



Dear Ms. Amy Hanley,

We confirm receipt of your correspondence of June 22, 2022 and appreciate the opportunity to elaborate on our request for confidentiality in connection with the present matter.

With regard to the scope of our original request, we confirm that it is to keep confidential the entirety of our response letter ("Response") until the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission ("CRTC") has rendered its determination. More specifically, we ask that the CRTC exercise its authority to vary the CRTC Rules of Practice and Procedure ("Rules") (Section 7) to accommodate this request on the basis of fairness and public interest. As the Response outlines, Safeguard Defenders has made wide ranging and serious allegations against CCTV-4 and CGTN which are unsubstantiated and/or inaccurate, and intended to mischaracterize the role of our media in connection with the events upon which its complaints are directed. These allegations directly and negatively impact the reputation and image of CCTV-4 and CGTN in the eyes of both the Canadian public and our existing and prospective business



---

partners in Canada, which has financial consequences for our business and undermines the competitiveness of our services in the Canadian market. Should the CRTC decide to publicly post the Response at this time but later determine that the allegations lack sufficient supporting evidence or are without merit, the damage to CCTV-4 and CGTN will have already been done. CCTV-4 and CGTN's ability to compete for viewers in the Canadian market will be materially affected, which will no doubt serve the stated interests of Safeguard Defenders but not those of the Canadian public.

We are not providing an abridged version of the Response since the redaction of small parts of the Response will not prevent the harms described above. We stand by the statements made in the Response.

The CRTC has asked that we provide a copy of the Response to Safeguard Defenders. Please note that Safeguard Defenders did not provide us with a copy of its complaint, as required under Section 22(1)(b) of the Rules. We only became aware of the complaint when the CRTC informed us. On the grounds of basic fairness and to maintain a level playing field, we respectfully request that the CRTC consider providing the Response to



---

Safeguard Defenders instead, and imposing on Safeguard Defenders, an obligation to keep confidential the contents of the Response until the CRTC has rendered its determination.

Yours sincerely,

Ivy Nie

China International Communications Co., Ltd

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Beijing, China, 100038