

Oregon Cybersecurity Advisory Council

Meeting Location. Oregon Institute of Technology (Oregon Tech)
Wilsonville Campus, Room 402, 27500 SW Parkway Ave., Wilsonville, OR 97070



Voting Members Present.

Kerri Fry	Charlie Kawasaki	Tom Quillen	Ken Kestner
Michael Gutsche (via Skype)	Andrew Plato	Rakesh Bobba (via Skype)	

Non-Voting Members.

Mike Wells	Megan McKenzie, Secretary	Stefan Richards	Kris Rosenberg

Guests.

Phil Keisling	Jess Daly	Dr. Margaret Banyan	Dr. Marcus Ingle
Rebecca Craven			

Call to Order

A meeting of the Oregon Cybersecurity Advisory Council was held on August 15, 2018. The meeting began at 9:00 am and was presided over by Kerri Fry, with Megan McKenzie serving as secretary.

Agenda Summary

- 1) **Attendee Introductions.**
- 2) **PSU CPS Update.**
- 3) **OSCIO Update on Legislative Concept and Process.**
- 4) **Work Group Updates.** Update on Cyber Oregon initiative
- 5) **Proposal Review/Approval Process.** Status update and review of survey
- 6) **Upcoming Events and Announcements.**

Approval of Previous Minutes

Discussion. Reminder from Kerri to review minutes prior to approval. No amendments.

Action(s).

- **Motion** (Charlie) – approve July OCAC meeting minutes | *motion seconded*; and *vote in favor* (5 in favor, 1 abstention).

Agenda Items

1) Attendee Introductions

Discussion. Stefan introduces Mike Wells (DOJ) – nearly formally appointed to OCAC (still needs to meet with Terrence). Mike gave a brief description of his involvement in cyber crimes and task forces at the state level and in law enforcement. Council members and other attendees also introduced themselves and described their OCAC roles and connections to Oregon's cybersecurity community.

Action(s). None.

2) PSU CPS Update

Discussion. The IGA between CPS and OSCIO was fully executed on Tuesday, August 14, 2018. Rebecca introduced the CPS team leadership, including CPS Director Phil Keisling, faculty member Dr. Marcus Ingle, Dr. Margaret Banyan, and Jess Daly. The whole CPS team can now be reached via a centralized email address: ccoeteam@pdx.edu Rebecca also reviewed the Statement of Work tasks, deliverables, and timelines. The team provided a sample CPS Progress Report to seek feedback on the required monthly documentation under Task 5 of the IGA. The August CPS Progress Report covered activities on August 14, 2018; the September report will cover activities up to September 18, 2018 (the day before the next council meeting). Feedback provided was to track hours against each task in addition to task completion percentages.

Action(s). None.

3) OSCIO Update on Legislative Concept and Process

Discussion. Stefan put together a draft of the legislative concept for the CCoE after last meeting and distributed it to OCAC. The legislative concept is currently with state lawyers and being put into legal format. Deadline for updates to the legislative concept is September 28, 2018. Stefan suggests looking at the draft language already distributed because the language will not substantially change. Stefan also said there are two different items to be concerned with in terms of the CCoE: 1) the legislative concept that will be adopted into statute with the changes that will be adopted into government and policy option package(s) (POPs); and 2) the report that includes the more granular budget, specifics of programming and activities, and other items that might change by year. In terms of deadlines for budget requests, the governor's budget has to be in to legislature by December 1, 2018; the last date for executive branch to file requests to be considered is December 14, 2018.

Kerri clarified that three items needed: finalized legislative concept by Sept 28, 2018; POPs for governor's budget (Governor's budget is due December 1st, need to request in early September – with a dollar figure and roughly 3 line description); and the full report establishing CCoE with details (Stefan suggested considering this to be a "business plan") is due by December 31 as outlined in SB90.

Charlie suggested that all major dates/deadlines related to these items be on all documentation going forward. Kerri also suggested that the council meet via conference call before the next scheduled monthly meeting on September 19, 2018, given the quickly approaching deadlines.

Action(s).

- **Schedule conference call meeting before September OCAC meeting.** Conference call is tentatively scheduled for September 12, 2018, from 9-10:30am.

4) Work Group Updates

Discussion.

Education (EDU) Work Group: Rakesh reported that a call with about 15 people took place in early August, characterized as "a great meeting with a lot of engagement". In that call, Rakesh gave an

update on the previous OCAC meeting regarding the governor's interest and funding potential for the CCoE in next legislative cycle. Proposals from the EDU community were requested – based on the discussion, there are about 10 different proposal ideas regarding CCoE activities. Proposal ideas included high school summer camp; K-12 general ed; CDC; extension-like services; scholarships for people with skills that are unable to afford certification exams. Time was also spent discussing what proposal should look like, and how to maybe coordinate multiple ideas into a single proposal. Big questions that emerged from this work group are: when are proposals due? How will proposals be evaluated? Charlie put together a sample proposal using NW Cyber Camps and distributed to OCAC and EDU call participants.

Stefan asked if the same proposal template being used for all requests; Charlie responded yes.

Rakesh also said that he and Andrew were able to connect with the veteran's group that provides retraining opportunities mentioned by Andrew in previous OCAC meetings, and that he would like to see a proposal regarding helping veterans to find retraining opportunities. Andrew said he will talk to Rick (and Vince, who wasn't on call) and get a proposal together.

Services & Tech (S&T) Work Group: Charlie reported that the S&T group had 3 rolling meetings since the last OCAC meeting, and that the group has begun picking up critical mass in terms of talent. At these meetings, the group began to converge around something like a MSSP/SOC – centralized services that deploy technical controls for underserved groups, specifically k-12 and small businesses. Special interest in including services like incident detection; vulnerability scanning; patching; things you'd expect a cybersecurity department within a larger organization to do. The other piece is a call center of some kind based on previous discussions with OSCIO and in OCAC meetings.

Stefan raised a concern about vendor voice being included in these discussions – Charlie clarified that Andrew and representatives from Symantec have been on calls and provided that perspective. Stefan clarified that this should be the “provider of last resort” and address concerns that a government-funded competitor might be created. Charlie said in theory, by serving communities that but for this solution, the private sector would not be serving, the CCoE becomes interesting to vendors because of aggregation to make things cost effective; Stefan suggested to think of it as brokering as a group, making a competitive contract for service providers. Charlie said that we need to determine where the call center stops providing service and refers out. Stefan reiterated the need to show that the private sector won't do this because it's not business viable, and the need to show that we're serving people that will not otherwise be served.

Charlie asked several clarifying questions: what can be done in terms of a proposal that makes sense with this timeframe? Can we do something that fires up in 2021? What is channel to recruit people to the service? Customer acquisition costs? Marketing budget?

Andrew emphasized the need to study the legal implications of providing services, which could become a impediment in this group. For example, the S&T Work Group determined in last meeting that forensics isn't doable. Kerri said that it depends on if this group is actually providing the services, or serving as a referral organization. Tom asked if the CCoE should be focused on providing services directly and/or serving as an accreditation channel. Andrew suggested that more investigation into liability limiting is needed (as with MSSP contracts): indemnification and liability aspects need to be considered.

ISAO Work Group: No members of this work group attended the meeting. Kerri stated that Dennis sent an email to OCAC members regarding a meeting coming up in the next couple weeks that he would be scheduling, and asked the PSU team to follow up with Dennis regarding supporting that meeting.

Public Outreach Work Group: Tom, Megan, and Skip have met a couple of times since the last OCAC meeting. Tom suggested that the group is struggling with whether to be “small, medium, or large” with approach in terms of public outreach; for example, whether to focus on building general awareness, or event infrastructure, or promoting the agenda of Cyber Oregon and OCAC. Strategy development work is upcoming, in addition to the nuts and bolts of outreach going forward. The group has specific tactical understanding of what costs look like in this space and costs to scale, and will want to use PSU's time

to assist with benchmarking around spend and voice – looking into other states’ emphases, spending, and scope around communications and outreach.

Tom/Megan also suggested that there might also be some “synergy” and shared spend with other work groups, like around NW Cyber Camp. Need to look at creative ways to get out to other areas of the state (SBDC, extension offices), as well as enhancing website, social media, what’s already set up. Are also anticipating a role in potential customer recruitment.

Kerri brought up branding and coming up with a consistent way to refer to the CCoE, OCAC, and Cyber Oregon – are these interchangeable, or should specific names/acronyms be used in specific ways going forward? Proposal of how we’re going to address the branding and merge or move forward with these three entities. Tom agreed that a brand strategy is needed. Request was made to add approval of a branding strategy to the next OCAC meeting agenda. Charlie said in his opinion there is only enough money for one brand; Megan agreed. Kerri stated that the group needs a good narrative to ensure that we’re not convoluting things that need to remain distinct. Mike said that it is confusing from the outside trying to figure out how the three entities work and/or are related to each other.

Finance/Policy/Legal Work Group: Kerri reported that this group needs help from Stefan to navigate the legal issues related to the CCoE. Specifically, priority needs are to determine what the risks are, what the boundaries of the CCoE are, insurance needed, etc. Kerri also brought up including legal representative in OCAC, and that other states’ cybersecurity efforts are being *led* by their AG’s office; Stefan said he needs an agenda with key questions to put in front of the attorney for OSCIO – who can either answer or refer to AG’s office to provide the right person. Stefan suggested that the need is really for legal consulting rather than a member of the council with this knowledge. Mike brought up 3 attorneys in civil enforcement division at DOJ as possibilities for contributing to OCAC with this kind of expertise; Stefan agreed that these contacts would be helpful to consult. Stefan said he will go to OSCIO attorneys for legal authority; Mike said he will approach contacts regarding additional legal assistance.

Kerri said that the OCAC needs both state’s advice on legal structures for government funding purposes; and need expertise in cyber realm for liability purposes, membership organization creation, etc. Kerri said that a membership cooperative organization that is a non-profit – members pay into – seems to be popular thought for CCoE structure.

Additionally, Kerri reported that she met with Dr. Shoureshi from PSU regarding this type of structure and PSU funds. PSU as a whole is very involved in research efforts, and looking to expand research efforts into cybersecurity; when asked by Dr. Shoureshi what was needed, Kerri asked for physical space for a CCoE, and help with individual to serve as Executive Director in a paid staff role. PSU has a new VP position tasked with developing relationships with community colleges and K-12s across the state – with emphasis on college preparedness and digital inclusion. PSU has offered part of new VP’s position as an Executive Director and physical space. Kerri reported that another meeting with Dr. Shoureshi, Skip, Charlie, Kerri, and new VP to discuss further would take place; and then this group would come back to council with a recommended direction.

Kerri said that a key ask in the PSU meeting was collaboration with other educational institutions across the state – ex: OSU, MHCC, OIT, etc. because PSU has solid representation/presence in Portland, OSU has rural representation; OIT has CDC; MHCC is creating professionals. Each fulfills niche that might make for powerful collaboration. Kris said that the EDU workgroup suggested putting together a collaborative proposal with all the schools. Rakesh said that Oregon needs to pool resources because it is a smaller state, and OSU would be glad to be part of this going forward. OSU might also have space and a director to support; like the vision. Concern expressed that OCAC makes sure to give institutions besides PSU a chance to take the lead as well.

Kerri reported that she also attended roundtables with Val Hoyle (Labor Commissioner), as well as a roundtable with Rep. Earl Blumenauer – both regarding the “future of work” with the tech industry specifically. Important to keep an eye out on future of work and future of security as we go forward

making plans. Discussed “what does work look like?” in the labor markets in the next 2-10 years. Clear thing from these sessions was that cybersecurity isn’t going away. How we do it might shift, but will continue to need people with these types of expertise. Two resources that could be helpful: April (need full name - specializes in “the future of work”); and Treehouse (for-profit organization) that provides training for technology, software development, etc. as well as retraining services and creating opportunities for digital inclusion (ex: Boys and Girls Clubs in marginalized communities).

Kerri suggested all work groups begin to think about funding and needed resources as proposals develop in sessions this month.

Action(s).

- **Andrew to connect with Veteran’s retraining group regarding proposal development.**
- **PSU to reach out to Dennis regarding ISAO Work Group support.**
- **Public Outreach Work Group to work with PSU to determine research activities and support.**
- **Stefan to connect Kerri with OSCIO legal resources regarding key CCoE legal questions.**
- **Mike to reach out to his contacts at the state regarding consultation and/or advice for CCoE structure and formation.**
- **Add brand strategy review and approval to the September OCAC meeting agenda.**
- **Kerri (with Skip and Charlie) to have follow up meeting with President Shoureshi of PSU and new VP regarding PSU involvement in CCoE**

5) Proposal Review/Approval Process

Discussion. Charlie began this discussion with several key questions: when is the proposal due? What does budget need to look like? What criteria will be used to make decisions? And when will proposal preparers hear back for next deliverable and for follow-on steps?

Kerri asked could proposals be reviewed by the work groups ahead of time; Charlie and others seemed concerned about that – like the “fox guarding the hen house.”

Stefan clarified that while the governor specifically said she wants the CCoE to go faster, she didn’t put out specific funding numbers, though the scale of things talked about was into the millions of dollars.

Rakesh would like to see some sort of “priority list” for proposals. Charlie suggested trying to prioritize the proposals, and also “bucketizing” how to invest funds. Kerri also wants proposals to clarify if the project is intended to be self-sufficient in the future.

Kerri said that proposals should identify how they fit within each of the six functions the CCoE has from SB 90, and that work groups explicitly look at the requirements for the CCoE, too. Tying back into the needs assessment would also be helpful.

Stefan suggested that at this point the narrative is more important than the specific dollar amount; when picking what to accept, fitting into a specific dollar amount shouldn’t be the first thing considered

Rakesh suggested to consider 2 criteria Kerri mentioned as well as creating an overarching understanding of where CCoE money ought to be spent.

Kris suggested that creating proposals for funding that could be funded this legislative session might be overly ambitious. Could the CCoE instead function as grant-making organization? Then ask for bucket of money to then fund programs/projects? Mike suggested that OCAC should ensure that the CCoE will do something well, instead of risking something getting starting and not being successful.

Tom suggested that OCAC is in “pre-RFI” mode. The biggest need is to build the framework, and the purpose of the proposal process should be getting a sense of the potential scale and interest because OCAC is not ready for a *true* proposal process yet.

Charlie asked if instead of needing to pick “winning” and “losing” proposals any time soon, should OCAC be asking for “concepts” instead? Andrew suggested that instead of asking for proposals we should ask for “pitch decks” with some high-level information and dollar amounts, rather than detailed specifics. Kerri said in light of this discussion, the template should be revised to ask for a minimum viable dollar figure and a desired dollar figure.

Rakesh summarized this portion of the conversation by saying that OCAC should call requested information a “concept” instead of a “proposal”; use these concepts to justify how much money is needed from legislature in 2019; use the concepts to compile the narrative for the CCoE legislation; and then use PSU team to help look at what other states are doing and put the story together. Biggest concern is meeting dates. Rakesh said he would write up his summary regarding concept proposal process and send it out to OCAC members on 8/16.

Stefan clarified that the governor’s budget goes from CFO to Gov in end of August; the governor will start building on that in early September. Kerri asked what the deadline for the OCAC contributions should be, and consensus was reached regarding the following dates:

- Concepts submitted to Work Groups by August 31, 2018
- OCAC to review submitted concepts by September 10, 2018. Kerri will work with PSU team to summarize and distribute concepts to OCAC members.
- OCAC meets via web conference on September 12, 2018 from 9-10:30am. All OCAC members should have read concepts by this meeting.

Action(s).

- **Rakesh to send summary of concept process to OCAC members.**
- **Kerri to schedule September 12 meeting.**
- **Work groups to inform groups of August 31 deadline and collect concepts.**

6) Upcoming Events and Announcements

Discussion. Charlie and Megan provided updates on upcoming events.

Oregon Telecommunications Conference (Hood River) – October 18-19 – don’t need input from council right now, but OCAC is providing a panel for this event: panelists are Charlie, Stefan, Dennis, Theresa Masse, Michael Gutsche. Need to gather input for key messages in the future; OCAC should consider how to positively impact priorities with participants’ messaging at these kinds of events.

Oregon CIO Forum – October 3-4 – TAO is a sponsor, and Charlie will be participating.

Cybersecurity Education Summit – November 2 – in Bend.

Kris said that he has been invited to OWASP Training day to speak and conduct a training on October 3.

Tom said that McAfee is doing an outreach day to schools and public officials on August 22nd from 10-2pm in Hillsboro.

Andrew mentioned that Anitian/Sherlock will be doing a relaunch in November.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Kerri Fry at 12:12pm.

Next Steps + Assignments

Action	Person Responsible	Date Due
Schedule September 12 conference call to review concepts	Kerri Fry	
Collect concepts using concept template from work group participants.	Work Group Chairs	August 31
Add brand strategy review and approval to September OCAC agenda	Megan McKenzie	
Follow-up meeting with PSU leadership regarding potential PSU involvement in the CCoE	Kerri Fry, Charlie Kawasaki, Skip Newberry	
Distribute summary of OCAC concept process and purpose for review by OCAC members	Rakesh Bobba	
Distribute meeting minutes for OCAC review	Megan McKenzie	
Draft agenda for September OCAC Meeting	Megan McKenzie	

Minutes Approved By

Chair
Signature.

Date.

Vice Chair
Signature.

Date.