

Panel 7: Alternative Lenses and Models for International Norms and Governance
(Friday, 13:15 – 14:45)

Chairs: Roger Hurwitz, Alexander Klimburg

Panel members: Martha Finnemore, Yurie Ito, Sarah McKune, and Emilian Papadopoulos.

This panel explores the possibilities, possible contents and levels of impact of norms initiatives by or for non-state actors, including private sectors, civil society, cyber security practitioners and even loosely organized individuals. Such interested third parties may include IGOs that develop a supra-national interest in stabilizing and maintaining cyberspace.

1. What is the logic for regional cybersecurity alliances in the supposedly borderless world of cyberspace? Do such alliances have interests and constituencies that in some sense transcend those of the individual member states? May there be some recognition that the notion of a “common problem” is that of a shared problem, because of interdependence, more than each state having the same problem?
2. Are norms and best practices at the operational level, e.g., an ethos of cooperation among national CERTs, a basis for influencing practices and potential norms at state and international security policy levels? Alternatively, to what extent is cooperation and trust at operational levels put at risk by behaviors of state actors?
3. The private sector, especially ICT vendors, Tier 1 carriers and major online services have considerable roles in shaping cyberspace. As a group, their interests and drivers might conflict with those of states. What freedom might some have for an initiative that sets out their own norms of use and misuse of cyberspace? What effect could this have?
4. NGOs and other members of international civil society (INGOs) typically have an interest in the free flow of communication. Some have been targets of cyber attacks by state actors, and some have received material aid from other states. What norms, e.g., export controls on surveillance and filtering technologies, might they advocate? Can they align with some states in promoting these norms, while not losing independence of state interests or their credibility? What might be appropriate forums for pursuit of their interests?
5. What has been the success in other domains and issues of interested third parties developing their own norms and getting state actors to adopt some? What conditions enable success and which block it. Is the abolition of the slave trade a relevant example or the more campaign against land mines? Or might the limited success of the environment movement be more relevant?
6. A decade ago, Chris Kelty wrote about “recursive publics” in cyberspace, i.e., online groups that discussed and created/ maintained the online conditions that allowed them to discuss and create/maintain the online conditions... They were norm entrepreneurs, after a fashion, but perhaps possible only in the cottage industry phase of cyberspace. Can such loosely organized groups still help shape cyber norms?