

BPF Cybersecurity 2019 – Session on BPF Cybersecurity: Putting agreements into action – operationalizing cybersecurity norms

1. Key Policy Questions and Expectations

Please state no more than three (3) policy questions you plan to discuss and what you expect from the session. Note: This will support the development of key messages in the later stages of the process.

- What is the role of norms? And can and should we then move forward from discussions on cybersecurity norms to operationalization of those norms?
- Are cyber norms cascading into the international system and what are some challenges that arise? What are some processes or norms that do not exist today but are still required?
- How can cybersecurity norms be assessed to evaluate whether they are working?

2. Discussion Areas

Please elaborate on the discussion held, specifically on areas of agreement and divergence.

Examples: There was broad support for the view that...; Many [or some] indicated that...; Some supported XX, while others noted YY...; No agreement...

The work of the 2019 BPF aims to build upon the ongoing work of the BPF to better understand the roles and responsibilities within cybersecurity for particular stakeholder groups. There is consensus on the necessity of cyber norms and their growing importance as a response to policy gaps. The development process of norms takes into consideration different concepts of culture, norms, and values in cybersecurity. As understanding of cyber norms become mainstream and widespread, the focus is shifting towards coordination, commonalities, and challenges to implementation. Not all norms are equal, hence there is discussion about whether implementation is always required in certain cases or whether simply observing cybersecurity norms can sometimes suffice. There are also varied understandings between stakeholders at different levels about when and where cybersecurity norms exist and the conversation regarding stakeholder obligations to those norms is also evolving.

3. Policy Recommendations or Suggestions for the Way Forward

Please describe any actionable policy recommendations or suggestions regarding the way forward and/or potential next steps by the IGF ecosystem. Note: Please aim to classify your inputs according to whether you think they are primarily economic, social-cultural, technical, or overarching governance issues? Are they best addressed through the IGF and/or elsewhere? If elsewhere, where?

There should be a clear consensus that cybersecurity is fundamentally linked to the exercise of human rights and the existence of cyber norms helps to shape a common understanding in that regard. Inclusive processes for drafting, implementing and evaluating cyber norms is key to ensuring their sustainability and effectiveness. Following the Paris Call for Trust and Security in Cyberspace there is a new emphasis on multi-stakeholder groups such as the BPF to spearhead contributions into existing dialogues. Technical and policy communities should be brought together to share best practices on successful norms. Establishing Communities of Interest (COI) is a recommended action during the implementation phase of cyber norms. COIs are like-minded groups coming together to further implement an already agreed standard or to transform a norm into diplomatic and / or more binding agreement. How government communities understand norms is different from how other communities understand norms. Therefore, the civil society and private sector should play a part in these communities of interest. Lastly, it can be helpful to reflect on whether a lack of implementation is down to a lack of skill or will. With skill, a lack of knowledge or capacity to adopt a norm can partly be addressed by sharing best practices. With will, a lack of desire for a government or actor to abide by norms could be addressed either increased public recognition of expected behaviour or by moving in some areas to more binding obligations. Economic sanctions and diplomatic awareness regarding best practice botnet norms is an example of an effective norms implementation.

4. Other Initiatives Addressing the Session Issues

Please share any examples, projects, initiatives mentioned that are addressing the issues tackled in the session.

Success examples, projects, and initiatives mentioned during the session:

- GCSC norms
- Technical examples related to the routing system and anti-spoofing standards and best practice
- APC publications on network and society organisations into the Human Rights Council procedures
- AccessNow publications
- Oregon Observatory of network interference
- OIA American research
- AR2018

5. Making Progress for Tackled Issues

What ideas surfaced in the discussion with respect to how progress might be made on the main issue(s) tackled? Indicate if this is within the IGF ecosystem or elsewhere.

Assessment of norms is deeply problematic for reasons linked to enforcement and attribution, which are political in nature. Instead, the focus should be on positive recognition and monitoring. For example, when actors are able to self-declare compliance to standards and norms, this becomes an important driver. Identifying the violators of norms is not always feasible, so publicising the extent to which norms have been taken up, and by which actors, can help to further socialise them. At least at a national level, norms can already be used in a variety of ways as policy tools implemented by individual governments. Assessment is important to demonstrate impact, but the assessment of norms is sometimes difficult and more of a technical challenge. The challenge becomes about what we measure and whether the data sources are of sufficient quality. The quality of norms observation is of critical importance in this equation and merits further discussion.

6. Estimated Participation

Please estimate the total number of onsite and online participants.

Please estimate the total number of women present onsite and online.

There were an estimated 60 onsite participants, of which about 20 were women
There were 8 online participants, of whom 3 were women.

7. Reflection to Gender Issues

To what extent did the session discuss gender issues, and if to any extent, what was the discussion?

The session discussions were gender-neutral and did not discuss gender issues.