Statement of the cross-regional group of states to advance confidence-building measures (CBMs) within the OEWG

Delivered by Canada on behalf of the group
at the OEWG informal virtual town hall meeting on 15 February 2023

Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Fiji, Czech Republic, Germany, Israel, the Republic of Korea, Mexico, the Netherlands, Singapore and Uruguay

Thank you Chair for the opportunity to provide comments on your paper.

I am delivering this statement on behalf of the cross-regional group on CBMs, which includes the following States: Germany, Canada, the Netherlands, Mexico, Israel, Australia, Brazil, Singapore, the Republic of Korea, Chile, Fiji, Argentina and Uruguay. The Czech Republic is also observer in this group.

The group:

- **Welcomes** the non-paper as a solid basis for further discussions by the OEWG. We are **pleased** that it focuses on the consensual elements coming out of the discussions in December and takes an incremental approach.
- We recommend that the paper make clear that the focus is on ICT **incidents *between states*** that are relevant for **international security,** and refer to underlying **normative framework** in point 2.
- The cyber capacity building section of the paper is overall good. We believe it is essential that all States can develop the capacity to participate in the Directory. That said, we want to ensure this is **CCB is targeted at building capacities to be ready to participate in the PoC directory.**
- We propose to **invite regional organizations** for the formal session in March, in order to allow them to share their experiences of building the capacities of States to participate in regional PoC Directories.

A few more specific points of feedback, on behalf of the group:

- We believe that States should ideally nominate **technical AND diplomatic PoCs in the directory,** as they complement each other in terms of expertise and contact networks. If states do not have PoCs at both levels yet, they should be allowed to nominate either technical or diplomatic PoCs as an initial step, with the perspective of engaging in cyber capacity building, in order to nominate a second PoC later.
- **Minimum number of member states**: While putting a certain number might seem a bit arbitrary, we believe that it is probably necessary to agree on a threshold for making use of the PoC directory, as well as underlining its relevance. We have suggested 50 member states in our working papers, keeping in mind the importance of having diverse geographical representation.
- **Access** to the directory should be granted only to those states that share their own contact details, in the group's view.

On the timeline:

The group would like to seek **clarification on the timeline for the proposed paper** on the CCB Action Plan, which is due in January 2024 according to your paper, Chair. We would suggest that perhaps we could expedite the process by working on more concrete elements between now and July of this year. These could be captured in the APR in July, and give us a good basis to start the operationalization of the Directory.

Thank you again for producing this paper Chair, and for giving States an opportunity to share their views on it today. With these suggested additions and changes, we feel the paper would be even stronger.

Individual group members may provide additional comments later in this meeting on behalf of their respective States.

Thank you.