



Meeting Minutes

Governor's Cyber Security Task Force

Attendance		DATE: June 30, 2023	
		TIME: 9:00 AM	
		METHOD: Zoom	
		RECORDER: Sherrean Whipple	
Member Name	Present	Member Name	Present
Tim Robb – Chair Office of the Governor – Director of Strategic Initiatives	X	Jeffrey Lewis – Director of Security & IT Compliance – NV Energy	X
Bob Dehnhardt – Vice Chair Chief - Information Security Officer of the State of Nevada	X	Aakin Patel Division Administrator - Office of Cyber Defense	X
Frank Abella – Chief Information Office for Carson City	X	Brandon Peterson – Assistant VP of Information & Research Computing – NV System of Higher Education	ABS
Paul Embley Representative from the Judicial Branch	X	Sandie Ruybalid Chief IT Manager - Nevada Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)	X
David Fogerson Chief - Division of Emergency Management/Homeland Security (DEM/HS)	X	Billy Samuels – Deputy Fire Chief – Clark County Emergency manager	X
Sanford Graves IT Professional I - Representative from the Legislative Branch	ABS	James Wood Technology Project Coordinator - Washoe County Technology Services	ABS
Tim Horgan Chief IT Manager - Representative from the Secretary of State's Office	X		
Representative			
Samantha Ladich – Senior Deputy Attorney General			
Sherrean Whipple – Administrative Assistant			

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Tim Robb, Office of the Governor – Director of Strategic Initiatives, called the meeting to order. Roll call was performed by Sherrean Whipple, Nevada Division of Emergency Management/Homeland Security (DEM/HS). Quorum was established for the meeting.

2. Public Comment

Chair Tim Robb opened the first period of public comment for discussion.

There was no public comment.

3. Approval of June 1, 2023 CSTF Meeting Minutes

Chair Tim Robb called for a motion to amend or approve the draft minutes of the June 1, 2023, Cyber Security Task Force meeting. Aakin Patel, Office of Cyber Defense, motioned to approve the minutes. David Fogerson, Chief of DEM/HS, seconded the motion to approve the minutes. All others were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed.

4. Overview of the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2023 State and Local Cybersecurity Grant Program (SLCGP)

Amanda Jackson, DEM/HS, informed the Committee that the Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for FY'23 will be coming out on July 11th, and that the state's completed application of FEMA is due on September 12th at 5:00 pm EST. Ms. Jackson explained that FEMA will be distributing \$400 million to the states in FY'23, which is more than double what was available in FY'22, but that there will be a 20-percent cost share for FY'23, up from the 10-percent cost share for FY'22. Ms. Jackson indicated that DEM/HS will review the project plan the week following this meeting and set dates for the sub-recipient application period. Ms. Jackson explained that the focus of FY'23 is to move into the implementation phase of the plan, with the recommended focus areas being prioritizing cyber security critical infrastructure and cyber security considerations of: water; education; wastewater; healthcare; energy; and elections. Ms. Jackson explained that although DEM/HS is not required to update its cyber plan or committees, FEMA suggested that DEM/HS consider adding members from the aforementioned section to the cyber security task force if not already represented. Ms. Jackson next indicated that in FY'22, Objectives 1 through 3 were required and Objective 4 was optional whereas in FY'23 requires all four objectives. Ms. Jackson concluded her presentation by informing the Committee that organizations with representation on the task force are eligible to apply for SLCGP funding.

5. FFY 2022 SLCGP Project and Budget Proposal Presentation

Vice-Chair Bob Dehnhardt explained that the Committee will hear project and budget proposal presentations that will be limited to five minutes.

A. Avigilon ACM Badge/Card Reader System

Mark Bedrosian, Douglas County, explained that existing physical access for all county facilities currently resides in an antiquated system and the intent is to convert the existing system over to a new platform. Mr. Bedrosian explained that Douglas County already has a test base for the Avigilon platform in the environment that is used for jails and camera systems.

Billy Samuels asked why the upgrade has not been factored into Douglas County's previous budget and why this has not been a capital item.

Mark Bedrosian indicated that he does not know why historically it was not targeted as a system in need of significant upgrade, but that it has been on his radar since he has been with the county.

Aakin Patel questioned how this project relates to cyber security.

Mark Bedrosian explained that physical security of critical areas and facilities and structures is an aspect of cyber security.

David Fogerson clarified that Mr. Patel is specifically discussing the application questions, and noted that Douglas County checked objective number 1, about writing and developing plans, rather than number 3, which relates to physical security.

B. Firewall/Network Edge Refresh

Mark Bedrosian, Douglas County, indicated that Douglas County currently has existing high availability pairs of Edge firewalls in its environment that have not as of yet been able to be incorporated into a replacement cycle.

Tim Horgan asked if Douglas County has accounted for ongoing costs that the new devices will need for maintenance.

Mark Bedrosian indicated that ongoing maintenance and support has already been budgeted for in annual support and subscriptions.

C. Multi-Factor Authentication for End-Users/Endpoints

Mark Bedrosian, Douglas County, explained that multi-factor authentication is not something that is currently in place in Douglas County's environment and something that Mr. Bedrosian would like to see implemented for security purposes.

Bob Dehnhardt questioned if Douglas County has accounted for the ongoing costs of implementing MFA.

Mark Bedrosian indicated that the costs will be built into the budget beginning the following fiscal year, and that this request is for the initial startup costs of this project.

D. Backup Datacenter Environment

Mark Bedrosian, Douglas County, indicated that in the past year, the County has built an offsite data center as its primary data center and this request is to create a mirror image of that data center as a backup site to allow for redundancy and resiliency in case of a significant cyber event. Mr. Bedrosian further noted that Douglas County is working on a lifecycle replacement plan for all infrastructure and upgrades.

Aakin Patel questioned how much of the environment this would actually duplicate.

Mark Bedrosian indicated that this would duplicate the entire environment.

E. Nevada Cybersecurity for the Judiciary

Paul Embley explained that the purpose of this project is to assess the counties to determine their capabilities from a cyber security standpoint.

Billy Samuels questioned if CISA has been contacted to begin the assessment, noting that \$925,000 seems like a lot of money to analyze shortcomings.

Paul Embley explained that CISA is participating in this but that they limit what they will do and are not set up to do the small counties.

Aakin Patel questioned how much of this project could feasibly be completed within the fiscal year.

Paul Embley indicated his belief that it could be close to done, noting that there are CISSPs on staff and that the project request includes contractors.

Aakin Patel indicated that trying to coordinate across multiple entities will be difficult to accomplish in one year's time.

David Fogerson asked Amanda Jackson by what date this money needs to be spent, and asked Mr. Embley if this assessment also includes the rural counties.

Paul Embley confirmed that it does include the rurals.

Amanda Jackson noted that the period of performance end date is August 31, 2026 and noted that DEM/HS generally asks that projects be completed a year before that end date but can extend the date out an additional six months if need be.

F. Cybersecurity

Ty Reid, City of Sparks IT Administrator, indicated that this request is mostly tuned towards assessment of the firewalls, getting a baseline of the current securities configuration, and ensuring that it is configured to CIS best practices. Mr. Reid explained that the same is true of the active directory environment, the Office 365 requirement, and the included request for Azure and Exchange to ensure that everything is in line with CIS benchmarks and best practices.

G. White Pine County SLCGP FY2022

Tabitha Hamilton, White Pine County, indicated that the project consists of a request for \$1,356 to send one IT personnel member to a DEFCON conference in Las Vegas to be trained and familiarized on a relevant cyber security subject matter as well as for professional services related to firewall configurations.

Jason Hutchins, White Pine County IT Director, explained that since he has taken over as director, he is in the process of doing a full refresh of IT equipment and is looking for assistance with the configuration of the Palo Alto firewall. Mr. Hutchins further noted that he has budgeted for maintenance of these devices already and that this project is for an initial setup.

Aakin Patel questioned if White Pine is budgeting for services through Palo Alto itself or through a third-party vendor.

Jason Hutchins indicated that services will be budgeted through a third-party vendor.

Tim Horgan asked how White Pine proposes to provide for ongoing implementation and management following the initial setup.

Jason Hutchins explained that he is comfortable with the implementation and management but does need help with the initial setup.

Mark Bedrosian, Douglas County, informed Mr. Hutchins that Douglas County has a fantastic resource with whom they work with for Palo Alto support, ongoing support, and configuration management and will be happy to provide that vendor information.

H. Washoe County: Incident Response Plan

Tal Zemach, Washoe County, indicated that the main objective of Grants Requests H, I, and J are to comply with NRS 603(a), compliance with cyber security framework and, more specifically, CIS controls. Mr. Zemach indicated that this request specifically complies with CIS Control 17, which highlights the importance of establishing and maintaining an incident response plan.

I. Washoe County: Annual Penetration Testing

Tal Zemach indicated that the main objective of this request is to comply with CIS Control 18, which discusses performing annual penetration tests and because CISA only does this every two years, the request is to hire a vendor to perform the annual tests.

J. Washoe County: Cortex XDR Host Insights

Tal Zemach explained that Washoe currently uses XDR to conduct threat investigation and prevention across endpoints and networks, and this add-on module to Cortex will provide more endpoint visibility and improve vulnerability management with the CVE metrics, as well as help with host inventory and to further understand what endpoints are doing.

Billy Samuels indicated that without approval of these requests, Washoe County intends not to renew the licensing for his module and questioned how the county would remain in 603 compliance without it.

Tal Zemach explained that the request should be reworded to indicate that the funding of these requests would improve compliance with NRS statute.

Billy Samuels indicated his belief that the wording is an issue on this project.

Aakin Patel noted that the projects have Washoe County selected as a rural entity and indicated his belief that Washoe would not qualify under the definition of 50,000 or fewer people.

Amanda Jackson clarified that if an applicant was going to serve a rural area within their county despite not being characterized as a rural county itself, they could identify what percent of rural populations this project would go to help, and that Washoe did identify 36 percent as their rural contribution.

K. Pershing County Multifactor Authentication

Mr. Abbott, Pershing County, explained that the project is the request to make best use of limited funding and personnel resources in the county to implement multifactor authentication on all work stations and servers, and includes the costs of the equipment and software, as well as the cost for the help of a third-party consultant to help complete the project.

Billy Samuels questioned if providers can be chosen or if counties need to go out to bid for providers.

David Fogerson confirmed that they need to go out to bid.

L. NV Shared Cyber Threat Intelligence Platform

Aakin Patel explained that this request is to start a shared cyber threat intelligence platform for the state.

David Fogerson indicated that each of these projects can be funded and that there is some extra money available within the grant should projects need additional funds. Mr. Fogerson encouraged everyone to work with DEM/HS grant staff before spending any of the grant money to ensure that federal and/or state laws are followed as if anything spent does not meet all of the requirements, counties will have to incur the costs themselves and will not receive reimbursement. Mr. Fogerson further indicated that quarterly reports are mandatory, even if there are no expenses in a particular quarter. Mr. Fogerson concluded by reminding all applicants that the grant requires that counties use CISA's assistance in their cyber security efforts and as such, Mr. Fogerson encouraged all applicants to form a relationship with Aakin Patel to make use of his abilities and resources.

6. Ranking of FFY 2022 SLCGP Project and Budget Proposal Presentations

Vice Chair Bob Dehnhardt explained that the Committee will report in rankings by voice as everyone is remote, and then a final combined ranking will be compiled for the Committee's vote.

David Fogerson added that if the Committee retains a purview to say that it does not agree with a project not meeting its requirements, the Committee could then rank a project not to move forward for recommendation.

Paul Embley requested that future projects be listed on an Excel sheet for easier ranking.

The Committee's rankings were as follows:

David Fogerson: A12, B9, C8, D5, E3, F7, G2, H6, I11, J10, K4, L1

Paul Embley: A11, B3, C7, D9, E12, F5, G8, H2, I4, J10, K6, L1

Jeffrey Lewis: A9, B1, C2, D4, E12, F7, G3, H8, I6, J11, K5, L10

Aakin Patel: A11, B3, C1, D6, E12, F10, G5, H7, I9, J8, K2, L4

Sandie Ruybalid: A12, B8, C9, D5, E3, F7, G2, H6, I10, J11, K4, L1

Billy Samuels: A8, B2, C1, D3, E11, F10, G4, H5, I9, J12, K6, L7

Frank Arbella: A11, B2, C7, D9, E4, F6, G3, H5, I10, J8, K12, L1

Tim Horgan: A10, B4, C5, D3, E9, F6, G1, H8, I7, J11, K2, L12

Bob Dehnhardt: A12, E5, C1, D7, E4, F10, G6, H8, I9, J11, K2, L3

Amanda Jackson noted that the combined ranking of all members was as follows: A12, B2, C4, D6, E9, F8, G1, H7, I10, J11, K5, L3.

Vice Chair Bob Dehnhardt called for a motion to clear up the language on some of the projects, then approve the ranking and move it forward. Aakin Patel, Office of Cyber Defense, motioned to approve the ranking. Billy

Samuels, Clark County, seconded the motion to approve the ranking. All were in favor with no opposition. Motion passed.

7. Public Comment

Vice-Chair Bob Dehnhardt called for any public comment.

Billy Samuels requested that the next agenda include discussion of how to spend leftover funds from the grant.

David Fogerson noted that he will speak with staff at DEM/HS about the possibility of reopening the grant to allow additional applicants.

There was no additional public comment.

8. Adjournment

Vice-Chair Bob Dehnhardt called for a motion to adjourn. A motion to adjourn was presented by David Fogerson, and second was provided by Sandie Ruybalid. All were in favor with no opposition. Meeting adjourned.