

Rehoboth Information Technology Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Date of Meeting: 10 May 2023 (7:06 pm)

Meeting Location: Francis Farm Arcade Bldg.
(and by ZOOM)

Members of Committee:

Anna Deignan (AD) (Chair)
Tim Maynard (TM) (Secretary)
Jay Jil (JJ)
Reuben Fishman (RF)

In Attendance:

Present
Present
Present
Present

Official Observers:

George Solas (B.O.S.)
Richard Panofsky (Personnel Board, Chair.)

Old Business:

Reuben Fishman moved to approve the minutes of the meeting of 12 April 2023. The motion was seconded by Jay Jil and was approved unanimously.

Reuben performed a review/update on the project of the Dispatch Interface for Police, Fire and Ambulance Services. The police need to add a software module. They need to add a license module for “C.A.D.” (computer aided dispatch) export. The license is not included in what they are currently paying for. They will have to purchase it (approximately \$5000, first year only) and have it deployed on their IMC installation.

New Business:

- Anna Deignan introduced the matter of possible issues with the Personnel Board. Extensive discussion ensued.
- Mr. Solas indicated the need for a training policy for the town.
- Anna explained the background. She proceeded to explain some of the past planning and made it clear that we have two imminent concerns: Computer Security and Cyber Security; both of which are required by Massachusetts Privacy Law and our Cyber Security insurance.
- Mr. Panofsky clearly indicated that there are two different issues in play, our insurance requirements and our training needs.
- Anna questioned whether it should be two different policies or a broader, all-encompassing policy.
- Mr. Panofsky indicated that the policy already exists:
 1. Workers are expected to adhere to their job description;
 2. Managers are expected to enforce adherence.
- He indicated that we do not need a duplication of policies. We do not hire people who do not know how to satisfy the computer requirements for their job.
- Anna stated that the committee should stay focused on user/cybersecurity awareness training.
- Mr. Panofsky stated that “Onboarding” will include cyber security awareness training. The policy should be short and to the point.

- Mr. Solas reiterated that the managers are responsible for enforcement.
- Mr. Panofsky suggested that the Cyber-security Training Program for Rehoboth should be approved by the insurance company.

Anna requested an update on the status of the “Information Technology Daily Needs” form that was generated by Mr. Panofsky. Mr. Panofsky indicated that this was just a tool used by the Personnel Board to provoke conversation in anticipation of Derek Rousseau’s (former IT Director) leave of absence.

Relative to the blank cyber-security (Beazley) questionnaire that was provided by Mr. Solas, Anna suggested that it would be useful if we had the last (completed) questionnaire. The committee requested that Mr. Solas procure a copies for the committee.

Relative to the new questionnaire, the committee felt that we need to establish who fills it out. Mr. Solas suggested that Bruce Andrews (temporary IT/AV director) would probably fill it out. Mr. Andrews did the I.T. Management in Seekonk before coming to us. Anna suggested that we may need to revise the questions and make adjustments to our behavior.

An extensive discussion of Multi-factor Authentication (MFA) was undertaken. Different forms of MFA were reviewed. It was felt that the Committee needs to make a recommendation to the B.O.S. to implement MFA by a specific date. Anna again emphasized to Mr. Solas that the committee needs a copy of last years completed Beazley questionnaire.

Anna introduced the issue of CMIT’s “Network and Security Assessment”. The committee undertook an extensive review of the assessment (as submitted to the town). The committee generally felt that, although informational, it did not meet the standards of a professional document.

Reuben suggested that there is so much “low hanging fruit” that they did not have to dig very deeply to get to 28 pages. Further, this report should have been labeled “CLASSIFIED” given the sensitivity of the information.

Anna reminded the committee that “you get what you pay for” and this was done “gratis”. This report was very poorly done and full of errors in grammar and format. There were no bullet points that would have made it easier to read and there was no executive summary. Further, it should have been specified in the document that this was an assessment conducted from (start date) to (finish date).

The general feeling of the committee was that it was poorly done, incomplete, unprofessional and not up to the standards of a professional organization. It was generally felt that we need an independent assessment by an uninvolved third party.

Anna stated that a complete assessment requires that a framework (template) applicable to our network should have been used and detailed. Anna will take the “CMIT Network and Security Assessment” and plug it into the NIST (National Institute of Standards and Technology) cyber-security framework (CSF) to determine the gaps in the report. This will provide a tool for the town to apply going forward.

Motion:

Move to adjourn
(at 9:24 pm)

Presented By:

Reuben Fishman

2nd:

Jay Jil

Vote:

Passed Unanimously