



## *Serious about WARPs*

### **The WARP Forum comes to Leeds**

#### **3rd Annual WARP Forum**

On Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2007, CPNI hosted the third annual WARP (Warning, Advice and Reporting Point) Forum at Leeds Town Hall.



The event was attended by over 70 delegates and included attendees from Japan, the Netherlands and Switzerland. Experience ranged from representatives of existing, fully operational WARPs to delegates who were learning about WARPs for the first time. The event offered delegates a unique opportunity to network with other people active in the area, and to share advice and experiences. For most delegates it was also the first opportunity to learn about, and provide input to, the development of a WARP Trust.

# Timetable

The timetable for the day was as follows:

10:00	<a href="#"><u>Introduction &amp; Aims of the Forum</u></a>	Director, CPNI
10:15	<a href="#"><u>Keynote Speech</u></a>	Stuart Okin,
10.35	<a href="#"><u>WARP Trust</u></a>	Tom Wills-Sandford
11.30	<b>Plenary Sessions</b>	
	<a href="#"><u>WARPs in Switzerland</u></a>	Manuel Suter
	<a href="#"><u>WARPs in the Netherlands</u></a>	Menno Muller
	<a href="#"><u>WARP Operators' Forum</u></a>	Bob Askwyth
	<a href="#"><u>WARP survey findings</u></a>	Bill Whyte
13.50	<b>Workshops 'Sales Pitches'</b>	Chairs promoting their workshops
14.00	<b>Workshops</b>	
	<a href="#"><u>Workshop 1</u></a> Chair	<b>WARPs for schools</b> Judy Revell
	<a href="#"><u>Workshop 2</u></a> Chair	<b>Marketing WARPs</b> Annette Bontke
	<a href="#"><u>Workshop 3</u></a> Chair	<b>WARPs in e-crime</b> Martin Wright
	<a href="#"><u>Workshop 4</u></a> Chair	<b>Sharing sensitive information – building trust</b> Mandy Messenger
	<a href="#"><u>Workshop 5</u></a> Chair	<b>University/Industry partnerships</b> Andrew Cormack
16.00	<a href="#"><u>Forum Feedback</u></a>	Peter Burnett, all presenters and chairs
16:45	<b>Close of Forum</b>	

## Introduction and aims of the forum

The forum was opened by the Director CPNI.

The Director welcomed everybody to this year's forum and started by describing the vision and principles of the newly formed CPNI. He stressed that the commitment and belief in WARPs had not changed and that WARPs had a positive future, citing three areas of particular importance:

- The opportunities raised by the new WARP Trust
- Integrating security advice to include personnel, physical etc.
- International developments

[Back to timetable](#)

## Keynote speech: What is out there?



The Forum keynote speech was provided by Stuart Okin, a Partner at Accenture. His presentation looked at the evolution of threats and the implications of those threats for the future.

Stuart's talk emphasised five issues:

- Security threats are getting more complicated/sophisticated;
- Targeted attacks are on the increase now (> 90% aimed at financial sector);
- SMTP is still the No1 attack delivery method;
- We need to keep an eye on peer to peer, wireless and web services (e.g. multiple service providers)
- There is a danger of complacency and this makes information sharing vital.

Stuart concluded by saying that to counteract these trends we must all take a more holistic approach to security management. One element of that approach is security awareness and this is where WARPs have such a valuable role to play.

[Back to timetable](#)

## WARP Trust



Tom Wills-Sandford is the Deputy Director General of Intellect, an organisation representing the UK IT, telecommunications and electronics industries. He is a key member of the team looking at the setting up of a WARP Trust.

Tom gave an overview of his organisation and then proceeded to give an outline description of the WARP Trust work funded by the DTI. To become endemic WARPs need to

- Extend their remit
- Grow in numbers
- Improve services
- Increase effectiveness
- Reduce costs

WARPs will need to “keep moving” to survive but must stay flexible and resolved to do so. The WARP Trust will provide the right environment to support these requirements. He described how the project now under way will produce an authoritative and validated business plan to create a WARP Trust which will deliver the WARP Vision.

[Back to timetable](#)

## Plenary Sessions

### WARPs in Switzerland

Manuel Suter

Manuel works for the Center for Security Studies, Zurich and reported on a study looking at information security among SMEs. The presentation highlighted the different issues facing small and medium sized businesses in Switzerland.

Not surprisingly, it was found that different types and sizes of company experienced different threats and are at different levels of risk management. They therefore have different needs. One solution does not fit all and this is where the tailoring capabilities of WARPs have a valuable part to play. WARPs can provide an extension and a complement to the CERT model with regard to the needs of SMEs.

[Back to timetable](#)

## **WARPs in the Netherlands**

Menno Muller

Menno is part of the CERT organisation of Holland responsible for advisories, warnings and active knowledge sharing. This government body is now involved with a WARP experiment in Holland which will see the establishment of three WARPs, initially in schools and adult education establishments but later moving to other sectors.

Menno explained the approach as a bottom up one where plans were presented at schools with a focus on potential benefits to staff.

[Back to timetable](#)

## **WARP Operators' Forum**

Bob Askwyth

Bob Askwyth is a member of Liverpool John Moores University and is currently chair of the WARP Operator's Forum. Bob covered the remit of the WARP Operator's Forum, typical areas for discussion, and its future.

He concluded by listing the positive benefits of the WOF

- Opportunity for WARP staff to share best practice
- Opportunity for new WARPs to seek advice
- Opportunity for CPNI - WARP interaction
- Opportunity to develop the WARP concept
- Opportunity to understand WARP development

[Back to timetable](#)

## **WARP survey findings**

Bill Whyte

Bill Whyte is an independent consultant who conducted two studies on the motivations for creating a WARP between November 2006 and March 2007. The study represents the output from 15 informal interviews with existing WARP Operators.

Bill summarised the findings of the study:

- People are a key strength
- Need to gather feedback and metrics
- Need to market more widely
- Give ownership to users
- Accept maturation and diversification of WARPs
- Work for a clear definition of the WARP product
- Development of variety of trust is vital

He concluded by listing the challenges for the future

- software policy
- aggregation of alert services
- need to target the unconverted
- viability of 'not-for-profit'

- need to accept diversity
- the nature of the ‘brand’

[Back to timetable](#)

## Workshop sessions

Five two minute slots were provided for each Chair to ‘sell’ their workshop; each workshop being run twice over the course of the afternoon. Delegates could attend two workshops of their choice during the afternoon sessions. The findings of both sessions from the five Workshops were later fed back to the forum in the final session of the day. Feedback was facilitated by Peter Burnett and Chairs were asked to provide comment on what they considered to be the most important issues to come out of the workshops. These are summarised below:

**Workshop One**      **WARPs and education**  
Chair                      Judy Revell

*Issues discussed:*

Drivers:

- Increased sensitivity to the holding of sensitive information
- Need to raise awareness of staff, senior management and governors
- Need to manage patch application effectively

Barriers:

- Perception of priorities
- Levels of awareness
- Variety of delivery

[See full workshop report](#)

[Back to timetable](#)

**Workshop Two**      **Marketing WARPs**  
Chair                      Annette Bontke

*Issues discussed:*

- Requirement for central resources
- Lack of marketing material
- Need of metrics to help marketing
- Overcoming resistance to selling WARPs
- Need for a marketing toolkit
- Marketing via third parties

[See full workshop report](#)

[Back to timetable](#)

**Workshop Three**      **WARPs and e-crime**  
Chair                      Martin Wright

*Issues raised:*

How can a WARP

- help prevent e-crime
- assist in warning the public about e-crime risks
- support victims of e-crime
- link with police
- capture trends and intelligence

[See full workshop report](#)

[Back to timetable](#)

**Workshop Four**      **Sharing sensitive information – building trust**  
Chair                      Mandy Messenger

*Issues raised:*

- Recent research
- A model of sharing
- Experience of using two tools exploring perceptions of sharing

[See full workshop report](#)

[Back to timetable](#)

**Workshop Five**      **University/Industry partnerships**  
Chair                      Andrew Cormack

*Issues discussed:*

- *Start up funding*
- *Sustainability*
- *Language of alerts*
- *Working with competitors*
- *Use of university infrastructure*
- *Demonstrating benefits to management*

[See full workshop report:](#)

[Back to timetable](#)

## Forum feedback



The feedback session started with a summary from each Workshop Chair of the main issues arising in their respective Workshops. Discussion was stimulated by questions from delegates and the main areas debated in the session are summarised below:

### **The generation of content**

Discussion centred on how to reward those who supplied content without compromising the sharing ethos. It was suggested that those organisations providing content raised their own status/profile and that this was the principle reward.

### **The setting up of the WARP Trust**

The main areas for discussion were:

- Determining the appropriate number of Operators on the Board
- A clear definition of what a WARP is
- Centralised marketing of WARP Brand

### **Business continuity and its inclusion by WARPs**

Final comment on this came from Peter Burnett of CPNI (“we’re working on it”)

### **Most attacks address weaknesses in people not technology.**

The discussion on this topic was concluded by the Director of CPNI saying that CPNI’s priority was to push personal security. WARPs create an environment in which to “switch people on about security”.

### **Transforming advisories from UNIRAS etc to share with WARPs?**

Peter Burnett. said there were plans “afoot” to make UNIRAS alerts available to RSS feeds with XML structure attached. There was further discussion on language style and a plea that WARPs should always convert advisories into a language suitable for the intended recipient.

### **Marketing WARPs**

Peter B replied that this was an issue that the new WARP Trust would be taking up and that the output from the workshop session on marketing would undoubtedly provide a useful input.

### **Close**

Peter B closed the Forum at 1645 thanking the delegates for a very successful day and with an invitation to a final networking session over refreshments.

**NB** - 100% of delegates who completed the feedback questionnaire agreed that the forum had been successful and that they would attend a follow up event. For a more detailed analysis and for all comments see [Feedback](#).

[Back to timetable](#)

---

## Workshop notes



## Workshop One

### WARP for schools workshop

This was a small workshop that examined how the WARP concept could be promoted to the school community.

#### **Drivers**

Concerns from central and county authorities about the handling of confidential information

Need for IT providers to manage upgrades and patches more effectively

#### **Barriers**

Management/professional ownership of IT issues

Lack of awareness of issues at grass roots

Competing priorities

#### **Solutions**

Use language that can be related to in communication and marketing

Raise awareness of issues

Start with the perceived priorities of members

Communication and support are key if decision makers are to be influenced.

[Back to timetable](#)

# Workshop Two

## Marketing WARPs

### Introduction:

The purpose of this workshop was two-fold:

- 1) to offer a platform for discussion regarding the marketing needs of current and potential WARPs, and
- 2) a range of tips and tools to help achieve a sound marketing strategy.

Attendees at the session included senior/mature WARP providers, WARP members as well as potential WARPs.

### Points of Interest:

The first half of the session highlighted the issues that most WARPs lacked a clear marketing strategy, little time to dedicate to any marketing activities with little or no budget. In addition, the absence of any kind of metrics or qualitative material just served to aggravate the issue even further. One member in particular mentioned that there wasn't a standard means through which to collate facts and figures that may help to market the WARPs concept. On another note, a WARP provider shared his concerns about a certain reluctance of IT security among small enterprises and how their ignorance of it had, in most cases, contributed to their closure. His challenge was to figure out what kind of marketing strategy to employ to make them aware of this serious situation. The last challenge was quite simply how to sell WARPs within the confines of one's own organisation and for IT managers to convince their superiors.

The second half of the session was dedicated to finding solutions to some of the above issues. These include:

- The need for a central marketing toolbox readily filled with templates and a set of 'national' key messages in a simple and easy-to-understand language;
- A dedicated effort to identify qualitative as well as quantitative material to support any marketing campaign;
- To be supported/endorsed by a Government/Authoritative body so as to lend kudos to a campaign;
- (For Local Government WARPs) To be included in the Comprehensive Performance Assessment (CPA) or District Audit papers so as to gain better awareness;
- Joining forces with an IT vendor and sell WARPs through third-party endorsement;
- Organising road shows to boost awareness and to recruit new members;
- Using existing contacts to spread the word;
- Using testimonials/case studies to 'sell' into the local press.

### Conclusion:

All attendees agreed that there was a need for a major marketing push on behalf of WARPs, not only from the bottom up but also from the top down. And while many identified that there was little time and as good as no budget for it, marketing has to

become more front-of-mind than it has to date with more of a 'must have' as opposed to a 'nice to have' attitude. It is only then that all the WARPs can pursue a clear marketing strategy of their own.

[Back to timetable](#)

## **Workshop Three**

### **WARPS and e-crime**

*Co-chairs: Martin Wright (West Midlands Police) / Ken Rabey (University of Wolverhampton)*

1) The two workshops were well attended and by a wide variety of representatives. There was broad understanding of the complimentary approaches between WARPs and e-crime prevention, for example mechanisms for reporting and information sharing within a trusted environment.

2) The workshop was posed a number of questions. There were:

#### **How can a WARP assist in preventing e-crime?**

The discussion group asked, what is e-crime? There was a good understanding of e-crimes such as: identity theft; theft of IP; malicious damage; on-line paedophilia; etc. but uncertainty as to: phishing attacks; spam; etc. The discussion concluded that the key outcome of any WARP and the National e-Crime Prevention Centre is to prevent e-victimisation. Within that context understanding e-crime is not to look to the legal definition of a criminal offence and but a victim's perspective of risk.

There was agreement that a WARP could behave in a manner similar to a Neighbourhood Watch scheme, for example disseminating definitive information within a trusted environment as to risk. There was agreement that the police need to be involved within WARPs both to lend credibility to the scheme as well as inputting and receiving risk information. In addition the formal link between a WARP and the police would create a single point of contact and overcome the desire to establish informal networks or relationships.

It was agreed that a WARP can assist in reducing e-crime risks by promoting security awareness and adoption.

#### **How can a WARP help warn the public of e-crime risks?**

The group discussed how a WARP reached beyond its own membership and as such created a diffusion of benefit. The 'spread' of definitive / authoritative advice as to how to become risk adverse would assist in warning the wider public. The nature of the advice would in itself act to remove / reduce the uncertainty of the public as to what steps to take. It was suggested that WARPs could input content to local papers and also 'reach-out' to vulnerable groups such as SMEs.

## **How can a WARP capture current e-crime trends / methods / intelligence?**

Very much based upon the answers / discussions around the above two questions the group identified that effective information sharing within a WARP would flag emerging issues and risks and through good partnership working with the police and others refer same. Need to establish confidentiality agreements (as used by SOCA with potential victims) to foster trust between investigative agencies and potential victims.

## **How can a WARP support victims of e-crime?**

There was an active and lively discussion regards repeat victimisation of e-crime victims. The understanding within the group as to how to reduce / address repeat victimisation of real victims, i.e. domestic burglary could be replicated within the e-crime agenda. There is perhaps a need to commission this research if it hasn't already been undertaken.

WARPs can assist in identifying victims of e-crime, anonymising the detail of the crime and sharing this with other vulnerable people / groups. In addition a WARP can act as a resource via which victims or those at risk of e-crime can seek advice and support.

## **How should a WARP 'link' with the police?**

The group identified that there may be problems with victims / WARP members reporting e-crimes to the police or other investigative agencies if there is no trust or there is a fear of reprisals – further e-attacks. There is a need for police crime prevention officers to be briefed on WARPs and possibly develop e-crime prevention skills to assist potential victims.

[Back to timetable](#)

# **Workshop Four**

## **Sharing sensitive information – building trust**

### **Workshop Summary**

A key role for WARP champions is the development of the trusted environment necessary to facilitate the sharing of sensitive information (such as the learning from incidents or threat data). This role extends beyond providing agreements and protocols for the handing of information, it involves helping members consider the range of influences that make up a trusted sharing culture.

The workshop introduced the results of recent research, described a model of sharing and finally provided participants the chance to try out two tools that can help WARP members explore their perceptions of sharing such sensitive information.

The workshop was highly participative and those involved indicated the usefulness of the tools and shared thoughts on how the tools could be used and adapted for use in their specific WARP environment.

### **Workshop feedback**

The first section of the workshop introduced a model of sharing sensitive information and the underpinning research. This research was conducted with WARP members and was complimented with recent academic thinking about people's behaviour in work place situations particularly in the areas of trust, collaboration, disclosure and social identification. Participants felt that the model seemed to reflect their understanding of the key issues.

During the workshop some participants used the questionnaire aimed at individual use. This introduced the sharing model and then posed 16 key questions, each in the form of a set of three statements. Which of the three options for each question selected is scored and can then be displayed on a graph representing the elements of the sharing model.

Participants found this simple to use and several shared that that found the tool effective in highlighting key issues and barriers. This raised questions and participants expressed interest in some mechanism for sharing the learning for how others addressed barriers and issues. There was also interest in any insights into the types of result profiles that might be popular and the implications of those types.

Participants also used a second tool comprising of a set of statement cards with instruction booklet. This was based on the same model of sharing but involved sorting the cards, according to the statement being true or false from the viewpoint of the participant. This sort can be an individual or shared activity. The sorted cards can be revised and marked up on a graph to highlight issues. If the card sort was done individually then a group can use a shared poster sized version of the graph to explore issues together. Participants used both methods to try out the tool

Participants found the cards a flexible tool. They adapted the card sort and used different methods of sharing their results:

- a) Some people sorted the cards and then did another sort of the FALSE statement considering only the cards that are highlighted barriers (these contain a code with a 2 or 3 at the end)
- b) A group using the shared poster sized graph laid out the cards that represented their issues on the graph. In this way they could refer back to the statement that highlighted the problem.

Feedback from the participants on both tools mentioned that:

- a) The tools rely on a good understanding of the English language. Interest was expressed in the possibility of provided a translated version.
- b) The tools are intended for use by those who might/could be a sharer at some point rather than for those who facilitate or run WARPs as the questions ask about the reader's viewpoint.
- c) There was a lot of enthusiasm for providing the tool through an automated on-line service. This would avoid the need to score and draw up the results by hand. In contrast there was strong recognition that a lot of valuable

understanding could be gained from a community discussing their thoughts and issues, as they used the tools.

Participants were provided with personal copies of the tools to take away. Access to the tool kit is also available in the form of pdf files on the WARP download services page.

[Back to timetable](#)

## Workshop Five

### University/Industry partnerships

#### Introduction:

The purpose of this workshop was to explore whether WARPs were a suitable model for universities to assist local SMEs as part of their community (known as 'third stream') activities. Attendees at the small session included universities that act as WARP providers for other sectors and international visitors with an interest in the SME sector.

#### Points of Interest:

The discussion concentrated mostly on the difficulty of engaging the SME sector, with some discussion of how universities might play a helpful role in this.

For SME WARPs in general:

- SMEs are particularly sensitive to cost, so an appropriate level and model for charges is critical. Per-seat fees were suggested;
- SMEs are very concerned about working with their competitors, so careful consideration will be needed of how to group them into WARP communities. Groups based on industry sector are likely to include competitors so it may be better to use geography (e.g. a WARP for a high street or science park) or to get large customers to encourage their SME suppliers to form a WARP. However these may cause issues of...
- Relevance of advice to a particular SME's use and experience of ICT, and accessibility of language to its particular needs and skills.
- It was also noted that there are a very large number of SMEs in the UK, so that planning for success means thinking on a \*very\* large scale.

Some ideas on addressing these:

- Work with existing SME membership organisations and groups, rather than trying to create new groupings from scratch. Chambers of commerce, local authorities or business links were suggested as useful partners. It was noted that there may be a particular difficulty with SMEs whose business is not in the ICT sector, as they are less aware of the problem.
- Provide clear messages for SME management on the benefits of joining a WARP. Experience of other communities suggests that benefits need not be direct: opportunities for networking, attending seminars, sharing resources, etc. may be persuasive. It was also noted that Local Authorities now have a responsibility to promote business continuity, under the Civil Contingencies

Act, and that linking WARPs to this objective (while retaining their ICT focus) might help promotion. It is also important to set expectations: a number of WARP members have apparently been surprised to discover that their WARP was not a “free service” but a “one-year trial membership”.

How universities might help:

- Universities have strong ICT infrastructure and experience and many have assisting their local communities as a formal part of their mission. These appear useful qualities for a WARP provider.
- However universities are not SMEs, so it may be worth aiming, in time, for the university to provide the WARP’s infrastructure (discussion groups, FWA software, etc.) while the job of WARP champion and facilitator move to members of the WARP community.

[Back to timetable](#)

## Feedback

### Your views on today’s Forum

	Very useful 4	3	2	Not useful 1
How did you find the day?	<b>60%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

#### What was the most useful part/session of the day?

Greater understanding of what a WARP is  
 Talking to others (*very common comment*)  
 Keynote speeches  
 Plenaries x2  
 Morning sessions x2  
 Marketing workshop x2  
 Information sharing workshop x3  
 WARP survey presentation x2  
 e-crime workshop  
 All of it !! x5  
 Finding out about larger WARPs  
 Workshops x2  
 e-crime discussion x2  
 Learning about the WARP Trust  
 CPNI Director’s talk

#### What was the least useful part/session of the day?

Distance to travel  
 Workshops – felt I was giving rather than receiving  
 Keynotes  
 Workshop Facilitators unable to attend other workshops  
 WARP Trust session did not give level of detail expected x3  
 Feedback session

**Was anything you expected to hear about not mentioned?**

Strategy details – road map for moving forward  
No  
More talk about beneficiaries (end users)  
State of WARPs in the UK (overview)  
Information transformation

**Is there a Workshop topic you would particularly like to see at next year's Forum?**

Working with SMEs  
Critical success factors in different communities  
Security awareness  
Journalism funding  
WARP benefits – feedback from across country  
Networking WARPs  
How to filter warnings effectively  
Technical workshop about installing upgrading WARPs  
Incident and vulnerability handling  
Larger WARPs – prospects and how they are being managed  
Writing and assessing advisories  
Marketing again  
A day in the life of a WARP operator  
Expanding the services offered by WARPs  
Information transformation  
Sustainability

**Where would be the best place to hold next year's Forum?**

London x4  
Somewhere central – Birmingham x2  
Centrally x3  
Leeds/Manchester x3  
Near an international airport  
The Hague

**Would you attend this event next year or recommend it to a colleague?**

YES **100%**                      NO **0**

Comments:  
Good to keep up with trends  
Overall a very useful day  
Well organised and good range of speakers

[Back to timetable](#)

Filename: 3rd Annual WARP Forum v8.doc  
Directory: Z:\Common\WARP Forum\2007\Results & report  
Template: C:\Documents and Settings\John Harrison\Application  
Data\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dot  
Title: 2nd Annual WARP Forum  
Subject:  
Author: Administrator  
Keywords:  
Comments:  
Creation Date: 16/04/2007 14:38:00  
Change Number: 4  
Last Saved On: 20/04/2007 07:03:00  
Last Saved By: Derek Pollard  
Total Editing Time: 21 Minutes  
Last Printed On: 20/04/2007 10:53:00  
As of Last Complete Printing  
Number of Pages: 17  
Number of Words: 4,180 (approx.)  
Number of Characters: 23,826 (approx.)