INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

LOCATION: Nevada State Library and Archive
100 N. Stewart Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701

VIDEOCONFERENCED TO: Nevada State Public Works
500 E. Warm Springs Road
Las Vegas, NV 89119

<u>**DATE AND TIME OF MEETING:**</u> *October 27, 2025, at 1:00 p.m.*

Meeting Minutes

1. CALL TO ORDER and ROLL CALL

Chair Jeramie Brown called the meeting to order and asked Administrative Assistant Nikki Feister to call the roll.

Members present:

- Jeramie Brown, Chair – Virtual
- Robin Heck, Vice Chair – Virtual
- Raymond Medeiros – In person
- David Tyburski – In person
- Christopher Turner – In person
- Timothy Galluzi – In person

Members absent:

- Senator Rochelle Nguyen
- Assemblywoman Natha Anderson
- Hillery Pichon
- Loren Young

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 of April 21, 2025, meeting.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

David Tyburski, IT Industry Representative, made a motion to approve the minutes from the previous meeting.

Chris 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 April 21st meeting of the Information Technology Advisory Board.

All approved, none opposed.

The motion passed.

4. REVIEW THE CHANGES ENACTED BY AB 432, SB 12, SB 467, AND OTHER LEGISLATION IMPACTING GTO AND STATE AGENCIES: *(for discussion and possible action)* – A discussion on what these changes mean for the Governor's Technology Office and State Agencies, and how this may impact ongoing and already projected initiatives.

Chair Jeramie Brown introduced Timothy Galluzi, State Chief Information Officer, to speak about the changes from the legislature session.

Board member Mr. Galluzi's forethoughtfulness into next year's calendar, beginning with our planning for the next legislative session, budget build, and a potential special session. Some strategic moves are on maturing the state infrastructure and policy framework.

Last legislative session, we accomplished and leveraged where Information Technology Advisory Board (ITAB) can be incredibly helpful by hearing various areas like industry, K-12, and government – we want your input.

Assembly Bill - AB 432 was an unsuccessful bill sponsored by Assembly member York. This bill envisioned a statewide security operations center and survived through the policy hearing. We had some great policy conversations regarding a statewide security operations center, as well as support from municipal partners and executive branch leaders. Unfortunately, AB432 made it to a money committee and never received a hearing, and that's where this bill went to go die. There needs to be additional conversation regarding a statewide security operations center and for collaboration statewide. Plans for building this out in regulation, using our regulatory framework in NAC. With the special session within the next month or so, this might be some of the language that we see come back. It was discussed during the last interim Finance Committee as something that the state might be interested in as a mitigating factor increase for cyber security maturity. AB 432 not only creates framework for how the Governor's Technology Office would engage in building a security operation center, it effectively authorizes the standing up of that

organization within GTO. It also provides services to non-executive branch entities that are not under the right purview of the governor.

Senate Bill - SB 12 **is** basically a cleanup bill from 2023 Session which elevated the Enterprise IT Services Division out of the Department of Administration and into the Office of the Governor, creating the Office of the Chief Information Officer within the Office of the Governor. SB 12, updated our agency title, removing Office of the Chief Information Officer, and just created the Governor's Technology Office. Governor's Technology Office is named appropriately since we are an executive branch that's named after its principal office holder. This bill took care of some of the other fine details that were not necessarily envisioned during the initial migration. SB 12 also changed units that were called out in statute within the Governor's Technology Office, transitioning two divisions into department level organization. We now have a department level organization that has divisions in it, thus allowing us to call the leaders of those organizations now division chiefs versus unit chiefs. That helps us as they go out to now engage with their peer organizations across various states, getting into meetings and rooms that they might not have been able to get into before. SB 12 also laid the groundwork to transition the cybersecurity leader for the state into an unclassified role versus a classified role also the Department of Administration seat on this body to the Chief Information Officer. Historically, when we were called Enterprise IT Services Division, we would report to and through the Department of Administration (DOA). It was appropriate that DOA was its voice on this body. Currently, that reporting structure has changed, and now we, the Department of Administration (DOA) and Governor's Technology Office felt that it would be appropriate that I took over as that voice on this body.

Senate Bill - SB 467, this was probably one of the more transformative measures that we had as far as policy bills. SB 467 transitions the Office of Cyber Defense coordination into the Governor's Technology Office, merging it with the Office of Information Security. Prior to this last legislative session, the state effectively had two primary cybersecurity teams, creating a very interesting reporting structure. Depending on where the primary focus of any given cyber event happened, you had a different leader that was responsible for it. The State Chief Information Officer has a vested responsibility for all cyber interests and for the governor. Which means the State Chief Information Office would work through another agency's department director to direct their staff, creating some issues when there are no issues during a cyber incident. Communicating and moving fast during a cyber incident is the key, which means combining these two areas into one team only makes the best sense. We were granted that transition on July 1, 2025.

During this last session, the Secretary of State's office had some interesting legislation regarding elections material and the use of AI. Nevada has really been

looked at for the way we approach legislation when it comes to AI and Emerging Technologies. We have a very balanced approach, where other states have launched a significant amount of legislation, like Colorado, which has a lot of legislation regarding AI. Nevada has a more measured approach, positioning itself as a good

model to help industry, by having appropriate guidelines and guardrails to protect its constituents. I believe that there was also other AI legislation that supports enhanced reporting and tracking from the Department of Taxation, which made it through.

Regarding the statewide investments, the biggest transformation would be DMV's modernization efforts that is still ongoing, as we continued its support during this last legislative session. Additionally, statewide Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) project continues its support and increased support during this last legislative session, both are not directly GTO involved. There was increased support for the middle mile broadband efforts, enhancements in Secretary of State's office for election security, as well as enhancements at Department of Taxation for their project Mint. These efforts increased enhancements in the Department of Employment Training rehabilitation for their modernization project. This session was pretty good as far as technology is concerned, there's always more that can be done, and we're always going to try to keep on pushing for increased attention and visibility when it comes to technology. It's always a balancing act getting folks to understand that anything that the programs do is impossible to do without adequate investments and supportive technology initiatives.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked if there were any questions.

David Tyburski asked Timothy Galluzi for clarification regarding the two areas merging, which are the Office of Information Security and the Office of Cyber Defense, SB 467. Timothy broke down the workings of the Office of Cyber Defense, this office focuses on executive branch which looks outward to the municipals, regarding non-medical governmental agencies, and provides indirect support to those folks. Where the Security Office Center (SOC) comes in which allows me to generally stand up any other units, teams, etc, to support my mission in general. Security Office Center (SOC) is not specifically called out. We will ask for feedback from our municipal partners to show specific assurances or guardrails, which will be put into legislation for their protection. We need to prove the value to our municipal agencies, because they do not fall under the executive branch and authority of the governor, and as such we need to make the case for them, getting their county Commission's and city boards on board.

David Tyburski thanked Tim for the clarification.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked if there were any questions – none at this time.

5. NEW INITIATIVES APPROVED IN THE GTO BUDGET: *(for discussion and possible action)* – A discussion on the new initiatives approved in the GTO budget and how ITAB can assist in the planning.

Chair Jeramie Brown introduced Timothy Galluzi to speak on enhancements and

investments. Another big, multi-year project that continued its support through this legislative session for us was our statewide Content Management System (CMS) modernization project that is continuing, and we're finding continued success with that now we've moved out of beta and are now launching sites as we speak. This platform came during a very critical time for us over the past few months and which really helped us. During this cybersecurity event, we were able to launch sites to get critical communications out to constituents because this platform was ready to go. We're really excited to see that the CMS project is continuing to move forward and was supported during legislative session. We saw over the past couple years, the demand for our services continue to increase. We have built up a significant level of trust with our partner agencies and executive branch and with this trust, we have increasing demands for our services. With all the increase demands for our services, comes request for more staff. We can only do so much with so many people. Increasing staff in our field services units, computing services unit, or our divisions, this was the focus of this last session. Full Time Equivalency (FTE) resources which we need full-time support, we even requested and received additional resource within our newly rebranded and reformed Office of Information Security and Cyber Defense. The key focus during this last session was those resources. Thankfully, we received about 90 to 95% of what we asked for. Some other examples of enhancements that made it through, Full Time Equivalency (FTE) to support migration of agencies to the cloud, Azure environments, additional Full Time Equivalency (FTE) for Identity migration, and support of that statewide identity work.

One of the big moves organizationally that we were able to accomplish during this legislative session was standing up our own fiscal support team. We did move away from the central administration services division, for our fiscal support that was handling all of our billing and accounting work, and we're moving that internal. We did some fiscal analysis, moving our own resources, and bringing in a purpose-built commercial Information Technology Financial Management (ITFM) system, in doing this we will end up saving our ratepayers about $1.5 million versus us having to pay the accounting team in the state. This is a good financial move for our rate payers. We also went after enterprise mobility, obviously a small investment in just rebranding the organization, and other infrastructure advancements for Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS). I believe that is probably the highlights and continued investment in our Information Technology Service Management System (ITSM). The focus of this last session for us was staffing, by increase in staffing, we have the support for the project approval from the previous legislature session of 2023.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked if there were any questions. David Tyburski asked a question to Board member Mr. Galluzi, if he has a list of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) that we're using to measure with new people, new staff? How are you measuring that it's successful to you?

Timothy Galluzi responded, yes, we have that broken down at each the division level.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

Jason Benshoof, our Chief Data Officer has pulled together agency intelligence reports and off of the data, our service desk is showing good numbers on customer satisfaction and sentiment across anybody that interacts with our service desk or technical teams. We're hoping to be able to make portions of this report public soon, we want a level of transparency. During each budget bill, part of our process is to look at each individual area within each budget account there are Key Performance Indicators. These Key Performance Indicators have been attributed to this agency which some are a decade old and worthless. They're just not good and do not showcase our measures of success. We will be getting data, Key Performance Indicators (KPI), on the new staff for budget build and asking this body, is there any advice you can give us? We are looking for feedback as we start the new budget build season in March, we've got a meeting or two before then that we can kind of brainstorm on some of these things that we might want to see before budget build season really kicks off. Budget build season will run from March to August; I believe July's deadline. So, we have a little bit of time to kind of work on some of these things together.

David Tyburski suggested that they can help with the brainstorming moving forward and into the budget build timeframe.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked if there were any questions – none at this time.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked Board member Mr. Galluzi if the Information Technology Advisory Board (ITAB) can help with the Governor's Technology Office (GTO) with what was approved in the budget, or as board members we can help with. Any areas that you particularly would like to see us assist in.

Timothy Galluzi informed us that with a potential special session approaching but not knowing exactly when it will be, we're not sure what comes out of the special session. We're definitely going to look at this enhancement list. I think our strategy going into this last session really set us up for success because we really focused on resources. We focused on Full Time Equivalency (FTE)s this last session, versus adding a laundry list of additional projects. Looking at a special session, we are adding more capabilities through projects, through additional investments in cybersecurity tools, which will be the projects that we're definitely going to be putting another strain on all those new Full Time Equivalency (FTE)s that we just asked for until those cybersecurity investments get proved. To answer your questions as how Information Technology Advisory Board (ITAB) can help, we can start working on brainstorming strategic planning for the next budget build since these are already kind of in flight. We need help with questions like, what are the most impactful things we should be looking at. This will help show the executive branch as well as our stakeholders that we are being good stewards of these very critical resources, by protecting the state as best as we can. What really matters to the legislature is the information and decision-making process. Is it possible for us to get a budget report of where the money is going now, for a better understand where we are and a list of initiatives, preferably based on some kind of risk analysis report. A risk

analysis report will help determine priorities moving forward as well as building out a budget that is more fitting for the needs of the state.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked Board member Timothy Galluzi, what tools are you using and what prioritization method. Jeramie brought up that it would be extremely helpful not just to see what's next year, but what GTO is currently working on, to make a better recommendation. To have a security scorecard, which would work really well in understanding how that looks globally, then we can pitch in on an area to find your weakest links, not giving away the farm. You don't want to give it away to the bad guys, use ranking system, for example this is ranking a two, where everybody else is a four. You want to focus on that too, because of whatever, you can hide away some of the detail behind it. It also begins to gamify that for the division, so that they start competing with each other to try to be the best, at least that's the theory behind it.

Tim agrees with Chairman Jeramie that the security score card system works and will be used in January. The State Information Security Committee has been noodling away on that for quite some time now, we're hoping to cross the finish line soon. I think it's an incredibly important tool to get people awake and aware of what's going on within their departments, within their divisions.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked if there were any questions – none at this time.

6. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED AGENDA ITEMS: *(for discussion and possible action)*
Board Member recommendations for cost optimization techniques.

Chairman Jeramie Brown started off addressing the board members. One of the things we had brought up at the last meeting was coming back with cost optimization technique recommendations for Governor's Technology Office (GTO) and with state. Does any board member have some recommendations on how the state can go through that cost optimization process.

Board member David Tyburski reflected, it goes back to what you asked for, regarding the budget was the list of tools justify, and where do we overlap? Where do we have places? We can identify scenarios where we've got one, two or three tools doing the same job. We can look at the utilization of those to keep, which will help in reducing costs.

Board member Timothy Galluzi added, even if we have to up a little bit of license on another one to cover, a lot of times, you still get a cost savings one of the biggest areas that I see that the executive branch is looking for improvement is just the complexity of the amount of licenses and tools that are being deployed across the executive branch and how much duplication there is. If want to simplify everything, if there are less tools doing the same the same work, it's only a net gain, and cost savings. We can get better economy at scale, and it's easier to secure at that point too, because you have a less complex environment to have to secure.

Board member Raymond Medeiros added, thinking along with that, the adoption of standards for potentially hardware, applications, software in certain areas, you're not going to be able to do that everywhere. Different departments use unique software, applications, and hardware. Where you can reduce the complexity, like you mentioned, which will reduce the security risks involved with a diverse amount of software versus a few that you can concentrate on. Patching them means you know their vulnerabilities, and they're more easily addressed. I think this standard would help in review of internal policies, practices and procedures, where you can identify technical debt that you can drop. That's not necessary. Those might be areas to streamline and save some money.

Vice Chair Robin Heck interjected, I think another thing you might want to consider while you're going through that exercise, I know at the city, when we are entering into software contract, we try to look at other agencies and what agreements they may have with that vendor, because at times we can get better pricing. I don't know what the contractual term is, but basically joining another contract, and I know government agencies are allowed to do that to a certain extent, so that might be another area to explore. I want to say a few meetings ago.

Board member Timothy Galluzi had a discussion with Board member Raymond Medeiros, regarding a list of methodology versus a ban list methodology for IT governance. Looking at our IT portfolio process because we do have our technology investment evaluation process where we do have an intake of all investments over $50,000 we do review and approve them. If your technology already exists in this allow list, then you get your expeditious paths. We already have a pre negotiated deal for those technologies. If it's not on that list, then GTO is then going to be heavily involved in your procurement process. We are going to be involved in it every step of the way to ensure that it is safe and secure for our environment, that it is appropriately vetted. People can launch free tools and then put sensitive information in it; we all saw that with Gen AI. When Gen AI got launched, and everybody started just dumping whatever they whatever they could, into it.

Chair Jeramie Brown asked if there were any questions or any other comments regarding cost optimization from state – there were none.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS: *(for discussion only)* – No action may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. Public comments will be limited to 3 minutes per person because of time considerations. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint. The Chair may, at its discretion, hold this agenda item open in order to receive public comments under other agenda items.

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

No public comments were made.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ADVISORY BOARD

7. ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Jeramie Brown called for a motion to adjourn the October 27, 2025, meeting of the Information Technology Advisory Board at 1:54 p.m.

Timothy Galluzi, Governor's Technology Office, made a motion to adjourn.
David Tyburski, IT Industry Representative, made a second motion to adjourn.

All approved, none opposed.

Meeting materials are available online at it.nv.gov/Governance/ITAB/Meetings/Meetings/ and by email request to CIO@it.nv.gov or via telephonic request to (775) 684-5800.
Notice of this meeting was posted before 9:00 a.m. at least three working days prior to the meeting pursuant to NRS 241.020, in the following locations:
Nevada State Library and Archives, 100 N Stewart Street, Carson City, NV 89701 And the following web locations:

o https://it.nv.gov/Governance/ITAB/Meetings/Meetings/
o https://www.notice.nv.gov

The appearance of the phrase "for possible action" immediately following an agenda item denotes items on which the Board may take action.
We are pleased to make reasonable accommodation for members of the public with a disability who wish to participate. If accommodated arrangements for the meeting are necessary, please
notify the IT Advisory Board staff (775) 684-5800 or you may email your request to CIO@it.nv.gov
as soon as possible and ideally at least one full working day prior to the time of the meeting.