

Governor's Advisory Council on Connected and Automated Vehicles Cyber Security & Data Privacy Subcommittee

Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: August 17, 2018 8:00 – 10:00 AM

General Meeting Notes

CAV Principles (K. White presentation):

1. Connected vehicles
2. Automation to take over human tasks
3. Electrified vehicles
4. Shared mobility

Issues (D. Riehl presentation):

What is the government's role in:

- Preparedness
- Ensuring vendors' sensors and devices are secure
- Required inspections of security
- Permit private citizens/companies
- Insurance
- Reporting requirements for vulnerabilities or attacks
- Encryption standards/backdoors
- Security by design/privacy by design
- Blockchain
- Privacy implications
- Innovation/trade secrets/PII
- GPS/driver behavior/travel history/in-car cameras
- Smartphones
- Statutory/regulatory/policy
- Commercialization
- Coordinate with Federal regulations
- What is disclosed ...

Top issues from the subcommittee's small group discussions:

Data Privacy

- Goal: Prevent anyone from de-anonymizing the data
- Data must be anonymized at the collection point

To what extent does the driver need to be identified (PII)?

- How do drivers fit?
 - In the future it may not be a “driver” (e.g., primary user, owner, operator)
 - The person who has contracted the vehicle
 - Connected vs autonomous cars (connected has a driver)
 - Legally/statutorily the term *driver* is problematic – *operator* more accurate/easier for court – make the distinction
 - Enabling system to determine whether driver or system is at fault

Driver/Infrastructure – Advancement of Research

- To what extent should Minnesota be a curator of data (clearinghouse?) and for what uses
- Swiping card on dashboard (rental car, driver’s license)
- How much data should be kept?
 - Internal vs external storage

Innovation

- What role does the government have to work with private industry to standardize?
- What testing standards are used for testing? Airplane?

Data and Records

- What should be identifiable and accessible? For example: Capability to determine fault. Should this be private?
- Government should provide a foundation of standard requirements for records.
 - “Black box” info
- State liability for connection with state infrastructure
- Car manufacturer liability
- (Note, link to Insurance and Liability Subcommittee)
- Who curates map data: road, lane, intra-lane
- Where does state’s responsibility begin?

What is the Role of Block Chain?

- There is precedent regarding responsibly to secure state’s IT systems and buy mechanisms to protect, but cannot take responsibility for what we don’t manage
 - Secure what you control
 - Transport layer security versioning issue
- 1609.2 IEEE Standard Wireless Access Vehicular Environments
- Testability

Public/Private Data

- Protection of data (Equifax concerns)
- Current -1 is the standard without a choice

- Coalition with other states
- Best practices with respect to cyber security – risk assessment
- Change profile – safe harbor with respect to liability issues for
- Pool of \$ for manufacturers to cover liability
- Service Organization Controls reports dependent on auditor – audit firm takes on liability of report
 - Will insurers report what they are doing to mitigate risk? SOC report?
- Demonstrating rigor and compliance
- SOC, ISO, NIST

Communication

- Consider how to communicate this to laypersons and the general public
- Build trust
- Legislators/others will not understand but instead ask if it is true and believable
 - Concerns about false reports and misinformation leading to catastrophic results/malicious information
 - Reliability and integrity concerns

Other

- DMV-type assessments – determine efficacy based on sensors and assign a score
 - DOT gives certificate to drive based on score or flips to manual and can't drive until 'trust' of system is approved
- Privacy by design – IPV6 (Internet Protocol version 6) privacy mode must be enabled
- Up front security because infrastructure changes are expensive

Tentative & Final Recommendations

Recommend making a distinction between operator and driver in statutes/rules/policies going forward.

General sense that it is in MN's best interests to pursue public/private partnerships to learn from and protect data. No specific recommendation yet.

Next Steps

Renee will send her presentation
Liaisons and CAV-X will provide resources on website

Parking Lot - items for follow up at subsequent meetings

None