

**CYBERSECURITY PLANNING COMMITTEE
FRIDAY, JUNE 16, 2023, 3:00 PM**

1. WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Narvaiz called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. ROLL CALL

MEMBERS PRESENT

Peter Mantos, Chair
Mr. Raja Sambandam
Mr. Bradley K. Purdy
Mr. Bill A. York
Mr. Nathan C. Brown

Cassandra Hayne
Dr. Lorie Liebrock
Mr. William (Tim) Presley
Mr. Robert Benavidez
Mr. Michael W. Good

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mr. Carlos Lobato
Brigadier General Miguel Aguilar
Ms. Tracy Lopez

Senator Michael Padilla
Mr. Srinivas Mukkamala

OTHERS PRESENT

Renee Narvaiz
Todd Glanzer
Anthony Ballo
Joshua Yadao
William Campos

Peggy Castner
John Roig
Avram Pacheco
Vincent Urias
Flori Martinez

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION - Motion was made by Mr. Presley and seconded by Mr. Sambandam to approve the agenda as presented.

There being no opposition, the motion passed.

4. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

MOTION - Motion was made by Mr. Sambandam and seconded by Mr. Presley to approve the minutes of the May 19, 2023 meeting as presented.

There being no opposition the motion passed.

Motion was made by Ms. Hayne and seconded by Mr. Sambandam to approve the minutes of the June 2, 2023 meeting as presented.

There being no opposition the motion passed.

Chair Mantos asked Ms. Narvaiz to screen share the Agenda for today's meeting.

Chair Mantos notified the Committee that there is an upcoming change in his role as it relates to this Committee, where he will no longer be the Chair Designate and Mr. Sambandam will be returning to his role as Interim Cabinet Secretary of the State CIO and he (Mr. Sambandam) will also remain the State CISO. Chair Mantos further explained that he will continue to run the meetings of this Committee until the Plan is completed, which is scheduled to occur toward the end of August. Chair Mantos stated that Mr. Sambandam will be bringing up the Office of Cybersecurity and when the work of this Committee ends he (Mantos) will no longer be the Chair. Chair Mantos noted that his new role will be that of the Special IT Project Coordinator,

within the Governor's Office, and gave an explanation of what that position may cover.

Chair Mantos asked if there were any questions concerning this and there were none.

5. Subcommittee Reports -

a. Plan Subcommittee – In the absence of Mr. Lobato, Chair Mantos asked if other members of the Subcommittee could report. Dr. Liebrock reported a brief discussion at this morning's meeting concerning the status of data which is coming in, commenting that Mr. Campos might be able to better report with respect to the summary visualization of what is happening with the data and status of meeting goals of the NOFO which will help prioritize proposal of future interventions.

Mr. Campos noted this would fall under Agenda item #6. Chair Mantos agreed to wait for that report until that point in the meeting.

b. Engagement Subcommittee: Robert L. Benavidez

Mr. Benavidez shared the number of responses to the Capabilities Assessment is at 34 currently, with one duplicate, giving an adjusted total of 33 unique organizations which have responded thus far. He noted the July 14th deadline to gather as many responses as possible. Mr. Benavidez also reported that he had just spent three days at the New Mexico Counties Conference to garner more support and additional responses to the Capabilities Assessment.

Dr. Liebrock responded to an item in the chat about the morning meetings and stated that BOTH the Plan Subcommittee and Engagement Subcommittee met this morning.

Chair Mantos thanked Dr. Liebrock and Mr. Benavidez for their reports.

6. Update on Capabilities Assessment - Deloitte

Chair Mantos noted that Mr. Todd Baran, who has been instrumental in setting up the Office of Cybersecurity, establishing rules, etc., has moved to the Attorney General's Office, and is still available on a limited basis.

Sambandam – Plan is to leverage the Capabilities Assessment on the State side of the house as well, and asked Mr. Mantos, in his new role, to assist in gathering feedback from other State Boards and Commissions as well as the political subdivisions, such as LFC and the judiciary. Any assistance Mr. Mantos could provide in these areas would be very valuable and timely to optimize the statewide planning which can be passed on to the new Advisory Committee coming soon.

Mantos – Will be happy to do what he can along these lines. The role is new and he is unsure of how this will function.

Mantos – Asked Mr. Glanzer to engage Mr. Campos in this report.

Glanzer – A couple of focus areas overlapping, the Capabilities Assessment and ongoing effort to get the survey out and also collect responses, with subsequent analysis and reporting. Have generated a summary view of reporting templates developed so far, as information has been collected. Mr. Campos has been working with both Subcommittees.

Campos – Screen shared and reviewed slides provided to the Engagement Subcommittee. This method of reporting will hopefully aid Engagement Subcommittee to identify sectors where more engagement and better participation may be needed. This information will continue to be updated as responses are received up to the July 14th deadline.

Mantos – Requested review of slide #2 and queried if this was illustrative or actual data collected.

Campos – This is actual information collected to date.

Mantos – Excellent. Still work to do.

Liebrock – Discussion this morning regarding efforts to increase these responses in a number of areas.

Mantos – Excellent, to include “going out there”, which is what has been discovered with some entities. Travel is difficult, time, etc., but will have to be done.

Liebrock – Occasionally more. She has been invited to the Navajo Nation Conference in Arizona, later this month, and she will ask the New Mexico area to please respond. Also, Mr. Sambandam is working on obtaining contact information for both Utah and Arizona, in order to engage with their colleagues.

Mantos – Public education responses look good, but by comparison to total number perhaps not so good.

Liebrock – Good with respect to initial low response from public education which has now improved. Absolute reporting number high compared to other sectors, but more representation than others in terms of percentage.

Mantos – Anything further from Mr. Glanzer, Mr. Campos or Mr. Benavidez?

Glanzer – Templates and data collected presented in a few different ways but summarized here in just a couple of slides. Each entity could be broken down by data collected with respect to the assessment areas and make subsequent comparisons within the entities as well. Illustrates focus areas to highlight in the cybersecurity plan and/or for carryover into different investment areas; one input to the process. Expressed his appreciation of both Subcommittees’ efforts in the collection and continued activities to obtain as many responses as possible. Will continue to provide updates to the templates moving forward.

Mantos – Thanked Mr. Glanzer. Any further questions?

Purdy – For a survey, does not think this is bad. For surveys you have what you want to get and what you are actually going to get. Surveys are easiest way to gather information, but get the lowest response; this is just a given. Mandates are returned when mandated, but otherwise if you get 10-15% back or less with a survey, don’t be disappointed, this is just a sampling and you have to work with that sample.

Mantos – Interesting that Mr. Purdy mentioned percentages. Asked Mr. Campos if percentages could be included in the reporting, which might be more meaningful moving forward.

Campos – Will do. Quick math, 116 responses from initial survey, about 34%, so assessment response currently about 29% of those that responded to the initial survey.

Purdy – Many times responses are from those most interested. For others this area is not their major focus at this particular time. Asked to review slide #3 again. Maturity level at 3 and below?

Campos – Correct, based on responses received to date.

Purdy – Tells one of two things; 1). Criteria too high. 2). Everyone convinced they have over-abundance of risk they are not currently managing. If everyone convinced they are not able to manage their current risks takes things back to much more conversation with legislators asking for funding from the state versus federal funding.

Mantos – Are we truly coming up the maturity curve? Broad steps to identify, engage and educate. Find out where gaps are and provide resources. This might be a reflection of the fact that there is a lack of maturity with respect to cybersecurity and this is why it is being addressed.

Purdy – Looks like a heavy lift right now. Really needs more emphasis.

Sambandam – Sees this as a risk assessment type of exercise. If the actual process owners are completing the survey, then their assessment of their control maturity should be respected, which will drive the exercise going forward. Taking a conservative approach in this case is good with respect to a statewide security plan. May be too early to read too much into the data obtained at this point, the more information gathered will help guide the focus of resources.

Mantos – Agreed.

Glanzer – The ability to gather more data and examine it in more detail by similar entity responses will provide further guidance. Perhaps explore added language in reference to maturity and informed risk. Not exactly a risk assessment. Need to be careful and provide guiding principles, or suggestive principles around the data and analysis collected and what those results could mean moving forward. Agrees with Mr. Purdy, input is what you get; may be good or bad in terms of overall numbers, but it is the information you have and at least the initial gathering of the information forms a baseline for moving forward in coming years.

Sambandam – Understands Mr. Glanzer's point of view. Looking at maturity, the highest one so far is continuity of communication, but that can be a misrepresentation taken by itself. Many cables in the same conduit. When conduit is cut there is no communication. Redundancy is a totally different story, this should be "taken with a grain of salt".

Purdy – Respects Mr. Sambandam point of view, data needs to be questioned, however, this represents people's perception. Surveys are all about people's perceptions, whether it is hard reality or not, you are dealing with perception. If they have a perception of a certain level that is what will need to be addressed.

Sambandam – Not questioning the data but having a contextual awareness of what's happening in the background is always good to know in the decision-making process.

Purdy – True. Thanks.

7. Deloitte Contract Amendment

Glanzer – Last meeting discussion about the Deloitte contract and support from the Committee. Reviewed history of Deloitte contract. Original contract ended in April 2023. Term was extended with proposed discussion of amended line items. This is a time and materials based contract, not deliverables. Original "not to exceed amount of \$595,000", and was way under at that time so contract was extended through end of July, continuing with basically advisory services with some intent to revisit remaining items that the Committee felt needed to be done, as well as timeline for those items which goes through end of August for completion of the plan and submission, aligning with the DHS timeline to allow for any re-work by September.

Was asked to take another look at the advisory services to be more definitive, based on the activities needed to get the plan and artifacts submitted and the timeline for this was briefed at the last meeting.

Previous edited version of the contract was posted. Highlighting the following areas for the Committee's review and discussion:

1). Update to activities that pertain more to the deliverables and what needs to be done in the timeline, based on the previous discussion of responsibilities of the Committee, Deloitte, the Subcommittees, etc. Those have been revised and were screen-shared. Edited version updates the timeline.

2). Acceptance of the timeline, which the Committee is working through as well, the dates to get both the Assessment and Plan completed, as well as the Investment Justifications, the submission, the collating and submission ready artifacts that have been discussed. Has been updated in a proposed manner to complete this per the timeline, and then provide support for anything that needed to be submitted. When the new NOFO comes out be able to digest that and help this Committee as well as the new Advisory Committee with the transition, hopefully seamlessly. Has all been updated in a version that can be posted to carry through and provide that level of additional specificity.

3). Not to exceed amount: This is a time based and materials based level of effort. Under the cap at the end of April, this was projected through July. Based on how things are working with the Subcommittees, funding should remain available through July, so not in question. If Committee and DOIT would choose to amend the contract with an extension through the end of all activities, through September, would propose a cap raise from \$595,000 to \$700,000, to accommodate the remaining period of time to allow for approval of completion of contracted work.

This has been provided to DOIT for posting or circulation as required. Deloitte was to provide with enough time to review and approve by the end of July, when the current amendment ends.

Mantos – Any comments?

Liebrock – Question: Extension states through December but everything else ends September 30th.

Mantos – Correct.

Liebrock – What activities occurring between September 30th and the end of the contract in December?

Mantos – Nothing. This is a buffer if something comes up.

Liebrock – Thank you for clarification.

Mantos – Nothing also means they are charging nothing, as mentioned this is for time and material. Further comments?

MOTION: Chair Mantos called for a motion to amend the contract. Mr. Sambandam so moved, seconded by Dr. Liebrock and Ms. Hayne.

Mantos – Any opposition? There have been concerns expressed previously and hopefully those have been addressed.

There being no opposition, the amendment is approved.

8. Presentation by Vincent Urias, Sandia Labs:

Mr. Urias thanked the Committee for their time. He then shared a PowerPoint presentation regarding the project he is currently involved with, a pilot project regarding cybersecurity network data and host-based collections being done in conjunction with the Department of Homeland Security. Currently partnering with the Cybersecurity Center at New Mexico Tech in terms of doing data aggregation. Looking for high level pilot partners at the state level and would especially like to partner with agencies within New Mexico. Reviewed slides and gave details of the project.

Sambandam – A lot of technical information. Can only speak to the state side of the house as this is what he has insight into. State has enlisted into such a platform but it is not open source collection, multilayer system in place. Key is ability to correlate and understand what the data points mean. How to effectively make use of that data point to mitigate risk, etc. Would like to have a “sit down conversation” to understand how this process works, how it can be modified, what flexibility is associated with it, what use cases will relate to the State and local governments. Very good piece of information.

Liebrock – Of interest to higher education but will depend on cost and usability for those with different skill levels.

Sambandam – What role would this play in mitigating a practical scenario risk such as the current issue with MOVEit? May have a good understanding of function in a contained environment such as the Labs, but at the State level there are some otherwise unknowns, a combination of many things. Need to consider how a product such as this would be helpful in this environment. Good piece of information. Happy to hear from a New Mexico based development related to cyber. Maybe connect offline to gain better understanding of how this product can be helpful from the State point of view or from the higher education point of view, as suggested by Dr. Liebrock, or anyone in this political subdivision and then for local governments.

Mantos – Question in the chat – Where does tier 1-3 analyst access the dashboard to begin using the automated tools?

Urias – Several deployment strategies used with other federal partners, largely in support of different risk profiles. Fully off-prim, Cloud-based services on-demand. Gave further technical details regarding this. Ultimately supports most deployment strategies ranging from on-prim to fully Cloud to support the different deployment strategies based on previous pilots.

Purdy – Not a criticism, very cool what is being offered, but does not understand some of the terminology. What is detonation services? Been in this field for 20 years.

Urias – Detonation services – ability to run executables and collect dynamic data from those executables and/or environmental artifacts from running them. Apologized for use of intel verbiage.

Sambandam – Safe to assume this refers to malicious payload?

Urias – Could be malicious, could be benign; question is how to determine that.

Mantos – Asked to go back a couple of slides, showing this process and asked Mr. Urias to speak to that point.

Urias – Twelve use cases, but one of them is e-mail detonation, largely because of increase in business e-mail compromises. Described this process in more detail.

Purdy – Comes across like a commercial presentation similar to that from multiple vendors who ask for \$200,000-\$300,000. Lots of good information, sounds like a lot of overlap with what CISA is doing and what the State is doing. Sounds like what will be the end product with the current grant funding, where something like this will have to be presented. Not sure this applies specifically here yet. Requested link for further investigation to see what will actually be useful.

Urias – CISA is currently one of our customers. Have done a crosswalk of gaps in CISA workflow and CISA data collection to accent those. Side effect of this conversation is that it may apply to SLED and may apply to other departments and agencies. Will send additional information and will walk through what is externally available and what services are being exposed at a global level. Can do a deep dive and explain why this process is unique.

Mantos – Asked that Mr. Urias contact Ms. Narvaiz or Ms. Gutierrez to get the links and other information out to the Committee members.

Sambandam – Asked Mr. Urias to include contact information.

Mantos – Encouraged Mr. Urias to put contact information in Zoom chat now.

9. Public Comment:

Mantos - Grateful for members' engagement in this process.

Purdy – Expressed appreciation for how Mr. Mantos has chaired this Committee.

Sambandam – Waiting for communication from the Municipal League to get meetings going there. Also working with Cabinet Secretary Mountain with respect to Indian Affairs. He is coordinating a time-slot to address tribal leadership at one time during their next gathering. Will keep Committee updated on these developments.

10. ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION - Motion was made by Dr. Liebrock, seconded by Mr. Sambandam to adjourn the meeting. There being no objection the motion passed.

There being no further business before the Committee the meeting adjourned at 4:01 p.m.

DocuSigned by:

Peter Mantos

6905F5F035CA44B...

Peter Mantos, Committee Chair