

07.06.2022

1-2. The Russian Federation shares the view that it is necessary for the convention to conform to the goals declared therein in the situation of diversity of both current and future technological tools that is reflected *per se* by the term “ICTs” being used.

Regarding the emergence of new technical tools for committing crimes and addressing them, the mechanism proposed for amending the convention and autonomy of national legislator in establishing additional offences can also accommodate those issues, if needed.

3,5,12. We believe that the first four articles of the UNTOC and UNCAC can inform the development of the structure of the general provisions of the convention.

The general provisions of the convention should also stipulate the requirement for human rights protection. At the same time, we do not agree with human rights standards being also dispersed through articles of subsequent chapters of the convention, since that would run counter to the object and purpose of the instrument being drafted which is not an international human rights treaty.

4,7. The Russian Federation adheres to comprehensive coverage of the goals of the convention and does not see any obstacles on the way to reaching consensus on such coverage. It implies that goals of the convention should reflect each specific stage of combating relevant offences, i.e. to prevent, detect, suppress or disrupt, solve, investigate, prosecute and adjudicate, as well as international cooperation, including all stages of asset recovery and technical assistance at each of those stages.

The goals of the convention should clearly indicate its applicability not only to reactive but also proactive investigations. The subsequent text of the convention should reflect that fact by governing both legal assistance and law enforcement assistance, as well as overt investigative measures and covert special investigative techniques.

International cooperation in these activities when respecting the sovereignty of the parties often has no alternative in the situation of anonymizing information space.

Russian draft convention contains all those things listed above.

6. Without prejudice to relevance of substantive law provisions on the criminalization of relevant offences, procedural law provisions of the convention related to requesting and providing electronic evidence should not coincide with the said substantive law provisions or be limited to them.

7. The Russian Federation proceeds from an assumption that the language of Article 4 of the UNTOC and UNCAC covers all sovereignty-related concerns.

Evidently, sovereignty-related considerations in the cyberspace are different from those in the physical environment owing mostly to data localization problem. These aspects of sovereignty are proposed to be addressed in the convention using norms dedicated to parameters of the jurisdiction to prescribe and jurisdiction to enforce.

9,11. We have already addressed those issues yesterday. We would like to stress once again the universal scope of the ICT device concept, while the term “computer system” lacks such a scope.

10. We believe it is advisable to agree on definitions after the substantive text of the convention has been drafted, but that does not mean that definitions cannot be developed in parallel, should need arise.