



SIM Launches New National Cybersecurity SIG

SIM Cybersecurity Inaugural Event – A panel discussion led by Executive Sponsor, Caren Shiozaki
“Personal Privacy or National Security: Can We Have Both?”

Panelists: Matthew Rosenquist – Cybersecurity Strategist for Intel Corporation and Michael Sohn –
Supervisory Special Agent with the FBI

The initial kick-off event for the newly formed Cybersecurity Special Interest Group under the umbrella of SIM delivered upon its promise to provide members with access to prominent industry thought-leaders who were brought together for this special event to address present matters related to cybersecurity.

Appropriately themed, “Personal Privacy or National Security: Can We Have Both?” this hour-long Webinar featured a moderated point and counter-point discussion between two panelists that eloquently represented numerous considerations that arise with respect to the balance between law enforcement’s desire to protect individual and National security, corporation’s challenges in providing secure technology, and individual’s expectations around privacy.

Caren Shiozaki opened the discussion with the assertion that “We are living in dangerous times... and have an expectation that our government and law enforcement agencies will do the utmost to keep us safe from terrorism and crime. At the same time, we demand the preservation of our privacy.” While the panelists shared the view that the matter of privacy is much more complex than it may seem at first glance, Michael Sohn (FBI) surmised that criminals may actually be temporarily winning the cybersecurity war because law enforcement officials could be at a disadvantage when tracking criminals due to limitations in technology and the U.S. legal system.

Michael says, “When bad guys can circumvent encryption with a \$40 purchase on the black market and law enforcement still hasn’t been able to defeat standard 256-bit encryption,” lowering the boom on cybersecurity crime certainly is difficult.

Both panelists could agree that the solution to addressing cybersecurity issues starts with a first-step; willingness to initiate the conversation. Michael Sohn says that, “These issues should not be decided by the companies that make the technology, nor should it be left up to law enforcement. The solutions need to come from the people,” a reference to the democratic process.

Michael Sohn shared a powerful slide in his presentation that resonated this same sentiment with quotes attributed to James Comey, “We have awesome new technology that creates a serious tension

between two values we all treasure – privacy and safety. That tension should not be resolved by corporations that sell stuff for a living. It also should not be resolved by the FBI, which investigates for a living. It should be resolved by the American people deciding how we want to govern ourselves in a world we have never seen before. We shouldn't drift to a place – or be pushed to a place by the loudest voices – because finding the right place, the right balance, will matter to every American for a very long time.”

Facts and figures demonstrating a recent rise and continuing trend in cybersecurity crime were shared with Webinar participants. These figures showed that the issues are only becoming more prevalent and are in urgent need of being addressed by governments willing to engage in the conversation.

As citizens, we can appreciate the sense of security encryption provides when using applications designed to address necessities such as banking. However, there are risks and trade-offs that need to be considered when the conversation includes such matters as providing law enforcement officials with backdoor access to these systems, even if it is done with the best intentions of individual and national security.

In the end, Matt Rosenquist sees these issues as a Venn diagram where “there is a tremendous amount of overlap.” We don't want to go to extremes. We don't want to surrender all privacy and we don't want to frustrate law enforcement. This all goes back to the need for open discussion and a willingness to make trade-offs. Then, says Mr. Rosenquist, “We put laws in place that facilitate both until they are changed by a future generation.”