

Gordon Housworth  
Intellectual Capital Group LLC  
phone: +1 248.626.1310  
email: [ghidra@icgpartners.com](mailto:ghidra@icgpartners.com)  
1 November, 2007

---

# **Low cost is not low risk: Intellectual Property and Outsourcing Risk in India**

# India is unlike other outsourcing and manufacturing regions

---

- ❑ India is unique in that risks to personnel and facilities coexist with IP risks throughout its regional supply chain.
- ❑ Personnel and facility risk will rise over time despite prodigious efforts by the Indian security apparatus.
- ❑ Commercial IP threat is presently more from foreign collectors and careless outsourcing in the Indian supply chain – which will include outsourcing to China.
- ❑ Indigenous commercial IP threat is largely “entrepreneurial.”

# Defining IP and its loss

---

- Intellectual Property: Exclusive rights to the conversion of a unique application of people, capital, technology, and information into shareholder value.
- Intellectual Property Theft: Loss of exclusivity.

# Think asset, not country, in assessing IP risk

---

- ❑ While certain assets are at risk in any country, the key is to think “asset” instead of “country.”
- ❑ Risk cannot be based on countries or “risky areas” but ***wherever a sufficiently valuable asset is accessible at any tier in any country*** - as the collector will move to the least defended point that contains the IP.
- ❑ We see collection efforts on US assets long before they are transferred offshore.
- ❑ Commercial and dual-use technologies are high on the collection list.
- ❑ “Country” is only part of integrated IP protection.

# Difficult to omit certain countries

---

- Unworkable to isolate “risky countries” with respect to IP migration.
- Revenue loss and market share erosion when presence is withheld.
- Host nations demand you be there with competent products and technology in order to do business.
- Three key vulnerability areas in any country:
  - **Pricing model compromise** (supplier outsourcing, subcontracting, etc.)
  - **Data citadel attack** (R&D hives and data warehouses).
  - **Human resources** (HR) churn.

# Global risk to both domestic and offshore facilities

---

- ❑ Most firms don't know they're at risk.
- ❑ If they do become aware, they don't know where to turn for valid assistance.
- ❑ Deprived of competent advice, firms employ non-solutions that lull themselves into a false sense of security.
- ❑ Firms silently surrender, fearful of negative consequences to business continuity or souring relationships with a host government.
- ❑ A firm's management may not confront a threat despite awareness and even presence of internal champions for improved protection.

# Why and how firms outsource

---

- Firms usually devolve the problem to a divisional or unit level, thus means, omissions and results vary on a case-by-case basis.
- Same problem solved in differing ways “to avoid some organizational consequence” such as:
  - Cost savings.
  - Headcount reductions (protect existing staff or get credit for a reduction).
  - Functionality (missing, failing or inconvenient).
  - Personal need (positive annual personnel rating).
- Each ‘solution’ may be measured against suboptimizing criteria.

# What is missing from outsourcing

---

- ❑ A decision making framework that integrates global and national aspects of need, technology, business considerations, risks, scope, duration, cost implications and ultimately solutions.
- ❑ There are always multiple solutions depending upon desired outcomes and bounds of monies, mindshare, and timing.
- ❑ Outsourcing and manufacturing risks and remediation are not harmonized.



# IP and outsourcing

---

- ❑ Firms effectively lose control of IP when it is outsourced as little as two levels.
- ❑ Observed IP theft by nations both in-country and in adjacent countries where they've either penetrated or bought stakes in local firms.
- ❑ Countries without strong police powers permit entry of secondary collectors that use a permissive environment to collect what they could not feasibly or financially obtain in a stronger security environment.

# Unique Indian characteristics

---

- ❑ India *has not* exhibited wide or state sponsored IP collection, being content at present to compete in terms of lower cost
- ❑ Indian military *does* collect for national security applications.
- ❑ Much IP theft is local “entrepreneurship.”
- ❑ Over time, expect IP attacks to shift to “commercial on commercial” collection.
- ❑ Bribery remains strongly embedded.
- ❑ Physical threat to core outsourcing facilities in India.
- ❑ Threat to IT and outsourcing assets in Bangalore and Hyderabad should be taken seriously despite denials from Indian authorities.

# Lashkar-e-Toiba (LeT), Army of the Pure

---

- ❑ Rose as part of Mujahideen resistance against Soviet occupation in Afghanistan; military wing of Markaz-ud-Dawa-wal-Irshad (MDI), an Islamic fundamentalist organization from Pakistan.
- ❑ Goals go far beyond regaining Muslim control of Jammu and Kashmir to recreating Islamic governance of India in union with other predominantly Muslim states surrounding Pakistan.
- ❑ Active in Jammu and Kashmir, India, Chechnya, Afghanistan, Iraq, Bosnia and elsewhere.
- ❑ More educated and skilled than peasant groups; cadres are well networked and computers savvy.
- ❑ History of orchestrating attacks in India.

# Lashkar-e-Toiba (LeT) lethality

---

- ❑ LeT cadres characterized by a level of brutality surpassing all other Pakistan-sponsored terrorist outfits active in Jammu & Kashmir.
- ❑ LeT ranks alongside the Chechens, the Algerian GIA (Groupe Islamique Armé) or Armed Islamic Group.
- ❑ LeT unlikely to engage in serious terrorist operations outside the Indian subcontinent.
- ❑ LeT's potential to strike Western targets in both Pakistan and India is all too real.
- ❑ LeT will continue to attempt to destabilize India's commercial and political elites.

# “Twofer” attack on Indian state and US/European outsourcing assets

---

- ❑ Attacks on outsourcers directly damages the Indian state and its economic capacity, and indirectly damages US and European firms -- where an attack on US soil would be prohibitive.
- ❑ Attacking software offices hits most international symbol of Indian success.
- ❑ Potential for panic from foreign investors and multinationals that could hobble rapid pace of India's economic progress.
- ❑ Economic and cultural destabilization seeks targets inflicting maximum damage to people and delivering a symbolic message.

# Attack progression

---

- Extending the “twofer” concept, we forecast this attack progression (2005):
  - Personnel and symbolic targets.
  - Expat data and business process outsourcing (BPO) centers.
  - Manufacturing and development centers.
- Latter two target groups can cause supply chain disruptions.

# Overlooked leverage, the embedded “twofer”

---

- Great numbers of US banks have Indian data centers, attacks against which have multiplier effect in that the bank and all its customers are affected.
- Targeting data, BPO and manufacturing facilities:
  - Leverages operations and business continuity of US/EU firms that would otherwise be difficult to attack.
  - Demonstrates that the Indian government cannot protect its offshoring endeavors.
- Unfortunately, relocating from India elsewhere in Asia merely exchanges direct attack risks to more intellectual property loss risks.

# Iconic attacks commence; LeT strikes India's "MIT"

---

- LeT attacked Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bangalore, Dec 2005, a "temple" of Indian "knowledge society."
- Shock waves reverberated through Indian high-tech community:
  - One of India's more prestigious educational and research institutions.
  - Presence in Bangalore "a key reason that the city became India's technology powerhouse."
  - Does R&D for multinational and local technology companies.
  - Alumni occupy key positions in the country's outsourcing industry.



# Damage control commenced immediately to placate US/EU outsourcing clients

---

- ❑ Nandan Nilekani, CEO of major Indian outsourcer, Infosys Technologies Limited, was quick to attempt to play down risk to US firms:
- ❑ *“Our campuses are physically secure. We have all kinds of checks that we do. The entire perimeter is guarded which we believe enable us to be fully secure.”*
- ❑ *“Even after American companies factor in additional security costs, doing business in India is still far cheaper than staying home.”*
- ❑ Today, perhaps. Tomorrow, not clear.

# LeT attacks India's financial capital, Mumbai (Bombay), 2006

---

- ❑ Mumbai Suburban Railway has highest passenger density of any urban railway system.
- ❑ Seven bombs placed in first-class “general” compartments (some reserved for women) targeting professional classes.
- ❑ Trains were running from Churchgate, the city-centre end of the western railway line, to the western suburbs.
- ❑ Analogous to the Madrid and London train/tube bombings, 209 killed, over 700 injured.

# Were it not for Indian intelligence...

---

- Indian intelligence has made sustained effort to penetrate and disrupt LeT and other Muslim jihadist groups, even on Pakistani soil.
- Despite remarkable effort, jihadists are shifting assets south and east of the *Line of Control* (de facto border dividing disputed zones of Indian and Pakistani controlled Jammu and Kashmir)
- Goal of targets that offer a force multiplier against the Indian state.

# Iconic, symbolic and personnel targets

---

- Bangalore's Indian Institute of Science (IISc) was a premier symbolic target. Expect others to follow from both jihadist and Naxalite Maoist attackers.
- Equally vulnerable:
  - Indian Institutes of Technology (IITs) (Delhi, Kanpur, Mumbai, et al).
  - Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs) (Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Calcutta, et al).
  - Virtually every expat outsourcing facility and personnel compound.

# Key for expat firms with no viable options for relocation

---

- ❑ Conduct a rigorous vulnerability assessment, then implement the appropriate risk mediation interventions for personnel, facilities, data and IP.

# Defend, defer and deflect for IP, plants and personnel

---

- Technologies migrate and threats emerge; firms assume risk by default in:
  - Not identifying what is already compromised or at risk.
  - Identifying what assets need to be protected.
  - Defining dollars and effort needed to realistically protect those assets - wherever they occur in the supply chain.
- If a collector obtains a critical IP asset, or an attacker targets a key facility, the owner's ROI justification can collapse along with its expected revenue stream.
- When the IP asset is the core of a system or subsystem that often contains more mature, less competitive technology, the entire system revenue stream truncates.

# What does work:

## Design Basis Threat

---

- Design Basis Threat (DBT) works regardless of whether the threat is counterterrorism (CT) or Intellectual Property (IP) theft:
  - Asset Value Assessment.
  - Threat/Hazard Assessment.
  - Vulnerability Assessment.
  - Risk Assessment/Risk Management.
- DBT defines a coherent view of risk tolerance, and a response strategy that interdicts the adversary's preparation, surveillance and collection.
- Beware use of scenario analysis as it is dangerously omissive, has no end as it has no scope-like business risk statement to bound it.

# Implementable, teachable, effective processes exist

---

- ❑ Prudent, non-adversarial business practices to identify current exposure and to combat collection efforts.
- ❑ Achieve success with strategies drawn from proven Counterterrorism (CT) practices applied to IP, personnel and facility risk evaluation and remediation.
- ❑ Experience shows these processes can be taught and embedded as company best practices performed by its employees, not outside consultants.
- ❑ Properly done, protection becomes a crucial business attribute, like quality, lean manufacturing or robustness.



# Fiduciary implications

---

- ❑ Firms that do not understand this landscape and industrial progression are ripe for IP harvesting and worse.
- ❑ Legal remedies largely ineffectual and rewards moot as the IP is already lost and all expected downstream revenue is attenuated.
- ❑ Asset/personnel attacks are supply chain disruptors.

# Predictions for the Indo-Chinese IT sector

---

- ❑ India will, for the foreseeable future, become the low-cost IT counterpart to China low-cost manufacturer.
- ❑ India and China will complete a shift to Linux, of increasingly indigenous versions, that, given the region's user volume and technical expertise, could see the center of Linux development shift to Asia.
- ❑ India will use its IT expertise to develop “asymmetrical” low-cost efficient computing devices driven by its 'disadvantaged' position on the Digital Divide. (Much like Japanese vehicles in the 1960s, those devices will mature and expand out of Asia.)

# Predictions for the Indo-Chinese IT sector, part 2

---

- India's IT-based products will take advantage of both rising local manufacturing efficiency and Chinese low-cost manufacturing (rising price-volume efficiencies in both nations) along with their rising broad based consumerism.
- India will increasingly outsource to, and acquire, IT/tech resources in China such that supply chain risks will reach similar proportions in both countries.
- India will become the recipient of Chinese attentions in IT intellectual property (IP) much as have US and European firms in the heavy manufacturing segment.

# Low cost is not low risk: Intellectual Property and Outsourcing Risk in India

---

Gordon Housworth

**INTELLECTUAL CAPITAL GROUP LLC**

26775 Crestwood

Franklin MI 48025

phone: +1 248.626.1310

email: [ghidra@icgpartners.com](mailto:ghidra@icgpartners.com)

website: <http://www.icgpartners.com>

weblog: <http://spaces.icgpartners.com>