



CZECH REPUBLIC

Permanent Mission of the Czech Republic to the United Nations

Ad Hoc Committee to Elaborate a Comprehensive International Convention on
Countering the Use of Information and Communications Technologies for Criminal
Purposes - Third Session

Statement by

Ms. Marta Pelechová

International Dossiers Coordinator, Ministry of Justice

New York, September 6th, 2022

Check against Delivery

One Dag Hammarskjöld Plaza, 48th floor
885 Second Avenue, New York, NY 10017
tel.: +1 (646) 981 4001, fax: +1 (646) 981 4099
www.mzv.cz/un.newyork

Madam Chair,

The Czech Republic aligns itself with the statement delivered by the European Union and wishes to add the following in its national capacity.

The issue of an implementation mechanism is an important one. On one hand we want the convention to be efficient, just like Uruguay mentioned right before me, and an implementation mechanism is one mean to reach this goal, on the other hand we do not want to impose any extra burden on the states parties. Therefore the ideal solution in our opinion would be to take the best from the existing mechanisms, eliminate from them what might not be working and use the core in the new convention.

So coming now to the questions. On question 38, just like many previous speakers we would prefer that the mechanism reflects the existing treaty mechanisms of the UNTOC and UNCAC. And we share the view of Singapore that in particular the UNCAC mechanism is more efficient and practical, with the country visits and especially with the Secretariat playing a vital role in the reviews, hand in hand with the reviewing and reviewed states. Therefore if there is an implementation mechanism established under this new convention, we would prefer it looks more or less like the one under UNCAC, while we might consider having a less demanding self-assessment checklist to ease the burden for member states a bit.

On question 39, we do not think a special body should be established, we would prefer to have a conference of states parties just like under UNTOC and UNCAC – and we would be interested to learn what the related costs would be, as it was suggested earlier by the U.S. Having the review of the convention as an agenda item during CCPCJ is not a practical approach in our opinion – the agenda of the CCPCJ is quite busy already and adding another agenda point would make it less flexible. And CCPCJ, just like the CND, is also a body where the membership rotates so only the members are entitled to vote, although of course the spirit of Vienna wouldn't let any voting happen. Moreover, a conference of states parties would be a less political and more expert body than the CCPCJ is. So to sum up this point, the review of this convention could become an informative point at the CCPCJ agenda as it is the case with UNCAC and UNTOC, but the CCPCJ should not be a platform for the review itself. Also, the existence of a platform for experts to exchange their opinions, similar to the previously successful IEG, could be considered.

To question 40, we believe that the inclusion of non-governmental organizations is crucial, and we can also be inspired here by the approach taken in previous treaties where the multistakeholders are invited to the conference of states parties and there are special meetings with them during some working groups as well.

Thank you, Madam Chair.