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Overview

I. Background

II. The President’s Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technology
   ** The need to develop computing experts to shape major policy debates

III. The policy focus to date – getting funding for (the right) computer science research

IV. The emerging importance of non-funding policy issues for computer scientists

V. How you and your colleagues can make a difference
Swire Early Career

- Princeton:
  - Public policy, economics
  - Interdisciplinary thesis—effects of information technology theory on legal and economic thought
- Yale Law School
  - JD and ABD in political philosophy
  - DC jobs in school and after
  - Law teaching 1990
  - First law of cyberspace paper 1993
  - Book on US/EU privacy 1998
  - Law professor at UVA, GW, Ohio State
White House/OMB

- Chief Counselor for Privacy 1999-2001
  - WH coordinator for HIPAA Privacy Rule
  - WH lead on GLBA Financial Privacy Rule
  - Chair, WH Working Group on Encryption for 1999 policy change
  - Chair, WH Working Group to update wiretap laws for the Internet 2000
- Other cybersecurity, e-Commerce, EU issues
After 2001

- Research on cyber-security, privacy, FISA etc. 2001-2008
- Security & privacy advisory boards for IBM, Intel, Microsoft, start-ups
- Special Assistant to President Obama for Economic Policy, 2009-10
  - Broadband spending
  - Spectrum allocation
  - Other issues
- Co-Chair, W3C standards process for Do Not Track, 2012-13
Current Employment

- 2013 arrived at Georgia Tech
  - Scheller College of Business
  - Courtesy – College of Computing, School of Public Policy
- Co-teach with computer scientists:
  - Privacy, Technology, Policy and Law
  - Cybersecurity Strategy and Policy
II. The Review Group

- Snowden leaks of 215 and Prism in June, 2013
- August – President’s Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technology formed
  - I pushed for inclusion of a technologist
  - They didn’t know one, I think, with the level of insider institutional expertise they were seeking
- 5 members
Our assigned task

- Protect national security
- Advance our foreign policy, including economic effects
- Protect privacy and civil liberties
- Maintain the public trust
- Reduce the risk of unauthorized disclosure
Our assigned task (2)

- Protect national security
- Advance our foreign policy, including economic effects
- Protect privacy and civil liberties
- Maintain the public trust
- Reduce the risk of unauthorized disclosure

Q: A simple optimization task, and write the algorithm?

A: No – need technical insight, integrated with other policy perspectives
Our Report

- Meetings, briefings, public comments
- 300+ pages in December
- 46 recommendations
  - Section 215 database “not essential” to stopping any attack; recommend government not hold phone records
- Pres. Obama speech January
  - Adopted 70% in letter or spirit
  - Additional recommendations under study
Theme 1: Offense & Defense in Cybersecurity

- Unlike Cold War, now same systems for “our” and “their” communications
- Strong intelligence and military reasons for offensive capabilities
  - Military in the future - Cyber Command, analogous to the way the Air Force became key to offense
  - Where more critical infrastructure is online, then offense against it more valuable
Defense and Cybersecurity

- Defense today:
  - Over 90% of critical infrastructure privately held
  - If install a patch, then tip off outsiders: can’t defend the “good guys” and still attack the “bad guys”
  - Cybersecurity has daily attacks against civilians, so defense is more important
- On balance, the Review Group strongly emphasized defense:
  - Improve security of government systems
    - Address insider threat, etc.
  - Encryption
  - Zero days
Strong Crypto for Defense

- Crypto Wars of the 1990’s showed NSA & FBI interest in breaking encryption (offense)
- 1999 policy shift to permit export globally of strong encryption, necessary for Internet (defense)
- Press reports of recent NSA actions to undermine encryption standards & defeat encryption (offense)
- RG Rec 29: support strong crypto standards and software; secure communications a priority on the insecure Internet; don’t push vendors to have back doors (defense)
- RG talked with IT experts but didn’t have a member
- No announcement yet on this recommendation
Zero Days & the Equities Process

- A “zero day” exploit means previously unused vulnerability, where defenders have had zero days to respond
- Press reports of USG stockpiling zero days, for intelligence & military use
- RG Rec 30: Lean to defense. New WH equities process to ensure vulnerabilities are blocked for USG and private networks. Exception if inter-agency process finds a priority to retain the zero day as secret.
- Software vendors and owners of corporate systems have strong interest in good defense
- WH recently announced basic agreement with this
Theme 2: One Internet, Multiple Equities

- The same Internet for multiple activities:
  - Intelligence, law enforcement
  - E-Commerce
  - Free speech & political dissent
  - All the fun stuff – cat videos
  - Military theaters of combat
One Internet, Multiple Equities

- For these activities, have multiple policy goals
  - National security
  - Strengthen cyber-defense
  - Privacy & civil liberties
  - Allies
  - Business and the economy
  - Internet governance
- RG recommendations to integrate these
- No one has research-level expertise in all of these
- An issue to ponder: how can we have leading computing experts with the institutional experience to help shape these decisions?
III. Getting Funding for (the Right) Computing Research

- A role model – Vannevar Bush
- The importance of research funding for computer science
  - Focus here on U.S., but analysis applies elsewhere
- Your expertise vital for policy about:
  - The level of funding for computing research
  - Funding the “right” research – setting priorities
Van nevar Bush
As Role Model

AS WE MAY THINK
A TOP U.S. SCIENTIST FORESEES A POSSIBLE FUTURE WORLD IN WHICH MAN-MADE MACHINES WILL START TO THINK

by Vannevar Bush

DIRECTIONS OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Condensed from the Atlantic Monthly, July 1945

...
Vannevar Bush (1)

- MIT EE professor (1919)
- Founded what is now Raytheon (1922)
- Analog computer to solve differential equations (1927)
- Dean MIT School of Engineering (1932)
- Science Advisor to FDR & led Office of Scientific Research & Development (WWII)
  - Thousands of scientists
  - Pushed the Manhattan Project
  - Focus on the policy goal: “Will it help to win a war – this war?”
    - Did not push ENIAC, because he thought not ready on time
Vannevar Bush (2)

- After the war, Bush pushed hard for creation of NSF
  - Created in 1950
  - Military & commercial rationales for federal spending
  - Global leadership required U.S. innovation
- Themes:
  - Bush led on policy outside of his research area
  - Imperative to support research funding
  - Research funding linked to national needs
  - Need to make hard choices about which projects to fund
The Importance of Computing Research Funding

- I agree with the importance of this
- Let’s look at how that gets explained to policy makers
The Computing Community Consortium

The **mission** of Computing Research Association's Computing Community Consortium (CCC) is to **catalyze** the computing research community and **enable** the pursuit of innovative, high-impact research.

CCC conducts activities that **strengthen** the research community, **articulate** compelling **research visions**, and **align** those visions with pressing **national and global challenges**.

CCC **communicates** the importance of those visions to **policymakers**, government and industry **stakeholders**, the **public**, and the **research community** itself.

[http://cra.org/ccc](http://cra.org/ccc)
“Lazowska sang a familiar refrain:

Research often takes a long time before it pays off – often 15 years or more.

Research often pays off in unanticipated ways – we can’t predict what the biggest impact will be.

Advances in one sector enable advances in other sectors.

The research ecosystem is fueled by the flow of people and ideas back and forth between academia and industry.

Every multi-billion-dollar IT industry sector has a clear relationship to Federal research investment. Federal investment doesn’t supplant private sector investment – it complements it.”
Example: Robotics

4 meetings during summer 2008
Roadmap published May 2009
Extensive discussions between visioning leaders & agencies

OSTP issues directive to all agencies in summer 2010 to include robotics in FY 12 budgets

National Robotics Initiative announced in summer 2011

Henrik Christensen
Georgia Tech

http://cra.org/ccc
The Consensus on This Agenda

- Compelling on the substance
  - Dramatic, life-changing results from federal funding in computing research
  - Research in this area pays off in concrete ways that matter to policy makers – jobs, economy, military
- Also, not surprising to see consensus in the computing research community
- Who is against greater funding for this research?
Implications for national leadership

- If you care about national security, the financial system, access to justice, precision agriculture, the balance of trade, health care, urban ecology, transportation efficiency, energy independence, education, scientific discovery, ... then you need to care about advances in computer science!

- Issues such as online privacy and security, Internet governance, software patents / intellectual property, electronic voting, etc., are now front-and-center on the policy agenda and require a combination of technical, legal, and sociological approaches.

Chief Technologists of the Federal Trade Commission

Source: Ed Lazowska
What An Outsider Notices

- If you care about national security and other issues, “then you need to care about advances in computer science.”
- I agree with that
- Note: the emphasis is on more research funding
  - Interesting that the word cloud last night for CRA did not include the word “policy”
- What does this community have to say about all the other policy issues?
- Where else can/should your domain knowledge help policy and society?
Implications for national leadership

- If you care about national security, the financial system, access to justice, precision agriculture, the balance of trade, health care, urban ecology, transportation efficiency, energy independence, education, scientific discovery, ... then you need to care about advances in computer science!

- Issues such as online privacy and security, Internet governance, software patents / intellectual property, electronic voting, etc., are now front-and-center on the policy agenda and require a combination of technical, legal, and sociological approaches.

Source: Ed Lazowska
The Role of the CTO at the FTC

- 2008 Paper: The FTC @ 100 & The Future of Consumer Protection

- Top recommendation “Appoint a Chief Technology Officer for the FTC”

- Felten, Bellovin, Sweeney are *not focused* on funding for computer science research

- They *are focused* on privacy, encryption, de-identification as applied to policy issues of the agency
III. The Emerging Importance of Non-Funding Policy to Computer Scientists
III. The Emerging Importance of Non-Funding Policy to Computer Scientists

- Factual claims for you to consider;
  - More policy issues are and will be facing computer scientists beyond the traditional research funding questions
  - Better policy outcomes will result from computer scientist engagement
  - The nature of pervasive computing means you may face more policy constraints in your research

- Three examples
  - Kinetic effects
  - Internet of Things/Internet of Devices
  - Big Data/Analytics
Kinetic Effects (1)

- Claim: when your software has direct physical effects, then the regulators of those physical effects will scrutinize your actions.
- To date, software has had little interference from the tort system.
  - Bug in software does *not* result in liability.
    - Can’t win damages from Microsoft if Windows has a vulnerability.
  - This creates enormous freedom to innovate, make mistakes, and learn by doing.
  - It is largely an unnoticed freedom – you don’t need lawyers to second-guess your code.
- You don’t need FDA-style trials for new offerings.
- A key legal doctrine – plaintiffs rarely win damages for mere “economic loss”.

Kinetic Effects (2)

- Thought experiment:
  - A driver-less car crashes into people due to a software bug
  - Car company liable to injured person?
  - Software writer liable either to injured person or car company?
  - From mere “economic loss” to physical damages
  - Also, today software defendants rely on the terms of service
    - That won’t work for the driverless car
    - Especially for the person hit by the car who did not consent
Examples of Kinetic Effects

- Robot research and deployment
  - Research lab and OSHA safety issues?
  - Prototypes of powerful metal objects and what is “reasonable care”?
- Kinetic effects of cyber-security attacks
  - Most experts believe cyber-attacks are *not* an act of war in the absence of kinetic effects
  - But, when take out the power grid or unleash water from a dam, that may be an act of war
- Role of software researchers and writers when creating these capabilities?
Internet of Things/Internet of Devices

- Terminology:
  - Many “things” won’t be networked – trees, stars
  - Sensors in devices will be pervasive and networked
  - With Antón and others, IoD privacy and security
- Importance of pervasive networking
  - Networking enables action at a distance
  - By unknown others
  - Proliferation of possible threats
Internet of Things/Internet of Devices

- Software will be embedded in vast array of every-day objects
- Policy issues proliferate
  - Audio/video recording and surveillance by property owners or people near you (in locker room)
  - Video feed informs the burglar when you leave home
  - What is “open” or “proprietary” or “private”?
  - Kinetic effects of devices – home appliances that glitch and cause harm
Big Data and Analytics

- Sensors and databases create Big Data
  - *Security*: Big Data breaches
  - *Privacy*: “insights” as privacy invasions
- White House report
  - Possible discriminatory effects: what if target marketing is linked to race or national origin for costly sub-prime loans?
  - Lessons from fair lending for “fair marketing”
    - May need to have procedures in place to detect and mitigate discriminatory effects on suspect classes
  - Those procedures not in place for most analytics today
Summary on Emerging Importance of Non-Funding Issues

- Computer scientists are core experts for:
  - Physical effects of software
  - Sensors and networking for Internet of Devices
  - Algorithms and other Big Data analytics

- Themes:
  - You are domain experts to contribute to many non-funding issues
  - More non-funding issues may affect your research
  - The “grand challenge” for this talk:
    - *How can the community of computing researchers best inform and shape these policy issues?*
V. How You and Your Colleagues Can Make a Difference

- Factual claims
  - More policy issues are and will be facing computer scientists beyond the traditional research funding questions
  - Better policy outcomes will result from computer scientist engagement

- To achieve better policy outcomes for society:
  - What you can do as department or school chair
  - What you and your colleagues can do as individuals
What You Can Do As School/Department Chair

- Send the message that policy engagement is valuable and valued by your school and nation
  - For state/land grant universities, institutional goal to give back to the state and general public
- Provide recognition for public service
  - Recognition within your school/department
  - Highlight policy work by faculty/students to university leadership and the general public
- Value policy-related service during promotion
  - Georgia Tech Faculty Handbook: participation on policy committees is part of employment, not “consulting”
What Should Count as a Scholarly Contribution

- Consider how and when to include non-peer reviewed writing for promotion and salary:
  - Agency commissions paper for its public workshop
  - Professor participates on NRC/NAS study
  - Professor writes testimony, white papers, and other policy-relevant materials
- Include participation on policy boards as indicia of prominence in the field for promotion & salary
What Individuals Can Do

- Multiple ways to contribute
- Professional organizations:
  - Provide helpful domain expertise
  - Keep participating
  - You may wake up one day as a chair!
Ways to Engage

- CRA / Fred Schneider’s public policy boot camp
- Revive CRA Digital Government Fellows Program
  - Present relevant work at agencies
  - Build relationships and experience
  - Learn how good academic research can converge with national needs
- Summer internships or short-term details
  - Congressional committees
  - Agencies as a scholar-in-residence
    - May be able to get an office if you have salary from elsewhere
  - Current example: Randy Bryant @ OSTP
Federal Advisory Committees

- Approximately 950 federal advisory committees
- About 62,000 members
- Advise policymakers on a wide array of important and challenging issues
- They often crave more technologists
  - (And fewer lawyers and lobbyists)
- Enlist your university government relations office to look for opportunities for nominations

Source: Antón, CRA LISPI Slide
Many Agencies Can Use Your Help

- Military
  - DoD, Air Force Science Board, Navy Science Study Board, etc.
  - NSA Advisory Board and Councils
  - Others

- Civilian
  - FTC
  - FCC
  - Commerce Department
  - Many others
Just Do It

- In Do Not Track standards process, had individuals accredited to participate
  - Jonathan Mayer, CS grad student, one of the most active participants
  - In a consensus process, your expertise can make a big difference
- Write public comments
  - 2008 CS professor (Antón) and law professor (Swire) co-authored FTC comments on technical/policy flaws in cookies
  - Well cited, and was an impetus for the Do Not Track standards process
  - Can do comments within or outside of ACM, CRA, etc.
Putting it all together to have an impact …

(With thanks on the next slide to Professor Antón)
How to be effective ...

- Must be perceived as independent and balanced.
- Don’t push your own agenda or partisan ideology.
- Must be free from significant conflicts of interest.
- Must leverage your expertise, rather than your ideology.
- Read ahead & do your homework.
- Speak up when you have valuable context, facts, questions, insights.
- Always thank / complement the briefer before diplomatically pointing out the obvious things they’ve overlooked or ignored!
- Be constructive and proactive!
- If you’re a woman, when interrupted (& you will be) speak louder to finish your statement when interrupted by the men, including the 4-stars!

© 2000-2013 Annie I. Antón et al.,
Georgia Institute of Technology
One Other Tip on Being Effective

- Biggest tip from one expert in computing and policy – find the right level of generality in a law/reg/proposal
- Each computing expert has his or her own priority
  - Fund *exactly this* project
  - Fix *exactly* my problem with a rule
  - Please pass a law with laser focus on that!
- **Warning:** this laser focus on your priority violates the first rule of advocacy: *know your audience.*
  - What are their concerns?
  - What do they need from this meeting?
Advice When Speaking to Policy Maker

- Laws must apply more broadly than one individual’s or group’s concern
- National laws and regulations
  - Are national (330 million people)
  - Need support from a diverse coalition
  - Often change at long intervals
    - HIPAA law 1996, first amended 2009
- **The moral:** provide enough flexibility in the rule to apply across time (a decade or more) and space (national)
- Know your “ask” – what is needed to fix your problem, but without naming a specific technology
- Put yourself in the shoes of that policy maker who needs a more general answer
Lessons Thus Far

- Review Group:
  - No one has research expertise on all of the relevant issues
  - How to build a portfolio of experience so you can be selected to participate and then be effective
- The focus on research funding for computing
  - Funding is vitally necessary
  - Even more necessary as computing becomes increasingly central to our society
- With that said, better not to appear only with your hand out for funding
  - More effective to build relationships on other policy issues & contribute in substantive ways
Addressing the Grand Challenge

- “Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country”
  - Policy is more than the funding the taxpayers provide to you
  - You are key domain experts
  - You have so much to offer
- The “grand challenge” for this talk:

How can this community of computing researchers best inform and shape these policy issues?
Finally, Two Quotes

- “Just because you don’t take an interest in politics doesn’t mean it won’t take an interest in you.”
  Pericles, 490-424 B.C.

- “If not me, who? If not now, when?”
  Hillel, 1st century B.C.

Thank you!

{peter.swire@scheller.gatech.edu}
www.petersswire.net