Subject: Opposition to Supporting Recommendation 3.8 on the federal government developing IoT sector definitions

Date: Monday, September 25, 2023 at 12:18:04 PM Pacific Daylight Time

From: Mike Bergman

To: Benson Chan, Dan Caprio

CC: Ann Mehra, ashehabi@lbl.gov, datadiva@debbiereynoldsconsulting.com, debra.lam@innovate.gatech.edu, Kevin.Kornegay@morgan.edu, maria.rerecich@consumer.org, nick.e@cropx.com, Nicole.Coughlin@carync.gov, pete@dotsandbridges.com, ranveer@microsoft.com, robby.moss@gmail.com, Steve.Griffith@Nema.org, tomkat@archon-ds.com, Barbara Bell Cuthill (barbara.cuthill@nist.gov), Jeffrey Brewer, greg.witte@hii-tsd.com

Benson and Dan,

Regarding this proposed Supporting Recommendation:

> **Supporting Recommendation 3.8:** (Proposed Update) The federal government should promote and support the development of an overarching guideline developed in a multi-stakeholder process that more clearly distinguishes the major sectors of the IoT for use when dealing with concerns such as cybersecurity.
>
> This overarching guideline would serve as a reference tool to distinguish the operating environments for the major sectors of the IoT and how cybersecurity concerns or issues would be addressed in a particular sector. For the guideline to be relevant it needs to be developed in a multi-stakeholder process that is open and includes industry participation across the various sectors (i.e., consumer, industrial, healthcare, finance, transportation).   This guideline would not necessarily define the major IoT sectors, it is better used as guidance when cybersecurity legislation or regulations are being considered.
>
> An example of a high-level writeup that would be included in this guideline that targets the industrial IoT sector is provided below: The Industrial IoT or OT sector leverages existing cybersecurity standards such as the IEC 62443 series of international standards that define requirements and processes for implementing and maintaining electronically secure industrial automation and control systems. Industrial automation and control systems are used in nearly every industrial sector such as manufacturing, transportation, energy, and water treatment industries. There are also several conformity assessment and certification programs that exist for these standards. When legislative or regulatory language is developed targeting this sector, ideally it should reference these standards.

I oppose including this Recommendation in the IoTAB report. The markets overlap and morph. The US government is not adept or agile in this context. Having the USG define market sectors risks legislators using these definitions and writing them into new laws. I cannot see a positive outcome from providing slow-moving definitions developed outside the market experts in industry, to, e.g., the Hill.

Further, *regulatory agencies should view this with extreme caution*. They have statutory authority over sectors already defined by Congress. Should these guidelines redefine automotive, medical, airborne (drone) IoT sectors, the results are either unnecessarily duplicative, or in conflict with, the existing statutory authorities.

Because the intent of the goal is to develop such guidance, it cannot be fixed by changing the wording. I propose deleting this recommendation from the draft IoTAB report.

Best Regards,

_____

Mike Bergman
Vice President, Technology & Standards
Consumer Technology Association, producer of CES®
m: +1(609) 865-4402
@mbergman42
CTA.tech | CES.tech