Views on a global points of contact directory pursuant to the first annual progress report contained in A/77/275 of the Open-ended working group on security of and in the use of information and communications technologies 2021-2-25.

Submission by Estonia

22 December 2022

In response to the Chair's questions on the global Point of Contact (POC) directory Estonia would like to make the following remarks.

For building a common understanding of the global POC directory, Estonia suggests that the goal and the tasks of the global directory should be clearly outlined. We should take into account that Member States may have different available resources for the accommodation of the global POC directory. The global POC directory should also take into account that Member States may have various pre-existing domestic organizational structures which may shape the countries' approach to assigning one or multiple POCs. Estonia does not see a conflict with, for example, the OSCE Confidence Building Measure 8 POC network or dedicated networks for CERTs. Circumstances where one national position may serve as a POC for several networks should not be discouraged.

In addition to serving as a confidence-building exercise, the global POC directory also supports capacity building. Assigning a national POC would assume conducting a domestic mapping of already existing national POCs in different networks as well as in general reviewing the roles and responsibilities related to the security of the use of ICTs on the domestic level. Best practices regarding POC networks from regional organisations such as the EU, OSCE, and others would certainly contribute to building the OEWG global POC directory as well as be offer guidance in avoiding duplication.

In terms of more technical details, Estonia would prefer the global POC directory to be held in a password-protected directory. Technicalities regarding the updating of the directory should be further discussed, e.g. whether States should have the functionality to update the POCs themselves or should this be done via the United Nations administration. The information available about the POC could be: name, title/position, email, phone, preferred UN languages. We suggest updating the information at least biannually. Estonia supports using the POC

directory for exercises, as appropriate, and conducting ping "tests" to ensure and encourage updating the contact information in the global directory. We have seen the positive effects that ping "tests" can have on updating the POCs, such as in the case of the Communication Checks conducted by the OSCE.

Estonia suggests not to impose strict policies for the communication between the global POCs. Information shared between POCs should be viewed on the same level as ordinary official communication, usually intended for official use only. Sensitive information should be shared using specific channels or marked accordingly.