

The OEWG has stressed importance of and cumulated discussions on the application of existing international law and norms, and a lot of States advocated for further exploring that issue in a scenario-based and cross-cutting manner to be practical and effective in responding to threats and risks in the cyber space. In this context, there are some points Japan considers necessary to be amended in Rev1.

For example:

- In Paragraph 36 of the Norms' section, references are made to documents which have not reached consensus such as the 2021 OEWG Chair's Summary and items which have not been sufficiently discussed to reach maturity such as about the new norms. Japan does not rule out the possibility of discussing such issues in future, but we consider it is premature at this stage to include them as it is in the draft report and suggest therefore striking out this paragraph.
- As for the voluntary checklist for the implementation of voluntary, non-binding norms of responsible State behavior mentioned in Paragraph 37, we support attaching it to the Final Report for the reasons already laid out by many delegations.
- About Paragraph 41 in the International Law section, Japan shares the spirit of elaborating further discussions based on the documents prepared by various groups of countries but the criteria for selecting those to be cited in the Report

is not clear to our eyes, and we are not very supportive of it. Japan does not support inclusion of documents and references regarding a new legally binding instrument in the way reflected in actual version when the issue has not gained wide support during past discussions. The same spirit applies to Paragraph 42 and we hope to see amendments in the next version.

Japan puts a lot of importance in capacity building since building resilience to cybersecurity cannot be achieved alone. In fact, Japan has been offering and conducting tangible and practical efforts for many countries and is willing to continue exploring what can be done at the UN level too. In this context, we should be mindful of the fact that there are already so many existing and ongoing capacity building efforts in the globe bilaterally and regionally, and the resources are limited as well. We should therefore avoid duplication of efforts to be both effective and efficient as a whole. We believe such voices had been expressed in the past discussion in the OEWG and Japan wishes some text to be added telling the necessity of UN and other actors being complimentary in the role as well as being mindful of limitation of resources leading naturally to the necessity of efficiency at the UN.

Before I end, I would like to join those who have congratulated the publication of national positions internationally by Republic of Korea and Thailand. In this relation,

like the Estonian and Canadian colleagues did, I would like to invite you all, regardless of publication of national positions on International Law, to have a look on the “Handbook on Developing a National Position on International Law and Cyber Activities” which has just been published as a fruit of collaboration among Estonia, Japan, NATO CCDCOE and University of Exeter. It’s not too long but is practical and useful.