

24 April 2019

Original: English*

**Thirteenth Meeting of Heads of National
Drug Law Enforcement Agencies, Europe**

Lisbon, 2–5 July 2019

Item 4 of the provisional agenda**

**Implementation of the recommendations adopted
by the Twelfth Meeting of Heads of National Drug
Law Enforcement Agencies, Europe****Implementation of the recommendations adopted
by the Twelfth Meeting of Heads of National Drug Law
Enforcement Agencies, Europe****Note by the Secretariat****I. Introduction**

1. The Twelfth Meeting of Heads of National Drug Law Enforcement Agencies, Europe, held in Vienna from 27 to 30 June 2017, adopted a set of recommendations following the consideration by its working groups of the issues set out below.
2. In accordance with established practice, the report of the Twelfth Meeting was transmitted to the Governments represented at that Meeting. A questionnaire on the implementation of the recommendations adopted at the Meeting was dispatched to Governments on 6 February 2019.
3. The present note was prepared on the basis of information provided by Governments to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) in reply to that questionnaire. As at 23 April 2019, replies had been received from the Governments of Armenia, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, North Macedonia, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, Serbia, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland.

* Available only in English, French, Russian and Spanish, which are the working languages of the subsidiary body.

** UNODC/HONEURO/13/1.



II. Implementation of the recommendations adopted by the Twelfth Meeting

Issue 1. Use of the Internet for drug-related activities

Recommendation (a)

4. Governments were encouraged to ensure that their law enforcement agencies were well informed, professionally trained and suitably resourced so as to be effective in the investigation of cyber-related offences and the related use of the Internet for illicit trafficking.
5. Armenia reported on the provision of specialized training for prosecutors, the work of its specialized police unit responsible for monitoring social networks in order to detect cybercrime and on the recent acquisition of equipment and software to facilitate investigations.
6. Belarus reported that its national drug control units had been provided with high-speed Internet access to facilitate investigation activities aimed at preventing and combating drug trafficking and the detection of Internet resources used for such trafficking.
7. Belgium reported that a specialized unit had been established as part of the federal police in 2016 in order to support criminal investigations. In addition, targeted training had been provided and training on open-source research was being developed. Belgium had also participated in a training event organized by the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL) on drug-related crime committed using the darknet.
8. Croatia, Cyprus and Italy reported having acted on the recommendation.
9. Czechia reported that training activities were gradually being implemented but were often insufficient or ineffective.
10. Finland reported on the establishment of a cybercrime centre for combating, inter alia, drug trafficking over the Internet. Advanced training courses were organized for cybercrime investigators.
11. Germany reported on the organization of national and international meetings, the use of informants and undercover police officers and enhanced cooperation with authorities working to combat cybercrime, specialized departments (for example, those working to combat counterfeit money and counterfeit pharmaceutical products) and non-police institutions (such as postal service providers). In addition, training courses and workshops on Internet research and cybercrime investigation had been provided and increased investment in human resources was foreseen.
12. Hungary reported that the Cybercrime Department and the Drug Crime Department of the National Bureau of Investigation were responsible for the investigation of cybercrime.
13. Latvia reported that additional resources, employees and equipment had been allocated in 2018 to strengthen the Cybercrime Unit of the national police. Further resources had been allocated for the training of police and customs officers.
14. Lithuania reported that a specialized unit had been established as part of the Police Bureau and officers had been appointed by police agencies nationwide to investigate cybercrime. Training was being provided on an ongoing basis.
15. Luxembourg reported that officers in the Narcotics Section of the national police had received training at the national level and had also participated in international training provided by CEPOL and the Federal Criminal Police Office of Germany.
16. Malta reported that its Cybercrime Unit, part of the national police, had provided technical assistance to those law enforcement agencies responsible for investigating cybercrime. Additional investments had been made in human resources, training and

equipment for the Unit. Furthermore, projects funded by the European Union were being implemented in order to strengthen capacities, including through training abroad.

17. Poland reported that officers of its national cybercrime unit participated in national and international training events (such as those organized by the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Cooperation (Europol) and CEPOL) in order to exchange experience and information and establish contact with other police forces and private-sector entities.

18. Portugal reported that it had established the National Unit for Fighting Cybercrime and Technological Crime as part of its Criminal Investigation Police in 2017.

19. The Russian Federation reported that it had established a working group on drug-related cybercrime within the Ministry of Internal Affairs in order to enhance the effectiveness of activities in that area. It had also ensured that the relevant units of the Ministry were equipped with modern software for monitoring and blocking illegal content.

20. Sweden reported that a cybercrime unit specialized in Internet monitoring and related intelligence-gathering and staffed with strategic and operational experts had been established within the police force.

21. Spain reported that its law enforcement agencies had specialized personnel and well-resourced specialized units responsible for combating cybercrime and that training was provided on an ongoing basis.

22. Switzerland reported that each of its cantons had its own cybercrime investigators and that the Swiss Police Institute had developed an e-learning cybercrime tool and had organized training activities for cybercrime investigators. Coordination activities and the exchange of best practices were facilitated by the national network of cybercrime units.

Recommendation (b)

23. It was recommended that Governments work together to overcome the obstacles encountered in undertaking the investigation of cyber-related trafficking offences across multiple jurisdictions and introduce the changes needed in legislation, practices and procedure to expedite information-sharing, enquiries with Internet service providers and the transfer of evidence.

24. Armenia reported that it cooperated with international law enforcement authorities within the framework of mutual legal assistance and on the basis of international agreements.

25. Belarus reported that, in addition to activities carried out under bilateral agreements, the Government cooperated with competent authorities of other States within the framework of relevant intergovernmental programmes, including those of the Commonwealth of Independent States.

26. Belgium reported having participated in the work of the European Commission addressing, inter alia, terrorism and hate speech. Belgium also reported that legislative changes that would allow for the General Administration for Customs and Excise Duties to carry out Internet-related investigations.

27. Bosnia and Herzegovina reported that its legislation was outdated and that its information-sharing needed improvement.

28. Croatia, Italy and the Republic of Moldova reported having acted on the recommendation.

29. Cyprus reported that its law enforcement agencies were willing to cooperate with international partners and indicated that national legislation might be reviewed.

30. Czechia reported that some legislative changes were gradually being implemented, but at a slow pace.
31. Finland reported on its participation in the European Multidisciplinary Platform Against Criminal Threats (EMPACT) and its use of services provided by the Europol Cybercrime Centre.
32. Germany reported under recommendation (a) on efforts relevant to recommendation (b).
33. Hungary reported that its Department for Combating Drugs was cooperating with postal service providers to ensure the enhanced flow of information between those providers and the police.
34. Latvia reported on the implementation of a project to strengthen efforts to combat serious and organized cross-border crime and promote cooperation with the countries involved. As part of that project, it had established models for joint action (best practices), including in relation to the illegal distribution of drugs using the darknet. Additional monitoring and investigation equipment had been obtained under the project.
35. Lithuania reported that a well-functioning mechanism for cooperation among the police, other law enforcement agencies and Internet providers was in place.
36. Luxembourg reported that it provided legal assistance upon request and that no obstacles had been encountered in collaborating with Internet service providers.
37. Malta reported that the national Cybercrime Unit was its point of contact for the 24/7 Network of Contact Points under the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime and for the 24/7 Cybercrime Network of the Group of Seven. Regular use was made of Europol and International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) channels.
38. North Macedonia reported that the Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs collaborated closely, both internally and with international entities.
39. Poland reported that joint meetings of officers of the Central Bureau of Investigation of the national police had been held with the support of cybercrime units for the purpose of working on cybercrime cases. Organizational restructuring had been carried out in 2018 with the aim of achieving a more comprehensive approach.
40. Portugal reported that its National Criminal Police had further intensified cooperation with law enforcement authorities in other countries and with international organizations (Europol) and that, as a result, the exchange of cybercrime-related strategic and operational information, including through use of the European Investigation Order, had increased.
41. The Russian Federation reported that it had encountered challenges in obtaining information from Internet service providers located abroad for the purposes of investigations and that its Ministry of Internal Affairs was interested in strengthening international cooperation in that regard.
42. Spain reported that its national legislation provided for information exchange and joint investigations with other countries. In addition, consultations had been held with Internet service providers.
43. Sweden reported on the contribution of the police to four national assemblies covering all aspects of the drug problem (including drug-related cybercrime), the enhancement of information-sharing and the assessment of needs with a view to amending national legislation.
44. Switzerland reported that it provided other States with assistance on the basis of requests and that it had signed the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime.

Recommendation (c)

45. It was recommended that Governments encourage their law enforcement agencies to develop the specialist skills that would support the investigation of cyber-related offences and lead to successful criminal prosecutions.
46. Albania reported that toolkits, equipment and training courses had been provided to its law enforcement agencies in order to facilitate the detection and investigation of cybercrime.
47. Belarus reported that regular training had been conducted with the participation of experts in social engineering and information technology and that international conferences had been organized to facilitate the sharing of best practices.
48. Belgium reported that its specialized Internet Investigation Unit was also in charge of the country's Internet Referral Unit, which monitored social media platforms.
49. Bosnia and Herzegovina reported that improvement was needed in that area of activity.
50. Croatia, Czechia, North Macedonia and Portugal reported having acted on the recommendation.
51. Cyprus reported that its law enforcement personnel were provided with training on a regular basis and that several national experts had been seconded to Europol, including for training purposes.
52. Finland reported on the cybercrime monitoring conducted by its dedicated Cybercrime Centre and on the provision of advanced training for cybercrime investigators and basic training for all law enforcement officers.
53. Germany reported under recommendation (a) on efforts relevant to recommendation (c).
54. Hungary reported that employees of its Department of Cybercrime received training on a regular basis.
55. Italy reported on the organization of training courses on online drug trafficking for national and foreign law enforcement officers in 2017 and 2018.
56. Latvia reported that a specialist was employed in the national customs authority to investigate darknet-related criminal activity and had received training both from that authority and from INTERPOL, CEPOL and the European Anti-Fraud Office.
57. Lithuania reported that training was provided on an ongoing basis by the Criminal Intelligence Centre of the Lithuanian Criminal Police Bureau. In addition, training activities were organized by other competent institutions, such as the Bank of Lithuania.
58. Luxembourg reported under recommendation (a) on action taken relevant to recommendation (c).
59. Malta reported that an analysis of the training needs of its Cybercrime Unit had been conducted in order to identify training priorities and that experts in cybercrime investigation were being recruited.
60. Poland reported that specialized cybercrime units had been established at the national and provincial levels.
61. The Russian Federation reported that advanced training on drug-related offences committed using information and telecommunications technologies was being developed, including in the form of national and international lectures, seminars and training courses.
62. Spain reported that national investigators were successfully investigating cybercrime, thus enabling the competent courts to prosecute the criminals involved.

63. Sweden reported that training had been provided and that law enforcement agencies, including the national police and customs, had been encouraged to further strengthen their capacities.

64. Switzerland reported that it had established a national working group to develop cybercrime training consisting of five skill levels and including e-learning, practical training and academic courses. In addition, Swiss cybercrime investigators participated in international training activities, including activities organized by Europol, CEPOL and the European Cybercrime Training and Education Group.

Issue 2: Alternatives to imprisonment for certain offences as demand-reduction strategies that promote public health and public safety

Recommendation (a)

65. Governments were encouraged to make full use of alternatives to imprisonment for people with drug use disorders in contact with the criminal justice system, particularly at the time of their arrest and at the pretrial stage.

66. Armenia reported that substance abuse had been decriminalized in 2008 and that convicted offenders with drug use disorders were provided with treatment.

67. Bosnia and Herzegovina reported that its courts could impose security measures on offenders if appropriate, including mandatory treatment based on assessment by a medical expert. Mandatory psychiatric treatment could be imposed under specific circumstances.

68. Belarus and Croatia reported having acted on the recommendation.

69. Cyprus reported on alternatives to imprisonment provided at the pretrial stage, in particular for individuals under the age of 24.

70. Czechia reported that special measures were in place for offenders with drug use disorders, including protective treatment or “security detention” (for reoffenders), imposed as alternatives to or in addition to imprisonment. National courts could order offenders to undergo treatment or impose other preliminary measures.

71. Finland reported that alternatives to imprisonment included reprimands for young offenders or referral for treatment. Prosecutors were encouraged to drop charges against drug users proved to have sought treatment, even if those persons reoffended.

72. Germany reported that alternatives to imprisonment included payment of a fine, deferral of the sentence if the individual was willing to undergo rehabilitation and, in cases where the individual might commit serious unlawful acts as a consequence of the drug use disorder, treatment in custody. If a suspended sentence was handed down or probation was granted, the court could impose certain conditions, including participation in drug counselling, community service or rehabilitation.

73. Hungary reported that alternative measures were applied in cases involving possession of a small amount of a drug and that the prosecutor’s office and the police offered voluntary prevention and treatment services.

74. Italy reported that the recommendation was being implemented.

75. Latvia reported that its national legislation did not provide for alternatives to imprisonment for people with drug use disorders but that special security measures could be applied. Detainees had the right to health-care services and the courts took into account the nature of and the harm caused by the offence, the personality of the offender and any mitigating or aggravating circumstances.

76. Luxembourg reported that alternatives to imprisonment were available with respect to people with drug use disorders and that prison reform and a new act on the enforcement of sentences had led to a decrease in the number of custodial sentences. Alternatives included the use of electronic bracelets, pretrial supervision, suspension of sentences, parole, community service, probation and deferred judgment.

77. Malta reported that, in accordance with its national legislation, individuals in contact with the criminal justice system as a result of drug abuse were liable for administrative fines but were offered support and the possibility of rehabilitation; alternatives to imprisonment included probation or mandatory treatment.
78. North Macedonia reported that psychologists and social workers were available to assist people with drug use disorders in contact with the criminal justice system.
79. Portugal reported that the use, acquisition and possession of drugs for personal consumption were administrative offences and that relevant legislation was implemented by its commissions for the prevention of drug addiction, which were part of the Ministry of Health.
80. The Russian Federation reported that relevant legislation was constantly being reviewed and drug users in contact with the criminal justice system were encouraged to seek treatment voluntarily; mandatory treatment and medical and/or social rehabilitation were offered as alternatives to imprisonment.
81. Serbia reported that safety measures and mandatory treatment were imposed in the case of people with drug use disorders; other alternatives to imprisonment included educational measures, especially for juvenile offenders, and home detention, with or without electronic monitoring. All such measures were applied in cooperation with the national Office for Alternative Penalties.
82. Spain reported that its Criminal Code provided for alternatives to imprisonment for any offence, regardless of whether the offence was drug-related.
83. Sweden reported that rehabilitation measures were in place and that local police cooperated closely with authorities including schools and medical treatment centres. While drug users in contact with the police were usually fined, alternatives such as treatment were also offered. Among other services, methadone treatment and syringe-exchange programmes were available.
84. Switzerland reported that its national legislation provided for measures less severe than pretrial detention, such as medical treatment or supervision, in cases where those measures achieved the same effect as pretrial detention. If an offender was dependent on drugs and had committed an offence in connection with that dependence, and under special circumstances, the judge could order residential treatment.

Recommendation (b)

85. Governments were encouraged to promote and implement institutional mechanisms, including through induction and training programmes, that enabled the police to screen, assess and refer appropriate cases to treatment facilities, taking into account their dual role as the first responders and the first criminal justice actors encountered by people with drug use disorders when they came into contact with the criminal justice system.
86. Armenia, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Hungary and North Macedonia reported having taken action to implement the recommendation.
87. Belarus reported that persons arrested on suspicion of having committed a drug-related offence were in most cases referred by law enforcement officers to the relevant health institutions for a drug test.
88. Bosnia and Herzegovina reported on training programmes provided to police officers in order to enable them to adequately screen and assess cases.
89. Czechia reported that the national courts could order offenders to undergo treatment.
90. Germany reported that, while national law enforcement officers were trained in first aid and in how to deal with people who use drugs, it was the role of medical professionals to assess such people and refer them for treatment.

91. Italy reported that dedicated training on relevant domestic legislation was offered.
92. Luxembourg reported that national police officers received basic training and could participate in all forms of training relevant to their activities. Offenders could be referred to appropriate treatment facilities.
93. Malta reported that its police officers were provided with relevant training abroad and that a drug court had been established. In addition, the Drug Rehabilitation Board had been established to monitor individuals referred by the drug court or by the ordinary courts.
94. Portugal reported that law enforcement officers were key partners in the implementation of the Decriminalization Act and worked closely with the commissions for the prevention of drug addiction, including in the area of awareness-raising among various actors.
95. The Russian Federation reported that alternatives were provided for and that individuals who had been fined for an administrative offence could be ordered to undergo treatment. Individuals who volunteered to undergo treatment could be exempted from administrative liability.
96. Spain reported that the implementation of the recommendation fell within the remit of the various State security forces.
97. Sweden reported that police officers were well trained to deal with people under the influence of controlled substances and, in doing so, took into account the social and health-related aspects of drug abuse.
98. Switzerland reported that its police officers had been trained in dealing with risk behaviour and were aware of contact points and relevant care services for people with drug use disorders. Medical care was guaranteed and a doctor would check whether a person was in sufficiently good health to be detained.

Recommendation (c)

99. Governments were encouraged to adopt or amend legislation, policies and guidelines that allowed flexibility when handing down sentences for drug-related offences that took into account the nature and gravity of the offence as well as the personality and background of the offender.
100. Armenia, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland and Hungary reported having acted on the recommendation.
101. Belarus reported that its courts considered, among other things, the nature of and motives for the commission of the offence, the extent to which the offence posed a threat to the general public, the identity of the perpetrator, the extent of the damage caused and any mitigating and aggravating circumstances.
102. Bosnia and Herzegovina reported that its courts considered, inter alia, all circumstances that had a bearing on the punishment, the degree of criminal liability, the motives for commission of the offence and the offender's personal situation and his or her conduct following the perpetration of the offence. Lighter penalties than those prescribed by law could be handed down.
103. Czechia reported that its national legislation provided for flexibility and that the nature and gravity of the offence, the personal situation of the offender and the consequences of criminal penalties for the offender's future were taken into account.
104. Germany reported that national sentencing principles allowed for flexibility with respect to sentences and that the nature and gravity of the offence and the personality and background of the offender were taken into account.
105. Latvia reported that penalties for drug-related offences were flexible, ranging from temporary deprivation of liberty to community service or the payment of a fine,

taking into account the nature of and harm caused by the offence, the personality of the offender and any mitigating or aggravating circumstances.

106. Luxembourg reported that its judicial authorities considered the specific situation of each offender and could decide to defer judgment, grant a stay of execution or order community service as alternatives to imprisonment.

107. Malta reported that the drug court could hand down sentences below the minimum established by law. Cases involving non-violent offences – for which a maximum period of imprisonment was established – found to have been committed in connection with drug dependence were referred to the Drug Rehabilitation Board.

108. North Macedonia reported that relevant legislation, a national strategy and action plans were in place and that there was close cooperation with non-governmental organizations to increase public awareness.

109. Portugal reported that its commissions for the prevention of drug addiction could, inter alia, issue warnings to offenders, ban them from frequenting certain places or meeting certain people, order them to attend a treatment institution, cancel their professional licence or firearms licence, if applicable, or (except in the case of people with drug use disorders) order them to pay a fine. Users found in possession of more than 10 daily doses of a substance were prosecuted.

110. The Republic of Moldova reported that its national drug policy for the period 2019–2026 provided for the amendment of legislation in order to define mechanisms and simplify the application of alternative measures in relation to drug-related offences.

111. The Russian Federation reported that its national courts assessed all the elements of a criminal case, including the personality of the defendant, before deciding on the punishment to be imposed, which could be lighter than the minimum applicable penalty.

112. Spain reported that its Criminal Code provided for mitigating and aggravating circumstances, thus allowing flexibility in sentencing and enabling all aspects outlined in the recommendation to be taken into account.

113. Sweden reported that its judicial system imposed no restrictions on evidence used in court and that its courts could take additional circumstances into consideration and apply alternative measures, including treatment.

114. Switzerland reported that, in accordance with its national legislation, sentences must be determined on the basis of the background and personal situation of the offender and the possible consequences of the sentence for the person's future.

Recommendation (d)

115. Governments were encouraged to employ a multidisciplinary approach in providing treatment and rehabilitation as an alternative to conviction or punishment and to promote and develop the capacity for institutional coordination between justice, health and social services authorities.

116. Armenia, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Hungary, Luxembourg and North Macedonia reported having acted on the recommendation.

117. Belarus reported that comprehensive plans of action focused on addressing drug trafficking, on preventing drug abuse, including among children and youth, and on social rehabilitation had been developed with the participation of law enforcement agencies and community-based and religious organizations.

118. Czechia reported on a national inter-agency and multidisciplinary coordination approach involving all relevant stakeholders, applied prior to imprisonment and continuing after release. Prevention and medical and non-medical treatment measures were provided for in prison settings.

119. Germany reported that alternatives to imprisonment were implemented by individual federal states or entities at the community level.

120. Italy reported that the activities of relevant stakeholders were coordinated through the National Centre for Monitoring Drug Addiction.

121. Lithuania reported on cooperation between the Vilnius Police and the Addictions Centre in providing methadone treatment for individuals without health insurance.

122. Malta reported that the recommendation was being implemented, including through the referral of offenders to the Drug Rehabilitation Board and the provision of treatment options.

123. Portugal reported that the implementation of the Decriminalization Act was based on a network approach whereby resources were allocated and partnerships were established among relevant actors in the areas of drug demand and drug supply, with a strong overall focus on prevention.

124. The Republic of Moldova reported that, while treatment was not provided as an alternative to conviction or punishment, treatment and rehabilitation services were available to persons wishing to use those services.

125. The Russian Federation reported that its State Anti-Drug Committee, which had been established in 2007, worked with the federal executive authorities, the drug control commissions, the executive authorities of the constituent entities, municipal authorities and civil society organizations.

126. Serbia reported that cooperation among competent institutions was focused mainly on communication with health institutions. In prisons, health care was provided in cooperation with regional health centres; specialized treatment was available in a prison hospital in Belgrade.

127. Spain reported that all relevant stakeholders were involved in the formulation of national strategies and that the current national strategy, for the period 2017–2024, fostered a participatory, multidisciplinary, multisectoral, egalitarian and universal approach.

128. Sweden reported under recommendation (a) on action taken relevant to recommendation (d).

129. Switzerland reported that, under certain circumstances, a custodial sentence of up to six months could be commuted to a term of community service or a term during which the offender is subject to electronic monitoring. If the offender was a minor, the proceedings could be suspended at any time for the purposes of mediation.

Recommendation (e)

130. Governments were encouraged to implement measures to increase public awareness of the benefits of using alternatives to imprisonment.

131. Armenia, Croatia, Cyprus, Hungary, Italy and Spain reported having acted on the recommendation.

132. Bosnia and Herzegovina reported on awareness-raising through the media and community policing.

133. Czechia reported that electronic monitoring (through the use of electronic bracelets) had been introduced in 2018; awareness of it was raised through the media.

134. Finland reported that the websites of the police and the national health-care authorities provided information on alternatives to imprisonment.

135. Germany reported that the Federal Government Drug Commissioner provided information on policies and published an annual report.

136. Malta reported that it had organized conferences and talks to raise awareness of the benefits of alternatives to imprisonment.

137. North Macedonia reported that it had organized lectures on vulnerable members of society who were at risk of developing drug use disorders.

138. The Republic of Moldova reported that campaigns had been organized to mark the International Day against Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking.

139. The Russian Federation reported that two nationwide campaigns had been conducted and a series of events held to mark the International Day against Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking. In addition, social media networks were used to raise awareness, an anti-drug discussion platform had been set up on national television and cooperation with a national radio station had been established.

140. Sweden reported that its national police, alongside other national agencies, organizations and experts, participated actively in the public debate on drugs and drug dependence, guiding the discussions and raising awareness.

Recommendation (f)

141. Governments were encouraged to collect and analyse gender- and age-disaggregated data on the use of alternatives to imprisonment and, if applicable, to undertake periodic evaluation of existing initiatives to provide treatment as an alternative to conviction or punishment for people with drug use disorders.

142. Armenia, Croatia, Cyprus, Hungary and North Macedonia reported having acted on the recommendation.

143. Czechia reported that data on alternatives to imprisonment, including gender- and age-disaggregated data, were collected and made publicly available.

144. Finland reported that gender- and age-disaggregated data were collected.

145. Germany reported that data on prosecution and penal systems, including in the context of alternatives to imprisonment, were collected by the Federal Statistical Office and published in various sources of criminal justice statistics.

146. Italy reported that the data collected were presented in an annual report submitted to the Parliament.

147. Malta reported that it collected gender- and age-disaggregated data for all types of offence.

148. Portugal reported that only 7 per cent of drug users were female. In 2017, the commissions for the prevention of drug addiction had provisionally suspended proceedings in the majority of relevant cases and had referred 10,825 offenders for treatment.

149. The Russian Federation reported that disaggregated data were collected and that, as of January 2018, a total of 163,207 people – including 16,159 women and 167 minors – were in custody for offences relating to drug trafficking.

150. Spain reported that gender-disaggregated data on sentencing were collected.

151. Sweden reported that the Swedish Council for Information on Alcohol and Other Drugs and the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention provided the Government with relevant data.

152. Switzerland reported that its Federal Statistical Office collected data on the use of community service and electronic monitoring.

Issue 3: Mainstreaming gender perspectives in drug-related policies and programmes

Recommendation (a)

153. Governments were encouraged to collect and analyse gender-disaggregated data to obtain more information about the situation and circumstances of women drug users and the various roles women assumed in drug-related crime and in organized

crime groups with a view to developing and implementing effective and comprehensive policies and programmes.

154. Armenia reported that, in 2018, of the 1,251 individuals who tested positive for the use of controlled substances, 2.6 per cent were female, compared with 2 per cent in 2017.

155. Belarus reported on the collection of gender-disaggregated data, including data on patients with drug use disorders and on drug-related crime.

156. Belgium reported that, while no official register was in place to enable evaluation of the extent to which women were involved in drug-related crime, the treatment demand indicator used by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction provided information on women who use drugs who were in treatment.

157. Croatia reported that data on individuals in treatment were collected and that those data were disaggregated by sex, socioeconomic characteristics, health and other gender-related indicators, but data on the involvement of women in crime were not collected. About 17–18 per cent of individuals treated for drug use disorders in 2017 and 2018 were female.

158. Cyprus, Germany, Hungary and Malta reported having acted on the recommendation.

159. Czechia reported that gender- and age-disaggregated data were collected and analysed and that about 30 per cent of individuals in treatment were female.

160. Finland reported that gender was taken into account in data collection and the preparation of statistics and that research had been undertaken on how to ensure a gender perspective.

161. Italy reported that dedicated initiatives were being organized by the Department for Anti-Drug Policies in collaboration with the Cooperation Group to Combat Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking in Drugs (the Pompidou Group) of the Council of Europe.

162. Latvia reported that gender-disaggregated data were collected and that studies on gender-related issues were occasionally conducted. A cohort study on drugs, encompassing women's roles in drug-related crime, had been in progress since 2006.

163. Lithuania reported that its national strategy for the period 2018–2028 was focused, inter alia, on treatment, rehabilitation and reintegration services tailored to individual needs.

164. Luxembourg reported that data collected through the Luxembourg Information Network on Drugs and Drug Use, an epidemiological monitoring system on drugs and drug use, were gender-disaggregated.

165. North Macedonia reported that its national drug strategy provided for the introduction of harm-reduction programmes focused on women and the development of an action plan for women with drug use disorders, for implementation by 2020.

166. The Russian Federation reported that the specific needs of women and minors were taken into consideration in its national strategies and programmes.

167. Spain reported that gender-disaggregated data were collected through national surveys and that the gender perspective was a guiding principle under the national strategy and its action plan.

168. Sweden reported that the Swedish Council for Information on Alcohol and Other Drugs and the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention collected, compiled and analysed gender-disaggregated data on drug abuse.

169. Switzerland reported that gender-disaggregated data were collected according to specific gender-related indicators and that the collection of data on addiction was under review.

Recommendation (b)

170. Governments were encouraged to ensure non-discriminatory access to health-care services for women, including in prison, and to develop gender-sensitive prevention, primary care, treatment and reintegration policies and programmes, particularly for pregnant women and women with caretaking responsibilities.

171. Armenia reported that its national penitentiary code contained provisions dealing with the specific needs of prisoners who were pregnant or nursing or who had children.

172. Belarus reported that no distinctions were made on the basis of gender in its national legislation, but special programmes were available for pregnant women and women with childcare responsibilities.

173. Belgium reported that a study on gender-sensitive prevention and treatment had been conducted in 2018. In the same year, the Federal Public Service had conducted a campaign on alcohol use in pregnancy as part of which health professionals had been provided with guidelines and information.

174. Croatia reported that health and social services for women with drug use disorders were accessible on a non-discriminatory basis and were provided by the national health-care system (through inpatient and outpatient services), with special emphasis on targeted treatment and social reintegration programmes for women, including in prison settings.

175. Cyprus and Hungary reported having acted on the recommendation.

176. Czechia reported on national prevention and treatment programmes that were focused on the individual needs of clients but addressed gender, gender identity and religion to a lesser extent. A separate treatment facility was available for women.

177. Finland reported that a special treatment facility was available for women and that the work of that facility was focused on the specific needs of pregnant women and women with small children.

178. Germany reported that the recommendation was being implemented, with a special focus on children raised in families affected by drug use disorders.

179. Latvia reported that equal access to health care in prisons, including drug prevention and treatment services, was provided for and that specific measures had been established for women, including pregnant women and women with children.

180. Lithuania reported that 1 out of its 13 rehabilitation communities was specifically for women and, if applicable, their children and that those communities provided social and psychological services, education and vocational training in order to facilitate reintegration into society.

181. Luxembourg reported that outpatient and residential treatment facilities were available for women drug users who were pregnant or had young children and that those facilities provided psychological and social rehabilitation and assistance in reintegration into the labour market.

182. Malta reported that the competent agency employed a female doctor to attend to women with drug use disorders and that that doctor focused on the specific health issues that such women faced, providing health check-ups and tests. In addition, the doctor worked with national non-governmental organizations that offered services to female sex workers.

183. Portugal reported that specific programmes and facilities were available for women, including rehabilitation centres, integrated programmes for maternal health care, residential centres for women, therapeutic communities and, in prisons, outpatient methadone treatment programmes.

184. The Russian Federation reported that all citizens had equal access to medical care, including in prison settings, and that a broad network of relevant institutions

had been established. In addition, a network of non-governmental institutions providing drug abuse treatment services had been established.

185. Serbia reported that gender equality was ensured in the provision of treatment, including in prison settings.

186. Spain reported on initiatives to ensure gender-sensitive programming, including in the areas of prevention and risk reduction, comprehensive and multidisciplinary care and social integration.

187. Sweden reported that gender equality was one of the topics discussed in its national assemblies. In addition, as part of methodological development work, the police had launched a project on facilitating the identification of female drug users.

188. Switzerland reported that a report entitled “Diversity” had been produced with the aim of promoting the diversity, coordination, quality and accessibility of prevention, counselling, treatment and harm-reduction services. In addition, dedicated therapeutic groups had been established according to gender-specific needs, as well as housing groups for women and their children and self-help groups.

Recommendation (c)

189. Governments were encouraged to ensure close cooperation and collaboration among all relevant national authorities in developing and implementing gender-sensitive drug policies and programmes that took into account the specific needs of and circumstances faced by women and girls with regard to the world drug problem.

190. Armenia, Cyprus, Germany and Hungary reported having acted on the recommendation.

191. Croatia reported that, in order to foster the exchange of good practices and to work towards the development of more effective policies that took the gender dimension into account, it had organized, inter alia, a conference in 2016 on challenges in the area of addiction and a round table in 2017 on the psychosocial rehabilitation of women with drug use disorders and childcare responsibilities. In 2017, Croatia had participated in Pompidou Group seminars on women and drugs.

192. Czechia reported that the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs worked closely with all relevant national authorities in developing and implementing gender-sensitive policies, the Government Council for Drug Policy Coordination being the main advisory and coordination body responsible for drug-related issues and for monitoring the implementation of national strategies and action plans.

193. Finland reported that gender-sensitive prevention and treatment measures were being implemented.

194. Italy reported that its Anti-drug Policy Department was conducting activities to raise awareness of gender-related issues.

195. Luxembourg reported that all competent authorities cooperated closely in the implementation of gender-sensitive drug policies and programmes and that those activities were supported by the Interministerial Group on Drugs and consultations with the National Drug Coordinator.

196. Malta shared an example of cooperation among relevant professionals, including staff of hospitals and non-governmental organizations, working with pregnant women with drug use disorders to provide tailored services at the various stages of pregnancy and after birth.

197. Portugal reported that the drafting, implementation and evaluation of its national plan was a participatory process involving all relevant ministries in order to ensure a gender-sensitive approach in national drug policy and in the design of targeted programmes for women.

198. The Russian Federation reported that its national strategies and programmes took into consideration the specific needs of women and minors.

199. Serbia reported that voluntary counselling, testing for HIV and hepatitis C and overdose prevention services were offered in prisons for inmates with drug use disorders.

200. Spain reported that the Spanish Council on Drug Dependence and Other Addictions had a standing working group on gender and that the Sectoral Conference on Drugs brought together relevant stakeholders responsible for drug policies in the autonomous communities.

201. Sweden reported under recommendation (b) on action taken relevant to recommendation (c).

202. Switzerland reported that drug-related platforms had been established at all levels of government (federal, cantonal, regional and city) to enable the exchange of experiences and promote understanding.

Issue 4: Money-laundering, illicit financial flows and effective countermeasures

Recommendation (a)

203. In support of the investigation of money-laundering offences and the recovery of the proceeds of crime, Governments were encouraged to enable access by their law enforcement authorities to the information held by their financial intelligence units.

204. Armenia reported that its Financial Monitoring Centre notified the law enforcement authorities of any suspicious transactions and provided them with relevant information. In 2017, a “unified information domain” had been introduced to facilitate the prompt exchange of information.

205. Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Hungary and North Macedonia reported having acted on the recommendation.

206. Belgium reported that the recommendation had been implemented and that particular attention was being given to further improving information flows, including through a liaison officer in the financial intelligence unit. The General Administration for Customs and Excise Duties cooperated closely with that unit. A draft law intended to improve access by judicial authorities to such information was under consideration.

207. Czechia reported that efforts had been focused on the recovery of proceeds of crime.

208. Finland reported that its national financial intelligence unit and Asset Recovery Office were part of the National Bureau of Investigation, which was part of the national police force.

209. Germany reported that its financial intelligence unit was required to transmit relevant information to the competent law enforcement agencies without delay if money-laundering, the financing of terrorism or any other criminal offence was suspected.

210. Italy reported that the Guardia di Finanza (a law enforcement agency responsible for countering financial crime and smuggling) received reports on suspicious transactions related to money-laundering or the financing of terrorism from the financial intelligence unit of the National Bank.

211. Latvia reported that an asset recovery office had been established within the State police force in 2016 as the competent authority for processing and transferring law enforcement inquiries to national asset recovery entities and for supporting investigations.

212. Lithuania reported that its financial intelligence unit provided information to law enforcement institutions.

213. Luxembourg reported that the Money-Laundering Section of the Criminal Investigation Department of the national police currently acquired such information

through the prosecution services but the Act on the Financial Intelligence Unit was to be amended to enable the direct exchange of information.

214. Malta reported that its Financial Intelligence Analysis Unit and law enforcement agencies shared information on investigations through a dedicated liaison officer.

215. Poland reported that a new act that was compliant with the recommendations of the Financial Action Task Force, relevant European Union provisions and regulations and amendments to the rules on collecting and sharing information as established by the General Inspector of Financial Information had entered into force in 2018.

216. Portugal reported that financial intelligence unit data could be accessed through its national framework for combating money-laundering and the financing of terrorism, its financial intelligence unit being a police entity.

217. The Russian Federation reported that specialized divisions had been established within the Ministry of Internal Affairs and its local bodies and that there was close cooperation with the Federal Financial Monitoring Service.

218. Spain reported that existing mechanisms and tools enabled its law enforcement authorities to obtain relevant information through the necessary judicial authorization and control.

219. Switzerland reported that the national financial intelligence unit was required to notify the responsible prosecution authority where there were reasonable grounds to suspect that assets were proceeds of money-laundering and/or the financing of terrorism. In line with the Financial Action Task Force standard, law enforcement agencies were permitted to request information from the financial intelligence unit.

Recommendation (b)

220. Governments were encouraged to ensure that evidence gathered through investigations of money-laundering offences by their financial intelligence units had legal standing in their courts if used in prosecutions brought by other law enforcement agencies.

221. Armenia reported that, in general, information protected by banking secrecy rules was shared only on the basis of a court decision and that a new legislative framework for addressing money-laundering and the financing of terrorism was being discussed.

222. Belarus reported that evidence collected in compliance with national legislation, including during the investigation of crimes related to money-laundering, was legally accepted by all government bodies at all stages.

223. Bosnia and Herzegovina reported that data gathered through financial investigations by its law enforcement agencies had legal standing in the courts.

224. Croatia, Cyprus, Hungary and the Republic of Moldova reported having acted on the recommendation.

225. Czechia reported that, in order to support investigations and the recovery of proceeds of crime, information was shared by its financial intelligence unit, the Government and the police on the basis of an official agreement concluded among those entities.

226. Finland reported that its national financial intelligence unit and Asset Recovery Office were part of the National Bureau of Investigation and that evidence gathered by them had legal standing in court.

227. Germany reported that personal data could be used only for the purpose for which they were transmitted. The use of such data for other purposes was permissible to the extent that transmission of the data for those other purposes would have been allowed.

228. Italy reported that evidence gathered during money-laundering investigations by the Guardia di Finanza could be used in criminal proceedings and that the judicial authority was informed about suspicious operations involving entities already under investigation.

229. Latvia reported that information provided by the Latvian Office for the Prevention of the Laundering of Proceeds from Criminal Activity could not be used as evidence in court.

230. Lithuania reported that information shared by its financial intelligence unit with law enforcement agencies in relation to possible criminal acts could be used as evidence in court.

231. Luxembourg reported that its financial intelligence unit regularly submitted reports containing financial information to the Public Prosecutor's Office for use in investigations conducted by law enforcement authorities.

232. Poland reported that information collected by its financial intelligence divisions could not be used as evidence. In the case of action taken by the General Inspector of Financial Information to freeze a bank account or suspend a transaction in connection with proceedings concerning money-laundering, a notification was sent to the relevant prosecutor's office and served as a basis for the decision as to whether or not to launch an investigation.

233. Malta reported that information gathered by its Financial Intelligence Analysis Unit could not be used as evidence in court but could be used to assist law enforcement agencies in their investigations, for example, in order to obtain evidence through mutual legal assistance requests (the European Investigation Order).

234. Portugal reported that if information (in suspicious transactions reports) was shared with its financial intelligence unit, the data collected could not be used as evidence in court. If the investigation was initiated by the financial intelligence unit, intelligence shared with the Public Prosecution Service and National Criminal Police could be used to support criminal investigations.

235. The Russian Federation reported that information provided by its financial intelligence unit was used by the Ministry of Internal Affairs for its operational and investigative activities in cases involving predicate offences (drug trafficking offences) and the laundering of the proceeds of drug-related crime.

236. Spain reported that, in addition to the action taken under recommendation (a), efforts were made to ensure compliance with chain-of-custody requirements.

237. Switzerland reported that information contained in reports filed by its financial intelligence unit could be used by the competent prosecutorial authority to obtain evidence that was admissible in court.

Recommendation (c)

238. Governments were encouraged to make use of the tools available for training and building the capacity of their law enforcement authorities, financial investigators and prosecutors available through the UNODC Global Programme against Money-Laundering and relevant training institutions.

239. Armenia reported on the work of its Standing Inter-agency Committee against Money-Laundering, including the development of a comprehensive methodological guide on investigating money-laundering that contained information on relevant legislation and cooperation partners. It also reported that training activities were being conducted for employees of the prosecution services and that a workshop had been organized for customs officers by the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs of the United States of America.

240. Belarus reported on regular training activities, workshops, joint meetings and international conferences.

241. Bosnia and Herzegovina reported that further training and capacity-building were required.
242. Czechia reported that its law enforcement authorities had received training in combating money-laundering from its financial intelligence unit, the Police Academy and CEPOL.
243. Finland reported on national training and training provided by Europol and CEPOL.
244. Germany reported that the various tools were used as appropriate.
245. Hungary reported that training and workshops were organized for the Drug Enforcement Division of the National Bureau of Investigation.
246. Italy reported that targeted training was provided and that workshops and courses were organized for national and international police officers and agents.
247. Latvia reported on national training for law enforcement authorities conducted in 2017 and 2018.
248. Lithuania reported that police officers and financial intelligence unit investigators received training, including through CEPOL and Europol.
249. Luxembourg reported that financial investigators within the national police could participate in all forms of training relevant to their activities.
250. Malta reported that it did not use the tools provided by UNODC.
251. Poland reported that, in 2018, a course on money-laundering had been conducted under the auspices of CEPOL and, in 2017 and 2018, representatives of the Central Bureau of Investigation of the national police had participated in CEPOL training initiatives and exchange programmes.
252. Portugal reported that training was provided but human resources and budgetary constraints had to be taken into consideration.
253. The Republic of Moldova reported on training requirements for its national authorities, including the military and the police and security forces.
254. The Russian Federation reported that the Ministry of Internal Affairs provided training for competent authorities, personnel of the operational, investigative and expert units of the drug control departments of local and central bodies and teaching and research staff of the Ministry's training institutions.
255. Spain reported that actors involved in financial investigations were familiar with and made use of available tools, including those provided by UNODC, and participated in relevant forums in order to develop contacts, improve their knowledge and learn about developments in the field.
256. Switzerland reported that the UNODC goAML system on countering money-laundering would be introduced shortly.

Recommendation (d)

257. Governments were encouraged to share with UNODC the results of their national money-laundering risk assessments to facilitate a coordinated global response and to strengthen the capacity of competent authorities and financial institutions to thwart attempts at money-laundering.
258. Armenia reported that the most recent national risk assessment on money-laundering and the financing of terrorism had been carried out in 2014 and a sectoral review had been carried out in 2017 in order to update the 2014 assessment. It also reported that UNODC assessments were used when assessing money-laundering risks.

259. Belarus reported that its Ministry of the Interior, when preparing relevant reports, included information on the work undertaken to detect and prevent acts of money-laundering related to drug trafficking.
260. Belgium reported that its national money-laundering risk assessments were not communicated directly to UNODC but were shared with the European Commission and European Union member States and discussed within the Financial Action Task Force, in which UNODC participated.
261. Bosnia and Herzegovina reported that the results of its assessments were shared with international partners, including UNODC.
262. Croatia and Hungary reported having acted on the recommendation.
263. Czechia reported that its data were shared with its financial intelligence unit, which participated in the Council of Europe Committee of Experts on the Evaluation of Anti-Money Laundering Measures and the Financing of Terrorism.
264. Finland reported that it contributed to the Europol Serious and Organized Crime Threat Assessment.
265. Germany reported that it intended to share the final reports with UNODC.
266. Italy reported that its Financial Security Committee was responsible for national risk assessments, which were shared with the European Commission and the Financial Action Task Force.
267. Latvia reported that it contributed to the assessments of the Council of Europe relating to the countering of money-laundering and the financing of terrorism and that a national action plan had been adopted at the end of 2018.
268. Lithuania reported that its national risk assessment on money-laundering and the financing of terrorism had been completed in 2015 and made publicly available and that a new risk assessment was planned for 2020.
269. Luxembourg reported that its first national risk assessment on money-laundering and the financing of terrorism had been published in 2018 and made publicly available.
270. Malta reported that the dissemination of national risk assessments required authorization by the Government.
271. Poland reported that its national risk assessment on money-laundering and the financing of terrorism was drafted by the General Inspector of Financial Information with the participation of the Financial Security Committee, cooperating units and relevant institutions.
272. The Republic of Moldova emphasized that information-sharing should be reciprocal.
273. The Russian Federation reported that its Ministry of Internal Affairs worked in collaboration with the national financial intelligence unit and other relevant bodies, including for the purpose of national risk assessments, which were conducted with the involvement of the Central Bank, representatives of the private sector and federal executive authorities that were part of the system to combat money-laundering.
274. Spain reported that it participated in information exchange and provided data on its national money-laundering risk assessments.
275. Switzerland reported that its national money-laundering risk assessment had been published on the website of the Swiss financial intelligence unit.

III. Conclusions

276. The overview contained in the present report reflects the situation in 24 of the 56 States represented at the Meeting. To provide the Meeting with more complete

information, all Governments should be encouraged to complete and return the questionnaire.

277. The quality and detail of the responses to the questionnaire show that Governments have taken effective measures to implement the recommendations adopted by the Twelfth Meeting of Heads of National Drug Law Enforcement Agencies, Europe, and that there is a well-established culture of cooperation between law enforcement agencies in the region.
