as it is currently constituted. The answer to this is; “We don’t know”. FEMA has not published guidance or directions indicating whether or not the Planning Committee must continue in its previously required form during the ensuing years of the funding opportunity. Since every year there will need to be a new grant application there is a strong possibility that every year the grant application will need to assert that there is a Planning Committee that meets the requirements of the NOFO. If this is the case, and if the state does not have the Planning Committee that is required, there is a potential of losing those future funds and future grants. The discussion then is how to ensure that the state has a Committee that will meet the current and future requirements of the NOFO. There are a couple of ways to do this. One is to simply have the current Planning Committee continue in its current form, but stand down and only conduct meetings and do work as required to meet the funding obligations of the state. The other possibility is to simply change the membership of the Advisory Committee to include the membership required by the current NOFO, which would solve the problem, and then the Planning Committee could dissolve. These are really the only two options. Senator Padilla has indicated to us that he will carry a bill in the next session to change the composition of the Advisory Committee if that is the desire of these two Committees, but this really is a question that should be discussed and decided amongst yourselves as to what is the most efficient way to accomplish the mission of both Committees.

Mantos – Thanked Mr. Baran for this explanation.

Sambandam – Asked Mr. Baran to elaborate on the changes to the requirements with respect to the role of the CISO as the Chair of the Advisory Committee as part of the “bill cleanup”.

Baran – The bill “clean-up” would make the State CISO a voting member of the Advisory Committee, and in order to ensure that some guardrails are in place, the legislation would have to require that the State CISO recuse him or herself from any votes or discussions relating to the employment of the State CISO. Currently the Advisory Committee is responsible for making recommendations as to who to hire and the compensation, as well as any disciplinary matters that might arise regarding the State CISO. Obviously, the State CISO was made a non-voting member to make sure that there was no conflict of interest there, so the new legislation would need to make the State CISO a voting member, but include the guard rails to require recusal. To change the other issues, the Committee would either need to be expanded by two positions, to include educational institutions and healthcare concerns, or seats that are currently appointed by the Governor and allocated to the counties and municipal governments would need to be re-allocated to health and education. Currently the counties have three seats and municipalities have three; one each of those could be moved to education and healthcare if the consensus

would be to not expand the Advisory Committee membership by two more, which would bring the total membership to 17. Asked if this addressed Mr. Sambandam's concern.

Sambandam – Yes. Requested the clarity for all those attending as well as for himself.

Mantos – Mr. Baran has presented the options, which seem reasonable. Had hoped the Planning Committee would be able to stand down at this point but appears they may have to continue until there is some resolution toward making the Advisory Committee acceptable to the federal government as the Planning Committee, described in the NOFO, or to have the Planning Committee continue. Opened discussion to Committee members regarding this. Which way should this go?

Raja – Would like to solicit input and feedback from the municipalities and counties first, then seek input from other segments present.

Mantos – Noted that the legislature is represented today as well as the judiciary. May not be best to try to resolve this today.

Gutierrez – Had a question for Mr. Baran. Does the decision not have to be made today, this is just open for discussion and decisions can be made independently in the respective Committee meetings?

Mantos – Thanked her for this question.

Johnson – There are three members who sit on both Committees and their opinions will matter greatly.

Mantos – His mental model is that the Cybersecurity Planning Committee's work will be complete at some point and they will be able to stand down and pass the roles that they had, or have in the NOFO, to the Advisory Committee. How to do this he is unsure of. Leave the discussion open. Take this to the individual Committees and try to arrive at a joint recommendation to present to the Legislature and the Executive Office.

Sambandam – Yes. Thank you.

Mantos – Would like to give opportunity for additional comments at this point. There were none. Started to continue to next point in the Agenda.

Johnson – Point of order; need to go back to item 7a and have a discussion on what elements to put into the report, which was the main reason for this joint meeting. Asked Mr. Glanzer to screen-share the mandatory requirements for the report once again. Could there be a discussion about what elements should be included.

Sambandam – This was one of the elements they had previously discussed. Had planned to work with Deloitte and bring up a template. Deloitte may have a preliminary draft version of potential elements which should be included, based on what other states have done across the ecosystem. Would like to request this from Deloitte.

Johnson – Agrees with this. Trying to be mindful as there is not much time. Would like to have bulk of the report completed in October for presentation in early November. Lots of other things happening in mid-November, such as LFC hearings, etc. Advisory Committee will be meeting

soon to discuss, so would like to have the input from both Committees today regarding what elements should be addressed.

Sambandam – Whatever the report indicates this should be substantiated with the state funding request as well, to present a holistic story.

Glanzer – Screen-shared the timeline again. Showed some of the language from the bill which mandated the report to the Advisory Committee. In support of this Deloitte has looked at some other state report submissions to their governors or their legislatures, which are similar. He then reviewed the screen share of a proposed high-level table of contents which provides a summary view of a potential State of New Mexico Cybersecurity Report from the Advisory Committee, which would be developed over the coming weeks for submission in compliance with the legislation at the end of November. He also noted that, as discussed previously, the goal is to have the report completed by the end of October so other timelines and engagements can be met. He gave further details of how this report could be developed, drawing on the experience and information gained during the Plan development.

Mantos – Thanked Mr. Glanzer for this overview and explanation. On the approach it seems that there may still be a role for the Cybersecurity Planning Subcommittee to also say that those elements coming out of the Advisory Report make sense and should include a transition, if appropriate, of responsibilities that allow receipt of continued benefits from the NOFO and meeting the federal requirements of a Planning Subcommittee.

Glanzer – Need to take into account the work that has been done and the people involved, to make sure that we include the proper information and the information which has been prioritized over the past year as part of that report.

Mantos – As part of the approach on that report the participants of the Cybersecurity Planning Subcommittee are not directly involved in this, but it seems as though they will be.

Glanzer – Perhaps Mr. Johnson might need to include that outreach from the Subcommittee to do some coordination or information gathering.

Mantos – Concerned that this could potentially go through the Advisory Committee and not comprehend the responsibilities of the Cybersecurity Planning Subcommittee in the future as it pertains to their continued responsibilities with respect to the NOFO.

Johnson – Believes everyone was thinking that the Planning Subcommittee was going to be sunsetted and things would continue over into the Advisory Committee.

Mantos – That's what I thought.

Johnson – Until that is known obviously it makes sense to honor the work done and the knowledge gained, which we thought would be transferred over into the other reports and items already collected and this could be leveraged.

Mantos – Just wants to make sure nothing is missed and that the Planning Committee gets the opportunity to say “that looks good”, etc.

Johnson – Can look at reaching out to see if there are members on the Planning Committee that would like to join the Advisory Committee. Thinks up to two more members could be added.



Gutierrez – You can have two more members of the Advisory Committee join that Subcommittee. Asked Mr. Baran if members from the Planning Committee could join this Subcommittee.

Mr. Baran was not available to answer.

Mantos – Will check with Mr. Baran on this.

Gutierrez – Can have two more members join the Advisory Committee.

Mantos – This may not be necessary. The current three may be enough as long as they understand they are “wearing that hat” as well.

Raja – Suggested identifying in the report the ability of the Committee to internally modify its composition, based on the changes to the NOFO, rather than going through the legislative process to change the composition of the Committee.

Baran – Asked Ms. Gutierrez to restate the question regarding the composition of the Committee.

Gutierrez – Can Planning Committee members join the Report Subcommittee?

Baran – For the Advisory Committee?

Gutierrez – Yes.

Baran – Yes. They would be invited as advisory members, as long as they did not constitute a quorum of their own Committee, up to that number could join.

Johnson – Would like to get confirmation from the Committee members regarding the format for the report as shared by Mr. Glanzer, as far as the outline for the report. Is there consensus on that? Are there any objections to that?

Mantos – Believes there is consensus. Any comments?

Raja – Believes this is a good starting point. If there are any recommendations that come up in the next few weeks these will definitely be taken into consideration and can be presented as additions, etc. Commented on the proposed Table of Contents and the definitions included, which gives a good read and flow to cybersecurity in New Mexico. Could possibly include the funding requirements and commitments from the State, along with the initial recommendation and some potential areas of risk that need to be mitigated, either by policy or by other efforts. Will work with Deloitte to provide this input on the aspects to get the attention of the Legislative and Executive branches, to identify areas of improvement.

Johnson – Appreciates that there is consensus on this. Since both Committees are represented today, if there are individuals present who are interested in joining the Advisory Committee as full members or joining as members of the Subcommittee, the Advisory Committee will be meeting on Friday, at 3:00 p.m. Robert and Tracy...Lorie.

Mantos – Good.

Gutierrez – Two members who are on both Committees, Robert Benavidez and Cassandra Hayne. Can take Robert as a member of the Advisory Committee. Can add up to at least four members of the...

Johnson – Advisory.

Gutierrez – Planning.

Johnson – Advisory, to the Report Committee. Is there anyone online who would like to participate?

Mantos – Dr. Liebrock is not online, would like to add her.

Gutierrez – The other two members are Todd Ulses and Kenneth Abeyta that are members from the Advisory Committee that are on that Subcommittee.

Johnson – Thanked Ms. Gutierrez for the clarification.

Raja – Saw two hands go up from Todd Ulses and Kenneth Abeyta.

Johnson – They are both already on the Subcommittee. Thanked them for their participation. Will see them Friday.

**c. Cybersecurity Planning Committee Grant Projects – Discussion – Raja Sambandam**

Mantos – Asked Mr. Sambandam to speak to this item.

Raja – The Plan has identified four potential areas for investment which are:

- 1) Improve resiliency.
- 2) Improve cybersecurity workforce.
- 3) Develop standards and a governance mechanism.
- 4) Manage, monitor and track cyber related threats and vulnerabilities (very operational, more of a monitoring control).

These are the four elements, at a very high level, that the agreed upon Plan is trying to identify as potential areas of investment, using the IJJA funding.

Asked Mr. Glanzer from Deloitte to confirm that he stated this correctly and that these are in no particular order.

Glanzer – That is correct, in no particular order. There are additional details as the Plan comes back that will define some of these, but these trace back to the State of New Mexico's goals to the required objectives and identified initial priorities.

Raja – Thanked Mr. Glanzer. Added that the Office of Cybersecurity has worked in parallel to establish many contracts at an enterprise level so they can quickly scale and get to market in a very short period of time with this work being done in parallel. Some of the things that can be provided, as quickly as possible, at scale, for all entities in the universe, so these entities do not need to pay from their budgets for vulnerability scanning, external penetration testing and attack surface management. These he can immediately scale and start including whomever, from that particular universe initially discussed, if they are willing to sign and get the consent form going.

This can be provided within the next 90 days.

Mantos – Thanked Mr. Sambandam for all of this work.

Sambandam – Attack surface management is passive intelligence gathering on the back-end which has been particularly scalable and it would be good to have consent signed to be able to continue to provide this service. This has been a valuable data gathering process. Gave details of process for entities to access this service and the advantages this provides. Will also be providing enterprise level contracts to counties and municipalities. Not only looking at preventative controls but also compensating controls to eliminate risk, not just mitigate risk.

Mantos – Expressed concern about outreach, how to make entities aware of this offer.

Lopez – Is having an IT roundtable for counties at the end of October and will definitely mention this. Will SLA be part of that enterprise level and will counties and municipalities have resources to go through those SLAs.

Raja – In this case the SLA will be determined by the counties. If they are willing to participate it will be first come, first served. When it comes to cyber, time to market is key. The sooner vulnerabilities are identified and fixed, the better off you are.

**8. Public Comment**

Mantos – Invited anyone to comment. None seen.

**9. Adjournment:**

Mr. Mantos thanked everyone for their participation today. Apologized for running overtime. Asked for a motion to adjourn.

**MOTION** Mr. Johnson moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Mr. Benavidez.

There being no opposition, the motion passed.

There being no further business before the Committees the meeting adjourned at 3:29 p.m.

---

Peter Mantos, Cybersecurity Planning Committee Chair

DocuSigned by:



437214FBE82C453...

---

Raja Sambandam, Cybersecurity Advisory Committee Chair, State CISO