

# **Agency Legislative Proposal - 2020 Session**

**Document Name**: 2020 DESPP Cyber Security

(If submitting electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal - 092620\_SDE\_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Department of Emergency Service and Public Protection

**Liaison:** Scott DeVico **Phone:** 203-525-6959

**E-mail:** scott.devico@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Division of Emergency Management and

**Homeland Security** 

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Michael Kowal, CTIC

Title of Proposal: An Act Concerning Statewide Cyber Resilience

Statutory Reference: Section 36a-701d

### Proposal Summary:

This proposal would be to require all state and local municipal government entities to report critical cyber related threats to the state intelligence fusion center, CTIC. CTIC shares cyber related information across a network of 80 fusion centers in all 50 states for the purposes of identifying threats and providing strategic warning in an effort to identify vulnerabilities and reduce risk. CTIC also has the responsibility of reporting information to the Intelligence Community through DHS and FBI.

Currently, the state has adopted a Cyber Disruption Response Plan, a comprehensive plan for dealing with any significant cyber incident. Additionally, the Cyber Security Committee, the Cyber Disruption Task Force and the State IT Security Officer Roundtable, are sources available to provide input and guidance for the Homeland Security Advisor to the Governor's Office. These mechanisms allow for the sharing of critical information with executive leaders and the plan allows for a coordinated response to critical cyber disruptions to the state. The proposal would unify reporting from both state and municipal agencies when critical cyber-attacks occur in their jurisdictions allowing CTIC to provide executive leadership visibility on the cyber threat landscape in Connecticut. The reporting would allow for the sharing of indicators and attack vectors which could alleviate others from being attacked. The proposal would also allow the state to build better resiliency by creating a mandatory bilateral channel of communication between all local and state government through the state fusion center. This would also allow state leaders to gain a better picture of the cyber threat landscape so as to better respond with adequate threat mitigation or vulnerability reduction measures.



#### PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

### ♦ Reason for Proposal

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary?
  - a. There is currently no mandate for municipal and state government to report any cyber incidents to the state for the purpose of providing situational awareness to leaders and response assistance to victims.
  - b. There are some laws which mandate notifications to customers when certain kinds of breaches occur such as Chapter 669 Sec 36a-701.
- (2) Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? Are other states considering something similar this year?
  - a. Other states have enacted laws which are specific to certain types of breaches. No state to date has enacted a bill to mandate municipal and state government entities to report cyber related incidents to a fusion center.
- (3) Have certain constituencies called for this action?
- (4) What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?
  - a. Currently reporting is very sporadic or does not occur at all. Due to how interconnected municipal and state governments are, a cyber breach could have far reaching cascading effects at a speed which requires timely reporting and response. Currently breaches are handled internally and rarely are reported to the state. The state currently has a difficult time ascertaining the magnitude of the cyber threat landscape for the homeland security advisor to the governor. Many municipalities attempt to quietly resolve the issue between their insurance company and lawyers.

| <b>♦</b>                                 | Origin of Proposal  | ☑ New Proposal                      | ☐ Resubmission |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| If this is a resubmission, please share: |   |                                     |                |  |  |  |  |  |
| (1)                                      | (1) What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package? |                                     |                |  |  |  |  |  |
| (2)                                      | Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?     |                                     |                |  |  |  |  |  |
| (3)                                      | Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?                |                                     |                |  |  |  |  |  |
| (4)                                      | What was the last action take   | en during the past legislative sess | ion?           |  |  |  |  |  |
| N/A                                      |   |                                     |                |  |  |  |  |  |

#### **PROPOSAL IMPACT**

♦ **AGENCIES AFFECTED** (please list for each affected agency)

| Agency Name: N/A Agency Contact ( <i>name, title, phone</i> ): Date Contacted: |            |                 |  |  |  |
|--|------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Approve of Proposal  | □ YES □ NO | ☐ Talks Ongoing |  |  |  |
| Summary of Affected Agency's Comments N/A                                      |            |                 |  |  |  |



| . ♦<br>Muni | FISCAL IMPACT (Will increase the need to expand CTIC cyber capability with more analysts)  cipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)                                      |  |  |  |  |
|-------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Man         | ates municipal government to report cyber related incidents to the state fusion center  |  |  |  |  |
| CTIC.       | No anticipated fiscal impact to Municipal agencies.   |  |  |  |  |
| State       |   |  |  |  |  |
| Man         | Mandates State government to report cyber related incidents to the state fusion center (CTIC). Mandated reporting would increase the need to expand the state's cyber analytical capability at the fusion center. |  |  |  |  |
| Fede        | ral   |  |  |  |  |
| N/A         |   |  |  |  |  |
| Addi        | ional notes on fiscal impact  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>◊</b>    | POLICY and PROGRAMMATIC IMPACTS (Please specify the proposal section associated with the in   |  |  |  |  |
| Muni        | cipal mandate   |  |  |  |  |

### **EVIDENCE BASE**

What data will be used to track the impact of this proposal over time, and what measurable outcome do you anticipate? Is that data currently available or must it be developed? Please provide information on the measurement and evaluation plan. Where  $possible, those \ plans \ should \ include \ process \ and \ outcome \ components. \ Pew \ MacArthur \ Results \ First \ \underline{evidence \ definitions} \ can$ help you to establish the evidence-base for your program and their <u>Clearinghouse</u> allows for easy access to information about the evidence base for a variety of programs.



- (a) For purposes of these sections, "breach of cyber security" means (1) any unauthorized attempt to gain access to or unauthorized acquisition of electronic files, media databases or computerized data; (2) any unauthorized interference with, access to or unauthorized acquisition of electronic files, media databases or computerized data, including any attempt to acquire funds in any form through such interference; (3) any other cyber security threat that may affect public health, safety or confidence. "Connecticut Intelligence Center" means the state's intelligence fusion center maintained within the Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection, Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security, in accordance with Connecticut General Statutes Section 28-1a(b).
- (b) In the event of any breach, or known attempted breach, of cyber security, as defined in section (a), affecting the computer systems of any municipality, school district, or state agency, the chief executive officer of the municipality, the superintendent of the school district, or the head of the state agency shall provide notice to the Connecticut Intelligence Center within 24 hours of discovery of the breach or attempted breach. Upon receipt of notification, the Connecticut Intelligence Center shall follow the procedures within the State Cyber Disruption Response Plan, which is an annex to the State Response Framework, in accordance with Connecticut General Statutes Section 28-5.



# **Agency Legislative Proposal - 2020 Session**

**Document Name:** DESPP-2020-FOI Address Exemption

(If submitting electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal - 092620\_SDE\_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection

**Liaison:** Scott DeVico **Phone:** 203-525-6959

**E-mail:** scott.devico@ct.gov

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Legal Affairs Unit

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Cynthia Isales, Agency Legal Director

Title of Proposal: Nondisclosure of DESPP residential addresses

Statutory Reference: Conn. Gen. Stat. § 1-217 (a) (2)

## **Proposal Summary:**

Amend freedom of information law to protect the residential addresses of all employees of the Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection.

## **PROPOSAL BACKGROUND**

#### **♦** Reason for Proposal

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary?
- (2) Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? Are other states considering something similar this year?
- (3) Have certain constituencies called for this action?
- (4) What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?

This amendment would bring consistency with the protection afforded to employees of other agencies. For example, the residential address exemption applies to all employees of the Department of Correction, Department of Children and Families, judicial branch, and Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities.

## ♦ Origin of Proposal ✓ New Proposal ☐ Resubmission

*If this is a resubmission, please share:* 

- (1) What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?
- (2) Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
- (3) Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
- (4) What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?



# **PROPOSAL IMPACT**

♦ **AGENCIES AFFECTED** (please list for each affected agency)

| Agency Name: Freedom of Information Commission Agency Contact (name, title, phone): Date Contacted:   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|-------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Approve of Proposal   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Summary of Affected Agency's Comments As in previous years, the FOI Commission is hesitant to support legislation expanding FOI exemptions. |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Will there need to be further negotiation? ☐ YES 🛮 🖾 NO   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| ♦ FISCAL IMPACT (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated imp                                  | oact) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)  No Impact.   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| State   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Impact.  |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Federal   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Impact.  |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| Additional notes on fiscal impact   |       |  |  |  |  |  |
| ♦ POLICY and PROGRAMMATIC IMPACTS (Please specify the proposal section associated with the imp  | act)  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No Impact.  |       |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | 1     |  |  |  |  |  |

## **♦ EVIDENCE BASE**

What data will be used to track the impact of this proposal over time, and what measurable outcome do you anticipate? Is that data currently available or must it be developed? Please provide information on the measurement and evaluation plan. Where possible, those plans should include process and outcome components. Pew MacArthur Results First evidence definitions can



help you to establish the evidence-base for your program and their <u>Clearinghouse</u> allows for easy access to information about the evidence base for a variety of programs.

Not applicable.

Sec. 1-217. (Formerly Sec. 1-20f). Nondisclosure of residential addresses of certain individuals. Written request for nondisclosure. Redaction. Exceptions. Liability of public agency, public official or employee for violation. Hearing. Penalty. (a) No public agency may disclose, under the Freedom of Information Act, from its personnel, medical or similar files, the residential address of any of the following persons employed by such public agency:

(2) [A sworn member of a municipal police department, a sworn member of the Division of State Police within] An employee of the Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection or a sworn law enforcement officer within the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection;