Internet Governance Forum
Pilot project "Implementing internet standards for a safer internet"

Wout de Natris / De Natris Consult

IGF MAG meeting

Geneva, 16 January 2020

Agenda

1. The pilot's origins
2. The research
3. The results
4. Next steps
5. Thank you
6. Questions

The past

- MAG working group on future strategy
- Report 'Strengthening cooperation within the context of the IGF'
- Long term and complex internet issues
- Tangible outcomes
- Pilot proposal
- MAG endorsement
- Self-funded

Why internet standards?

Internet security is a major issue

Many solutions already exist

They are (severely) underused

What internet standards?

➢ DNSSEC (secures domain names)

➢ RPKI (secures routing)

➢ BCP38 (secures email)

➢ OWASP top 10 (secures websites)

➢ ISO 27001 (secures information)

➢ Safe software principles

Three main questions

At the meta level:

Is the IGF capable of producing tangible results that bring a complex issue further?

Project level:

What are causes for slow deployment?

What are ways forward?

Approach

1) Survey
2) Reach out (parliamentarians)
3) IGF workshop
4) Interviews
5) Desk research
6) Report
7) Outreach
8) Follow up

Results

Six recommendations
1) Business case
2) Legislate/regulate
3) Build into products
4) Dissemination
5) Education
6) Communication

Results

Paradox 1 (Do not) legislate/regulate

Paradox 2 Security

Paradox 3 Public core of the internet

Paradox 4 Technical community

➢ What is an internet standard?

➢ Do stakeholders understand each other?

➢ Interaction and communication

➢ Governments focus on end users

Results 2

➢ After 5G we will be lost

➢ Education must be bettered, fast

➢ Legislation

➢ Regulation

➢ So, who actually protects the public core of the internet…

➢ … when options to protect are voluntary options?

Conclusions

1) Legislation is the easiest route to deployment, all else is (much) harder (paradox!)
2) Regulation: What do we have? (paradox!)
3) An internet standard is not an official standard, even formally excluded by law
4) Internet standards are a part of the public core of the internet, yet
5) excluded in e.g. GCCS, UNG High-Level panel and formal texts

Conclusions

6) Communication between technical community and all others needs to become better
7) Internet of Things moves towards regulation
8) Education programs need to become better
9) Governments need to play a role, but which?

Potential actions

➢ Create a positive business case

➢ Determine whether arguments against legislation/regulation are valid

➢ What can regulators do under current laws?

➢ Assist end users, SMEs and developing nations by...

➢ Addressing platforms on enhancing security

➢ Develop current education programs

Potential next steps

➢ Dissemination of internet standards
➢ Interaction technical community others
➢ IoT standards/certification
➢ Reach out program
➢ Internet resource organisations and abuse of resources
➢ Norms as identifiers of abuse/breaches
➢ New generation internet

The meta outcome

Can the IGF deliver?

?????

The meta outcome

Can the IGF deliver?

Yes, this is the result of 2,5 months of work and a workshop of 1,5 hour/45 minutes

A thank you to

Bundesministeriums für Wirtschaft und Energie

DINL

ecp

Medienstadt Leipzig e.V.

Ministerie van Economische Zaken en Klimaat

SIDN

SURFnet

What comes next?

That is your choice

There is reason to believe that:
- ➢ There's support for a phase 2;
- ➢ Funding will be found;
- ➢ Next steps will make a difference
- ➢ Further reach out is possible
- ➢ What form?
- ➢ …

And in the end …

Thank you! Questions?