

# INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

**LOCATION: Nevada State Libraries and Archives  
100 N. Stewart St., 1st Floor Boardroom  
Carson City, Nevada 89701**

**VIDEOCONFERENCED TO: Department of Human Resource Management,  
7251 Amigo St., Ste 160  
Las Vegas, NV 89119**

**DATE AND TIME OF MEETING:** June 20th, 2024, 10:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. (PST)

## MINUTES

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL

Chair Jeramie Brown called the meeting to order and asked Administrative Assistant Brittany Shomberg to call the roll.

Member Present:

- Jeramie Brown, Chair - In person
- Robin Heck, Vice Chair – Virtual
- Raymond Medeiros – Virtual
- David Tyburski -Virtual
- Hillery Pichon- Virtual
- Senator Rochelle Nguyen – Virtual

Members Absent:

- Christopher Turner
- Sandra Ruybalid
- Assemblywoman Natha Anderson
- Jack Robb
- Loren Young

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS: *(for discussion only)* –  
No public comments made.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: *(for possible action)*- Chair Jeramie Brown

David Tyburski, Information Technology (IT) Industry Representative, made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the Information Technology Advisory Board held on March 21, 2024. Hillery Pichon, Attorney General's office, seconded the motion.

Chair Jeramie Brown, Department of Transportation, called a vote to approve the minutes as they stand.

Board members unanimously approved the meeting minutes, motion passed.

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

### 4. CHAIR/VICE-CHAIR ELECTIONS: *(for discussion and possible action)*- Chair Jeramie Brown

Chair Jeramie Brown, Department of Transportation, explained they are required to hold annual elections for the positions of Chair and Vice Chair for this board. It was not on the agenda for the first meeting of this calendar year, but they made sure it was on the agenda for the current meeting. This is an opportunity for someone to step up if they choose and nominate themselves for the position of Chair or Vice Chair. He inquired if there were any volunteers who would like to nominate themselves, or if there were other nominations for Chair and Vice Chair.

Robin Heck, City of Las Vegas, nominated herself again for Vice Chair.

Hillery Pichon, Attorney General's Office, stated his agency is in the process of moving their offices otherwise he would happily contribute after the move.

David Tyburski, IT Industry Representative, noted that Chair Jeramie Brown has done a good job and nominated him to continue his Chair participation.

Hillery Pichon, Attorney General's Office, concurred stating that was a good move.

Chair Jeramie Brown reiterated there is a nomination for the Chair as himself and a nomination for Vice Chair Robin Heck and asked if there were additional nominations. Seeing none, he called for vote for his continuation as Chair of the Information Technology Advisory Board for the State of Nevada.

Board members unanimously voted for Chair Jeramie Brown to continue as Chair. None opposed.

Chair Jeramie Brown called for a vote for Vice Chair Robin Heck to continue her position as Vice Chair. All unanimously voted to approve the nomination, none opposed.

### 5. GOALS OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD: *(for discussion and possible action)*- Chair Jeramie Brown and Board Members

Chair Jeramie Brown, Department of Transportation, asked the Board the intent and impact they would like to see going forward. Specifically, what it is they would like to accomplish and if they have goals for the board. This would include points they would like to bring up as far as where the board is headed and what members would like to see the board do in the next year.

Hillery Pichon, Attorney General's Office, stated he initially brought up AI policy procedures for the state, concerning the subsequent agencies and how they use it as it is huge. It is something the Attorney General's office has an interest in, but concerns grow as anywhere one might put their hand in when it comes to technology, can open access to external sources and seems dangerous. He continued that he feels it should be a state initiative that will align all policy procedures, so agencies are aligned.

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

Chair Jeramie Brown clarified that as an advisory board, they are unable to develop a policy for the state, although they can provide input and advice on what direction that policy might take. The Office of the Chief Information Officer can take that advice and adjust to what they feel is appropriate. The advisory board can provide some advice and direction for individual industry best practices, but Artificial Intelligence is so new he doesn't think anyone has best practices quite yet.

Hillery Pichon stated he has worked with interested parties on the matter as they are actively working on it. He can share what they have done so far if this board is interested as they have relationships with other countries that have been collaborating on the subject. He clarified he can also share it with Timothy Galluzi directly.

Chair Jeramie Brown said if members of the board would like to share it with himself and Administrative Assistant Brittany Shomberg, they can include it on the following meeting's agenda to speak on the matter.

David Tyburski, IT Industry Representative, added his company has been working on setting standards as well. He agreed the Information Technology Advisory Board could publish valid standards for Artificial Intelligence and other areas statewide. He mentioned an additional conversation concerning administrative reset, what they have learned from compromises to the system, etc. He was not suggesting correcting the initial policy but at least providing some examples and best practices so the state can use that as a mechanism to adopt.

Chair Jeramie Brown restated that the board would discuss best practices and some type of document for the state.

Senator Rochelle Nguyen, District 3 Representative of the Senate, added that concerning Artificial Intelligence, the Guinn Center is getting ready to publish some of their nonpartisan findings around policy recommendations. This may be something that the board could look at to see if they align with some of the findings with what is being taken into consideration for Artificial Intelligence as they have done excessive research in the area. She continued to give an example of when she attempted to take her car to a dealership, and they had a cybersecurity issue that meant they had to reschedule. She followed with an explanation that the dealership systems were down because they were hacked and being held for ransom at the time of the board meeting.

Raymond Medeiros, Carson City School District (CCSD), said he would like to keep cybersecurity at the forefront as it continues to be a threat to operations and goes hand in hand with Artificial Intelligence. He would like the board to stay updated so they can provide feedback to the state as he believes their collective experience and knowledge could be beneficial.

Chair Jeramie Brown stated he would like to see the board provide additional advice to the state so they can discuss industry best practices in all areas mentioned by members. He continued to say he would like this body to serve the state as a resource for the direction they want to go in terms of strategy for Artificial Intelligence, cybersecurity, and day-to-day operations. The

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

board's advice can be incorporated into the state's agenda and goals moving forward. He then clarified with Timothy Galluzi that this would meet the Office of the Chief Information Officer's needs.

Timothy Galluzi, State Chief Information Officer of the Office of the Chief Information Office (OCIO), agreed as that is the key mission of the Information Technology Advisory Board to garner as many viewpoints as possible. They want to hear from as many stakeholder groups as possible to help guide them in their strategic thinking and operations. Especially from industry representatives who deal with these concerns daily and legislative representatives who may have constituent concerns. They want to hear from everyone what the needs of the state's technology really are and to ensure that they are addressing those needs. They are aware there are many policy concerns and trepidation when it comes to emerging technology such as Artificial Intelligence. There are many similar concerns with cyber security overall and they are open to having those conversations as they welcome any input this board might be able to provide.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked the board if there were any additional questions or comments. None were asked.

6. DATA RETENTION POLICY: *(for discussion and possible action)* -Timothy Galluzi, State Chief Information Officer of the (OCIO)

Chair Jeramie Brown, Department of Transportation, recognized Timothy Galluzi, State Chief Information Officer of the (OCIO).

Timothy Galluzi, State Chief Information Officer of the (OCIO), began by iterating he would like to solicit feedback to see what the board's organizations are looking at as data retention has been an ongoing conversation, particularly around email platforms. When it comes to records it is incredibly complex in the public sector. He prefaced by stating they wholeheartedly believe in honest, transparent government and they owe that to all their constituents. They believe the public has a right to know about how its government operates and they have a duty to provide the records needed to have that information. There is a balance to that giving the responsibility on the government to provide a substantial number of voluminous records and in some cases that may be tens of thousands of email records because they are available. He noted attendees in attendance in Las Vegas who are conveniently present as they are the true experts concerning the state email platform. The Office of the Chief Information Officer has long taken the position that agency email is their agency's property.

The email belongs to the agency and the OCIO is just a custodian of the platform in which that email resides. As such, that email or the records which may be contained in that email is an agencies' responsibility to manage and maintain. The responsibility of managing those records and record retention policies would then fall to those agencies as well. The issue that remains is that at the enterprise level, the Office of the Chief Information Officer can provide administrative and technical controls for that email platform. They remain in a tenuous situation where they effectively hold on to email data longer than the retention schedule requires causing a significant increase in cost for the platform the backups are stored. As most things in the web environment

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

have been backed up, primarily the email platform, they have taken steps to mitigate the volume of data that is included in the process.

For example, when they implemented the Barracuda web filtering to pull as much spam as possible from the backup. This still leaves a significant amount of email data that is no longer required to be kept as a record as they are beyond the retention period costing the state and taxpayers money.

He inquired with the board if they had any advice or recommendations. Timothy Galluzi further asked: How have the representatives from organizations or private industry tackled this? How have they implemented controls within their organizations? For email retention, were emails automatically purged at a timeline of one, two, or three years? What did that look like? How did the change management or change control go over? Do they have strategies or recommendations on how they can step forward with it?

Raymond Madeiros, (CCSD), stated his understanding of email retention depends on what content is in the email and not necessarily the receiver or sender. Carson City School District has a maximum 10-year retention for information relevant to what he deals with, so he must apply a 10-year retention on himself. The issue with that is if you have the information, you must present it through the open record. There can be ramifications to keeping records longer than required but he noted others have different retention periods tied to them because their requirements are different, most landing in the three-to-five-year range. They could not get any more granular than that at this point.

David Tyburski, IT Industry Representative, stated his company is in the process of initiating a step-down process the first thing they did was mandated email, such as chat messages, zoom, teams, and other communication platforms as opposed to being a storage medium for records. If someone were to store data as a record based on content, it would need to be drawn from the email system into something else to keep the information so that the communication channel platform stays clean consistent with their policy of a 180-day retention period on their email platform. They are currently on a step down of having 20 years of material. They were unable to do so in the beginning, they began a five-year window, and they walk back every six months. This means they retain six months' worth of materials.

He assumes the state would have a similar construct and they have emails dating back longer so they would have a step process to do something similar. The bigger point was looking at it from the perspective that having Teams, messenger, or Zoom can be maintained the same. Information from an email platform can be in another communication medium so even though email may be compliant, you would need to push the record into something else to help solve some of the challenges.

Chair Jeramie Brown inquired how it is enforced.

David Tyburski clarified there is a policy on the email platform as well as Teams and Zoom. They can do data retention and another data destruction policy, so they built it. Users get a 45-day notice that everything beyond a predetermined date is going to get purged from the system

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

with no recoverability. They tend to put a little effort into pulling the records out. Once a notice is sent out, they see an uptick of employees pulling data and following the necessary process as they should. Once they get the frequency down to 180 days it should be easier as it would essentially be a biannual event for everyone to store their records even though it will purge monthly. He knows that larger companies like Microsoft have a 30-day window that maintains records in their email server for 30 days. His company initiated a similar policy in many ways by specifying that it is a communication platform and not a storage of record. If something needs to be stored as a record it needs to be taken out of the email platform because it will be deleted if not.

Timothy Galluzi agreed that the OCIO is trying to make the same point and articulate that the email platform is a communication platform and not a data storage/retention platform. The State of Nevada has an approved records retention schedule that discusses administrative correspondence files regarding routine business which specifies letters, email, social media, associated correspondence. This relates to communication for day-to-day activities within the office which have a retention policy of a year and they are being held indefinitely within the platform even though administrative control is acquiesced at the enterprise level, the responsibility to uphold the retention policy is at the agency level. This remains a challenge and the approach David Tyburski discussed may be appropriate to drive this implementation forward. This has been discussed with the Attorney General's office as well. The issue has gained the agency's interest because they also see this as a significant liability for the state.

Hillery Pichon, Attorney General's office, agreed with Timothy Galluzi and further added if the board would like to speak with the general counsel for the Attorney General's office, he is sure she would provide advice to the state on the matter.

Raymond Medeiros added he would like to stress that seeking legal counsel for the e-discovery piece and some of the NRS requirements that are attached as well. He continued to recommend an inventory of what the retention requirements are as they differ depending on content, referencing the points David Tyburski and Timothy Galluzi made about a general correspondence retention policy. He would like further clarification for subjects that may be an outlier such as financial records emphasizing that his school district has created rules around communications applications such as Teams so it can back up to OneDrive. Administrators can configure retention schedules and rules inside Office365 so if a user deletes the data, it is still retained in discoverable and retrievable.

Timothy Galluzi said he appreciated all the advice, and the agency understands this is not an issue that will be solved overnight. It will be a task that the State needs to chip away at as they owe it to taxpayers but there remains a balance to not purge records that are of public interest. They have a responsibility to protect data that is needed so it will be a balancing act that they need to go through quite diligently to ensure it is done right.

Chair Jeramie Brown stated the only piece of advice he has is user education. One of the issues that occurs is when people create these records, they do not always understand how it is meant to work and what they can do to make sure things are labeled appropriately as a record and

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

exported from the system into the records management tool. For these reasons, he would recommend user education on data retention schedules and how they can manage that. He was confident that was the same case in other agencies as well.

Raymond Medeiros added the Nevada State Library and Archives does have guidelines for developing a policy for managing email. He was not sure if it was of any help, but they do have documentation on the subject.

David Tyburski stated if the state does come up with a better method that the users accept and adopt well, there are many industries that would take interest in learning more.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked board members if there were additional comments or suggestions.

No further comments were made.

### 7. AI WORKING GROUP POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS: *(for discussion and possible action)* -Michael Hanna-Butros Meyering, Chief Communication and Policy Officer of the (OCIO)

Chair Jeramie Brown gave the floor to Michale Hanna-Butros Meyering of the OCIO.

Michael Hanna-Butros Meyering introduced himself as the Chief Communication and Policy Officer for the (OCIO) and as Chair of the Emerging Tech/AI Working Group under the State Technology Governance Committee. The Working Group is internal within the State of Nevada comprised of representatives from various agencies. Some of the framework they are working on are clear definitions of everything that's revolving around Artificial Intelligence and defining what comes to mind between Artificial Intelligence versus Generative Artificial Intelligence as there is a distinction. One thing they can benefit from is nonpartisan research and materials from institutions like the Guinn Center which remains a huge asset for the Working Group. There remain to be other resources such as a legislative tracking of efforts across the state and looking at what has been effective in other states. This also includes what has failed and using those lessons learned to help shape a policy that is appropriate and fitting for the state of Nevada.

Chair Jeramie Brown inquired where the working group is with a state Artificial Intelligence policy.

Michael Hanna-Butros Meyering stated that they have a draft, and they are in a position where they are finalizing loose ends and ensuring they clarify all definitions. They are revisiting some permissible and non-permissible examples of Artificial Intelligence as an example to help guide some of the policy recommendations. They will be able to present hopefully within the next month to the State Technology Governance Committee and share their recommendations.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked if there were areas the Working Group would like the Information Technology Advisory Board to provide input on and if they are seeking specific advice.

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

Michael Hanna-Butros Meyering responded that they would appreciate additional insight from the private sector. The idea of proper governance sits with innovation coming from the private sector, so it would be of interest to find what Artificial Intelligence policies are set with organizations. He is aware of reactive policies that have come out with an example of the World Wide Developer's Conference (WWDC) hosted by Apple where they announced all iPhones will be deeply integrated with Chat GPT which resulted in a reaction to ban those devices within specific unnamed organizations. That remains to be some of the reactions and some of the response to some of the AI advancement that is happening, and they expect it to evolve moving forward. He made it known he is interested to see what other organizations outside of government are considering with similar open large language models and everyday tools are becoming available on all iPhones.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked board members if anyone had any comments or advice?

David Tyburski, IT Industry Representative, that his company has been concerned about data proliferation. He continued to state that AI as a tool is bad, giving an example of a hammer being a tool but both can be used for good or bad. Artificial Intelligence can be used in both a good and bad way. It depends on how one uses it. The problem that many face is transparency in where the data goes. He continued with an example on using an open platform Artificial Intelligence, in this scenario would the user run into the similar scenario like Facebook and Cambridge Analytica where the user does not realize their data is being shipped into a third party which could be exposed in ways that they would not know the location data is going. Their focus has been on being able to encapsulate Artificial Intelligence into a controlled environment for usability and the organization.

He continued that shutting down those public scenarios from the state's perspective and the ability to enforce transparency for the manufacturers of an Artificial Intelligence platform or large language model of where the data is going, how it is being used so that those in the industry know the government can make a good decision. He clarified that he is not suggesting it would not be used regardless but if they are not required to be transparent they won't. If an entity is unaware that they are making decisions blindly it does not help anyone so establishing a statement where they must share where the data is going and who in the third party is being incorporated into the large language model (LLM). This would allow them to make a better conscious decision of how to utilize it from an industry perspective or a personal perspective.

Michael Hanna-Butros Meyering inquired if there is a standard practice the private sector uses when acquiring a new software. This is regarding how Artificial Intelligence or AI is a keyword in most tools that are available, but it could be because of marketing. He used Grammarly as an example as a consumer plug-in through a web browser that advertising its use if AI and inquired on the private sector's approach to similar programs.

David Tyburski explained his company has a vendor management process so when they onboard vendors and approve software for use in their organization, they go through a rigorous process to ask those questions when they can. This system is not guaranteed, and they have a policy stating no one can use unapproved software. That does not mean they do not utilize shadow IT, or the



## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

users don't use alternative software. Employees feel empowered to do it regardless, but the company does their best to make necessary software available. The company still requires the proper processes to vet their vendors and vet where that data is going. In the modern world, from a cyber security perspective, data is the most important thing out there. That is what entities are going after, so if someone in his position is not doing what they can to protect the data it is going to end up in the possession of an entity he may not expect. That could mean an exposure to Artificial Intelligence, or he could put it on OneDrive, and someone shared it with a third party he was unaware of. It could be a human interaction as well.

The more they know, the more they see how data flows, and where it goes, the more adequately they can protect it. The previous discussion about data retention being a difficult model, understanding data flow and data protection is much more difficult. He stated he recognizes the challenge but the more information available, the better decisions can be made and that applies to users of large language models. The answer that can be given today on a fledgling technology is they do not know how that information is processed. They do not know all the systems that are touching it or where the data is going because they built this large language model off 28 other large language models with open-source technology. He thinks the state is doing their best to understand that but there is a lack of enforceability stating vendors need to be able to provide that information or have some accountability so decisions can be made. Experts are better equipped over the thousands of potential users that want to utilize Chat GPT and simply upload the latest model into their browser may not know the full impacts of doing so. This could expose state records or consumer information that third parties would then be able to access without a scope of the implications as they were attempting to sue the latest tools.

Hillery Pichon, Attorney General's office, said the recommendation he would make currently is that this is one of the moments when they are at an inflection point not only for the state, but for the country. For the State of Nevada specifically, he feels as though they should endeavor on something he knows no one really wants to pursue and that is to build their own large language model so they would own the data for the future. He conferred with David Tyburski and continued to state that everything he has seen involves third parties in every context, even when they disclose otherwise but when investigated further it is proven. He feels this is when the state should engage experts to build their own large language model and find the funding to do so as it would benefit the state in the long term.

Timothy Galluzi, State Chief Information Officer of the (OCIO), clarified his policy priorities regarding Artificial Intelligence policy for the Executive Branch. When they create an Executive Branch-wide policy, their intent is not to answer every single question there may be. The OCIO's intent is to provide enough guardrails for the state so that agencies can feel empowered to leverage these tools safely and then to create their own policies on how they want to then engage with these tool sets. So, with that in mind, he presented a few guiding principles that have been discussed with the state CIO community at large and one may see common themes.

Transparency is first and foremost, especially transparency in procurement. They want to be knowledgeable of what tools are included in the tool set any vendor may be trying to sell the state. They want to know if agencies are using open-source Artificial Intelligence tools as they

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

need to be aware if those tools are brought into the environment. Additionally, along the lines of transparency, they want to know what data set was used to train these models. They want to know what happens to the data that goes into these models. Does it stay contained within the state infrastructure or is it being sent out and used to train a commercialized model? Both scenarios would lead to a very different conversation for the state. Another key tenant is that if the model is going to be making decisions for constituents, his priority is that a human remains in the loop. They are talking about critical and sometimes life-changing decisions for Nevadans therefore it is critical those decisions are still made by the individuals empowered to make decisions, which is humans.

Artificial Intelligence can augment and inform, but a human needs to be the one making the final determination in a lot of these cases. Traceability is key. They want to know the source of information these AI tools are providing to constituents and that constituent needs to be able to follow it back to the source. Many of the use cases the OCIO sees in pilots that showed promise for can trace back to already publicly available information such as published policy or regulation. These are great examples because anyone can trace that back to source material and confirm the information is accurate.

Finally, any model or tools that are launched really needs to practice the tenet of continuous evaluation improvement. They need to continuously look at these models to ensure that the answers as well as responses coming out are expected and not convoluted. Furthermore, that these models are not introducing biases and if they are, the state agencies can reevaluate it so they may apply fixes. They would constantly ensure the accuracy because one of the most dangerous things about these tool sets isn't the fact occasionally, it may give the wrong answer, it's that the incorrect answers sound plausible. For example, if a constituent is asking a chat bot from an agency how to complete an action and the chat bot gives an incorrect but plausible answer, the constituent may take that as the truth which would create a difficult situation for the agency.

There was a case where a car dealership had a chat bot that was able to negotiate the price for a vehicle and someone negotiated the price down to a dollar for a pickup truck. They tried to hold the dealership agreement of a vehicle for one dollar. Obviously, they did not purchase that truck for a dollar but that is an illustrative example of how these chat bots and generative AI tools require them to be cognizant of the information that is put out. This is made even more crucial when considering the confidence and integrity of the state government utilizing it as a tool. He thinks Michale Hanna-Butros Meyering and the Emerging Technologies/ AI Working group are doing yeoman's work putting together an Executive Branch AI policy that can provide framework for additional AI policies at the agency level. He finished by expressing that he is sure this will be an ongoing conversation with their colleagues from the legislative branch as they are looking at BDR's for the next legislative session.

Chair Jeramie Brown thanked Timothy Galluzi and Michael Hanna-Butros Meyering for their comments and asked the board if there were additional questions or comments.

No one had additional questions or comments.

## INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

### 8. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED AGENDA ITEMS: *(for discussion and possible action)* - Chair Jeramie Brown and members of ITAB

Chair Jeramie Brown, Department of Transportation, opened the agenda item for discussion for board members to bring up any proposed agenda items for the next meeting of the Information Technology Advisory Board. He inquired if there was anything they would like to discuss at the following meeting.

Raymond Medeiros, Carson City School District, reiterated his comment from earlier in the meeting concerning cybersecurity challenges and efforts at the state level that the board may be helpful with.

Chair Jeramie Brown confirmed that topic and introduced an item that may be beneficial for the board to discuss is advice on multi-factor authentication. He referenced David Tyburski mentioned previously and that it is something known to come up in other forums discussing different avenues to pursue multi-factor authentication. He stated his thoughts on the board being able to provide some good advice on what direction the state could look at moving forward.

No additional comments or suggestions were made by board members.

Chair Jeramie Brown added that if the board members have any between then and the following ITAB meeting, they can email Administrative Assistant Brittany Shomberg who can reiterate them to himself for discussion of agenda items for the next board meeting.

### 9. PUBLIC COMMENTS: *(for discussion only)* – Chair Jeramie Brown No public comments were made.

### 10. ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Jeramie Brown called for a motion to adjourn the June meeting of the Information Technology Advisory Board for the year 2024.

Robin Heck, City of Las Vegas, made a motion to adjourn.

Hillery Pichon, Attorney General's office, made a second to the motion to adjourn the meeting.

All board members agreed.

Chair Jeramie Brown adjourned the meeting.

---