

Distr.: Limited 11 March 2021

Original: English

Kyoto, Japan, 7–12 March 2021

Agenda item 6 International cooperation and technical assistance to prevent and address all forms of crime

Report of Committee II: workshop 4

Addendum

Current crime trends, recent developments and emerging solutions, in particular new technologies as means for and tools against crime

Proceedings

At its 4th to 6th meetings, on 10 and 11 March 2021, Committee II held a 1. workshop on current crime trends, recent developments and emerging solutions, in particular new technologies as means for and tools against crime. The Korean Institute of Criminology and the National Institute of Justice of the Department of Justice of the United States of America, both members of the United Nations crime prevention and criminal justice programme network, assisted the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) in the preparation and organization of the workshop. The Committee had before it the following documents:

Background paper prepared by the Secretariat for the workshop on current (a) crime trends, recent developments and emerging solutions, in particular new technologies as means for and tools against crime (A/CONF.234/11);

(b)Working paper prepared by the Secretariat on developments regarding crime prevention and criminal justice as a result of the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic (A/CONF.234/15);

(c) Discussion guide for the Fourteenth Congress (A/CONF.234/PM.1);

(d) Reports of the regional preparatory meetings for the Fourteenth Congress (A/CONF.234/RPM.1/1, A/CONF.234/RPM.2/1, A/CONF.234/RPM.3/1, A/CONF.234/RPM.4/1 and A/CONF.234/RPM.5/1).

2 The three sessions of the workshop were moderated by the following experts, respectively: Phelan Wyrick, Director, Research and Evaluation Division, National Institute of Justice; Han-kyun Kim, Senior Research Fellow, Korean Institute of Criminology; and Dimosthenis Chrysikos, Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Officer, UNODC.

3. At the 4th meeting of Committee II, the Chair of the Committee made an introductory statement. The following panellists discussed cryptocurrencies and darknet markets, as well as technology-related issues in the field of firearms: Anthony Teelucksingh, Department of Justice of the United States, as keynote speaker;





Hayato Shigekawa, Chainalysis; Thomas Holt, Michigan State University, United States; José Romero Morgaz, European Commission; Anna Alvazzi del Frate, Alliance of NGOs on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice; and María Jiménez Victorio, Civil Guard, Spain.

4. Statements were made by the representatives of the Russian Federation, the United States, Morocco, France, Mexico, Indonesia and China.

5. At the 5th meeting of Committee II, the panel discussion on the use of technology and trafficking in persons, smuggling of migrants and child abuse and exploitation was led by the following panellists: Douglas Durán, Latin American Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, as keynote speaker; Jo Harlos and Amber Hawkes, Facebook; Phiset Sa-ardyen, Thailand Institute of Justice; Michele LeVoy, Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants; Jane Annear, Department of Home Affairs, Australia; and Irakli Beridze, United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute.

6. Statements were made by the representatives of Italy, the Philippines and Brazil.

7. At the 6th meeting of Committee II, the panel discussion on artificial intelligence and robotics, ethical considerations and international cooperation in criminal matters was led by the following panellists: Cheol-kyu Hwang, International Association of Prosecutors, as keynote speaker; Roderic Broadhurst, Australian National University; Irakli Beridze, United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute; Luciano Kuppens, International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL); Arisa Ema, University of Tokyo; Taegyung Gahng, Korean Institute of Criminology; Danka Hržina, Municipal Attorney's Office, Croatia; and Frances Chang, Department of Justice, United States.

8. Statements were made by the representatives of Canada and Argentina. A statement was also made by the representative of the Asia and Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders.

Chair's summary

9. The first panel discussion began with a keynote speech emphasizing that, despite their legitimate use, cryptocurrencies and other encryption technologies presented challenges to the investigation of online offences. Moreover, criminals continued to use virtual assets to move and conceal illicit funds, in particular in jurisdictions lacking anti-money-laundering requirements. One panellist highlighted the substantial increase in research over the past two decades relating to illicit market operations online, with a more recent focus on drug-related cryptomarkets. Recent evidence suggested that an underground economy had developed around identity theft and the sale of stolen data. Reference was made by two panellists to notable successes in coordinated takedowns of darknet markets. Other panellists referred to the spread of the additive manufacturing (3D printing) of firearms; the technology used to hide weapons, evade security controls and facilitate the transportation of firearms; and the threat of "hybrid firearms".

10. In the ensuing discussion, several speakers provided an update on their countries' preventive measures, good practices and legislative reform efforts in response to various challenges posed by the criminal misuse of information and communications technologies. Several speakers emphasized the importance of specialized cybercrime structures within prosecutorial and law enforcement authorities. Emphasis was placed on the need for focused training of competent authorities. A number of speakers echoed the need for inter-agency coordination and public-private partnerships in response to cybercrime challenges. It was noted that the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, especially the right to privacy, needed to be taken into consideration in the prevention and investigation of cybercrime.

11. A number of speakers highlighted the importance of strengthening cooperation between national authorities and communication service providers to ensure the

preservation of, and access to, data and facilitate timely responses to cybercrime cases. Some speakers welcomed the establishment, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 74/247, of an open-ended ad hoc intergovernmental committee of experts to elaborate a comprehensive international convention on countering the use of information and communications technologies for criminal purposes.

12. It was noted that existing multilateral legal instruments, such as the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime, were the foundation of effective international cooperation in preventing and combating cybercrime.

13. Some speakers highlighted the added value of the Expert Group to Conduct a Comprehensive Study on Cybercrime – or a separate track within the UNODC framework in the future, with due regard to the need for avoiding duplication – as a platform for the exchange of information on national and international responses to cybercrime.

14. During the second panel discussion, the keynote speaker and panellists noted that, while the rapid use of digital technologies worldwide had provided significant benefits to society, new opportunities for exploitation in relation to trafficking in persons and smuggling of migrants had emerged through the use of the Internet and of social media and online gaming sites. The coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic had exacerbated related criminal threats. One panellist highlighted that technology could be harnessed to improve gender-based responses, including by supporting remote investigations to reduce secondary victimization. Tracking illicit financial flows could be another way in which technology (such as blockchain and artificial intelligence) could support policies to combat trafficking in persons.

15. Two panellists referred to their company's approaches to online safety through prevention (safety notices and removing accounts used to engage in potentially inappropriate interactions with children), detection (harmful content reduction, proactive detection and network disruption) and related responses (blocking fake accounts, collaborating with law enforcement authorities and establishing help centres to report content related to trafficking in persons). Another panellist expressed the need for caution with regard to the growing use of digital technologies in border control and immigration. Two panellists referred to the emerging threat of the commissioning of live-streamed child sexual abuse.

16. In the ensuing discussion, multi-stakeholder strategies were identified by a number of speakers as a vital preventive element in the fight against cybercrime. One speaker supported collaboration with national immigration authorities and international organizations to gain a better understanding of the online modi operandi of trafficking in persons networks.

17. The third panel discussion started with a keynote speech in which reference was made to the advantages of combining artificial intelligence with direct communication with the authorities responsible for international cooperation in criminal matters. One panellist examined the role of the transparent use of artificial intelligence in judicial decision-making, as well as in forensic analysis, intelligence-led policing models and existing surveillance systems. Another panellist referred to the Centre for Artificial Intelligence and Robotics, which had been established within the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute with the aim of improving the knowledge of both the risks and benefits of such technologies. Another panellist presented the work of the INTERPOL Innovation Centre, which was aimed at assisting law enforcement authorities in keeping pace with innovative policing issues.

18. Two panellists discussed ethical considerations in the use of artificial intelligence. One of them noted that academia could play an important role in research and in education for researchers and practitioners. The other panellist underlined the potential conflict between the use of big data and artificial intelligence to predict crime and human rights. Related ethics guidelines were therefore necessary to ensure

efficient oversight, compliance with due process, fairness, non-discrimination and accountability. One panellist referred to challenges and lessons learned from the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on international cooperation in criminal matters, with reference to adaptation and the use of innovative approaches (electronic transmission of requests, videoconferencing, strengthening of direct communication and judicial networks). Another panellist underlined the importance of fully equipped and empowered central authorities, citing as good practices the posting abroad of law enforcement and judicial attachés and the use of law enforcement channels prior to the submission of mutual legal assistance requests.

19. In the ensuing discussion, speakers reiterated the importance of strengthening international cooperation, including through the use of liaison magistrates. One speaker referred to examples of constantly evolving technological tools in national investigations. Another speaker asked whether there were cases in which the issue of the admissibility and credibility of data obtained through artificial intelligence had been raised. In response, it was noted that the issue would be considered in the future and that tools for such consideration existed in domestic laws and multilateral instruments (in provisions on the use of special investigative techniques and conditions for such use).

20. Further support was expressed for the UNODC Global Programme on Cybercrime, as well as the tools developed by UNODC, such as the Sharing Electronic Resources and Laws on Crime (SHERLOC) knowledge management portal, the directory of competent national authorities, the *Practical Guide for Requesting Electronic Evidence Across Borders* and the Mutual Legal Assistance Request Writer Tool.

21. The Chair invited participants to consider the following points raised during the discussions:

(a) Combining geographical insights from cryptocurrencies with on-chain data reveals trends that mirror findings also reported in the "mainstream" drug trafficking market. However, more knowledge is required on how darknet market operations intersect. For better operational results, law enforcement authorities should develop synergies with various stakeholders, including the private sector and security researchers, with a view to supporting online investigations;

(b) Member States should assess the need for a policy on the possession of and trafficking in blueprints for 3D printing that could enable the illicit manufacture of essential components of firearms;

(c) Support was expressed for the application of new technologies for the marking of firearms, record-keeping, tracing and the destruction of designated arms. There is a need to keep pace with technological developments, which may apply to multiple areas, to prevent the unlicensed production of firearms, their illicit conversion and reactivation, diversion practices and online trafficking in firearms;

(d) Consideration should be given to the adoption of new technologies for stockpile management and security in the field of firearms, as well as to the use of new technologies for inventory management and the monitoring and protection of weapons in transit;

(e) Member States should prevent corruption and increase transparency mechanisms, building on the important role of industry, academia and civil society organizations, with regard to firearms and technology-related security threats, for example, through increased cross-checking of databases, the use of big data and of new technologies for improved security of digital documents, and transparency in authorized trade;

(f) Anonymous reporting of trafficking in persons and the submission of electronic evidence by citizens by means of mobile telephone or Internet platforms could be promoted to facilitate the work of authorities with limited numbers of staff and resources;

(g) Cloud-based technology, big data and artificial intelligence could improve technical capabilities for more effective and coordinated policy responses to trafficking in persons at the national and international levels;

(h) Member States should closely review the implications for at-risk groups of the use of technology in policing and immigration control and develop clear guidelines and ensure transparency in the use of technology in the context of immigration enforcement, while creating accessible means for challenging its misuse;

(i) Member States should ensure that legislative frameworks sufficiently cover live-streamed child sexual abuse. There is also a need to further analyse how national data and intelligence can be utilized to detect indicators of live-streamed abuse and a need to engage with the digital industry and the financial sector to identify means for proactively detecting live-streamed abuse and ensure the reporting thereof to law enforcement authorities;

(j) Member States should ensure that legal frameworks keep pace with technological developments, including in relation to artificial intelligence, and should seek to streamline international cooperation in criminal matters through the use of technology and innovative tools by practitioners and central authorities that are equipped and empowered to fully benefit from such technology and tools;

(k) Member States are encouraged to monitor and understand the risks posed by the malicious use of artificial intelligence technologies to ensure accountability and integrity, promote ethical standards in the use of these technologies and secure the confidence and trust of citizens and communities in the application of new technologies.

V.21-01505