GFCE V-Meeting: CCB Research Agenda Consultation Session

6 May 2020 13.00 - 14.00 UTC
CCB Research Agenda Lifecycle
1. Gathering Ideas and RQs
   • WGs identify knowledge gaps and ideas
   • Research Committee translates ideas into research questions
   • WGs prioritize research questions in the group

2. Prioritizing RQs
   • Secretariat compiles the RQs from the WGs
   • The GFCE Community is invited to rank and prioritize the RQs

3. Presentation of Agenda
   • Based on the received rankings, the GFCE Foundation Board will present the CCB Research Agenda to the Community

4. Funding received
   • The Foundation Board invites donors to fund research projects on the Agenda throughout the year

5. Research project is commissioned
   • The Secretariat prepares proposals for research consultant and the research project is executed
   • The Secretariat keeps the WGs up to date on the process

6. Research project complete
   • The Research Committee receives the research project and shares it with relevant WGs
   • The research project is then delivered to the wider GFCE Community and is uploaded on the Cybil Portal

CCB Research Agenda Process
1. What are knowledge gaps relevant to cyber capacity building that you have noticed in your Working Groups and/or in your jobs?

- Metrics to measure the impact of CCB projects
- Result monitoring and evaluation
- Objective, experience-based metrics to evaluate cyber capacity building progress
- Practical guidance on the implementation of norms
- Measurement, Technical Skills, Soft Skills (Management, Career Path Planning), etc.
- Principles and best practices in designing and implementing CCB programs
- Mapping available research, particularly from developing countries (eg Africa)
- Certification of Skills
- Overviews to give insight in multiple frameworks around the globe on a particular topic
1. What are knowledge gaps relevant to cyber capacity building that you have noticed in your Working Groups and/or in your jobs?

- How to organize and focus cyber workforce development.
- Relating to Cutting edge technologies
- Developing global methodology for tracking/attribution of attacks
- Online education modules
- Measuring capacity building approaches and effectiveness; identifying capacity building needs;
- What impact do NCS have?
- There is a lack of well documented case studies that outline the successful and (more importantly unsuccessful) elements of capacity building efforts.
- A systematic understanding of how CCB can be embedded into existing fora in the resprive regions.
1. What are knowledge gaps relevant to cyber capacity building that you have noticed in your Working Groups and/or in your jobs?

- Explaining cyberstability framework, importance of cyberdiplomacy
- Identifying vulnerabilities to core internet infrastructure
- Assessments on whether human rights safeguards in CCB are effective or counterproductive.
- Landscape review of relevant existing research
- The two central questions is 'what works in CCB?' (ie. What is empirically validated best practice) and 'What are the trade off?' (ie where do you spend your marginal euro/dollar when resources are short?).
- Emergent technology impact
- Security issues in healthcare, agriculture and education sectors that impact large populations.

Regarding cyber security knowledge, skills and awareness there are more unknowns than knowns. Measuring the effectiveness of programs is definitely one, but also mapping the scientific status quo on what we actually know.
1. What are knowledge gaps relevant to cyber capacity building that you have noticed in your Working Groups and/or in your jobs?

- Study lessons from developing countries
- Cyberhygiene, effective awareness raising programs, which are replicable globally
- A lack of neutral impact analysis of programs (so conducted by a third party rather than implementors of the project)
- How to make use of advanced impact assessment metrics? How to guarantee transparency?
- Understand effective mechanisms to coordinate and avoid overlapping capacity building measures.
- We don’t know enough about how to choose between different ‘best practices’. If resources are limited do you build a CERT or a cyber training school? How should countries decide?
- What a best practices in non-cyber related capacity building efforts that the research community considers important for CCB
- Yes

Knowledge gaps: how to make (academic) studies, assessment reports, indices, and materials fit for CCB purpose, i.e. in the form of training packages, mentoring handbooks etc.
2. Should the whole community be responsible for prioritizing and agenda-setting?

- Yes: 12
- No: 9
- Not sure: 3
3. Each research question must be elaborated in a one-pager with further information. What should be on this one-pager?

- Explanation of question: 18
- Main beneficiaries: 12
- Time/cost estimate: 15
- Relevance or connection to CCB: 19
- Knowledge gap it aims to address: 22
- Others: 6
4. What would be important to include in the criterion for prioritizing RQs & agenda-setting?

- Availability of data/information.
- An assessment of what research already exists (e.g. literature review).
- Diversity in beneficiaries.
- Should benefit large population.
- Impact to GFCE mission.
- How the RQs directly impact GFCE goals and priorities.
- Target audience.
- Overall impact and benefit for the beneficiaries and the CCB community as a whole.
- Relevance for the objective of the WG and GFCE community.
4. What would be important to include in the criterion for prioritizing RQs & agenda-setting?

| The expected impact and contribution of the research for the global CCB community |
| Benefit to whole GFCE community |
| Usefulness beyond one beneficiary (i.e., possibility to cover broader region, or replicate for others) |
| Usability / impact of the product |
| Relevance for WGs’ members and partners and feasibility of the research |
| Feasibility, affordability, sufficient data, previous readership experience and quality |
| The prioritization should take account of other research done outside of the GFCE context, including building on existing knowledge (e.g., public health experience on awareness building). |
| A consideration of content or work already being done in the wider community |
| should fill a clear niche, and can’t be covered through “normal” research opportunities |
4. What would be important to include in the criterion for prioritizing RQs & agenda-setting?

Will the outcomes of the research impact a significant proportion of GFCE’s members?
5. How often should we call for new ideas and update the CCB Research Agenda?
6. Do you agree with the proposed role of the Research Committee?

- Yes: 14
- No: 1
- Not sure: 4
7. What background should a member of the Research Committee have?

- Academia: 2
- Research-focused: 11
- Active in a GFCE Working Group: 2
- Within GFCE Community: 2
- Outside GFCE Community: 0
- Others: 1
8. How should we form the new Research Committee?

- Elections: 0
- Targeted outreach: 13
- Others: 4
9. What else should the GFCE Secretariat consider as we refine the mechanism?

- Clarify roles and responsibilities of the WGs, Secretariat, research committee
- Have a look at how other organisations (generally, in cyber affairs) commission research. I'm thinking of APNIC grants, etc.
- Evaluate the research project(s) as a seventh step in the mechanism?
- Availability and sources of funding and the vehicles to distribute $ to researchers
- Have/acquire adequate capacity to conduct high quality research
- Clear roles and responsibilities of the research committee in relation to the AB, WG/TaskForce Chairs, Foundation Board, etc...
- Availability of people to serve on the RC - Time is valuable
- Critically reflect whether the new CCB Committee can really meet the expectations that were discussed today.
- Agree on certain principles for research projects, e.g. diversity, representation
9. What else should the GFCE Secretariat consider as we refine the mechanism?

- Think about effective engagement strategies to involve/follow academia and/or national science foundations on relevant research.
- Clear mandate, clarifying and specifically framing roles, responsibilities.
- Scoping of the universe of peer reviewed academic journals with some focus on CCB for possible engagement and partnership.

This only works if we have money. Maybe this can be linked to some kind of subscription paid by Members. Small amount could go a long way. We should also look at ways to make the money go further, e.g., partnership with other grant making groups.
Thank you!
Thank you!