

2016 IGF Best Practice Forum (BPF): Cybersecurity – Virtual Meeting II

Summary Report

14 June 2016

1. The second coordination call for the 2016 IGF Best Practice Forum (BPF) on cybersecurity was held on 14 June 2016. The purpose of the call was to build on the discussion and work towards selecting a focus and framework for the 2016 BPF.. It was noted by many that the meeting drew a wide diversity of views and that there was good regional diversity amongst participants. The webex recording of the meeting can be accessed here:
<https://intgovforum.webex.com/intgovforum/ldr.php?RCID=c6a62a8ac8593d97a800fde16d422a4c>
2. The meeting was facilitate by Markus Kummer. He opened the call with a short briefing on the discussions held during the first virtual coordination meeting, where there was some emerging consensus around the importance of focusing the 2016 BPF work on issues around cooperation and collaboration in cybersecurity, and that this kind of work, which would involve bringing diverse stakeholders together to work to overcome common challenges in this field, would be uniquely fit for an IGF BPF. There is also emerging agreement that the BPF for 2016 should not be seen in isolation, but should rather be seen in a long-term perspective. There was general agreement that capacity building would be an integral component for the work of the BPF. End users, law enforcement agencies, policymakers, and all of the other range of actors involved in cybersecurity, should be reached out to and involved in the work. National and Regional IGF initiatives (NRIs)s should also play an important role in feeding their discussions into the work, and vice versa.
3. Participants felt there was a need to take a broad view in exploring the topic of cybersecurity, moving beyond specific targeted threats, such as DNS abuse or DNNSEC. There was broad agreement that other organizations and processes were already dealing well with many specific issues related to cybersecurity and thus this BPF should not duplicate such targeted efforts.
4. One participant raised that a focused discussion on ‘Cybersecurity Situational Awareness’ could be a useful way to gather specific best practices and see how different organizations might already be working together and where collaboration and cooperation could be enhanced. This would also require input from law enforcement agencies and specialists who need to be cooperating with all actors, depending on the various situations that arise. Another participant suggested that finding a balance between ‘user friendliness’ and ‘building confidence’ in the Internet, taking a user-perspective look and it was said that this lens could lend itself to the idea of a theme around ‘situational awareness’.

5. One participant noted also that gathering information around best practices in 'situational awareness' and the collaboration and cooperation needed to enhance cybersecurity at all levels and to raise the confidence of users using ICTs and the Internet, would be particularly relevant for developing countries interested in capacity building. It was suggested further that a theme might be adopted to enable the establishment of a common international scaffolding and development of emergent best practice, with the intention to achieve globally applicable common policy to help increase technical capabilities, reduction in vulnerabilities and the exertion of positive influence engendering increased confidence in the operation of underlying information technologies, on which the Internet relies.
 6. A suggestion about working around the topic of the security of 'Internet of Things' was raised and it was noted that the IGF Dynamic Coalition on Internet of Things was interested in working with the BPF.
 7. There was a discussion also throughout the meeting about ways in which the BPF could seek broad community input that would inform and shape the work. Such a call for input would seek to find agreement amongst the community about an appropriate point of entry and a framework for the work. Various suggestions were made in this regards, such as a survey to gain some insight about what issues were priorities of concern on the ground. It was noted that there might be merit in giving further thought into how to frame a public call for inputs, and what questions should be raised so that the input received could be most useful and focused towards framing the BPF.
 8. There was agreement on the need for another call ahead of the MAG meeting in New York in July. The IGF Secretariat was asked to send out a doddle poll and arrange for a next virtual meeting in early July, while the discussion will continue on the mailing list in the meantime. The group was asked again to conduct outreach to their respective stakeholder communities to try and gather more and new participants for the BPF work moving forward.
-