IGF 2017 Reporting Template

- Session Title: A RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH TOCYBERSECURITY: A PIPE DREAMOR A CRITICAL MEANS TO ASECURE AND STABLE INTERNET?

- Date: 17 December, 2017

- Time: 09:00-14:00

- Session Organizer: Association for ProgressiveCommunications (APC), Centre for CommunicationsGovernance at National Law University Delhi (CCG),Centre for Internet and Society (CIS), DerechosDigitales, Citizen Lab, Global Partners Digital (GPD),Internet Society (ISOC), UN Office of the HighCommissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), andPrivacy International

- Chair/Moderator: Deborah Brown, APC

- Rapporteur/Notetaker: Maud Barret Bertelloni

- List of Speakers and their institutional affiliations:

Panel 1
Chinmayi Arun (CCG), Kathy Brown (ISOC), Marietje Schaake (Member of the European Parliament), Francisco Vera Hott (Privacy International)Moderator: Peggy Hicks (OHCHR)

Panel 2
Madeleine Carr (Cardiff University); Lea Kaspar(GPD),Kaja Ciglic (Microsoft); Markus Kummer(IGF Best Practice Forum on Cybersecurity),and Chrystiane Roy (Government of Canada)Moderator: Irene Poetranto (Citizen Lab)

Panel 3
Maarten van Horenbeeck (Technicalcommunity); Maryant Fernández (European DigitalRights Initiative); Maria Paz Canales (DerechosDigitales); Luis Fernando García (Red en Defensa delos Derechos Digitales)Moderator: Lucie Krahulcova (AccessNow)

Panel 4
Sunil Abraham(Centre for Internet and Society)and Matthew Shears (GPD)Moderator: Anriette Esterhuysen (APC)

- Key Issues raised (1 sentence per issue)

What do we mean by a rights-based approach tocybersecurity? Is such an approach a pipe-dream, oran essential means to a secure and trusted internet?

The extent towhich cybersecurity initiatives are or are not, adopting a"rights-based" approach.

What are the obvious risks and challenges in the field of cybersecurity? How do policy and norms impact on the humanrights and security of people? What are the'not-so-obvious' issues at stake? Who controlsthe mainstream cybersecurity narrative? Doesthis need to be challenged, and if so, how?

- If there were presentations during the session, please provide a 1-paragraph summary for each presentation:

- Please describe the Discussions that took place during the workshop session (3 paragraphs):

In the discussion of what is meant by a human rights based approach to cybersecurity, it was asserted that we should always base policies on human rights in practice, this is a broader struggle than just around cybersecurity. We should create a human security angle to security matters, including cybersecurity, in a way that we ensure there is trust and security but that they are not undermined by new efforts against terrorism or cyber attacks. The EU should be leading a values-based approach to security and should be streamlining digital rights through foreign policy efforts, to make it an integral part of what the EU stands for, not only at home but also abroad. In the case of liability issues and security and rights by design it is very important to look to the private sector, as well to bind companies where necessary.

In the discussion of spaces where cybersecurity discussions are taking place, the role of the ITU was examined. It was asserted that the ITU is, structurally and systemically, tnot a space where rights-based discussions regarding cybersecurity you can flourish, because it does not have the expertise or the capacity to do so. It is fundamentally an intergovernmental organization where member-states dominate the conversation and multistakeholder participation is minimal. There are also financial barriers to entry, let alone participation which especially excludes civil society participation. This results in alienating the human rights experts needed for a rights-based approach to cybersecurity, in privacy being co-opted to rubber stamp certain standards or policies that do nothing for the rights of users or, even worse, actually subverting the rights of users.

There was also discussion of developments during the year, including setbacks for civil society participation at the Global Conference on Cyberspace, as well as disagreement among States at the UN Group of Governmental Experts. With respect to the potential of a treaty on cybersecurity, most speakers expressed caution and examining who would be setting the agenda for the treaty, and to what end. Most seemed to to agree that a treaty would not result in greater respect for human rights in the context of security, but it would instead result in increased control over users. There was also a discussion about whether to focus the discussion at the global normative level or ongoing national debates. While there was not consensus on what to prioritise, there was agreement that both are important.

- Please describe any Participant suggestions regarding the way forward/ potential next steps /key takeaways (3 paragraphs):

Breaking down silos was a common theme, suggested from participants, including more collaboration between civil society and the technical community. This could happen by civil society going into technical spaces, having trainings, capacity building, and collaboration around national legislation. Participants suggested that civil society must go multidisciplinary, taking engineers on its side, poaching them from corporations. This requires that civil society "do its homework" and come prepared to debate technical matters advocacy continues beyond multistakeholder fora, even when civil society doesn't have a seat at the table.

Working together requires relying on a set of civil society organizations that share a similar if not common theory of change: this will also allow to other NGOs as willing to represent your agenda and take on new battle grounds which we haven't participated in or traditionally feel seeded from. Although that is no longer in the core civil society agenda anymore, if you think of regulation and some of the emerging issues such as fake news both policy levers, open source, free software and open standards are all important.

It is critical to be more engaged in technology spaces, we need to start thinking about ourselves as wanting to be hybrids, think like technologists, understand the technology and the security concerns. We can't realistically sit at the table if we don't bring some of those solutions to the table. Instead, we need to propose solutions with human rights built in. CERTs for instance are very open to talking with civil society

Gender Reporting

- Estimate the overall number of the participants present at the session:
12 out of 18 speakers were women.
- Estimate the overall number of women present at the session:

Around 50% of people present at the session were women.

- To what extent did the session discuss gender equality and/or women's empowerment?
The session did not address gender equality in a major way, however cybersecurity threats to women were discussed.

- If the session addressed issues related to gender equality and/or women's empowerment, please provide a brief summary of the discussion: