

**AfriSIG 2022**  
**Multistakeholder consultation on capacity building in  
cybersecurity: Guide to the process for producing an output  
document**

*Lilongwe, 16 to 18 July 2022*

## **Table of Contents**

<a href="#">About this document.....</a>	<a href="#">1</a>
<a href="#">Goals of the process.....</a>	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">The Context.....</a>	<a href="#">2</a>
<a href="#">The Task.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">Defining “Consensus” .....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">Good Faith and Diversity within Stakeholder Groups.....</a>	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">The Output Document .....</a>	<a href="#">5</a>
<a href="#">Sharing the Output.....</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">Work Process.....</a>	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">Stakeholder Groups.....</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">Chairing and Secretariat Roles.....</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">Chairs.....</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">Secretariat.....</a>	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">Practicum Schedule.....</a>	<a href="#">9</a>
<a href="#">1Programme.....</a>	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">Primary References.....</a>	<a href="#">13</a>

## **About this document**

This document outlines the process by which participants from all stakeholder groups will collaborate to produce an output document that reflects their perspectives, discussions and learnings on African needs and priorities with regard to capacity–building in cybersecurity. It also contains the schedule, a step by step guide to the work process and various roles and responsibilities.

## Goals of the process

- To enable participants to deepen their understanding of the perspectives on cybersecurity, and specifically on capacity building in cybersecurity, held by different stakeholder groups in Africa.
- To build a “hands–on” understanding of the advantages of collaborative, multistakeholder approaches to international and national cybersecurity.
- To deepen understanding of how the OEWG principles of capacity building are already being implemented and how to build on this in the future.
- To foster understanding of the different and complementary roles of stakeholders in supporting the implementation of the UN’s normative framework for responsible state behaviour in cyberspace
- To enable participants to be able to discuss, negotiate, and influence the issues and approaches comfortably and with an awareness of different perspectives.
- To strengthen African participation in global cybersecurity discussion and decision–making forums.

## The Context

The first United Nations [Open–Ended Working Group](#) on developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security (OEWG) delivered, among other outputs, a set of capacity building principles which provide the opportunity for African states to approach capacity development collaboratively, involving all stakeholders. The second OEWG (2021–2025) is mandated to discuss issues related to state behaviour in cyberspace and to advance the framework already agreed by states (including Confidence Building Measures (CBMs), the application of international law in cyberspace, cyber norms and capacity building). The third substantive session of the 2nd OEWG includes two opportunities for multistakeholder input:

**(i) An informal consultation open to non–state actors and states convened on 21 July** by the chair, prior to the start of third substantive session of the 2nd OEWG starting on 25 July.

**(ii) On the afternoon of 27 July, a “dedicated stakeholder session”** convened in accordance with modalities for the participation of non–state actors agreed on by the OEWG on 22 April 2022. According to the programme of work, this part of the meeting will consist of an “Interactive session with States and stakeholders on best practices and lessons learnt with regard to stakeholder involvement in capacity–building initiatives in the ICT security sphere (90 mins)” and an “Interactive session with States and stakeholders on how stakeholders can work with States to contribute to the implementation of the concrete, action–oriented proposals made by States at the first and second substantive sessions of the OEWG as captured in the draft annual progress report (90 mins)”

Towards having a focussed discussion with stakeholders, the chair has prepared guiding questions for both the informal consultative meeting on 21 July 2022 and the dedicated stakeholder session on 27 July 2022.

The task of participants in the AfriSIG2022 / Multistakeholder consultation on cyber capacity building is to try and reach consensus on responses to the guiding questions taken from the [letter from Mr. Burhan Gafoor, the OEWG chair](#) of 22 June 2022. The questions are in the text box below. AfriSIG2022 organisers added one question which you see further down in the section on 'work process'.

### **GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSIONS WITH STAKEHOLDERS AT THE THIRD SUBSTANTIVE SESSION<sup>1</sup>**

**For discussion on best practices and lessons learnt with regard to stakeholder involvement in capacity-building initiatives in the ICT security sphere. Suggested guiding questions:**

1. What are the various ways in which stakeholders are currently involved in supporting and/or delivering capacity-building initiatives in the context of the current ICT security capacity-building landscape?
2. What kind of capacity-building initiatives or projects can stakeholders most meaningfully and effectively contribute to? Are there certain types of initiatives (e.g. technical training, skills training etc.) that present particularly suitable opportunities for meaningful and effective contributions from stakeholders?
3. What forms of stakeholder involvement (e.g. contribution of technical resources, co-creation of programmes, contribution of time and expertise of skilled individuals) work well and what forms of stakeholder involvement work less well?

**For discussion on how stakeholders can work together with States to contribute to the implementation of the concrete, action-oriented proposals made by States at the first and second substantive sessions of the OEWG. Suggested guiding questions:**

1. With regard to the concrete, action-oriented proposals made by States at the first and second substantive sessions of the OEWG as captured in the draft annual progress report, are there any specific proposals which stakeholders can most meaningfully and effectively contribute to the implementation of, given their unique expertise, resources, knowledge and experiences. If so, which proposals are these, and in what way can stakeholder holders contribute to their implementation?
2. With regard to the concrete, action-oriented proposals made by States at the first and second substantive sessions of the OEWG as captured in the draft annual progress report, are there any specific proposals which can be expanded to cover stakeholder groups? To consider one example, can a parallel Points of Contact directory be created by stakeholders to cover key contact points in the private-sector and technical community?

<sup>1</sup>From <https://documents.unoda.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Letter-from-the-OEWG-Chair-22-June-2022.pdf>

## The Task

To produce a negotiated response to the **guiding questions on capacity building** prepared by the chairperson of the 2nd OEWG that reflects priorities in capacity building from a multistakeholder African perspective. If consensus can be achieved among participants, these priorities could be presented to the 2022 African IGF and submitted, as an output of the consultation/AfriSIG2022, to the upcoming third substantive session of the OEWG, starting on 25 July 2022 at United Nations headquarters in New York, but preceded by an informal consultation with all stakeholders on 21 July.

## Defining “Consensus”

“Consensus” has different definitions. The internet technical community developed, in the course of its work the concept of “rough consensus” where most participants in a process agree and a decision is made, even if there are some who do not agree fully. It is based on a set of principles that evolved over time within the Internet Engineering Task Force, the body responsible for the internet’s technical development and standards:

- Lack of disagreement is more important than agreement
- Rough consensus is achieved when all issues are understood and addressed, but not necessarily accommodated
- Rough consensus is ideally the start of an ongoing conversation, and not simply an end in itself.
- Consensus is the path, not the destination – “Coming to consensus is what we do during our processes to arrive at the best solution.”
- Rough consensus is not the same as a majority view: “One hundred people for and five people against might not be rough consensus” and “Five people for and one hundred people against might still be rough consensus”. Look at the [IETF RFC on rough consensus](#) (request for comment) document from 2014 for an explanation.

“Full consensus” is usually used in UN processes and implies that all participants agree fully. For the purpose of this consultation we propose that participants use **rough consensus** to produce an output, but **full consensus** on how to present, use and disseminate the final output document – if one is produced.

It is possible that a rough consensus agreement on an output document is not achieved. While this would be disappointing, it would be valuable in terms of understanding the issues and diverse perspectives at hand and where more understanding and collaboration needs to be developed.

## Good Faith and Diversity within Stakeholder Groups

No matter which stakeholder group participants are part of, or whether they agree with one another or not, they should approach the consultation in good faith and with the assumption that they all share the goal of reaching an acceptable consensus. Stakeholder groups are also not homogenous. There can be as much diversity among views held by different people in different

governments, or even among different departments in the same government, as there are between, for example, government and civil society. The same applies to civil society.

## The Output Document

- Its length, table of content and format should ideally follow these guidelines:
- Three to four pages maximum
- It should respond to the question provided by the AfriSIG 2022/Multistakeholder consultation organisers on capacity–building needs
- It should respond to at least one of the questions in each of the two of sections in OEWG 's letter of 22 June 2022 and include examples and recommendations where possible. The proposed table of contents for Zero Draft/output document is based on the guiding questions presented by the OEWG chair. Paragraphs will be numbered. **Use of the sub–categories within each main section is optional.**

Preamble: About the document

Section A: ICT security capacity–building needs of African states and other stakeholders

A1 – General capacity–building needs including institutional capacity

A2 – Needs specific to particular stakeholder groups/ actors / institutions

Section B: Best practices and lessons learnt on stakeholder involvement in capacity–building initiatives in the ICT security sphere

B1 – Current non–state actor involvement in supporting and/or delivering capacity–building initiatives in the context of the current ICT security capacity–building landscape.

Please include examples where possible

B2 – What type of capacity–building initiatives are most suited to meaningful and effective contributions from nonstate actors?

B3 – What forms of nonstate actor involvement (e.g. contribution of technical resources, co–creation of programmes, contribution of time and expertise of skilled individuals) work well and what forms of stakeholder involvement work less well?

Section C: Action oriented stakeholder collaboration for human and human rights–centric ICT security in Africa

C1 – Specific proposals for collaborative actions – with reference to the action–oriented proposals made by states thus far in the 2nd OEWG and reflected in the draft annual progress report.

C2 – Proposals for including nonstate actors in the concrete, action–oriented proposals made by States at the first and second substantive sessions of the OEWG as captured in the draft annual progress report.

## Sharing the Output

This document will be considered for presentation to the 2022 African Internet Governance Forum if all participants in the process agree to this and, if there is consensus, submission to the OEWG.

However, it is the decision of participants how to proceed. In other words, even if consensus is not achieved by all stakeholder groups, participants can discuss if, and if so, how and with what framing the output can be shared. The organisers might also choose to share the output, or part of it, as part of the larger reporting on the event, without attributing its contents to any specific participant or group of participants.

## Work Process

**Stage one – working in stakeholder groups 16–17 July:** Participants will first meet in their stakeholder groups to reflect on the outcome of the virtual pre–event and do a first review of the guiding questions. They will come up with priorities in response to the questions which they can all agree on. All responses from groups must be in writing and sent to the Secretariat prior to each plenary. Groups are expected during stage one, to:

- A. Review the outcomes of the virtual preparatory session held on 15 June and draw on these as they want to.
- B. Respond to these questions:
  1. What are the top five cyber capacity building needs the continent needs to address? (From the AfriSIG22/Consultation organisers)
  2. As many of the guiding questions from OEWG chair as they can, but prioritising those in bold:

*For discussion on best practices and lessons learnt with regard to stakeholder involvement in capacity–building initiatives in the ICT security sphere. Suggested guiding questions:*

1. What are the various ways in which stakeholders are currently involved in supporting and/or delivering capacity–building initiatives in the context of the current ICT security capacity–building landscape?

**2. What kind of capacity–building initiatives or projects can [nonstate actors] stakeholders most meaningfully and effectively contribute to? Are there certain types of initiatives (e.g. technical training, skills training etc.) that present particularly suitable opportunities for meaningful and effective contributions from stakeholders?**

**3. What forms of stakeholder involvement (e.g. contribution of technical resources, co–creation of programmes, contribution of time and expertise of skilled individuals) work well and what forms of stakeholder involvement work less well?**

*For discussion on how stakeholders can work together with States to contribute to the implementation of the concrete, action–oriented proposals made by States at the first and*

*second substantive sessions of the OEWG. Suggested guiding questions:*

**1. With regard to the concrete, action-oriented proposals made by States at the first and second substantive sessions of the OEWG as captured in the draft annual progress report, are there any specific proposals which stakeholders can most meaningfully and effectively contribute to the implementation of, given their unique expertise, resources, knowledge and experiences. If so, which proposals are these, and in what way can stakeholder holders contribute to their implementation?**

**2. With regard to the concrete, action-oriented proposals made by States at the first and second substantive sessions of the OEWG as captured in the draft annual progress report, are there any specific proposals which can be expanded to cover stakeholder groups? To consider one example, can a parallel Points of Contact directory be created by stakeholders to cover key contact points in the private-sector and technical community?**

**Stage two – first plenary:** Stakeholder groups present their initial perspectives to one another during a chaired plenary. The primary purpose is to hear one another out, get a sense of where there is agreement and disagreement, and to ask questions for clarification.

**Stage three – working in stakeholder groups:** Participants will reconvene in their groups, take into account the initial reactions of other stakeholder groups during the first plenary, and finalise their input for the Zero Draft of the output document. During this stage groups are encouraged to reach out to one another through their rapporteurs or other chosen representatives. Bilateral discussions between groups are also encouraged.

**Stage four – Second plenary:** Starting with a Zero Draft participants will review the document paragraph by paragraph with the secretariat tracking the text. Accepted text will stay, text not accepted will be either deleted, if there is consensus, or placed in “brackets” for later consideration.

**Stage five – working in groups:** Participants will convene in stakeholder groups to review the marked Zero Draft and agree on what their bottom line is. In other words, what they really want to include, what they don’t want to include, and what they are willing to accept even if they do not fully agree. Inputs are submitted to the Secretariat.

**Stage six – final plenary negotiations:** ALL the participants will work through the document and aim to reach rough consensus on its contents and decide how to move forward with it (or not). It will conclude with a debrief on the process.

## **Stakeholder Groups**

Each participant is already identified, primarily – we know some people work in more than one sector or stakeholder group – with one of these stakeholder groups:

- Business and technical community
- Government and intergovernmental organisations
- Civil society, research and media community

One member of each Stakeholder Groups will be assigned the role of Rapporteur.

## Chairing and Secretariat Roles

Several of the faculty will have been asked to co-chair the practicum. These roles will include chairing plenary sessions and working with the fellows to achieve consensus on an outcome without imposing their points of view. Their efforts will be coordinated by the Chair of the Practicum with the assistance of the Secretariat.

### Chairs

Chair: Anriette Esterhuysen

Co-Chair (Government & IGO): Albert Antwi-Boasiako **tbc**

Co-Chair (Technical community): Abdul-Hakeem Ajjola **tbc**

Co-Chair (Civil Society): Grace Githaiga **tbc**

The Co-chairs will also act as advisors and can help facilitate the Stakeholder and the stakeholder groups with their work. Other faculty may be available for consultation as needed. Some faculty may be asked to take on key stakeholder roles.

### Secretariat

Responsible for organizing meetings, collating text contributions into draft documents, and generally helping the participants fulfill the requirements of the exercise.

Sheetal Kumar – [sheetal@gp-digital.org](mailto:sheetal@gp-digital.org) and Ruby Khela – [ruby@gp-digital.org](mailto:ruby@gp-digital.org)

## Practicum Schedule

	Session	Time	
Day one: 16 July	Introduction to the Practicum	12:30–13:00	
16 July	Meeting with SG Rapporteurs	During coffee / tea break	
16 July	<b>Stage one – working in stakeholder groups 16–17</b> <b>July:</b> Participants will first meet in their stakeholder groups to	Working lunch + Pre/post dinner	Coordinate with Secretariat & SG Advisors

	<p>reflect on the outcome of the virtual pre-event and do a first review of the guiding questions. They will come up with priorities in response to the questions which they can all agree on. All responses from groups must be in writing and sent to the Secretariat prior to each plenary</p>		
<p>Day 2 17 July</p>	<p><b>Stage two – first plenary:</b> Stakeholder groups present their initial perspectives to one another during a chaired plenary. The primary purpose is to hear one another out, get a sense of where there is agreement and disagreement, and to ask questions for clarification.</p> <p><b>Stage three – working in stakeholder groups’:</b> Participants will reconvene in their groups, take into account initial reactions of other stakeholder groups during the first plenary, and finalise their input into the Zero Draft of the output document. During this stage groups are encouraged to reach out to one another through their rapporteurs or other chosen representatives. Bilateral discussions between groups are also encouraged.</p>	<p>Working lunch (12:30–14:00) for groups, followed by <b>Session 12 from 16:30 to 17:30</b> for both stage two and the start of stage three.</p> <p>Groups can continue doing work on stage three in the evening and/or over breakfast the next day.</p>	
<p>Day 3 18 July</p>	<p><b>Stage four – Second plenary:</b> Starting with a Zero Draft participants will review the document paragraph by paragraph with the secretariat tracking the text. Accepted text will stay, text not accepted will be either deleted, if there is consensus, or placed in “brackets” for later consideration.</p>		

18 July	<p><b>Stage five – working in groups:</b> Participants will convene in stakeholder groups to review the Zero Draft and agree on what their bottom line is. In other words, what they really want to include, and what they don't want to include. Inputs are submitted to the Secretariat.</p> <p><b>Stage six – plenary negotiations:</b> ALL the participants will work through the document and aim to reach rough consensus on its contents and how to move forward with it (or not).</p>	11:00–12:30	Coordinate with Secretariat & SG Advisors
18 July	Practicum Outcome presentations and discussion.	14:00–15:00	

## 1 Programme

Time	Session and session description
DAY 0 Friday, 15 July	Arrivals
DAY 1 Saturday, 16 July	Overview of the programme, introduction to participants the topic and to the AfriSIG 2022 practicum. Chair of the day: Margaret Nyamburu Ndung'u, PRIDA, African Union Commission
8:30–10:00	<p><b>SESSION 1 – WELCOME, OVERVIEW AND INTRODUCTIONS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of the programme, Chatham House rules and AfriSIG ground rules.</li> <li>• Participant introductions and cybersecurity “hopes and fears”.</li> <li>• Overview of the “practicum” to produce a multistakeholder consultation output on African perspectives and priorities on capacity building in international cybersecurity – introduction to the task and its purpose.</li> </ul>
10:00–10:30	COFFEE / TEA BREAK – Meeting with group rapporteurs, secretariat and chairs.
10:30–11:30	<p><b>SESSION 2 – What is internet governance and how does it relate to international cybersecurity?</b></p> <p>Format: Presentation followed by interactive discussion that follows up on pre-AfriSIG webinar.</p> <p>Scope: Basic overview of internet governance from a “narrow” perspective; overview of international cybersecurity processes of the last 20 years. This</p>

	session will establish what 'international cybersecurity' is and how it relates to cybersecurity in general.
11:30–12:30	SESSION 3 – International cybersecurity discussions at the UN First Committee: The OEWG in context. Format: Presentation followed by interactive discussion. Scope: The OEWG in the context of the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) and discussions on responsible state behaviour in the United Nations General Assembly First Committee. Process and overview of outcomes of the first OEWG and overview of scope, process and schedule of the second OEWG.
12:30–13:00	SESSION 4 – AfriSIG 2022 – OEWG multistakeholder consultation practicum: Stage one – African perspectives on cybersecurity capacity–building Format: Presentation followed by group work which will start over lunch. Scope: Presentation of priorities mentioned during the virtual consultation on 15 June. AfriSIG 2022 followed by pre–lunch practicum check–in to prepare for Stage one group work.
13:00–14:00	WORKING LUNCH Practicum stage one exercise
14:00–15:30	SESSION 5 – Why do we need a human and human rights–centric and multi–stakeholder approach to international cybersecurity Format: Presentation followed by interactive discussion. Scope: Cybersecurity narratives and what 'human centric' means, importance of inclusive multistakeholder engagement, challenges, and opportunities, with specific reference to the African context.
15:30–16:00	COFFEE / TEA BREAK
16:00–17:30	SESSION 6 – Cybersecurity as a component of societal security, human rights, gender and development. Format: Presentations followed by discussion.
18:30	DINNER followed or preceded by practicum teams meeting in groups.
DAY 2 Sunday 17 July	In–depth look at the first OEWG and its outcomes. First practicum session focusing on African priorities on capacity building in international cybersecurity. Chair of the day: Frederico Links.
8:30–9:00	Review of day ONE: Questions and answers. Format: Open discussion of questions submitted by participants.
9:00–10:30	SESSION 7 – The Africa Context: the 1st OEWG: Deep diving into issues it addressed – Threats; International Law; Rules, Norms and Principles for Responsible State Behaviour; Confidence–building Measures; Capacity–building; and Regular Institutional Dialogue. Format: Presentation followed by interactive discussion on the 1st OEWG and its outcome from an African perspective. Scope: In–depth look at the outcome report of the OEWG with particular focus on the principles for capacity–building. Discussion will focus on challenges and opportunities, and the implications of these, for African stakeholders. This session will include the "Elephants in the room" discussed during the virtual preparatory session on 15 June. Format: Presentation followed by interactive discussion. Scope: TO BE FINALISED.
10:30–11:00	BREAK
11:00–12:30	SESSION 8 – National–level engagement with the GGE and the OEWG

	<p>process</p> <p>Format: Short presentation followed by Interactive panel</p> <p>Scope: Overview of existing efforts to implement the responsible state behaviour framework covered earlier in the morning – e.g. what regional groups are doing, what the UN is doing, specific countries etc.</p>
12:30–14:00	LUNCH – WORKING LUNCH – PARTICIPANTS TO LUNCH WITH THEIR GROUPS
14:00–15:00	<p>SESSION 9 – AfriSIG 2022 – OEWG multistakeholder consultation practicum</p> <p>Stage two – first plenary: Stakeholder groups present their initial perspectives to one another during a chaired plenary. The primary purpose is to hear one another out, get a sense of there there is agreement and disagreement, and to ask questions for clarification.</p>
15:00–16:00	<p>SESSION 10 – The 2<sup>nd</sup> OEWG, the Programme of Action and the Ad Hoc Committee on a cybercrime convention</p> <p>Format: Presentation followed by discussion.</p> <p>Scope: Current international cybersecurity processes at the UNGA First Committee and beyond.</p>
16:00–16:30	BREAK
16:30–17:30	<p>SESSION 11 – AfriSIG 2022 – OEWG multistakeholder consultation practicum.</p> <p>Stage three – working in stakeholder groups’: Participants will reconvene in their groups, take into account initial reactions of other stakeholder groups during the first plenary, and finalise their input into the Zero Draft of the output document. During this stage groups are encouraged to reach out to one another through their rapporteurs or other chosen representatives. Bilateral discussions between groups are also encouraged.</p>
	GROUPS TO WORK before or after dinner as needed.
DAY 3 Monday 18 July	<p>The 2<sup>nd</sup> OEWG and African priorities and inputs on capacity building in international cybersecurity.</p> <p>Chair of the day: Anriette Esterhuysen</p>
8:30–9:00	<p>Review of day two: Questions and answers</p> <p>Format: Open discussion of questions submitted by participants.</p>
9:00–10:30	<p>SESSION 12 – Strengthening African collaboration and participation in international, regional and national cybersecurity</p> <p>Format: Sharing of existing initiatives followed by facilitated discussion</p> <p>Scope: In–depth look at how national, regional and international cooperation can be harnessed to strengthen African cybersecurity capacity. Note that this session is linked to one of the OEWG chair’s guiding questions.</p>
10:30–11:00	TEA / COFFEE BREAK
11:00–12:30	<p>SESSION 13 – Practicum / Output document</p> <p>Stage four – Second plenary: Starting with a Zero Draft participants will review the document paragraph by paragraph with the secretariat tracking the text. Accepted text will stay, text not accepted will be either deleted, if there is consensus, or placed in “brackets” for later consideration.</p>
12:30–13:00	<p>SESSION 14 – Briefing from the African IGF Multistakeholder Advisory Group</p> <p>Format: Presentation</p> <p>Scope: What to expect at the African IGF.</p>
13:00–14:30	LUNCH – Stage five – working in groups: Participants will convene in stakeholder groups to review the Zero Draft and agree on what their bottom line is. In other words, what they really want to include, and what they don’t

	want to include. Inputs are submitted to the Secretariat. ADD DEADLINES HERE AND ELSEWHERE
14:30–16:00	SESSION 15 Stage six – plenary negotiations: ALL the participants will work through the document and aim to reach rough consensus on its contents and how to move forward with it (or not).
16:00–16:30	SESSION 16 – AfriSIG 2022 evaluation, practicum debrief and closing.

## Primary References

Further references can be found here:

- OEWG II Draft annual report: <https://documents.unoda.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Letter-from-the-OEWG-Chair-22-June-2022.pdf>
- Stakeholder inputs to first OEWG intersessional meeting: <https://www.un.org/disarmament/oewg-informal-multi-stakeholder-meeting-2-4-december-2019/>
- [Using the OEWG to open doors and build partnership for a secure and human centric internet in Africa](#)
- [AU–GFCE Collaboration: “Enabling African countries to identify and address their cyber capacity needs”](#)
- [Integrating Cyber Capacity into the Digital Development Agenda](#)