

8 July 2022

Original: English\*

---

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

Valetta, 12–15 September 2022

Item 4 of the provisional agenda\*\*

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

1. The Thirteenth Meeting of Heads of National Drug Law Enforcement Agencies, Europe, held in Lisbon from 2–5 July 2019, adopted a set of recommendations following consideration by its working groups of the issues set out below.
2. In accordance with established practice, the report of the Thirteenth 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 8 April 2022.
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 1 July 2022, replies had been received from the Governments of Albania, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, Türkiye and Turkmenistan.

---

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

\*\* UNODC/HONEURO/14/1.



## II. Implementation of the recommendations adopted by the Thirteenth Meeting

### Issue 1. The misuse of new technologies and communication modes for drug-related activities

#### Recommendation (a)

4. Governments were encouraged to strengthen cooperation between law enforcement agencies, financial intelligence units, financial supervision agencies, judicial authorities and the private sector to prevent the misuse of new technologies and combat the illegal drug trade in the darknet, including with the use of cryptocurrencies. Such cooperation should take place both at the national and international levels.
5. Azerbaijan reported that its customs officials had participated in an online seminar on cybercrime investigation, held by the investigative office of the Department of State of the United States of America from 7 to 9 December 2021.
6. Belarus reported that meetings were regularly held to foster the sharing of experiences among law enforcement agencies in the thematic field.
7. Belgium reported that its customs and police officials participated in international operations tackling sale of drugs on the Internet, coordinated by Europol and the European Anti-fraud Office (OLAF).
8. Bulgaria reported on the work of the General Directorate for Combating Organized Crime within the Ministry of the Interior.
9. Czechia reported on the establishment of a working group on darknet monitoring, comprising representatives of the Ministry of the Interior, the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Justice.
10. Denmark reported on the establishment of a new national Special Crime Unit, aimed at strengthening the efforts against the most complex economic crimes, organized crime and cybercrime.
11. Finland reported that the monitoring of illegal actions on the Internet, including on the darknet and using cryptocurrencies, had been enhanced by establishing a special function/network for that purpose.
12. France reported on the main tasks of the Advisory Board for Combating Money-Laundering and Terrorist Financing.
13. Germany reported on existing cooperation frameworks and entities between the Financial Intelligence Unit and the national law enforcement agency and between the Financial Intelligence Unit and the Federal Financial Supervisory Authority.
14. Ireland reported on the cybercrime-related work of the National Police Service.
15. Kyrgyzstan reported that the Service for Combating Drug Trafficking of the Ministry of Internal Affairs regularly participated in relevant training courses and seminars organized by international organizations, focusing on detecting, documenting, categorizing and proving offences involving drug trafficking committed through the use of information and financial technologies, and offshore jurisdictions, beneficial ownership and money obtained by criminal and corrupt means.
16. Latvia reported that the State police were planning to establish a Cybercrime Unit which would eventually contribute to strengthening the capacity of the police to counter criminal use of technology.
17. Lithuania reported on the cybercrime-related work of the Criminal Police Bureau.

18. Poland reported on the work of the Central Cybercrime Bureau under the national police.
19. Romania reported that its law enforcement entities were cooperating with international law enforcement agencies, financial entities and the private sector in order to identify and investigate persons that were using cryptocurrencies.
20. The Russian Federation reported on the existing cooperation frameworks to exchange information on persons involved in drug trafficking offences committed through the use of information technologies.
21. Serbia reported that the Ministry of Health had no jurisdiction with regard to the matter, but was ready to take part in all related matters, as appropriate.
22. Spain reported on the national instruments that fostered interagency cooperation in preventing the misuse of new technologies and combating the illegal drug trade on the darknet.
23. Sweden reported on the measures taken to strengthen the fight against illegal trade of drugs through the Internet, including in the darknet.
24. Tajikistan reported that cooperation between law enforcement agencies and financial intelligence units had been established at the appropriate level and that bilateral and multilateral agreements were concluded with the law enforcement agencies of partner States.
25. Türkiye reported that six operations had been conducted between 2015 and 2022 to counter the dissemination of narcotics or psychotropic substances through the Internet and social media platforms, resulting in the detainment of 534 persons and the reporting of 21 websites.
26. Turkmenistan reported that the State policy was aimed at fostering inter- and intra-agency coordination of the activities of relevant entities and at strengthening the work of investigative bodies to detect and suppress offences linked to the trafficking in and use of narcotic drugs, psychotropic substances and precursors.

#### **Recommendation (b)**

27. It was recommended that Governments use the regional meetings of heads of national drug law enforcement agencies and other relevant regional and international forums for the exchange, systematization and sharing of good practices in the area of combating the illegal drug trade, including trade involving the misuse of new technologies.
28. Azerbaijan reported that it exchanged alerts and other information with neighbouring countries and countries of destination regarding detected cases of drug trafficking.
29. Belarus reported that the customs authorities participated on a regular basis in international and regional deliberations on drug law enforcement facilitated by the Committee of Heads of Law Enforcement Agencies of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) Council of Heads of Customs Services.
30. Belgium reported that it participated in different meetings organized by Europol on related topics.
31. Bulgaria reported that close cooperation was maintained between its competent national authorities and the Department of Combating Narcotic Crimes of Türkiye.
32. Czechia reported that working meetings took place on a regular basis to facilitate information-sharing in the drug scene among relevant entities.
33. Denmark reported that it was sharing good practices through the Secure Information Exchange Network Application (SIENA) and had attended several events on good practices in the European Multidisciplinary Platform against Criminal Threats (EMPACT).

34. Finland reported that exchange of information and sharing of good practices was taking place on a regular basis between the Nordic countries and especially in framework of the drug-related priorities of EMPACT.
35. France reported that a meeting of the European Union national drug coordinators had been held on 8 April 2022, focusing on drugs in the digital age, including with regard to anti-trafficking, awareness-raising, prevention and care, and featuring three round tables to enable the exchange of good practices.
36. Germany reported on the cybercrime-related activities implemented by the Customs Investigation Bureau.
37. Ireland reported that its National Police Service held the presidency of the Pompidou Group, which worked collaboratively on the international stage with partners reacting to the illegal online drug market.
38. Kyrgyzstan reported that the technical sectors of the State Coordinating Committee for the Control of Narcotic Drugs, Psychotropic Substances and Precursors held annual joint meetings to consider the recommendations of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, the World Health Organization (WHO) and other intergovernmental bodies and organizations, to strengthen coordination and compliance with international regulations relating to drug trafficking.
39. Latvia reported on the implementation of the international project on the development and application of innovative and proactive tools to combat drug trafficking organization in European Union Member States.
40. Lithuania reported that information was periodically exchanged directly between law enforcement agencies and through law enforcement liaison officers in the Baltic Sea region.
41. The Republic of Moldova reported on the regional cooperation activities held together with Ukraine, Belarus and Romania, respectively.
42. Poland reported on the work of the International Training Centre for Combating Clandestine Laboratories.
43. Romania reported that heads of national drug law enforcement agencies and other relevant national experts shared good practices in the area of combating illegal drug trade, at the margins of international meetings.
44. The Russian Federation reported that cooperation activities were regularly carried out among anti-money-laundering agencies in order to identify new challenges and threats in a timely manner and, on that basis, to develop appropriate countermeasures.
45. Serbia reported that the Ministry of the Interior was the competent body for the illegal drug trade, including trade involving the misuse of new technologies.
46. Slovakia reported that in the context of the Slovak presidency of the V4 platform, the national police force, in cooperation with the authorities of other Member States, was working on a solution to the issue of legislation on new psychoactive substances.
47. Spain reported that there had been increased information exchange and intelligence-sharing with the police forces of third countries, and within Europol and INTERPOL, particularly with regard to the use of new technologies.
48. Sweden reported that the Operational Department at the Police Authority took active part in regional meetings fostering exchange of information and good practices, hosted by Europol, the Nordic Police and Customs Cooperation and the Baltic Task Force on Organized Crime.
49. Tajikistan reported that it shared its experience in combating drugs and preventing drug abuse at the relevant meetings organized by the United Nations, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), the Collective Security Treaty

Organization (CSTO) and the Central Asian Regional Information and Coordination Centre.

50. Türkiye reported that its Police Counter Narcotics Department regularly attended the meetings of the Heads of National Drug Law Enforcement Agencies, the Subcommission on Illicit Drug Traffic and Related Matters in the Near and Middle East and other similar regional initiatives.

51. Turkmenistan reported that the Prosecutor General's Office annually collected information on, and analysed, measures to combat trafficking in narcotic drugs and convened meetings of the Board of the Prosecutor General's Office to discuss related findings.

### **Recommendation (c)**

52. It was recommended that Governments ensure system-wide basic training for law enforcement officers, including through UNODC cryptocurrency training courses, with a focus on the key skills related to new communication tools, the darknet and cryptocurrencies.

53. Belarus reported that thematic training courses were held at the training institute of the Ministry of the Interior and at other educational institutions, in order to build the capacity of customs officials.

54. Belgium reported that its customs and police officials had not yet attended any training organized by UNODC; however, European Union-wide training courses organized by the European Union Agency for Law Enforcement Training (CEPOL), Europol and OLAF had been followed.

55. Bulgaria reported that specialized training courses had not been yet conducted.

56. Czechia reported that its police and customs officers had the opportunity to participate in training programmes on monitoring the new trends in drug crime.

57. Denmark reported that the national police were offering law enforcement officers and civilian employees training on an ongoing basis.

58. Finland reported that no training activities had been conducted owing to the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic and associated travel restrictions.

59. France reported that activities to combat customs-related cybercrime were centralized within the National Directorate for Customs Intelligence and Investigations.

60. Germany reported that training courses with a focus on new communication tools, the darknet and cryptocurrencies were primarily offered to members of Internet research units.

61. Ireland reported on the training courses conducted for national authorities on the monitoring of online and darknet platforms; blockchain analysis; fraud and cybercrime; and awareness of cryptocurrencies.

62. Kyrgyzstan reported that the UNODC field office regularly conducted training on the combating of drug dealing facilitated by information technologies; the use of modern payment instruments in cross-border drug transactions and drug-related money-laundering; and cryptocurrency and the laundering of proceeds of crime.

63. Latvia reported that the State police had attended the CEPOL modules on darknet, darkweb and cryptocurrencies.

64. Lithuania reported that training was provided on a regular basis for police officers on investigating cybercrime, including with regard to the use of cryptocurrency and darknet.

65. The Republic of Moldova reported that 14 training sessions and webinars had been held in 2020 and 2021 for the Directorate for the Investigation of Drug-Related Crimes on, inter alia, cybercrime; emerging trends and markets; investigation of

trafficking in human beings, drug trafficking, smuggling of tobacco products and money laundering; risk analysis and search techniques; and synthetic drugs and illicit laboratories.

66. Poland reported that it planned to conduct training for European Union law enforcement officials on the use of cryptocurrencies to conceal illegal assets.

67. Romania reported that its counter-narcotics police officers participated in CEPOL webinars on cryptocurrencies and darknet investigation and in other training courses/webinars organized by other international entities.

68. The Russian Federation reported on the Ministry of the Interior's system of professional training in combating cybercrime and offences involving the laundering of proceeds of drug trafficking.

69. Serbia reported that the Ministry of Health had no jurisdiction to organize cryptocurrency-related training courses.

70. Slovakia reported that police officers had participated in CEPOL training courses on the use of cryptocurrency.

71. Spain reported that several courses and seminars had been organized for the police and the judiciary on the darknet, blockchain and cryptocurrencies.

72. Sweden reported that training on cryptocurrencies and the darknet was provided on a regular basis for law enforcement officers and other civilian experts employed at the Police Authority.

73. Tajikistan reported that system-wide basic training for law enforcement officers, with a focus on key skills related to new communication tools, the darknet and cryptocurrencies, should be organized by UNODC jointly with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Eurasian Group on Combating Money Laundering and Financing of Terrorism.

74. Türkiye reported that 388 personnel had been trained between 2019 and 2022 on the fight against laundering proceeds of crime, and 66 personnel had received cryptocurrency training as of September 2021.

75. Turkmenistan reported that UNODC and the OSCE Centre in Ashgabat had organized a number of international training events for national law enforcement agencies on combating trafficking in narcotic drugs, psychotropic substances and precursors.

## **Issue 2. New modi operandi in trafficking and trends in concealment methods and transport, and the role of customs authorities in effective border management strategies**

### **Recommendation (a)**

76. It was recommended that Governments encourage strong cooperation between police, customs and other law enforcement and specialized agencies at the national and international levels. In addition, cooperation with the private sector, including shipping companies, exporters and postal and express courier services, should be strengthened.

77. Albania reported on the continuous and strong cooperation between the State police and the Ministry of Finance General Directorate of Customs; between specialized counter-narcotics structures and the border police; and between the State police and the Ministry of Health.

78. Azerbaijan reported that joint investigative teams were established with other law enforcement agencies in criminal cases where the investigation was being led by the customs authorities of Azerbaijan.

79. Belarus reported on strong inter-agency cooperation among internal affairs agencies, the border service, investigative bodies and other competent bodies, to counter drug trafficking.
80. Belgium reported on intensive operational cooperation between the customs authorities, the federal police and the Public Prosecutor in the ports of Antwerp, Zeebrugge and Ghent and at the airports of Brussels.
81. Bulgaria reported on close cooperation between the Ministry of the Interior and the Customs Agency, and between the General Directorate Combating Organized Crime and private sector entities, including courier and logistics companies, telecom operators and exporters.
82. Czechia reported that cooperation agreements had been signed with the private sector, including shipping companies, exporters and postal and express courier services, as well as with the chemical and pharmaceutical industries.
83. Denmark reported that the police and the Customs Agency were cooperating on both an operational and strategic level.
84. Finland reported that its Customs Service had several memorandum of understanding agreements with the relevant private sector actors.
85. France reported that the National Anti-Narcotics Plan ensured enhanced coordination among relevant law enforcement agencies.
86. Germany reported that cooperation between the police and customs authorities at the national level was strengthened through the use of joint police/customs investigation groups for combating organized crime.
87. Hungary reported that its Customs Service was a member of the Joint Drugs Coordination Committee, responsible for, inter alia, establishing the national drug policy.
88. Ireland reported that the National Police Service had a memorandum of understanding with the Revenue Customs Agency, which was responsible for the monitoring and regulation of postal, courier and shipping companies.
89. Kyrgyzstan reported that joint investigative activities relating to drug trafficking were carried out by the police, the State Customs Service, the State Committee for National Security and the State Penal Service.
90. Latvia reported on the implementation of the international project entitled "Development and application of innovative and proactive tools to combat drug trafficking organization in European Union Member States".
91. Lithuania reported that the Criminal Police Bureau actively cooperated with non-governmental and private organizations to establish a constructive dialogue in the fight against illicit drug trafficking.
92. Poland reported on effective cooperation with the private sector, including shipping companies, exporters and postal and courier services.
93. Romania reported on strong cooperation among the police, customs and other specialized agencies in the area of combating drug trafficking as well as on cooperation with postal and express courier services.
94. The Russian Federation reported that training was provided, as part of cooperation with postal and express courier services, on ways of detecting packages with illegal contents and on the procedure to be followed when such packages were discovered.
95. Serbia reported that the Ministry of Health had no jurisdiction with regard to the matter.

96. Slovakia reported that the Police-Customs Cooperation Unit was responsible for the strengthening of cooperation between the police and the customs authorities and for detecting drug-related crimes within airport, postal and express courier services.

97. Spain reported that the risk analysis units, which were composed of customs and police officers, had enhanced the national efforts to combat various types of drug trafficking.

98. Sweden reported on well-developed cooperation between the Police Authority and the customs authorities.

99. Tajikistan reported that cooperation between the national law enforcement agencies and relevant authorities had been established at the appropriate level and was duly encouraged.

100. Türkiye reported on strong cooperation among all national law enforcement agencies.

101. Turkmenistan reported that its law enforcement agencies cooperated closely with the private sector, including shipping companies, exporters and postal and courier services, in the investigation of criminal cases involving trafficking in narcotic drugs.

### **Recommendation (b)**

102. It was recommended that platforms for regional and international law enforcement cooperation organizations and centres, including Europol, Frontex, INTERPOL and the World Customs Organization (WCO), be actively used for regional and international cooperation as in the elaboration of regional and international threat assessments and for facilitating investigations of specific cases as well as post-seizure investigations.

103. Albania reported on its membership in analytical projects as well as in the EMPACT project on organized property crime.

104. Belarus reported on the active use of the platforms provided by WCO and INTERPOL.

105. Belgium reported that the customs and the police services regularly participated in the activities organized in the framework of the EMPACT operational action plans, such as Joint Action Day.

106. Bulgaria reported that it closely cooperated with Europol and the South-East European Law Enforcement Centre (SELEC).

107. Czechia reported that the platforms of regional and international law enforcement cooperation organizations and centres should be actively used in the elaboration of regional and international threat assessments and for facilitating investigations of specific cases as well as post-seizure investigations.

108. Denmark reported that the police actively used all mentioned platforms, including some of the WCO platforms, which facilitated sharing of intelligence, best practices and case-related information.

109. Finland reported that all platforms referred to in the recommendation were regularly used for regional and international cooperation.

110. France reported that the relevant agencies were regularly informed of the new tools made available by the Regional Intelligence Liaison Office for Western Europe of WCO.

111. Germany reported that Europol, the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB), Eurojust, INTERPOL and WCO were regularly used for information-sharing, joint operations and joint investigations.

112. Hungary reported that the Customs Service was carrying out its activities to combat illicit drug trafficking, in cooperation with the European Union and international organizations.

113. Ireland reported that the National Police Service was currently a member of EMPACT and continued to utilize the platforms put in place by Europol and INTERPOL to strengthen cooperation with international partners.

114. Kyrgyzstan reported that national authorities collaborated with international organizations, including OSCE, UNODC, the European Union and INTERPOL, in combating drug-related crime.

115. Latvia reported that it took part in Europol activities and participated in EMPACT.

116. Lithuania reported that it participated in different international operations initiated by Europol, INTERPOL and WCO and was actively involved in the roll-out of EMPACT operational action plans.

117. The Republic of Moldova reported that the communication channels with Europol were operational and that information was exchanged both at a general level and on specific cases.

118. Poland reported that it contributed to the development of regional and international threat assessments and to facilitating investigations into specific cases, as well as investigations after seizures.

119. Romania reported that it used all regional and international platforms for regional and international cooperation, including for the elaboration of regional and international threat assessments and for facilitating investigations of specific cases, as well as post-seizure investigations.

120. The Russian Federation reported that initiatives aimed at the harmonization of national anti-drug laws were promoted through international platforms.

121. Serbia reported that the matter was under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of the Interior and/or the Ministry of Justice.

122. Slovakia reported that exchange of information via Europol and INTERPOL took place on a regular basis.

123. Spain reported on the frequent use of multilateral platforms for international police cooperation, such as those provided by Europol and INTERPOL, to exchange operational information and intelligence, especially to facilitate ongoing investigations.

124. Sweden reported that the Police Authority cooperated frequently with third countries via INTERPOL and exchanged information and data with UNODC.

125. Tajikistan reported that it was an active member of INTERPOL.

126. Türkiye reported on the seizure of heroin and cocaine made in the context of cooperation with SELEC.

127. Turkmenistan reported that the Ministry of Internal Affairs was in continuous contact with INTERPOL.

### **Recommendation (c)**

128. Governments were encouraged to consider the utilization of artificial intelligence for the purposes of analysis, profiling, cross-checking of information, targeting the trafficking of drugs through the mail and parcels, and other customs-related activities, including with a view to adapting to the changing criminal environment.

129. Albania reported that the State police performed annually an assessment of risk by criminal groups and an assessment of the threat of organized crime and serious crimes.
130. Belarus reported that active use was made of a risk analysis and management system, non-intrusive inspection methods and modern customs control technologies, when carrying out customs checks on international mail consignments.
131. Belgium reported that it had considered using artificial intelligence for the detection of dubious shipments through postal services and the 100 per cent scanning of sea containers by customs authorities.
132. Bulgaria reported that the Ministry of the Interior was considering opportunities to introduce artificial intelligence into its daily activities.
133. Czechia and Romania reported that the respective national authorities used artificial intelligence as recommended.
134. Denmark reported that the Customs Agency was analysing and profiling information related to persons, companies, countries, modus operandi and package concealment on the part of shipping companies.
135. Finland reported that methodological progress had been made in the use of artificial intelligence and that development work would continue.
136. France reported that a related pilot study on mail consignments was currently under way.
137. Germany reported that components of artificial intelligence would be provided in the context of safety and security risk analysis, controls and risk management at the European Union level.
138. Hungary reported that a working group on artificial intelligence had been set up to utilize the value of the data assets of the National Tax and Customs Administration and thereby put scientific methodologies and tax and taxation experience at the service of public taxation.
139. Ireland reported that the National Police Service supported the Revenue Customs Agency in the investigation of controlled substances imported through the mail.
140. Kyrgyzstan reported that an analytics centre had been established within the Service for Combating Drug Trafficking of the Ministry of the Interior, equipped with the latest analytics software, including ArcGIS, ArcCatalog and Social Grabber.
141. Lithuania reported that information on postal parcels and express shipments was constantly analysed and assessed by customs officers, using intelligence analysis and a customs risk management system.
142. Poland reported that standard analysis, forensic analysis and phone call analysis used artificial intelligence in organized drug crime cases.
143. Serbia reported that the Ministry of Health had no jurisdiction with regard to the matter.
144. Spain reported that various initiatives were under way with regard to the use of artificial intelligence, big data and data mining to identify persons and/or parcels or containers that might contain substances.
145. Sweden reported that artificial intelligence was under implementation as a tool for intelligence work in the Police Authority.
146. Türkiye reported that the Division of Analysis had been established within the Police Counter Narcotics Department to, inter alia, identify crime methods and related elements, foster analysis and evaluation, and ensure that criminal investigations were carried out more rapidly, objectively and effectively.

147. Turkmenistan reported that the customs authorities possessed the latest technologies for detecting caches used to conceal narcotic drugs in vehicles.

### **Issue 3. Addressing the illicit manufacture and diversion of and trafficking in precursors**

#### **Recommendation (a)**

148. Governments were encouraged to consider optimizing the use of international provisions, such as provisions established by the European Commission, including the “catch all” clause, which allows for the seizure of non-controlled chemicals that can be used for the illicit manufacture of drugs on the basis of grounded suspicion.

149. Albania reported on the tasks of the Ministry of Health, the State police and the customs authorities in exercising the control of precursors.

150. Belarus reported that national legislation provided for the seizure of non-controlled chemicals where there were grounds to suspect that the chemicals in question were being used for the illicit manufacture of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances.

151. Belgium reported that the customs service made use of the “catch all” procedure to seize non-controlled substances.

152. Bulgaria reported that different options were considered in order to optimize the application of the instrument.

153. Czechia reported on the special legal regulation on the “catch” of goods, similar in nature to the “catch all” clause, which was used for the seizure of design precursors.

154. Denmark reported that the police were aware of the “catch all” clause and were closely cooperating with the Customs Agency to prevent any scheduled and non-scheduled substances being used in the production of illicit drugs.

155. Finland reported that the use of the “catch all” clause was problematic.

156. France reported that it had been applying the “catch all” clause to flows of non-scheduled precursor chemicals which, as shown by administrative investigations, were clearly at risk of being diverted for the purpose of manufacturing synthetic drugs.

157. Germany reported that the “catch all” clause had not been implemented as generally applicable national law to date.

158. Hungary reported that competent authorities were permitted to obtain information on any orders for non-scheduled substances or operations involving non-scheduled substances and to enter companies’ premises and conduct inspections in order to get evidence of licit use of those non-scheduled substances.

159. Ireland reported that the National Police Service regularly assisted the Revenue Customs and the Health Product Regulatory Authority in the investigation and seizure of non-controlled chemicals utilized in the manufacture of controlled drugs.

160. Kyrgyzstan reported that work was being carried out to identify and seize trafficked narcotic drugs, including precursors and non-scheduled chemicals.

161. Latvia reported that the State Medicines Agency maintained the list of non-scheduled substances that could be seized under certain circumstances.

162. Lithuania reported that the national legislation provided for the possibility for the seizure of non-controlled chemicals that could be used for the illicit manufacture of drugs on the basis of grounded suspicion.

163. Poland reported that it relied to a great extent on the regulations established by the European Commission, including the “catch all” clause.

164. Romania reported that its authorities were allowed to confiscate non-controlled chemicals only upon having evidence that those substances would be used for the illicit manufacture of drugs.

165. The Russian Federation reported that it was not permitted to seize non-controlled chemicals that were in legal circulation.

166. Serbia reported that matters relating to the “catch all” clause were under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of the Interior.

167. Spain reported that the scope of the “catch all” clause should be redefined so that non-controlled substances and designer precursors could be tackled effectively.

168. Sweden reported that non-controlled chemicals were seized when, through investigations, they could be linked to the illicit manufacturing of controlled drugs.

169. Tajikistan reported that its legislation did not provide for the seizure on the basis of reasonable suspicion of non-controlled chemicals that could be used in the illicit manufacture of drugs.

170. Turkmenistan reported that if there was evidence that precursors listed in Schedule 4 of the Act on Narcotic Drugs, Psychotropic Substances and Precursors and Prevention of Their Trafficking were intended for use in the illicit manufacture of narcotic drugs or psychotropic substances, they were immediately seized.

#### **Recommendation (b)**

171. Governments were encouraged to develop and enhance cooperation with the private sector on a constant basis, with a view to enhancing the regulation of substances, both controlled and non-controlled, which could be used for the illicit manufacture of drugs.

172. Azerbaijan reported that the customs authorities ensured that chemical precursors used in the manufacture of narcotic drugs were used for authorized purposes by legitimate importers.

173. Belarus reported that cooperation with private sector was being fostered.

174. Belgium reported that the national competent authority, in collaboration with the Customs Service, organized regular visits to operators in the private sector in order to raise awareness on the risks of diversion of substances, both controlled and non-controlled.

175. Bulgaria reported that the Ministry of the Interior had established very good cooperation with parcel service providers.

176. Czechia reported that the Customs Administration, together with the police, had long had good relations with the private sector, including with the chemical and pharmaceutical industries.

177. Denmark reported that the Customs Agency cooperated on a daily basis with private shipping companies and courier services in monitoring shipments and postal packages.

178. Finland reported that it had actively taken part in international actions together with the INCB, the European Commission and European Union Member States to develop and enhance cooperation with the private sector.

179. France reported that in 1993 it had established the National Mission for Precursor Control to ensure the support of businesses in combating the diversion of precursor chemicals.

180. Germany reported that the Joint Customs and Police Precursor Monitoring Unit had been working closely with economic operators for many years and was in a continuous exchange of information with the Chemical Associations, which included, inter alia, scheduled and non-scheduled substances.

181. Hungary reported that its national competent authority collected information on ephedrine, acetic anhydride and potassium permanganate every two months from the operators and collected information on non-scheduled substances on a yearly basis.

182. Kyrgyzstan reported that the Service for Combating Drug Trafficking of the Ministry of Internal Affairs was preparing a draft plan for the implementation of a national warning system relating to the emergence of new synthetic drugs and new psychoactive substances.

183. Latvia reported that cooperation with the private sector was mainly defined in the Law on the Legal Trade of Narcotic and Psychotropic Substances and Medicinal Products, and also Precursors and other regulations that defined the procedure of reporting and notifying export/import.

184. Lithuania reported that since 2014, the Criminal Police Bureau had cooperated with chemical distribution companies operating in the country, which voluntarily provided information about the circulation of uncontrolled substances in the country.

185. Poland reported that the national legislation imposed on the private sector the obligation of cooperation in cases where there was a probability that the trade in certain chemicals from category 1 and 2 could be aimed at committing a drug offence.

186. Romania reported that national authorities were constantly cooperating with the private sector, including with a view to enhancing the regulation of substances, both controlled and non-controlled, which could be used for the illicit manufacture of drugs.

187. The Russian Federation reported that cooperation had been established with sellers of chemical products in the country, with a view to combating drug trafficking effectively.

188. Serbia reported that the Ministry of Health was in permanent contact with all legal entities engaged in the production and/or trade of psychoactive controlled substances and precursors through the submission of periodic and extraordinary reports upon request.

189. Slovakia reported that cooperation with the private sector to enhance the regulation of substances was under the competence of the Ministry of the Economy.

190. Spain reported that a voluntary cooperation agreement had been concluded with the private sector in relation to the reporting of suspicious transactions involving non-controlled substances that were included in special surveillance lists drawn up at the global and European levels.

191. Sweden reported on well-developed cooperation between the Police Authority, the Medical Product Agency and the customs authorities.

192. Tajikistan reported that in 2021, the Drug Control Agency had conducted workshops and training courses in those cities and districts of Tajikistan where relevant business entities operated, focusing on the national legislation with regard to drug trade.

193. Turkmenistan reported that the Ministry of the Interior of Turkmenistan issued licences for activities relating to the trade in controlled narcotic drugs, psychotropic substances and precursors.

#### **Recommendation (c)**

194. Governments were encouraged to consider enhancing the exchange of information and strengthening cooperation in conducting joint investigations and carrying out controlled deliveries in cases of trafficking in precursors.

195. Albania reported on close cooperation between the State police and the State Intelligence Service.

196. Belarus reported on close cooperation with foreign partners in combating drug trafficking.
197. Belgium reported that joint investigations were conducted through the involvement of Belgian law enforcement agencies in the EMPACT operational action plans.
198. Bulgaria reported that the Ministry of the Interior had significant experience in participating in joint investigations and carrying out controlled deliveries in close cooperation with the European law enforcement agencies.
199. Czechia reported that the Customs Administration cooperated in the exchange of information in the conduct of joint investigations and the implementation of controlled deliveries in cases of trade with precursors with other national entities and international organizations, as well as directly with individual countries.
200. Denmark reported that it could take part and also initiate joint investigations and controlled deliveries with other countries in the European Union.
201. Finland reported that with regard to occasional shipments under transit procedure, cooperation with the law enforcement authorities of the destination country would be initiated without a delay.
202. France reported that the lack of any provision for adversarial proceedings or guarantees of the right of defence in European Union instruments made it impossible to use mechanisms such as controlled delivery or the searching of premises and, consequently, ruled out any possibility of judicial cooperation among Member States.
203. Germany reported that several controlled deliveries of scheduled and/or non-scheduled substances either from Germany to the Netherlands or from Eastern European countries through Germany to the Netherlands had been carried out.
204. Hungary reported that the customs service used several platforms in the field of information sharing and enhancing cooperation, such as for example the module CIS+ (Customs Information System) within the Anti-Fraud Information System.
205. Ireland reported that the National Police Service regularly carried out, along with the Revenue Customs Agency, controlled deliveries of illegal drugs.
206. Kyrgyzstan reported that controlled deliveries were carried out as part of both bilateral and multilateral cooperation with international organizations.
207. Latvia reported that joint investigation teams had not been established in the reporting period; however, the State Medicine Agency, the customs authorities and the State police ensured information exchange on demand.
208. Lithuania reported that it participated in the Pre-Export Notification Online (PEN Online) system, the European Union forum of experts on drug precursor control and the Precursors Incident Communication System (PICS).
209. Poland reported that its law enforcement agencies were fully prepared to use controlled deliveries at the national and international levels.
210. Romania reported that national authorities were constantly exchanging data and conducting investigations on cases of trafficking in precursors and also conducting international controlled deliveries, when necessary.
211. The Russian Federation reported that information was exchanged regularly with the competent authorities of foreign States, notably on the margins of events held by SCO and CSTO.
212. Serbia reported that the Ministry of Health had no jurisdiction in conducting joint investigations and carrying out controlled deliveries in cases of trafficking of precursors.
213. Slovakia reported that cooperation was performed on the basis of European investigation orders received from other countries as well as of national needs.

214. Spain reported that exchange of information through Europol, INTERPOL and the relevant liaison officers, or on a bilateral basis, was being stepped up.

215. Sweden reported that with the support of Europol, the Police Authority had conducted several drug-related joint investigations and controlled deliveries, including with regard to precursor chemicals.

216. Tajikistan reported that the Drug Control Agency and the Customs Service used CENcomm, a secure communication platform, to exchange information and conduct joint operational activities, including operations to combat trafficking in chemical precursors.

217. Turkmenistan reported on the use of controlled deliveries as outlined by the national legislation.

**Issue 4. Ensuring holistic national responses through improved cooperation among domestic authorities, in particular, the law enforcement, health and justice sectors**

**Recommendation (a)**

218. Governments were encouraged to promote multisectoral collaboration in the development, implementation and evaluation of drug demand and supply reduction programmes and services, including through the establishment of national coordination mechanisms.

219. Albania reported on the work of the National Committee for the Coordination of the Fight against Drugs and the National Drug Data System Office.

220. Belarus reported on the adoption of an integrated action plan for 2021–2022 on the implementation of effective measures to counter drug trafficking, prevent drug use and strengthen the social rehabilitation of drug-dependent persons.

221. Belgium reported that it had set up a General Drugs Policy Cell that integrated all the competencies related to drugs at the federal and regional levels.

222. Bulgaria reported that the Ministry of the Interior was effectively cooperating with the National Focal Point on Drugs and Drug Addiction within the Ministry of Health.

223. Czechia reported that the Government Council for Drug Policy Coordination facilitated a platform for continuous communication among all entities involved in the implementation of the drug policy.

224. Denmark reported that the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Justice, the Ministry of Social Affairs, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Taxation maintained frequent informal contacts to coordinate efforts in implementing the drug policy.

225. Finland reported that the multisectoral national Drug Policy Coordinating Group was responsible for ensuring collaboration between different administrative sectors on drug policy.

226. France reported that the National Anti-Narcotics Plan provided for such collaboration.

227. Ireland reported that the National Police Service was currently engaged in a number of demand and harm reduction initiatives under the National Drug Strategy 2017–2025: Reducing Harm, Supporting Recovery.

228. Kyrgyzstan reported that the technical sectors of the State Coordinating Committee for the Control of Narcotic Drugs, Psychotropic Substances and Precursors held annual joint meetings to discuss issues relating to prevention, including among prisoners and young people.

229. Latvia reported that coordination with involved parties was ensured, when necessary, for the development and implementation of related programmes and services.

230. Lithuania reported that ensuring multisectoral cooperation among national stakeholders was key for the creation and implementation of national drug policies.

231. The Republic of Moldova reported on the work of the National Anti-Drug Commission acting as an interdepartmental body to coordinate the implementation of the drug policy.

232. Poland reported that the demand reduction work was performed by a number of public administration institutions as well as non-governmental organizations.

233. Romania reported on the work of the National Anti-Drug Agency established in 2002 to ensure multisectoral collaboration in the implementation of the drug policy.

234. The Russian Federation reported that the Ministry of the Interior, in collaboration with the Prosecutor-General's Office, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Education, developed and implemented additional measures to combat drug trafficking in educational entities and to prevent drug-related criminality among adolescents.

235. Serbia reported that the Ministry of Health promoted and established national coordination mechanisms and cooperated with the relevant United Nations agencies and European Union bodies.

236. Slovakia reported on cooperation among the Ministry of Health, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Family and the Ministry of Education in the prevention area.

237. Spain reported that the Government Delegation for the National Plan on Drugs drew up relevant addiction-related action plans under the National Strategy on Addictions 2017–2024.

238. Sweden reported that the Police Authority took active part in, and hosted, the joint government initiative against organized crime, which consisted of 12 national authorities working together to combat organized crime, including the illicit trade in drugs.

239. Tajikistan reported that the Drug Control Agency was the coordinating authority in the area of combating trafficking in narcotic drugs, psychotropic substances and their precursors.

240. Türkiye reported on the implementation of projects aimed at preventing the sale of drugs on the street and improving the reporting mechanism for drug-related crimes.

241. Turkmenistan reported that it was implementing a programme to counter drug trafficking and to provide assistance to persons with substance use disorder.

#### **Recommendation (b)**

242. Governments were encouraged to strengthen cooperation and effective coordination among national authorities, in particular in the health, education, social, justice and law enforcement sectors, in order to ensure that the specific needs of affected individuals are appropriately met.

243. Albania reported that the State police continuously cooperated with all other structures involved in addressing and countering the drug problem.

244. Belarus reported that its educational, health, social security and law enforcement authorities cooperated closely under the Integrated Action Plan.

245. Belgium reported under recommendation (a) on efforts relevant to recommendation (b).

246. Bulgaria reported that the Ministry of the Interior attached great importance to multiagency cooperation and ensured regular collaboration with other relevant agencies.
247. Czechia reported that the key policy document in the area was the National Strategy to Prevent and Reduce the Harm Associated with Addictive Behaviour 2019–2027.
248. Denmark reported that the police had strong cooperation with the Health Authority, the Medicines Agency and the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction.
249. Finland reported that the multisectoral Drug Policy Coordinating Group was responsible for ensuring collaboration between different administrative sectors on drug policy.
250. France reported that the Interministerial Mission for Combating Drugs and Addictive Behaviours was responsible for the implementation of the National Plan of Action against Addiction, which involved the health, education, social affairs, justice and law enforcement sectors.
251. Ireland reported that the National Police Service regularly engaged the public through various community and educational settings on the issue of controlled drugs.
252. Kyrgyzstan reported under recommendation (a) on efforts relevant to recommendation (b).
253. Latvia reported that the Coordinating Council for Drug Control and Drug Addiction Prevention gathered together all key institutions to ensure coordinated trend awareness and policy implementation.
254. Lithuania reported that the main legal act addressing alcohol, tobacco and drug prevention included almost 20 institutions from all relevant sectors, including health, education and others.
255. The Republic of Moldova reported on the adoption of the National Anti-Drug Strategy for 2020–2027 and the National Anti-Drug Action Plan for 2020–2021, which ensured cooperation among specialized institutions and non-commercial organizations in carrying out supply and demand reduction activities.
256. Poland reported that the Council for Counteracting Addictions under the Prime Minister’s office functioned as a coordination and advisory body for preventing and addressing drug addiction.
257. Romania reported that cooperation protocols had been signed by the Ministry of the Interior with the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Health, and the Ministry of Justice, which included concrete actions to support the beneficiaries of the joint drug prevention and integrated care projects.
258. The Russian Federation reported that additional measures had been implemented to detect and counter unlawful activities by rehabilitation centres providing services related to the social rehabilitation and reintegration of drug users.
259. Serbia reported that the Centre for Monitoring Drugs and Drug Addiction within the Ministry of Health collected, monitored, analysed, interpreted and reported data required for informed decisions of policymakers.
260. Slovakia reported under recommendation (a) on efforts relevant to recommendation (b).
261. Spain reported that regular and effective cooperation and coordination had been established among national authorities in all relevant sectors.
262. Sweden reported that the Operational Department at the Police Authority cooperated closely with the health, education, social, justice and law enforcement sectors in domains that concerned the drugs market and its impact on the society.

263. Tajikistan reported that the Drug Control Agency had prepared, in consultation with the relevant ministries and agencies, a revised directive of the Government on cooperation between ministries and agencies in combating drug trafficking and controlling the licit trade in drugs.

264. Türkiye reported on the work of the Hotline for Consultation and Support on Fight Against Drugs.

**Recommendation (c)**

265. Governments were encouraged to enhance effective coordination of investigations at the national and international levels, including through the centralization of information- and intelligence-sharing.

266. Albania reported that the national counter-narcotics structures had increased international cooperation in exchanging information with international organizations and liaison officers and in developing parallel operations and investigations with foreign authorities.

267. Azerbaijan reported that relevant information from INTERPOL, information on criminal convictions and data from the inter-agency computerized information retrieval system were used.

268. Belarus reported that criminal investigations were coordinated at the national and international levels by the investigative bodies and prosecutorial agencies.

269. Belgium reported that the Federal Police would support, together with the Federal Prosecutor's Office, the coordination of investigations, when necessary.

270. Bulgaria reported that the Ministry of the Interior was exchanging intelligence information with partner agencies on a daily basis.

271. Czechia reported that it cooperated with many police and judicial authorities of other States in the fight against serious organized drug crime, both nationally and internationally.

272. Denmark reported that it was sharing information with other countries through SIENA and, at the bilateral level, through the INTERPOL information exchange system.

273. Finland reported that the national model of criminal intelligence coordination among the police, customs authorities and border guard was regulated by legislation.

274. France reported that joint investigation teams set up together with several European countries were particularly suitable for addressing cross-border crime and terrorism.

275. Germany reported that international investigations were coordinated by the Customs Investigation Bureau and Europol and Eurojust.

276. Hungary reported under issue 3, recommendation (c), on efforts relevant to issue 4, recommendation (c).

277. Ireland reported that the National Police Service continued to collaborate with partners at the national and international levels in the implementation of relevant operations.

278. Kyrgyzstan reported that an analysis centre had been established as part of the Service for Combating Drug Trafficking of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, in order to coordinate efforts to combat drug trafficking.

279. Latvia reported that its law enforcement agencies took part in all relevant international cooperation related to intelligence-sharing.

280. Lithuania reported that the Criminal Police Bureau had been designated as a coordinating authority to counter trafficking in illicit drugs and psychotropic substances at the national and international levels.

281. The Republic of Moldova reported that regional counter-narcotics sections had been created within the North, Central and South Directorates of the National Inspectorate of Investigations.
282. Poland reported that it used the SIENA system on a daily basis.
283. Romania reported that its authorities were constantly coordinating investigations at the national level and cooperating with other Member States, if necessary, in order to identify and investigate organized crime groups operating at the international level.
284. Serbia reported that the Ministry of Health had no jurisdiction with regard to the matter, but was ready to take part in all related matters, as appropriate.
285. Slovakia reported that the Ministry of the Interior was preparing an Internal Regulation Act on information- and intelligence-sharing.
286. Spain reported that police forces made intensive use of multilateral platforms for international police cooperation to coordinate operations effectively.
287. Sweden reported the Police Authority had a well-developed system for sharing intelligence among the different levels of the organization with a view to initiating criminal investigations.
288. Tajikistan reported that a legal framework for joint investigations and the coordination of criminal investigations was in place.
289. Türkiye reported that a Division of Analysis had been established within the Police Counter Narcotics Department, with a view to, inter alia, ensuring that criminal investigations were carried out more rapidly, objectively and effectively.
290. Turkmenistan reported that it had planned activities in the period 2021–2025 to, inter alia, foster cooperation in strengthening national legislation on drug trafficking and expand cooperation with the European Union, UNODC, WHO and other entities.

#### **Recommendation (d)**

291. Governments were encouraged to regularly update the directory of competent national authorities, in line with the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988.
292. Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechia, Finland, France, Hungary, Ireland, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Romania, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, Spain and Tajikistan reported that the respective directory of competent national authorities had been updated.
293. Denmark reported that it had not been possible to obtain information on the recommendation within the deadline of the questionnaire.
294. Poland reported that it was a part of all international drug control conventions and an active counterpart in collaboration among judicial and law enforcement authorities at the regional, subregional, multilateral and bilateral levels.
295. Serbia reported that the Ministry of Health was ready to take part in all related matters, as appropriate.
296. Sweden reported that the Police Authority, the Tax Agency, the Economic Crime Authority, the Coast Guard and the customs authorities were appointed as the national crime combating authorities
297. Turkmenistan reported that the competent national authorities were specified in the Act on Narcotic Drugs, Psychotropic Substances and Precursors and Prevention of Their Trafficking, of 2017.

### **III. Conclusions**

298. The overview contained in the present report reflects the situation in 26 Member States. To provide the Meeting with more complete information, all Governments should be encouraged to complete and return the questionnaire.

299. The quality and detail of the responses to the questionnaire show that Governments have taken effective measures to implement the recommendations adopted by the Thirteenth 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.

---