

State, Local, Tribal, and Private Sector Policy Advisory Committee (SLTPS-PAC)

Mark A. Bradley, Chair

July 29, 2021

10:02 a.m. EDT

Mark Bradley: All right. Let me kick this thing off. I am Mark Bradley, the SLTPS-PAC Chair and also the Director of Information Security Oversight Office.

This is the second state, local, tribal and private sector policy advisory committee meeting of 2021, the 20th meeting overall. Hopefully the next meeting we will be able to do this in person. Obviously, we are still unable to do that.

This is a public meeting subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The minutes of the SLTPS-PAC meetings are available to the public.

This meeting is being audio recorded. Please identify yourself each time you speak so we have an accurate record of your comments. This is of particular importance because this meeting is being held via teleconference and the audio recording will be used to produce a transcript. Also, when you're not speaking, if you can remember, please mute your phones.

Some updates, membership changes specifically. I'm pleased to announce new SLTPS committee members. First, Jeffrey Imsdahl, Deputy Chief Security Officer and Senior Director, Systemic Monitoring Analysis and Resilience Services, Xcel Energy, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

And Kevin Klein, Director, Colorado Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Management. They replaced Jessica Davenport and Tiffany

Kleemann. We thank Tiffany and Jessica for their service. Welcome, Jeff and Kevin.

On the federal side, I must report that Charlie Rogers has retired. Charlie was involved in the SLTPS back since the beginning. He attended the first meeting in 2011 and supported the first DHS Vice Chair during the early years. He performed the duties of the DHS Vice Chair beginning in 2014 and was officially appointed Vice Chair in 2018.

He served in that role until last year when Richard McComb, the DHS Chief Security Officer, joined the committee with Charlie as the alternate. Charlie gave his first update on the DHS SLTPS program in 2012. These updates have been a staple of the SLTPS-PAC ever since. We thank Charlie for his dedication and contribution to the committee and wish him very well in his retirement.

Pending formal notification, Ricardo Duran will be taking the role of the DHS alternate. Welcome, Ricardo. Delighted to have you.

Ricardo Duran: Thank you, sir.

Mark Bradley: You're welcome. We're going to do a very quick roll call again for our transcript nature. So let me just - I'll just read the name out and then your title and then just say present. That's good enough for me. All right. Rich McComb, DHS Vice Chair.

Rich McComb: Good morning, Mark. Rich McComb is here.

Mark Bradley: Hi, Rich. Mike Russo, DoD member? I will circle back to Rich. I know Valerie Kerben said she was going to be a little late. She represents the ODNI. Glenn Bensley, DOJ?

Lori Ellison: Lori Ellison is here for Glenn.

Mark Bradley: Hi, Lori. Sidonie Dunham, Department of Transportation member.

Sidonie Dunham: Here, present.

Mark Bradley: Okay. Great. Scott Gerlach, FBI, alternate.

Scott Gerlach: Present.

Mark Bradley: Kate Connor, State alternate.

Kate Connor: I am present.

Mark Bradley: Thank you. Tracy Kindle, DOE alternate.

Tracy Kindle: Present.

Mark Bradley: Great. Michelle Beasley, the DCSA observer.

Michelle Beasley: Present.

Mark Bradley: Great.

Mark Bradley: Mary H, CIA observer.

Mary H: Present.

Mark Bradley: Thank you. Marc Sachs, SLTPS Vice Chair.

Marc Sachs: Marc is here. Good morning.

Mark Bradley: Tom Woolworth, SLTPS member. We'll circle back with hm. Mary Michelle Schechter, SLTPS member.

Mary Schechter: Present.

Mark Bradley: Great. Meghann Teubner, SLTPS member. All right. Debra Ann Winsor, SLTPS member.

Debra Winsor: Present.

Mark Bradley: Great. Jeffrey Imsdahl, I know you're here. Kevin Klein, you're here?

Kevin Klein: Present.

Mark Bradley: Yes. All right. Let's see. All right. Are there any of participants on the phone who would like to identify themselves?

Meghann Teubner: Meghann Teubner, NYPD. Sorry. I dialed in a bit late.

Mark Bradley: That's quite all right.

Keith Minard: Keith Minard, DCSA. Thanks.

Mark Bradley: Hi, Keith. Yes.

((Crosstalk))

Mark Bradley: Once again, please.

Evan Coren: ISOO CUI.

Mark Bradley: Hi, Michael. Go ahead.

Michael Russo: Hi. Michael Russo, DoD. Sorry I had issues.

Mark Bradley: No. That's okay. No, no, no. No problem.

Keith Everly: Keith Everly, NRC.

Mark Bradley: Thanks. Hi, Keith.

Steven Stern: Steven Stern, FBI program manager, Phoenix.

Mark Bradley: Hi, Steve. Anyone else?

Randy Rose: This is Randy Rose from the MS-ISAC.

Mark Bradley: Hi, Randy. All right. Anybody else behind Randy? All right, going once, going twice.

Antoine Washington: Antoine Washington, DHS INA.

Mark Bradley: Okay. Great. Anybody else? All right, going, going, gone. All right. I'm going to introduce right now Evan Coren of my staff. He is my lead analyst on our

Controlled Unclassified Information program, and he will provide an update on where the CUI program stands.

I'm moving Evan up in the batting order today because he has another meeting. All right, Evan. The floor is yours.

Evan Coren: Thank you, Mark. So, in the last annual report, 90% of agencies reported they would have their CUI policy done by the end of this year, 2021.

And 90% of agencies also reported they would have their fiscal and cybersecurity safeguards done by the end of this calendar year. And that's a top agency level. The component parts will have another year as it trickles down through the chains of command.

In addition, we're working closely with the GSA and with DoD to get our FAR clause out to streamline the contracting process and gives everyone a common approach to the contracts that go forward. We're meeting basically constantly on that one at this point.

During implementation a number of agencies identified they were having challenges with Microsoft Office 365 security labels and we're having an ongoing conversation with Microsoft. They were concerned and they are working on a variety of things.

And we are also open to any other contract vendor that is interested in contacting us about any issues they might be having. So please reach out.

We've also set up working groups for agency engagement on the data destruction and word processing. We want to get CUI implemented into international agreements. There's already a lot of international agreements that

have various information sharing provisions. And we want to make sure that we're moving forward in a common approach. And the State Department could be leading that last one.

We're also working on a variety of projects to streamline the CUI registry to make it as uniform as possible. The first segment that we're working on is the privacy index. Because this is the set of categories that are used by the most number of agencies, we decided to start there. We are working both through the CUI registry committee but also the Privacy Council. We're going to start engagement on that.

After privacy, the next group that we will look at is the law enforcement categories. And we've already had some engagement with the Department of Justice on that. They'll be in the lead. And then we'll move in the wide range of other agencies like the Department of Interior, which is, I think, the second largest after DOJ, and DHS. There's a large number of agencies that have law enforcement impact.

And then the next one after that I think is going to be of interest to this group. We will look at the archaeological resources, historical preservation and National Park Services, the park system resources categories, to see about that. And we've started some initial engagement on that with the Department of Interior and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. And DoD has also been capable of that.

At the last registry committee meeting, we decided to broaden that group out. And the Department of Energy, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Department of Agriculture, for example, will also be joining that effort because a lot of this deals with the large land owners out there.

And one of the things that brought this to our attention was as DoD was implementing, a number of the military departments started reaching out saying that there was a - they had a number of Tribal sites on their bases that they use these categories on and they wanted to make sure that they were doing it in a same or similar way as Department of Interior and wanting to do it through the right channel. So, we started a conversation with the Department of Interior, DoD and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

And Department of Interior is now leading that effort. And they brought to the table Bureau of Indian Affairs as well as Tribal partners, including Diane Hunter, who is a Tribal probation officer for the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and giving us some good insight on the various perspectives we're trying to work through.

And so, I wanted to make sure everyone knew that those were upcoming and so stay tuned. And if anyone has any questions, I'm happy to take questions.

Mark Bradley: All right. Evan, I'm hearing no questions so I want to thank you for coming and we appreciate your very thorough update on CUI and the good news that 90% seem to be moving to having their policies in place.

I'm now going to turn to my deputy, Greg Pannoni, who is going to discuss the old business of the committee here. Greg, take it away.

Greg Pannoni: Good morning, everyone. Thank you, Mark. Greg Pannoni here. Happy to be here.

So, as far as old business items, we have the minutes from the last meeting, which was January 27. They were finalized on April 21.

And then I'll move to the action items. We had four action items from the last PAC meeting. The first one concerned the update from the clearance, SLTPS security clearance database, and specifically the FBI's capabilities to populate the clearance, the Central Verification System that's housed by the DCSA, Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency.

And so, we were looking to get a status update on that to see if it was possible to include not just non-task officers that the FBI has cleared under the SLTPS-PAC but also others that they may have cleared for inclusion in the data transfer so that we would have a more robust clearance verification database for SLTPS persons.

So, a lot of progress has been made by FBI on that. And we're anxious to hear about the current status of the transfer of clearance information. I believe Scott Gerlach is going to provide - from the FBI - is going to provide an update. So, with that, we'll pause on this first item and I'll turn it over to Scott, please. Scott?

Scott Gerlach: Hey, good morning. Thank you. I am Scott Gerlach with the FBI. And before I get started, I just want to start off by introducing Steve Stern and Felicia Savoy, who are here to support me on the technical side of the topic this morning if any questions come up.

But just to provide a quick recap of the topic from the previous meeting. The FBI has been working to download clearance information for state, local, Tribal and private sector personnel, whose clearances are held by the FBI, into the clearance verification system.

This was expected to go live at the end of March of 2001. I am pleased to report that the 9,163 task force officer clearances was completed in late March and has been tested.

Moving forward, the process is not completely automated. It does require the FBI to push monthly reports to the NPT2 portal that will include adds, deletes and changes of clearances. And it will be included in the CVS.

So, at this time the FBI considers that part of the project complete. And my understanding is that there's no current plans to include any other data sets to include non-task force officers into the data transfer to CVS.

I know based on what you just stated, I think there's been an expectation that some additional data sets would be included. And I spoke with Marie Bernoi yesterday, and she did inform me that if that is a desire to add additional data sets that that would need to be discussed and those requirements would need to be provided to the FBI to make that formal decision.

So, pending any questions, that's my update for this morning.

Greg Pannoni: I don't hear any other questions so with, of course, deference to the Chair, I think we all know the Order for this program, the executive order, calls for a - I don't have the order in front of me - but essentially for a complete database of all the cleared SLTPS-PAC personnel.

So, it would seem that we should take up that discussion subsequent to the meeting with the FBI about other non-task force type personnel that the FBI holds clearances for under this program.

Scott Gerlach: So just, just for my awareness, what - and I got asked this when I was getting myself up to speed yesterday - what additional - is there an example of a non-task force officer that you would need or that would need to be included? Just so I kind of have an idea of what we're looking at here.

Greg Pannoni: So I'm not sure I could even give you a specific example, other than the parameters being that all state, in other words, non-federal, state and local government, non-national security program, private sector and Tribal personnel that are cleared under this State, Local, Tribal personnel Private Sector program by various government agencies.

There is supposed to be a database that all those people are identified within. So, to the extent that the Bureau or any other agency has cleared individuals, perhaps someone from the private sector. It could be for who knows, a variety of reasons, some certain say threats to a specific entity.

It's just really not easy to specify. But the idea is that there would be a fulsome database of SLTPS-PAC personnel that are cleared. So, I don't know if that helps or not, but that's my understanding.

Scott Gerlach: Okay. I'll take that item back to Ms. Bernoit and have a conversation and see where we go from here on that.

Mark Bradley: Yes, Scott, this is the Chair. I think, you know, what Greg is saying, I'll just repeat it again. It's broader than just members of the task force.

And I don't know whether any of our SLTPS partners on this call would like to give an example for Scott of somebody who wouldn't be on our task force but who still has a clearance and, you know, they need to receive classified information. So, Marc or anybody else who is out there.

Marc Sachs: This is Mark Sachs. It's really a matter of if there's an emerging situation where the government is aware of either a private entity, a privately owned asset, or a state and local or Tribal level.

If something is emerging quickly and they need to get in touch with somebody and a clearance is necessary to be able to have that one stop place where they can look up the organization. You know, here is Fred Flintstone. He's cleared at such and such a level. Here is his phone number.

And they can get that information to that affected entity rapidly rather than trying to go through all these hoops of finding the local FBI field office. Does anybody know anybody there, et cetera, et cetera.

Kevin Klein: Kevin Klein. I had given an example of maybe an analyst in a fusion center that received the initial clearance through the FBI. And like our cybersecurity analysts, he is not tasked to the task force but, you know, working in the fusion center.

Marc Sachs: It's really when there's a matter of timeliness and urgency or you may need a partner to help analyze something. You don't understand what's being seen and perhaps somebody from that group can help.

But it's a timeliness question, and it's something that's been hard to do over the decades because if you're not in an analyst role or you have a Rolodex filled with people who are cleared, it is hard to find a central location where you can look up an organization to find out who has the clearances and get ahold of them quickly to help with whatever the situation is.

Mark Bradley: Yes. Does that help, Scott?

Scott Gerlach: It does. It does. I will take this back to the team and provide them the feedback and then we'll have to provide a new update or maybe this will be a conversation we'll have to have offline until we get an idea of exactly how to move forward.

Mark Bradley: Okay. Well listen, again, you guys have done great work and we appreciate it. And again, I mean, so some more yards to run the ball on. But anyway, we appreciate that.

Scott Gerlach: We appreciate it. Thank you.

Greg Pannoni: Yes. Thanks to the other members for jumping in as far as - especially providing the rationale for why there needs to be a central robust database of all the cleared SLTPS personnel.

So, I'll move to the second action item from the last meeting. And this one, it's related, really. In this case, it involves the ODNI and similarly the numbers of personnel that under the SLTPS program that it has sponsored and holds clearances for.

And so, we initiated that discussion at least one or two meetings ago. But due to the sensitivities of the data, the ODNI wanted to have that discussion in a SCIF. And with the COVID restrictions still in place at the National Archives, we have been unable to host such a meeting.

And as the Chair mentioned, at this time it's still unknown specifically when we will be able to do that. Hopefully by the next meeting we will be able to do that but no guarantees on that. So, until ISOO has returned to full operations that issue remains tabled.

Okay? The third item was for ISOO to continue to identify and review policies relevant to discussions about allowing access to classified information at home and to ascertain what policies permit and what they do not permit.

We have not identified other policies in addition to those reported at the January meeting. And we are unaware of any policies that would allow a non-federal employee to access classified information from a personal residence.

So that, coupled with I want to say, but the situation is so fluid, it's not so certain at this point. But that as we start to ease COVID restrictions this action by a number of agencies, the fact that we do these restrictions, a number of agencies will start to return to normal operations and we could therefore close this. So that that's certainly subject to your voices being heard.

But as I said, the key point, I'm unaware of any policies that allow non-federal employees to access and work with classified from their domicile.

So, let's move to the fourth item, and then we'll take questions at the end. The fourth action item was for ISOO to schedule and hold another meeting of the Cyber Threat Information Sharing Working Group prior to this meeting.

And so just to give you a little bit of context, I want to note that on a number of occasions, the working group participants had spoken of the need to better understand the current situation with regard to the sharing of cyber threat information before the group could make recommendations that would hopefully improve it.

With that in mind, we asked the Department of Homeland Security to provide an assessment of the as is state of cyber threat information sharing with the state, local, Tribal, private sector partners.

And in response DHS provided extensive information on the as is condition of cyber threat information sharing. We provided this information to the working group participants and then requested they review it in preparation for the working group meeting, which was held in mid-May.

And our aim was to help the working group reach a shared understanding of the current state of cyber threat information sharing enterprise, which would enable them to make informed recommendations for improvement.

In attendance we had Carole Kelliher from the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, CISA. And Ms. Kelliher highlighted actions that CISA is taking, was taking and continues to take to improve the sharing of cyber threat information. She shared a wealth of information and engaged in a lively and frank discussion with the working group participants.

Towards the end of that meeting, the working group turned to the topic of recommendations for consideration by the Chair. And it was decided that the participants would submit their final recommendations for consideration.

Those who previously submitted recommendations agreed to consider them in light of the discussions subsequent to their submission and with an eye towards ensuring that they are specific to the purpose and authority of the PAC.

So, we received 15 recommendations from the working group: 7 from the private sector participants and 8 from the federal government participants.

Before sharing the recommendations with the full PAC membership or making a determination regarding which recommendations to move forward, the Chair wanted to obtain input from the two SLTPS Vice Chairs.

So with that, we asked Mark Sachs, representing the non-federal SLTPS entities Vice Chair that he is, to provide feedback and DHS as the other Vice Chair.

We did receive the feedback from the non-federal SLTPS entities via Marc Sachs, and DHS continues to coordinate with CISA on the recommendations provided by the working group.

That analysis entails what is being done now that addresses the recommendations and what can be done to close any gaps if the recommendation is accepted to be feasible and executable.

So, once we received a response from DHS on the recommendations, the Chair will review all the recommendations and feedback and further communicate potential ways forward with the full PAC membership.

So, with that, I'll stop. And just as a side note, we did send, as you probably are aware even before we sent it, sort of late breaking. But there was a national security memorandum on improving cybersecurity for critical infrastructure control systems that came out yesterday. And we did provide that to all the PAC members.

So, we all know clearly a lot has been happening in this space because, as one senior administrative official said, and I'm quoting, we are woefully

insufficient in our cybersecurity posture. So, a lot has been done but clearly a lot more needs to be done to modernize our cyber defenses.

So, with that, I'll stop there and ask if there's any questions with respect to any of the action items.

Marc Sachs: Greg, this is Marc Sachs.

Greg Pannoni: Yes, Marc.

Marc Sachs: Yes. Just to follow-on with what you're talking about with the Threat Sharing Working Group. At the meeting we had in May, CISA mentioned a CIPAC group that's also been working on information sharing and providing some recommendations to CISA.

I've been participating in that since then. It's a fairly robust group, lots of good information going back and forth. But it still sounds like CISA is struggling a little bit with where they position themselves in the flow of information, the things that the government knows, the things that the private sector knows, and how to mix that together to produce, you know, useful early warning bulletins, advisories and so forth.

So, a lot of good work is being done there, but I think they still have a long way to go. And I know they appreciate the work of this committee in terms of giving them some recommendations moving forward.

Greg Pannoni: Thank you Mark. Does anyone else have any questions?

Rich McComb: Hey, Greg. This is Rich McComb, government Vice Chair, Chief Security Officer, Homeland Security. Yes, you know, as you stated, we had Brian

Ware and then Carole Kelliher provide kind of a current state of their information sharing environment.

We have those recommendations. We are coordinating with CISA. As I think everybody here on this call can appreciate, they've actually been very much engaged in the business of helping us enhance cybersecurity across the U.S. government in light of recent events, you know, SolarWinds, the Microsoft Exchange, ransomware, et cetera.

So, they're very busy and we appreciate that. But we are working with them to provide some formal comments with regard to those 15 recommendations. We do believe that some of them are being addressed, perhaps not, you know, completely.

As Marc indicated, this is a work in progress in some of these areas with regard to determining exactly the level of sharing and when that information - more importantly with an information, should be shared.

We also do believe that some of these recommendations are probably outside the scope of the SLTPS-PAC, and we'll have some recommendations perhaps with some engagement with the NSC, who obviously is running a policy committee in this area.

So more to follow, but we are committed to providing our responses here in short order.

Greg Pannoni: Thank you, Rich. So, I agree with all these comments. And I do think it's a whole-of-government effort that is needed to tackle these thorny issues. And there's obviously funding that comes into play with some of this as well.

But that's it. Unless anyone else has any other questions with any of the key action items. Well, I am hearing none, so back to you, Mark.

Mark Bradley: All right, thank you, Greg. All right. Let's hear next from Ricardo Duran, Duran, I'm sorry, Director Compliance Standards, Training Division, DHS, who will provide an update on the DHS SLTPS Security Program. Ricardo, please.

Ricardo Duran: Thank you, sir. Good morning, everyone. My name is Ricardo from DHS. And I have just a couple of updates for the committee.

Item one, right, the general statistics for this fiscal year as it relates to the SLTPS committee: DHS has performed four room certifications, and we audited 12 fusion centers. And we have approximately 9,000 SLTPS partners with DHS-sponsored clearances.

Eighty percent of this population has a secret clearance and 12 percent of this population are at the TS level.

There have been no major deviations with these numbers. We have been consistently maintaining the steady pace of cleared personnel pre- and post-pandemic.

Item two, as we're coming to the end of this fiscal year, DHS has taken this opportunity to revise all of its SLPS governance documents and its accreditation forms. This is to ensure and align with DHS and U.S. government policies that were developed throughout the year.

And since all of our performance audits were completed remotely this past year, for our upcoming fiscal year '22 we are anticipating and leveraging

various auditing methodologies that will include a combination of both on-site engagements and remote audits.

This is all dependent on the state of the nation with the pandemic. But either way, we stand ready to move forward in whatever environment presents itself and just to keep marching forward with our compliance and oversight responsibilities.

Pending any comments, this concludes my two updates.

Mark Bradley: Thank you for that, Ricardo. Again, we're delighted to have you and look forward to your input in the meetings. All right. We're going to move now - oh, sure. No, no, Absolutely.

We're going to move now to our general open forum discussion. But before we do that, I'd like to ask the new SLTPS members, Jeffrey, you go first and then Kevin, just tell us a little bit about yourself and your background and, you know, anything you'd like to focus on or would like the committee to concentrate on. Please, Jeffrey.

Jeff Imsdahl: All right. Thank you, sir. Jeff Imsdahl, Senior Director of Xcel Energy, Enterprise Security and Emergency Management, Deputy Chief Security Officer and responsible for, you know, physical and cyber threat intel, our advanced capabilities group, our combined enterprise command center, which includes physical, cyber and all hazards.

So, as we build out that restructure, I really appreciate to be on this particular committee and understand where we're at with clearances. And everything that we do from an information standpoint will hopefully help both the

government as well as the private sector to be able to share information more freely as we go forward. So, thank you.

Mark Bradley: You're most welcome. All right. Kevin?

Kevin Klein: Hey, good morning. Kevin Klein. I'm the director of the Colorado Division of Homeland Security, Emergency Management, and I'm Governor Polis's Homeland Security Advisor.

I serve on the National Governors Association, Homeland Security Advisory Committee, their executive committee, and kind of picking up some stuff from other homeland security advisors across the country.

Clearly, I've got some catching up to do. This is my first meeting. Some of the things that have come up that now I have an interest in is addressing emerging threats and sharing information with maybe some more or less traditional state partners.

And I'm thinking along the lines of like our Office of Economic Development and International Trade that, you know, get foreign companies to ask the governor of their states and making sure that they have the information that they need.

So, apologies for the background noise. I'm in travel status. But I'm excited to be part of this group. And if anybody needs me or has anything that I can help with, let me know.

Mark Bradley: All right. Well, thank you both very much. And again, we are so pleased to have you both as part of this process. So, again, welcome. And if you need anything, please let us know.

All right. Now we're going to go to again the general open to forum discussion. The floor becomes wide open to anybody who wants to say anything or discuss anything or raise anything that we've missed or should be concentrating on. So, who would like to go first?

Marc Sachs: This Marc Sachs. I'll step up since it's quiet.

Mark Bradley: All right, Marc.

Marc Sachs: At the January meeting, a question I threw out during the session had to do with the new administration and the fact that we had a forthcoming appointment of a Cyber Director at the White House.

I'm just wondering in the six months now since the administration has been in, has there been anything from them to you or to the committee of any interest or anything they might be wanting us to look at? Or is it silence that end when it comes to our work? Again, the new administration lens is what I'm looking at.

Mark Bradley: Not that I'm aware of. I mean, I know they've been busy standing it up and, you know, it's like so much else when a new administration comes to town, it's a slow process. Rich or Greg, do you know anything that I've missed?

Greg Pannoni: No, Mark. This is Greg, I don't. I mean, it appears pretty clear they've been working on some things, I mean, just posting this national security memorandum on improving cybersecurity for critical infrastructure and establishing an industrial control system cybersecurity initiative.

And from what I gather, they've done some pilots with the electrical sector and they're moving on to the oil and gas, the pipeline. So, it appears they are doing things. But no, I'm not aware of any communications between the committee and the cyber director at the White House.

((Crosstalk))

Mark Bradley: Rich, you go ahead.

Rich McComb: I'm sorry. No, I'm not aware of any other particular efforts to reach out. I do believe that that might be a great opportunity to do. But at this point, I'm not aware of anything.

Mark Bradley: Right. I mean, Marc, one thing we have to do perhaps for our January meeting is to invite somebody from that directorate to come and give us a briefing on what they're doing if that would be helpful.

Marc Sachs: I think that would be absolutely appropriate because that would be at about the one-year point of the administration. You know, kind of an opportunity to reflect over their shoulder and, you know, with the new offices they've created, perhaps to give us that kind of update would be great.

Mark Bradley: Okay. Well, Bob, would you make a special note of that for us to reach out to that directorate.

Bob Skwirot: Will do.

Marc Sachs: Okay, great.

Mark Bradley: All right. Sure.

Mark Bradley: Anyone else, please, have anything else to say or raise or discuss?

Meghann Teubner: This is Meghann Teubner from the NYPD. I just wanted to flag that we have through a partnership with the NYPD and New York City Cyber Command, the Global Cyber Alliance, (Danny) and others here in New York, the Manhattan DA's office, and others in New York, they've created a critical infrastructure security initiative where they share information on IOCs and cyberattack threat vectors, TTPs, et cetera, with this group of individuals who are joining to build trust and resilience to protect critical infrastructure in New York.

They take the products that are pushed out by FBI and DHS in partnership with them and make sure that all of the appropriately cleared or needed partners receive IOCs in order to protect their systems. If it would be of interest to the group, I'm happy to link you guys up with the lieutenant here at the NYPD who kind of got it off the ground to see if perhaps it would be worth a briefing on it for the group at a later date.

Mark Bradley: So, this is the Chair. I think that sounds extraordinarily helpful to, especially given all the infrastructure, critical infrastructure you've got in New York City.

Meghann Teubner: I think it's something that could easily be replicated in other cities or jurisdictions, even just between government agencies in order to ensure that, you know, individual CISOs or whoever is responsible for protecting systems, receive those, you know, compromised IPs or TTPs that are being used to target similar entities. Okay. Great.

Mark Bradley: Yes. If you work with Bob Skwirot of my staff just to set up a briefing with anything you would like. Okay?

Meghann Teubner: Sounds wonderful.

Mark Bradley: Thank you for the generous offer.

Randy Rose: This is Randy Rose from the MS-ISAC. I was wondering if the last speaker can you shoot me an email also about that? Because we have some piece from the MS-ISAC that I think could probably play into that.

Meghann Teubner: Yes, absolutely.

Randy Rose: I think it's something you might be interested in. So it's just my first name, randy.rose, just like the flower, R-O-S-E, @cisecurity.org, so Center for Internet Security.

And then really, honestly, any SLTT folks that are interested, you know, shoot me an email at that same email address, randy.rose@cisecurity.org. And we can get you connected to our feeds. And we work with Kevin and DHS and, you know, so we're pulling in those feeds already.

And those are free to any SLTT team member or any SLTT, period. They don't have to be a member of the MS-ISAC.

Mark Bradley: Very good. Thanks, Randy. All right? Anyone else? All right. This is a shorter meeting today, obviously. So anyway, let me just get to the next meeting.

The next SLTPS-PAC meeting will be held on Wednesday, January 26, 2022. Again, that's Wednesday, January 26, 2022 from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon.

Let's hope by then it'll be possible to at last hold in-person meetings at the National Archives. So please mark your calendars for that. I know it seems like a lifetime away but let's keep our fingers crossed.

Okay. Well with that and unless anybody else has anything to say I am prepared right now to adjourn the meeting. All right, adjourned. You all please stay safe and I look forward to seeing you all in person. Okay. Goodbye.

END