

**Table 1: Strategic responses to cybercrimes, cyber-attacks and cyber-warfare involving economies with different categories of relationships**

Nature of relationship	Some examples	Strategic responses
A. Membership in formal multilateral frameworks related to cybersecurity (e.g., CoECoC)	Signatories of CoECoC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local capacity building and institutional development</li> </ul>
Lack of membership in formal multilateral frameworks related to cybersecurity		
B. Cooperative, strong, close, favorable and stable diplomatic and economic ties	Relationships of most CoECoC signatories with India and Indonesia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local capacity building and institutional development</li> <li>• Harnessing the power of successful regional organizations that are internally cohesive and have security as a key focus</li> <li>• Providing opportunities for developing economies' voice and participation.</li> </ul>
C. Formal diplomatic and economic ties characterized by periodic tension and distrust	China-U.S. Russia-U.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working on areas of common interests</li> <li>• Help and encouragement to integrate with the West</li> <li>• Establishment of a high level working group made up of policy makers</li> <li>• A 'bricolage' approach to cybersecurity</li> </ul>
D. No formal diplomatic and economic ties	U.S.-North Korea U.S.-Iran Japan- North Korea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of offensive and defensive capabilities tailored to specific threats.</li> </ul>