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VIENNA, 8 April 2020
Mr. Chair,
Distinguished delegates,

1. The Netherlands supports the statement made by the EU on behalf of its Member States and in accordance with usual practice would like to add the following in its national capacity.

2. The UN Expert Group on cybercrime has proven to serve as a key international forum for experts to exchange best practices and on technical assistance to prevent and combat cybercrime.

3. The work of the Expert Group has already led to a considerable increase in capacity building on cybercrime worldwide. Hence, exchanging expertise plays a major role in bridging the digital divide and brings tangible benefits to all countries. The Netherlands underlines the invaluable role of UNODC and the UN’s cybercrime-expertise in Vienna in this respect.

4. Cybercrime poses complex challenges in a technological environment that evolves at a fast pace. These cybercrime challenges are a worldwide phenomenon; it is in the interest of all countries to continue to exchange best practices, ideas and practical knowledge in a structured format.

5. Consequently, the Expert Group should continue to provide a forum for exchanges among practitioners and experts. Such exchanges may pertain to model laws or model clauses, relating to such issues as jurisdiction, special investigative techniques and challenges posed by the volatile nature of electronic evidence and its admissibility in court. The Expert Group could also make available, on the basis of substantive contributions by Member States, a regular assessment of cybercrime trends and new threats.

6. In that regard, the Netherlands reiterates its support for recommendations rr and uu on International Cooperation. However, if it would help to reach consensus, we can also be flexible and accept the replacement of the Expert Group by a similar forum, as long as it allows for exchange among experts and practitioners.

7. Mr. Chair, we agree with many other delegations that although future work of the Expert Group can certainly be complementary to that of the Ad Hoc Committee established under UNGA Resolution 74/247, it is definitely separate from it. Much needed technical exchange among practitioners is neither a duplication nor a replacement of treaty negotiations, and cannot be suspended until a Convention text is agreed upon.

8. Providing a forum for expert exchanges is evidently not part of the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee. Similarly, the elaboration of an international convention should clearly be outside of the mandate of this Expert Group or a similar body.

9. In view of these considerations, Mr. Chair, my delegation encourages the Expert Group to invite the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice to further discuss the mandate and work plan of the Expert Group or, alternatively, the creation of another Vienna-based body for exchange by experts and practitioners, for the period beyond 2021.

10. Thank you, Mr. Chair.