# INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

**LOCATION: Nevada State Library,
Archives, & Public Records
100 N. Stewart St., 1st Floor Boardroom
Carson City, Nevada 89701**

**VIDEOCONFERENCED TO: N/A**

**DATE AND TIME OF MEETING:** *September 11th, 2024, at 10:00am*

## Meeting Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL

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

    Members present:

    - Jeramie Brown, Chair – In person
    - Robin Heck, Vice Chair – Virtual
    - David Tyburski – Virtual
    - Hillery Pichon – Virtual
    - Christopher Turner – Virtual
    - Sandra Ruybalid – In person
    - Joy Grimmer – Virtual
    - Loren Young – Virtual

    Members absent:

    - Raymond Medeiros
    - Senator Rochelle Nguyen
    - Assemblywoman Natha Anderson

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

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

    Chair Jeramie Brown, Department of Transportation, asked board members if they had any questions or comments related to the draft minutes from the previous meeting.

    No one had questions or comments.

    Chair Jeramie Brown called for a motion to approve the minutes from the June 20th, 2024, meeting.

# INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

Joy Grimmer, Department of Administration, made a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting.

Christopher Turner, Washoe County School District, seconded the motion.

Chair Jeramie Brown called for a vote from members of the Information Technology Advisory Board to approve the minutes from the June 20th, meeting of the Information Technology Advisory Board.

All approved, none opposed.

The motion passed.

4. EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES/AI WORKING GROUP PRESENTATION: *(for discussion and possible action)* - Michael Hanna-Butros Meyering, Chief Communication and Policy Officer of the (OCIO)

Chair Jeramie Brown, Department of Transportation, introduced Michael Hanna-Butros Meyering of the Office of the Chief Information Officer and Chair of the AI/ Emerging Technologies working group within the State Technology Governance Committee.

Michael Hanna-Butros Meyering explained the previous week, the Office of the Chief Information Officer hosted an AI Roundtable event. Legislators were invited and Assemblyman "P.K." O'Neill was in attendance, along with nonpartisan members from the Guinn Center to contribute to the conversation. He continued to present the material Timothy Galluzi, the State Chief Information Officer shared at the event and noted the link to the presentation was sent to board members as well.

He explained the objective of the event was to align the scope of the Artificial Intelligence (AI) policy is intended for, further emphasizing the safeguards and guardrails that will be put in place to allow flexibility as the technology advances. This will allow each executive branch agency to have the flexibility to be more stringent as their business needs and the technology evolves. The purpose of the executive branch policy on AI is intended for the executive branch of state government to use for: balance, innovation, safety, compliance, and maintaining public trust.

Furthermore, a QR code was available for attendees to view the draft in it.nv.gov. The link is available for public viewing of the AI Policy Draft is here:
[Policy on the Responsible and Ethical Use of Artificial Intelligence in Nevada State Government Executive Branch](#)
The link to the presentation shown to AI Roundtable attendees and ITAB members during this meeting is here:
[State AI Roundtable Presentation](#)

Some key definitions defined within the policy is the distinctive difference between Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI). For brevity, he

explained Generative AI models create new content such as: audio, code, images, text, and video. New types of media generated will be taken to the State Technology Governance Committee for approval. It can then be reviewed as a workshop with the AI/ Emerging Technologies Working Group as the policy is a product of fruition of the executive branch coming together to establish something all agencies can be a part of.

They also highlighted the definition of synthetic media, general media and its relevance prior to AI. Under the definition of AI transparency, they also made sure to include documentation and disclosure of AI methodologies, data use, and decision-making processes that is relative to vendor acquisitions and purchasing, Digital provenance ensuring authenticity and origin of digital content through traceability, clarifying the content is created by a human unless otherwise stated. Content generated by AI should be disclosed that it was generated by AI or that AI was involved in the process of that production. He continued to go over how the core principles of the AI policy include: fairness and equity, innovation, privacy, safety and security, and transparency, accountability, and explainability. Overall, can anyone explain how the information came to be. The governance structure around it will be the key body as the established State Technology Governance Committee will have a role in that aspect as it relates to the Office of the Chief Information Officer. It is also specified how the AI/ Emerging Technologies Working Group is a key player in pooling executive branch representatives to come up with a solution.

Responsibility and acceptable use regarding policy is also mentioned. Many of these guiding principles should be taken under consideration as agencies develop their own AI policy applicable to their organization and business needs. It was further noted that the AI policy proposed promotes policy principles with examples of acceptable use cases and when they are permissible. Also relevant, procedures for required approvals and non-permitted use, as well as procedures to report violations. Security and compliance have directives from a group of individuals who are knowledgeable in security and are members of the AI/Emerging Technologies Working Group. Early in the conversation, they quickly realized there were other experts they could leverage around that specific topic. He referred to the OCIO's Information Security team and how they could shape the AI risk assessment and security posture within the State of Nevada.

They concluded the subject of Artificial Intelligence will be an ongoing dialogue as AI is ongoing and exponentially growing, even changing at the time of the meeting. That was a summary of the highlights from the AI Roundtable event, he stated he would take questions and suggestions from the board.

Michael Hanna-Butros Meyering also wanted to add that there was a feedback mechanism that is open to the public in the form of a Microsoft Form allowing feedback to be received by AI/ Emerging technologies working group. He further encouraged board members to give as much feedback on the policy as possible. This would give further constructive criticism, even allowing insight on what is positive and what subject could have more detail.

# INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

Timothy Galluzi, State Chief Information Officer of the (OCIO), corroborated that pending significant edits, changes, or revisions the AI/ Emerging Technologies Working Group would get the draft policy before the State Technology Governance Committee so members can vote on the policy. He would then want to publish it after their approval. Moving forward, they would have an executive branch AI policy state agencies can leverage to subsequently build their department policies from and find alignment within.

5. BOARD MEMBERS RECOMMENDATIONS ON AI STANDARDS: *(for discussion and possible action)*– Chair Jeramie Brown and members of ITAB.

Chair Jeramie Brown, Department of Transportation, asked board members if they have any recommendation son AI standards and what advice do board members have for the state as they continue to partake in not only in the realm of traditional AI but Generative AI tool sets.

Loren Young, IT Industry Representative, regarded ensuring they have a policy on AI being good to establish, continuing to question why a government agency would utilize AI. He continued to comment on the presentation about the policy and how it stated AI mimics human-like output but followed with the perspective government should represent the people. He then stated that he would think that people would want people to make decisions for them, as that is his thought process. He inquired what is expected from AI in the government realm.

Sandra Ruybalid, Department of Health and Human Services, responded by explaining the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) is people focused and uses chatbots, a form of AI. She continued to explain that they use form-filling AI so if they send a form to someone that they need filled out and have it returned. AI reads the form, verifies it, and allows them to efficiently better serve the people.

Timothy Galluzi, State Chief Information Officer of the (OCIO), substantiated Sandra Ruybalid's statement, continuing that they are seeing pilots across the executive branch with applications agencies are deploying AI tools for efficiency in back-office processes and call center technologies. The OCIO wants to ensure there are appropriate guardrails and policies against absolute replacement of human interaction. His guidance has been clear from the onset of these tools that the deployment of AI technology will have a human-centered approach. In this, a human will be kept involve din the process no matter what, so they are not deploying AI to make decisions regarding benefits being delivered to constituents. Furthermore, they are not allowing AI to adjudicate cases on individuals. Instead, they are deploying AI in a way that the pilots add efficiencies, retrieve data, and handle some of the very repetitive or time-consuming tasks agencies often ask state employees to undertake. These tasks would otherwise pull them away from more human-centered tasks of helping constituents.

# INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

He continued to explain that is where agencies will see the most benefit, allowing employees to have more interface with constituents as they would not be utilizing much of their time with back-office tasks. This would allow some of that burden to be shifted to algorithms or robotic process automations such as AI tools.

Recently, the Department of Taxation went public with a new tool that is based off ChatGPT (a chatbot/ virtual assistant) that takes documents written by tax lawyers at a postgraduate reading comprehension and input them into a tool that rewrites them to a lower high school reading level. This matters because approximately 80% of business owners across the State of Nevada are sole proprietorships. They are single business owners and they are likely not lawyers. They are trying to make government more accessible for everyone, especially government forms. The OCIO hears concerns about state representatives wanting to ensure that government is available and accessible so that resembles the constituency they serve.

Timothy Galluzi emphasized that state government is up against real challenges of resourcing and that will likely not change. Until something drastically changes in that regard, they will always have very lean operations so they must look for opportunities to be as efficient and effective as possible. They have a great opportunity with AI tools to accomplish that and can provide more examples of deployments across the executive branch that leverage back-office processes to create more efficiencies.

Chair Jeramie Brown inquired if Timothy Galluzi has seen agencies looking into AI tool sets to help augment staff's ability to provide better services or faster responses to constituents. In other words, if someone were to call the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) looking for assistance with a particular issue and searching through documentation can take a long time. He asked if they are seeing efforts to implement AI tool sets to scan through the plethora of resources DHHS has so they may provide a faster answer to those questions.

Timothy Galluzi responded by saying he believes there have been conversations but they have not seen a specific case yet. They are starting to chip away at that. One use case may come close but it is for internal users. The Governor's Finance Office (GFO) has gone public with a pilot relative to the budget system. Every other year, agency's build their budgets and for those that did the process recently, they may know that many fiscal teams are relatively new as the state has had a massive turnover in fiscal units. Many fiscal staff were building their agency's budget for the first time so the GFO trained a chat bot on the entirety of the budget manual so someone could ask the chat bot natural language questions on how to do certain budget-building tasks and sources. He also mentioned a model from vendors to train a chatbot on the entirety of NRS and NAC that are existing publicly available information. They are trying to do something similar in having a trusted data source where a user can ask natural language questions and the responses returned would all be cited, so the source material would be readily available. This is

incredibly important as it would mitigate many of the challenges seen with GenAI tools such as, hallucinations and biases. If one can trace it back to the original source content, it would be incredibly helpful for the government staff who would utilize it for a living. He finished by saying there are many opportunities to leverage AI tools for information gathering research.

Chair Jeramie Brown thanked Timothy Galluzi for clarifying and asked board members if they had additional comments or questions regarding recommendations on AI standards.

David Tyburski, IT Industry Representative, was called on and responded at the previous meeting he went in depth asking questions about the use of AI, as well as the security to make sure the state is protected. He continued that from what he has heard, there is a lot of conversation on the topic but he thinks the right steps are being considered.

Chair Jeramie Brown thanked David Tyburski for his comments and asked if there were additional questions or comments.

No additional questions or comments were mentioned.

6. CYBERSECURITY STANDARDS FOR THE STATE OF NEVADA: *(for discussion and possible action)* -Bob Dehnhardt, State Chief of Information Security of the (CIO)

Chair Jeramie Brown, Department of Transportation, introduced Bob Dehnhardt as the State Chief Information Security Officer of the (OCIO) and would be discussing the topic of cybersecurity standards for the State of Nevada.

Bob Dehnhardt introduced himself and mentioned he enjoys talking about the state standards as the state security policy and standards are developed by the State Information Security Committee (SISC). The committee consists of Information Security Officers (ISO's) from all agencies. They have participants currently that are from outside the executive branch for information sharing and collaborating purposes but the voting members are from the executive branch. When they are look at developing a new standard or modifying an existing standard, they will stand up a subcommittee of members who can focus on the project and delve into the changes that need to be made. Thy will then bring it back to the committee to be discussed and vote on it once it is approved. After that, it will go to the State Chief Information Officer (Timothy Galluzi, OCIO) for final approval and enactment.

It is a collaborative process and they try and make sure everyone's voice is heard so they can weigh in. Their policies and standards are publicly available on it.nv.gov. He mentioned the timing of the topics of multi-factor authentication, identification/

authorization standards, and personnel security is particularly appropriate as they have been topics of discussion at the recent SISC meetings.

Personnel security was just voted on the previous month at the meeting to enact several changes that had been suggested. Standard S.304.01 establishes requirements for positions that are considered sensitive in information technology, defines what makes the positions sensitive, and sets requirements for background checks of employees. The most recent changes to the standard were that previously they were going by position title allowing instances where employees were getting around the background check requirement by stating it was not their job title. Their job title would not require the stringent background check and they would be given tasks that should require additional clearances, leaving a significant hole in security. As a result, they change the definition from position title to position roles/duties that are performed full time as well as part time.

He continued to explain he prefers the term information security to cybersecurity as it is philosophical for him. Cybersecurity is about protecting the technology, infrastructure, systems, and network as a means to an end. The end is protecting the information housed in those systems and is passing over that network. The information is the "why" they do all the security work. In closing that loophole, the SISC has made it more about whether someone has access to the information, rather than what the job title is. He feels that this a significant step forward in securing the information the public has entrusted to the state's use and care.

In addition to those changes, they added a reporting and tracking element that will be the responsibility of human resources to do but each agency's Information Security Officer (ISO) is responsible for ensuring it happens. Those that have duties that may involve sensitive information should be tracked, including a paper trail of the authorizations to ensure the protections are being held in place. This was voted on at the previous meeting and approved but they were still finalizing the language to get approval from the State CIO before publishing to the website.

Standard S.501.01 covers user identification and authorization, including password requirements as well as multi-factor authentication requirements/standards. In the past, they have had to work hard on this topic as the state is under many federal regulatory requirements. Many of these requirements are from a decade ago that have not kept up with the best security practices concerning passwords. The state has tried to take initiative and implement guidelines that are more advanced than the federal standards. They retain requirements for highly complex passwords but are strengthening language around multi-factor authentication to encourage and consider its use. State standards continue to mandate strong password requirements working towards including the use of password dictionaries. Password dictionaries would allow users to check if a password is involved in a data breech, which would prevent use of the password in the state's environment. The

federal government is slowly implementing standards comparatively advanced. The National Institute for Standards in Technology (NIST) a year prior updated their primary catalog of security controls in special publication 800-53. It included a complete change on password requirements to deemphasize having complex, hard-to-remember passwords but instead opting for password dictionary checks as well as multi-factor authentication as the preferred method for securing accounts.

Federal agencies are not as inclined to adhere to those standards but the State of Nevada is trying to move in that direction, in anticipation with agencies like the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and the Social Security Administration similarly advancing their standards. Finally, he emphasized the state security standards are intended as a baseline and a minimum standard for any agency in the state. If an agency fell under a federal regulation that has different requirements that may be more stringent, they need to do that and agencies are always welcome to establish their own security standards that exceed the State of Nevada standards. The SISC is establishing a baseline that restricts agencies from having standards below what they have set on behalf of the State of Nevada.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked board members if they had any questions or comments.

David Tyburski, IT Industry Representative, asked for clarification if Bob Dehnhardt mentioned standards on deprovisioning employees when they leave organizations. He asked if there are standards on that as he had many conversations recent to this meeting, as it is a common prevalent issue of an over-provisioned scenario of people who should have been removed, leading to compromises. Setting a standard that says it must be removed in 24-48 hours of the departure of the employee, for example, and inquired if that was included in the existing standards.

Bob Dehnhardt responded he could not recall if that standard is specified but assured David Tyburski they were checking. It is a priority for him as they do need to deprovision rapidly and accurately, at the very least. He continued to say they had been working on different changes to the personnel system but ideally, he would want HR to have a red button (simple solution) when someone puts in their NPD-45 for retirement or notice of leave. He would want HR to have the ability to take simple action to immediately deactivate all accounts related to the employee.

David Tyburski responded that he approved of the idea.

Bob Denhardt followed up his previous statement with clarification from the personnel security standard Timothy Galluzi provided him that addresses termination. It does not have a specific time limit which is something they can amend. It uses the term "immediately" but that can be open to interpretation as it can mean slower than expected, referencing the speed of state. He finished by saying that can be something they can take into consideration to strengthen.

# INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

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

No one had more questions or comments.

7. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED AGENDA ITEMS: *(for discussion and possible action)*
Discussion of any proposed modernization efforts in the State of Nevada. -Chair Jeramie Brown and members of ITAB

Chair Jeramie Brown, Department of Transportation, asked board members if they had any proposed agenda items for the next ITAB meeting, adding he would ask each member individually. He asked Sandra Ruybalid if she had anything to suggest.

Sandra Ruybalid, Department of Health and Human Services, stated she could not think of anything.

Chair Jeramie Brown responded by addressing the board if they think of anything between then and the following meeting to contact Administrative Assistant Brittany Gutierrez-Shomberg so it can be discussed adding it to the agenda.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked Vice Chair Robin Heck if she had input on what will be discussed at the next meeting.

Vice Chair Robin Heck, Local Government Representative, stated she would like to continue the discussions on Artificial Intelligence as it is an important topic for everyone currently.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked Hillery Pichon if he had any suggestions to add.

Hillery Pichon, Attorney General's office, stated he believes they are on the right track so he is observing and listening.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked Joy Grimmer if she had any suggestions for the next meeting.

Joy Grimmer, Department of Administration, said she would like a continued update on how state agencies utilize Artificial Intelligence.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked David Tyburski if he had anything to add for the next meeting's agenda items.

David Tyburski, IT Industry Representative, stated he agreed on the continued topic of Artificial Intelligence also mentioned his appointment to the board is due to end at the end of October of the current calendar year.

# INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

Chair Jeramie Brown responded that they would investigate that and thanked him for the reminder. He asked Loren Young if he had anything he would like to be discussed at the next board meeting.

Loren Young, IT Industry Representative, asked for clarification regarding the subject Bob Dehnhardt divulged concerning security. He could not recall if Bob Dehnhardt touched on state agencies being able share information or if information is accessible between departments, the effects of implementation of AI and possible security issues.

Chair Jeramie Brown called on Christopher Turner to make suggestions.

Christopher Turner, Washoe County School District, stated he is keenly paying attention to AI discussions because as it filters down from the state level it informs all organizations that fall underneath that operate in the state of Nevada. Directives help inform the Washoe County School District with their operations and policies moving forward. He is particularly interested in what is implemented at the state level regarding privacy and data integrity safeguards. The state has access to all resident's data, the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) has for example, and in other capacities. He was curious how the state is bordering all that data and ensuring it is only used internally to safeguard it from external threats.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked Christopher Turner if he was talking in a general sense or specific to AI.

Christopher Turner clarified his question was specific to AI and Gen AI. In the instance they implement Gen AI on a server and its documents so they can make it more operationally efficient, how do they ensure the threat actors and inappropriate access is managed well. They are challenges everyone is working through.

Chair Jeramie Brown stated he would like to discuss methods for data sharing amongst agency affiliated Information Technology Advisory Board members. He continued that he would like to see recommendations on ways they have found to facilitate data sharing within their organizations. The Department of Transportation has their own data sharing requirements and he would like input/guidance on what works well for other agencies and what can be improved upon.

He asked board members who represent State agencies to consider that topic between then and the next board meeting.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked if any board members had any final comments or things they want to talk about at the next board meeting.

No members had additional comments or suggestions.

8. PUBLIC COMMENTS: *(for discussion only)*

# INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

Chair Jeramie Brown asked attendees of the meeting if anyone had public comments.

No public comments were made.

9. ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Jeramie Brown called for a motion to adjourn the September 11th, 2024, meeting of the Information Technology Advisory Board.

David Tyburski, IT Industry Representative, made a motion to adjourn.

Chair Jeramie Brown called for a second motion to adjourn.

Sandra Ruybalid, Department of health and Human Services, made a second motion to adjourn.

Chair Jeramie Brown called for a cote to adjourn the September 11th, 2024, meeting of the Information Technology Advisory Board.

All approved, none opposed.

---

Full links are included below:

AI Policy Draft:

https://it.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/itnew.nv.gov/content/About(1)/Policy%20on%20the%20Responsible%20and%20Ethical%20Use%20of%20Artificial%20Intelligence%20in%20Nevada%20State%20Government%20Executive%20Branch(draft).pdf

AI Roundtable Presentation:

https://it.nv.gov/uploadedFiles/itnew.nv.gov/content/About(1)/State_AI_Round_Table.pdf

State of Nevada Security Standards and Procedures:

https://it.nv.gov/Governance/Security/State_Security_Policies_Standards___Procedures/