Thank you, Chair, for the draft report. My delegation welcomes the adoption of the modalities and of the program of work, as well the participation of other stakeholders in this meeting – including stakeholders from my own country. We believe that this broader participation is positive for the work of the OEWG and perfectly compatible with its intergovernmental nature. Speaking of which: we also consider the full participation of all Member States to be crucial to the work of this Group.

Agreeing on the report is important not only because the OEWG was mandated to do so, or even to show progress. It is also important because, despite procedural challenges, Member States were able to discuss substantive issues during the first two sessions. This work must be honored and reflected in writing, which will set a direction and a positive tone for our work ahead.

On the introduction to the draft:

Firstly, the basis of our work is the “acquis”. Reaffirming the reports from the first OEWG and from all GGEs is crucial. We must demonstrate, as Member States, the ability to build incrementally, not only on what those reports have already established, but also on what they have identified as areas for further study. In other words, the reports have set themselves a roadmap for our work.

Secondly, we thank the Chair for refreshing our memory on the Group’s mandate, in other to avoid unnecessarily disparate views on what we are here to do.

Thirdly, within that mandate, the implementation of the framework of norms, as per the resolution that established the OEWG, is a priority. Brazil agrees with the US delegation that international security should be our focus. How capacity-building fits into that focus is a more challenging topic; developing countries need to build a basis to address the implementation of norms, a basis that, sometimes, will be relevant beyond international security. My delegation will discuss this further in the respective section.

Fourthly, in line with the comment made by Spain, gender equality is a cross-cutting issue at the UN, already recognized as such by every multilateral angle that is relevant for the OEWG. In the “information society” angle, the gender divide is one of
the expressions of the digital divide that Member States have agreed to address in the World Summit of Information Society. In the “international security” angle, there is the Women, Peace and Security Agenda.

On section B (threats):

Firstly, my delegation welcomes the insertion of item 7 a). We agree with China that the best language to use in this paragraph is “exchanged views on”; the text should be more about non-exhaustive diagnostics than about a too rigid or too normative perspective.

Secondly, Brazil agrees with the EU and others on the importance of referring to threats themselves, not only to possible responses to them. This is consistent with the UN’s history of deliberation on the topic, as well as with the general perception in the room, during the previous session, of a heightened level of risk and alert. This perception was echoed by most Member States, as well as by Under-Secretary Nakamitsu this morning, when she referred to a “steady stream of ICT incidents”. There is no need to use this section of the draft progress report for naming and shaming, since this report is not the place for performing attributions; we just need to be consistent with the perception, by Member States, of a higher level of alert.

Thirdly, my delegation is open to consider how emerging technologies fit in this scenario.

Fourthly, a point on interfaces with other tracks of discussion on digital issues. We welcome the mention to “ensuring the availability and integrity of the Internet”, keeping in mind that the OEWG is not the proper forum to address broader Internet governance issues. Furthermore, we believe that ramsonware may be relevant for the OEWG when it reaches the level of threat to international security. This may or may not happen; in most cases, ransomware will be best dealt with in the cybercrime track. A contextual approach is therefore needed. In this vein, my delegation would like to propose the deletion of items 7 b) VI and VII, which overlap with discussions of cybercrimes. We appreciate the Chair’s efforts to fix this overlap by adding language on coordination with other processes; it is our view, however, that this didn’t achieve the desired clarity.

On section C (norms), Brazil does not have any amendment proposal at this stage; we would just like to highlight the voluntary nature of measures dedicated to support and monitor their implementation.

Thank you, Chair.