Way Forward GFCE Working Groups

Interactive session - Monday 20 July 14:00 UTC
Agenda

→ Welcome remarks by moderator Manon van Tienhoven
→ Introduction by GFCE Secretariat Director, David van Duren
→ Interactive discussion Mentimeter
→ Next steps & closing remarks
Way Forward GFCE Working Groups: Introduction

David van Duren, Director GFCE Secretariat
1. Which Working Group and/or Task Force are you a Member of?
2. For those that answered 'none' or are not part of a WG/TF, why not?

- a. I do not see the value of participating in the Working Groups/Task Forces
- b. I do not have time or resources
- c. There is no incentive for me
- d. The WG topics are too limited or don’t apply to my area of interest
- e. Others
3. For those that are in a WG, why did you join that group?

- Networking
- Relevant to my work
- Not a member of WG
- Knowledge sharing
- To exchange knowledge (to learn and share) with others working on Cybercrime
- Engagement with the community
- I thought it was relevant to what I was concerned with at the time
- Interested in the papers put forward by the WG
- The topics covered by the working group are relevant to my day to day work.
3. For those that are in a WG, why did you join that group?

- I am interested in the topics and there is a need for CCB in those areas.
- This WG is closest to my current job.
- Friendship.
- Staying apprised of current CCB trends and networking.
- Knowledge sharing.
- To be part of the community and work together on joint initiatives.
- CIIP is important for my country.
- To make sure that the groups don’t produce content that my organization would find problematic.
- Engagement with the GFCE goal of cyber capacity building for awareness and professional training.
3. For those that are in a WG, why did you join that group?

I think WGA has significant potential to make a difference and that I have the skills to contribute to that.

The work intersects with other WGs and overall GFCE objectives.

Great chance to network with experts working in the same field.

The GFCE suggested us to be in the two WGs but the areas are also the closest to our work.

Staying apprised if current CCB trends and networking.
4. Which identified challenges do you recognize or observe in the Working Groups?

a. How can we increase the active membership in Working Groups and Task Forces?
   - 13 responses

b. How can we increase engagement out of the GFCE Working Groups?
   - 18 responses

c. How can we create more visibility for the Working Groups?
   - 7 responses

d. How can we provide more synergies between the GFCE Working Groups?
   - 13 responses

e. How can we provide more clarity on the Working Groups process within the GFCE?
   - 10 responses

f. I do not see any challenges
   - 0 responses
5. Do you see any additional challenges to the mandate or functioning of the Working Groups?

- Constant need to balance time spent talking about capacity building and time doing it!
- The structure is too complicated.
- Additional challenges are operationalising the excellent ideas brought up.
- Related to outputs, lack of a clear objective and purpose of the WGs?
- Outcomes are not identified.
- There are more implementers than people who need help.
- Making sure that the working groups and task forces are targeted and focusing on the things that they can do well.
- Need more things to do.
- Dilemma between policy interest and capacity building needs - added value.
5. Do you see any additional challenges to the mandate or functioning of the Working Groups?

- Sustainability of projects due to voluntary nature of commitments among members
- Complicated multiple systems (zoom, meet, teams) to access Working Group efforts.
- We need more 'customer' demand
- No clear goals
- Disbalance among members who contribute and those who just benefit from outcomes
- Risk of being seen as one of many think tanks but lacking delivery.
6. Is your engagement based on your ability to justify use of your time for GFCE to your employer?
7. Do you agree with this idea?

- Yes: 15
- No: 3
- I do not know: 6
8. Do you see the value in re-assessing or adding roles in the WGs to give more individuals responsibility to help develop/coordinate the work plan?

- Yes: 17
- No: 3
- I do not know: 3
9. How should active participation in the WG(s) be recognized/promoted?

- Recognition
- Reducing the amount of things that are required - streamlining the workplans and outputs so that there are not so many things that need to get done.

- Good Outputs
- Use magazine, websites and conferences

- Targeted incentives
- Recognition (non-financial) of “collaborative” initiatives and members on the GFCE website.

- Helping people to justify their work for the GFCE toward their employer.
9. How should active participation in the WGs be recognized/promoted?

- When people feel that they make a difference and results are really delivered
- Agree that using GFCE website as a tool to promote initiatives
- Promotion on the website and social media
- Mentioned on the website (with picture)
- Promoting outputs throughout the GFCE network, Website, Magazine, Annual Meeting... (comms strategy for outputs)
- Tangible outcomes / practical info / useful connections
- Ability to delegate the hard leg work to ... a person/persons to develop, study, assess...
- For many from developing notions a letter/certificate of recognition is helpful
9. How should active participation in the WGs be recognized/promoted?

- Viewed from the edge WG membership seems to be an open-ended commitment - but fixed workshops - clearly a day a two - would be easier to resource.
- ‘Job titles’ and a higher profile for GFCE generally (the more profile the organization has, the more value a ‘role’ with the organization has). And, of course, cookies!
- Global promotion of personal brands when products are distributed.
10. Do you promote the work of the WG that you are involved in within your network/organization?

- Often: 10
- Sometimes: 7
- Never: 0
- Others: 1
11. Do you have any recommendations on how to promote the visibility of the WG/TF outside the GFCE? (For example through certain fora or networks?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More online</th>
<th>Regional organizations</th>
<th>More fora and networks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential connection with the ICT4D community such as conference participation/speaking</td>
<td>outreach to the ICT4D community</td>
<td>Large donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFCE panels in relevant events (including member/partner events)</td>
<td>Regional orgs e.g. APCERT</td>
<td>Insights, papers, outcomes etc will help - also the cybil portal that I have often recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Do you have any recommendations on how to promote the visibility of the WG/TF outside the GFCE? (For example through certain fora or networks?)

- Share WG/TF outputs widely with colleagues, organizations that can distribute them broadly.
- Development community organizations
- I believe the more involved the organizations are, the bigger advocates they become. Especially if the work done can be used in communication.
- Social media, dedicated presentations at events
- “Civil society” groups
- Targeted campaigns together with other actors/organizations in the field
- More visibility of the GFCE in conferences of other fora
- Regional bodies (technical and gov), other multilateral/multistakeholder fora
- We need to raise the profile of GFCE through more active outreach to organizations that represent likely customers of capacity building eg regional organizations. We need more profile in the development community.
11. Do you have any recommendations on how to promote the visibility of the WG/TF outside the GFCE? (For example through certain fora or networks?)

- Engage developing countries
- ICT providers
- One pager per working group to share (easily to digest)
- Do we want to develop an identity for WGs that is different from GFCE generally? A recommendation for promotion of WGs outside of GFCE would be linked to what the purpose is,
- Dedicate subpage on the GFCE website
- Producing tangible outcomes is the most effective means
- We must support the GFCE to evolve into a credible information source - its a self fulfilling and sustainable situation
- Intersection of Policy, Culture and Incident management is an important area to look into
- Other international fora
11. Do you have any recommendations on how to promote the visibility of the WG/TF outside the GFCE? (For example through certain fora or networks?)

A series of cross-cutting “How to guides”
12. Do you have any ideas or suggestions for tangible WG deliverables across multiple Working Groups?

- Model policy or a toolkit
- Awareness
- WG A's work is foundational. It should inform all other WGs work (and be informed by it).
- Lessons learned/principles of doing cyber capacity building - crosscutting for all WGs
- A CCB campaign for the cyber awareness month. All WGs could contribute to an overarching GFCE campaign
- A document/webpage on the next big challenges in capacity building - with an overall introduction and a paragraph from each WG. So the output is a GFCE "one pager" on the next BC's
- Cross-working group Chair meetings (more meetings 😔)
- How to draft a funding proposal
- For group D could be recommendation for effective cybersecurity awareness campaign or mapping out the stakeholders and responsibilities for awareness raising in the country as it differs greatly
12. Do you have any ideas or suggestions for tangible WG deliverables across multiple Working Groups?

How about an annual report of some sort
13. Are we missing elements in the cross-cutting structure?

- Define the outcomes of cross-cutting structure
- A more regular WG Chair meeting.
- WG Chair meetings to promote horizontal integration between WGs.
- Clearing house group
- Clearing house requests are cross-cutting
- $$ for independent GFCE projects
- Concerning the project mapping on CYbII: actors from different WGs submit the same project when it connects to more than one theme.
- Not missing, because in terms of actual persons, there's probably overlap. Other point: can we make things simpler? For externals, I think the structure is just complicated
- The link between Cyber Cap Building and Economic and Social Development
13. Are we missing elements in the cross-cutting structure?

Money, money, money!

Efforts to remove gaps

WGs should link their work to an articulated GFCE-wide set of objectives - or is everything about capacity building. WGs should have a common link to overall objectives.
14. Do you agree with the idea to align the Working Group process with the annual GFCE plan cycle?

- Yes: 12
- No: 2
- I do not know: 6
15. Do you have any other suggestions/recommendations regarding the GFCE Working Groups process?

- Increasing participation – best addressed by answering the questions for them (members)
  - Multimedia (text, Audio, Video and ppt) archive of members discussing a topic of interest to them
  - b) within GFCE scope
  - 2 Mapping of opportunities for members.

- Continue to highlight the benefit of membership and participation

- Simplification of structure would ease engagement of new members and partners. It can feel a little like people are speaking in code.

- 3 Recognition (non-financial) of “collaborative” initiatives and members on the GFCE website
  - 4 Letter or certificates of recognition
  - 5 Facilitate opportunities for members to mentor a new generation of interested enthusiasts, professionals and start-ups.

- Balance the flexibility currently afforded to WGs to align WG activity with overarching objectives of GFCE generally

- I’d seek advice from the Advisory Board :-)  

- Yes. The WGs have been fairly successful in coordinating effort of the community that delivers capacity building, but less good connecting with people who need that capacity. If the latter is a goal, we need to think about how that is improved.

- Consider the timing of meetings, some members are unable to participate as it is too late/early
15. Do you have any other suggestions/recommendations regarding the GFCE Working Groups process?

- Associate a Knowledge Partner to support each WG to enable continuous working on selected themes, better coordination and agility.
- We should have a mechanism to allow for additional work. How do we ensure the work evolves to ensure new ideas are part of GFCE’s work on emerging tech.
- General focus on available practice expertise, knowledge sharing, research but also seek collaboration for clearing house requests.
Thank you for your participation!
Thank you for your participation!