

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak. My name is Jon Callas, and I am Director of Technology Projects at the Electronic Frontier Foundation. In my career, I have founded a company, Blackphone, that made smartphones as well as worked on cybersecurity issues at a large, international corporation that makes smartphones, computers, and similar devices.

I support the Right to Repair as outlined in HR2698. Some people have objected to the bill on the grounds that there are information security and cybersecurity issues in the bill. It is true that repair of devices has security considerations. As we consumers put more of our lives on smart devices, these considerations become more important.

Nonetheless, HR2698 says that the OEM must provide the same parts, tools, etc. as they would provide to one of their authorized repair providers. The OEM must already consider an authorized repair center to be a risk to their mutual customer. There have been cases where a technician has violated the customer's trust, to the shock of that customer, the OEM, and the authorized repair provider. The relationship between these four parties is complex and the OEM already designs its system so that the repair person does not have access to the totality of the information on the device.

There is thus no additional work the OEM must do to address a new entity that is covered by HE2698. They can be treated exactly like the existing ecosystem of OEMs and authorized repair. In the case of self-repair, which is a part of right-to-repair, the customer may wish to perform the repair precisely because they do not trust someone else with their device, and HR2698 thus reduces the cybersecurity considerations that the OEM must work with. (For completeness, if the OEM does not have cybersecurity protections for their customers, the situation is no worse under HR2698.)

Every consumer must make the decision about who they trust with repairs for nearly everything. HR2698 does not harm the OEMs, who must already take into account that their authorized centers might have incompetent or unscrupulous employees. It does not harm the authorized repair centers, who can certainly compete with others on the grounds that as an authorized center, they have received training etc. from the OEM. It merely provides opportunities and choice for the consumers in Oregon.

I urge the legislature not to be swayed by those who would sow fear and uncertainty. Most consumers will want to have their devices repaired by the OEM or an authorized repair provider. The OEMs themselves already have to take these issues -- which are real issues -- into consideration through action or inaction. All HR2698 does is to provide choice to consumers and opportunities for any small business to provide services to customers who desire them.