



Data Task Force
March 17, 2025, Meeting minutes
Remote Meeting via Interactive Conference Technology
1151 Punchbowl Street, Conference Rm. 410, Honolulu, HI

DRAFT

Meeting was held via Microsoft Teams (videoconference interactive conferencing technology).
Physical location: 1151 Punchbowl Street, Conference Room 410, Honolulu, Hawai'i

Members Present

Rebecca Cai, Chair, Office of Enterprise Technology Services (ETS)
Chris Jitchaku, University of Hawaii
Thomas Lee, Hawai'i Data Collective
Dr. Eugene Tian, Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism
Mai Nguyen Van, Judiciary
Derek Vale, Department of Health
Torrie Inouye, Bank of Hawai'i
Representative Amy Perruso, State House

Members Excused

Timothy Hosoda, Department of Education
Phan Sirivattha, Department of Human Services
Kaimana Walsh, Hawai'i Green Growth

Other Attendees

Candace Park, Deputy Attorney General
ETS: Christine M. Sakuda, Javzandulam Azuma, Joanna Lee, Bradford Baris, Juha Kauhanen
Lisa Watkins
Brian B.
Seth S. Colby
Yvonne Yoro
Caleb

I. Call to Order; Roll Call

Roll call was taken. With quorum established, the meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m.

II. Public Testimony

None.

III. Approve meeting minutes for the December DTF meeting

Member Lee made a motion to approve the minutes as presented, which was seconded by Members Tian and Vale. A vote was taken and passed unanimously.

IV. 2025 Hawaii Data & AI Summit: Data Task Force panel planning

Chair Cai discussed the upcoming Data and AI Summit scheduled for May 14th, 2025, in Waikiki. Chair Cai mentions the suggestion of having a general session with the Data Task Force members at a 10:00 a.m. general session following the keynote speech to share their mission, vision, accomplishments, and plans. Chair Cai emphasized the importance of having all members present to receive feedback from government employees on the focus areas for the coming year and asked the members to confirm their availability and input on suggested topics for the panel. Chair Cai encouraged members to think of any other suggested topics for the panel, highlighting the value of receiving feedback government employees to guide the task force's focus for the upcoming year.

V. 2024 Data and AI Activities Summary – Thank you!

Chair Cai thanked the data task force members for their valuable feedback and contributions to the team's accomplishments in 2024 even with the short turn around times.

VI. Status update on the 7 Data and AI guidelines required to be developed in accordance with HRS section 27-44

Chair Cai provided an updated on the comprehensive review of the seven guidelines, which are currently being reviewed by the Chief Information Officer (CIO), Comptroller, and Attorney General (AG) to ensure they are solid before rollout. The review process involves multiple stakeholders to ensure thoroughness and accuracy and aims to make sure the guidelines are robust and ready for implementation.

- a. Data Quality Guidelines
- b. Data Privacy Guidelines
- c. Data Catalog Guidelines
- d. Data Classification Guidelines
- e. Data Retention Guidelines
- f. Open Data Guidelines
- g. GenAI Assistant Technologies Usage Guidelines

VII. Per 27-44, what is data task force's scope of work on creating and implementing policies, standards, guidelines to start improving the State's data and AI?

Per §24-44, Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chair Cai highlighted that some guidelines, such as AI guidelines, could apply to all state employees and devices, but not necessarily to the executive branch. The team needs to ensure the guidelines are set up according to the law and authorized by it. Chair Cai raised the question of whether the enforcement of guidelines should be handled by ETS, the Data Task Force, or individual departments. The discussion included the need to avoid double work and ensure clarity in the enforcement process.

Chair Cai outlined the current review process, which involves the CIO, Comptroller, and AG and questioned whether the guidelines should be brought back to the Data Task Force for review after this process or if the current review is sufficient.

Chair Cai mentioned that in many states, enforcement is up to individual departments, with some involving the AG. The discussion included the need for tools to empower the enforcement entity, whether it be departments, ETS, or the AG.

Chair Cai discussed the responsible use of AI tools, emphasizing that there is no difference in securing data shared with AI compared to other technologies. Each department and their employees must ensure responsible use and follow standard protocols in case of a breach. Chair Cai announced that the tools and resources that were asked for were approved in H.B. 300, H.D. 1.

Member Vale commented on the importance of having a comprehensive view of the standards review process and the necessity for agencies to report on enforcement issues, particularly related to AI tools also emphasizing the need for sharing draft changes to maintain the intent of the standards. Chair Cai agreed, highlighting the alignment with cybersecurity breach processes and the importance of Data Task Force members being in consensus.

Member Lee commented on the role of the Chief Data Officer (CDO) and the need to clarify the scope of the task force, emphasizing the importance of addressing issues across various sectors, including health, human services, and judiciary. Member Lee also stresses the need to align with current statutes while considering the incorporation of other government branches. Chair Cai agreed and suggested that they clarify this as an action item for the year.

VIII. New bill update: SB742 Relating to Data Sharing – Establishes a statewide data sharing and governance working group

Chair Cai explained that Senate Bill 742 focuses on data sharing and data governance, aiming to improve operational efficiency and interoperability among state departments. The bill has received strong backing from various departments and nonprofit organizations and has passed two hearings on the Senate side. Chair Cai encouraged the Data Task Force members to provide testimony in support of the bill before the next hearing. SB 742 identifies the existence of data silos within government operations, where departments optimize their own data use but do not share it effectively, leading to inefficiencies. The proposal includes the formation of a data governance and sharing working group to identify and catalog necessary datasets, ensuring proper access control while promoting inter-departmental collaboration.

Chair Cai highlighted the benefits of data sharing and governance, including improved operational efficiency and better decision-making through enhanced data interoperability among state departments.

Member Vale expressed optimism regarding the passing of SB 742, which would facilitate collaboration on data sharing platforms. Chair Cai emphasized the necessity of tools for effective data sharing, referencing a recommendation made by their CIO and recent budget developments that could provide essential tools for their work.

Member Lee questioned the relationship between the Data Task Force and the working group.

Chair Cai outlines that the Data Task Force focuses on guidelines and policies for responsible data usage and sharing, while the governance group emphasizes mandatory data sharing among departments.

Member Vale highlights the challenges associated with governance tools and the need for a roadmap to facilitate effective data sharing, particularly concerning sensitive data.

Member Tian expressed concerns regarding the legality and confidentiality of sharing microdata, emphasizing the potential impact on data collection efforts and the willingness of individuals to provide information. SB 1491 – relating to departmental data sharing; and HB 131 – relating to research; raises questions about their actual impact on current practices. There is significant apprehension regarding sharing microdata, particularly from tax departments, as it could violate privacy laws. The discussion indicates that while aggregate data is shared, microdata poses legal challenges. SB 742 points out the difficulties in obtaining accurate data, particularly in crisis situations, such as natural disasters, where reliable records are often lacking and the importance of confidentiality in surveys is emphasized. The potential release of microdata could deter individuals from participating, thereby increasing costs and complicating data collection efforts.

IX. Roles and responsibilities of departments in statewide data sharing Roles and responsibilities of departments in statewide data sharing

Chair Cai discussed a collaborative approach to data sharing and governance across departments, emphasizing the importance of a federated data model where each department retains ownership of its data while adhering to statewide standards and guidelines. Each department maintains ownership of its data while participating in a statewide data governance framework that promotes shared access and compliance with standards and the framework includes a statewide geospatial data platform and master data management tools, which departments can utilize to enhance data quality and facilitate sharing. The initiative emphasizes collaboration among departments to enforce standards and guidelines while allowing for individual data cataloging and classification based on departmental needs.

X. Additional discussion points:

a. Federal changes and removal of data – impact to your agency

Government organizations removed or modified over 8,000 web pages and approximately 3,000 datasets; Data.gov removed 3,379 datasets; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention altered or removed over 3,000 pages; and the Census Bureau removed 3,000 pages of research materials.

Chair Cai discusses the implications of recent federal changes in open data, highlighting the removal of numerous data sets and the challenges this poses for state departments and emphasizes the importance of understanding which departments utilize specific data sets and the need for a centralized statewide data platform to avoid redundant efforts in data storage and quality management.

- b. Some states ban DeepSeek use on state devices and networks due to data-harvesting concerns

DeepSeek is a powerful AI tool owned by a Chinese company. The use of the AI tool raises questions regarding security concerns related to data being sent to servers in China amidst US-China relations, which led to several states to impose bans on its usage.

Governor ban for Texas, New York, Virginia, and Iowa; bill pending legislation for Kansas; and departmental ban for Nevada, North Carolina, and Oregon.

Chair Cai mentioned the AI usage guideline document that was proposed that emphasizes that non-public data should only be used with state-licensed AI tools, which effectively excludes using the discussed Chinese tool for sensitive data.

Member Vale inquired about the potential ban on using Deep Seek on state-owned devices due to data security concerns, with a memo being prepared to inform departments about the policy and the timeline for release. Chair Cai informed the members that the CIO and Comptroller are working on a memo to be released but it is still in the review stage between Chair Cai and the AG. There is a lot of feedback that needs to be incorporated and updated.

- c. Suggested topics for the next meeting?

Chair Cai asked the Data Task Force if there are any suggested topics for the next meeting, which follows the Data and AI Summit. Chair Cai will send an email to the members asking for suggestions on how to work together to support the data sharing and governance working group, if the bill passes.

Member Vale suggested how to implement the policies and any further guidance on how to enforce them within agencies.

XI. Announcements

Next Meeting: June 23, 2025

XII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:56 p.m.