Cybersecurity Competence Building Trends

19 April 2016

Vladimir Radunović DiploFoundation David Rüfenacht MELANI



Context

Challenges

- Threats to institutions, business, CI
- Multidisciplinary area (technology, law, diplomacy, economy, management, psychology, media)
- Fast-changing environment

Opportunities

- Driver for employment
- Economic growth
- Global competitiveness



Context

Developing national capacities and competences

BY

Transforming the national labour market to meet the changing environment

BUT

Building qualified labour goes beyond traditional education and one-off training courses



Research

- Inquiry: FDFA inquiry on 'Promote cybersecurity competence building in Switzerland through lessons learned abroad'
- Objective: contribute to strengthening cybersecurity skills and competences in Switzerland (especially re. CI)
- Task: Review of trends and policy instruments of 10 OECD countries on cyber competence building that could feed into NCS



Methodology

- Problem: developing human skills and competences through training and education for technological and organisational measures to counter cyber-threats
- Methodology: Qualitative research (July-October 2015) based on review of the literature, content analysis of (open) documents, secondary analysis and statistics
- Case selection:
 - Pre-set countries: Estonia, Israel, Republic of Korea, the Netherlands, UK and US
 - Added countries: Austria, Finland, France and Germany



Key findings

- Countries observe both risks and opportunities: cyberpreparedness and global industry competitiveness
- Combination of long-term and short-term approaches to transforming labour markets
- Trends heavily based on PPP (development of curricula, certification, capabilities, regional hubs):
 - strategic lead and incentives by government
 - funds and cutting-edge technology by private sector
 - knowledge, outreach and research potential by academia



Lead trends

Promoting com	ibetence buildin	g at universities
		y at an i o o o o o o

University programs supported	Labelling of	Regional development
by the government	universities	

Competence building through professional training						
State	Collaboration	Improving the	Manager and	Knowledge		
personnel	w/ professional	competences of	decision-	frameworks, job		
training	certification	the private sector	making level	descriptions and		
	bodies	(SME and CI)	training	professionalization		



University programs supported by the government

- Strong PPP element
- Supported by government (specific Ministry)
- Economic growth is aimed
- Long term development
- Research Lab & Network development



University programs supported by the government





Labelling of universities

- Student advantage (tuition fees)
- University advantage (attract new students with image, potential facilitated research funding, research network, establishing programs)
- Government advantage (training for future employees, screening of future employees, potential say to research directions)
- Disadvantage: potential loss of independence and link with politics (real and/or reputational loss)

Example: Center for Academic Excellence in Defense Education (CAE-CD) (US)



Labelling of universities



Regional development

- Developing universities, research labs, innovation hubs, labs, joint ventures
- Need for funding: regional development and use of national and supra-national and/or research funding (especially private sector)
- Never a 'totally' new place: located in regions with lead universities and political and economic relevance
- Depends on context and geopolitical situation

Example: CyberSpark Industry Initiative at Ben-Gurion University in Be'er Sheva (Israel)



Regional development



State personnel training

Extremes: state training vs private training

 Government regulatory institution trains specialists: Example: ESSI certificate by ANSSI- CFSSI (France)

+ control, highly specialized

 – costly, high labor toll on regulatory institution, potentially longer to adapt, workforce mobility

 Use of professional certification bodies: *Example*: US DoD Policy 8570.1 – 8410 requirements (US)

+ low cost of adaption certification (technical experts), 'soft' standardization (public-private, national-international), workforce mobility, workforce reallocation time

 takes time to decide on providers and/or certificates, costly for trainees (financial)



State personnel training



Collaboration with professional certification bodies

Creating a certificate for national needs

- + creates certificate adapted to national legal framework, advantages of professional certification bodies,
- needs national legal framework (takes time, commitment), suited for national not international, and need for 'critical size'

Example: BSI Cybersecurity Practitioner (Germany)



Collaboration with professional certification bodies



Improving the competences of the private sector

- Especially for SME and CI
- Incident handling and prevention framework (using professional certification bodies)
- Frameworks and standards for private sector
- Government subcontractors mandated to implement
- Securing the chain
- Awareness training

Example: 'Cyber Essentials' - standards/ requirements and Certification for SME (UK) & 'Référent en cybersécurité' guide with standards by ANSSI (France)



Improving the competences of the private sector



Manager and decision-making level training

- Addressing awareness among CEO & decision-makers
- Multidisciplinary: politics, regulation, business management
- Helps deciding on investments in IT and cybersecurity sectors in institutions
- Need for quick and applied training

Example: Executive Academy within CyberSpark (Israel) & Master's degree in Cybersecurity at JyvSecTec (Finland)



Manager and decision-making level training





Knowledge frameworks and job descriptions

- Lack of understanding of what is and what will become cyber competence
- Defining tasks and required knowledge
- Allowing for recombination and evolution
- Helps employer, employee and HR for training management

Example: 'National Cybersecurity Workforce Framework 2.0' by the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education (US)



Knowledge frameworks and job descriptions





Conclusion



Full paper: www.diplomacy.edu/cybersecurity

> Contact: vladar@diplomacy.edu

