

From: Felix Rauch Valenti
To: [Assistance Bill Consultation](#)
Subject: Feedback on Assistance and Access Bill 2018
Date: Saturday, 8 September 2018 11:27:20 AM

This is my feedback on the proposed Assistance and Access Bill 2018. Having earned a doctor's degree in technical science, more specifically in computer science, I feel technically qualified to express my opinion on the bill.

The bill is terrible for Australian's privacy and data security and must be strongly rejected.

It is not possible to get access to end-t-end encrypted communications without either implementing a backdoor in the communication (thus removing it's security), or by implementing backdoors in the platform (e.g. computer or mobile phone) that allows access to the messages before or after they are encrypted. This is in direct contradiction with the reforms, which rules out backdoors.

The proposed legislation is not proportionate:

Any backdoors, whether in communication protocols, encryption or a platform's security are terrible ideas, since any of these weaknesses will sooner or later be found by criminals. Bad actors could then use the backdoors to steal people's information, access their online banking, or commit identity theft with far reaching consequences for the individuals. At this scale (since the backdoors would have to be on every device in Australia) these attacks could have a bad impact on the economy.

There is also no transparency. Just talking about the measures in public could lead someone in jail. When the security of all Australian's devices is going to be affected by legislated technical measures, then the technical details of these measures will have to be wildly discussed, to ensure the measures are proportionate and effective. Only open discussion amongst security researchers, IT specialists and concerned citizens can ensure that.

The proposed legislation is not effective:

Criminals will just switch to their own software with end-to-end encryption that it not accessible to the government or its agencies. Nothing can be done against that.

The proposed legislation is neither necessary nor proportionate and is just another step in the direction of an Australian surveillance state. Another such surveillance law further undermines the thrust of the Australian people in its government. The bill must be rejected.

Regards
Dr. sc. techn. Felix Rauch Valenti

Email: [REDACTED]
Address: [REDACTED]