



EMCDDA PAPERS

Drug squads: units specialised in drug law enforcement in Europe

Contents: Key findings (p. 2) | Introduction (p. 3) | Background, objectives and methods (p. 6) | Key figures and institutional affiliations (p. 9) | Mandates and supervision (p. 21) | Conclusions (p. 32) | References (p. 34) | Annex (p. 35)

Abstract: Drug law enforcement is likely to be the intervention that contributes the most to reducing the supply of drugs in Europe. Important statistical datasets on drug seizures and drug law offences are the result of drug law enforcement activity, yet little is known about how drug law enforcement is organised in Europe. Based on a survey of specialised units, or drug squads, in 26 countries, this report provides for the first time essential facts about drug law enforcement in Europe. Data on the number of staff, institutional affiliations, mandates and functions of the more than 1 000 drug squads operating in Europe and their approximately 17 000 officers are presented and put into perspective, and knowledge gaps are identified. This report thus provides an evidence base against which to monitor future changes, while offering insights that will help in the contextualisation of essential datasets. Thus, it will be of interest to policymakers, but also to the scientific community, the public at large and those working in law enforcement in Europe and beyond.

Keywords illicit drugs
drug supply reduction key indicator
drug law enforcement police
customs drug markets

Recommended citation: European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (2013), *Drug squads: units specialised in drug law enforcement in Europe*, EMCDDA Papers, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg

Key findings

This report provides the first European overview of units specialising in drug law enforcement, a key intervention in reducing drug supply. As such, it may be viewed as a monitoring baseline against which future changes can be compared.

About 1 100 specialised drug law enforcement units exist in the 26 European countries participating in the project.

At the time of the survey, September 2012, the staff of drug law enforcement units in Europe amounted to about 19 000, 90 % of whom were law enforcement officers (17 000).

Drug law enforcement units represent about 1 %, on average, of all police staff in Europe, though proportions vary from 0.1 % to 3.5 % in the 23 countries providing information.

Political decisions regarding drug law enforcement in Europe are made primarily by the interior ministries (in charge of police and gendarmerie-like forces), which have responsibilities over drug squads in 24 of the 26 of participating countries.

Ministries of justice have direct responsibility over specialised drug squads in seven countries.

Ministries of finance and trade, which are mentioned by 14 countries, also play a significant role, mainly through the involvement of customs services.

However, justice ministries play a central role in the provision of supervision of drug law enforcement. Indeed, drug law enforcement activities in Europe are overwhelmingly supervised by justice system officials, especially prosecutors, while in a handful of countries other authorities carry out this function.

More detailed information is needed on the roles of customs and justice system officials, including prosecutors, in drug law enforcement in Europe.

As in other areas of policing, drug law enforcement is embedded within the overall system of checks and balances characteristic of democratic states ruled by law. However, because it can make use of intrusive techniques (such as wiretaps and undercover measures), drug law enforcement may require closer supervision than other policing activities.

Most specialised drug law enforcement units in Europe are established within the police, specifically the judicial or criminal police, where almost all countries have established drug squads. However, in most countries, drug squads are also established in other police organisations and other law enforcement organisations such as customs and gendarmerie-like forces.

The distribution of drug squads across the different types of law enforcement organisations is one of extreme diversity, with a wide range of different national combinations existing in Europe.

By contrast, two organisational models dominate the European landscape for implementing drug law enforcement: *dedicated* units, which focus exclusively on drugs and exist in 21 countries; and *serious and organised crime-related* units, which are reported in 18 countries. The two types of organisations coexist in 11 countries.

In two-thirds of the participating countries, there are no formally established units where police and customs organisations cooperate on drug issues.

Nearly all participating countries report that drug law enforcement includes an intelligence-gathering function, mostly performed by drug squads, but in some countries also by drug intelligence units. The management of the drug law enforcement intelligence function in Europe should be analysed in connection with the ongoing development of intelligence-led policing at national and European level.

In most countries, drug squads with a comprehensive technical mandate operate alongside units with specific technical mandates. Thus, for instance, in several countries, units mandated to address all types of drug law offences work alongside squads specialised in combating illicit synthetic drug production.

In a majority of countries, most drug squads operate under a local or regional territorial mandate, while a national mandate is assigned to a central drug squad.

In Europe, it appears that the preferred approach is to give a concrete drug law enforcement response at local levels. This implies that, even if the drug phenomenon has a transnational dimension, the perception is that it requires a local response.

Introduction

This report presents the main results of an EMCDDA study carried out in 2012 on drug law enforcement in Europe. Based on the study, it is now possible to provide, for the first time, an overview of the specialised units that work to reduce the supply of drugs in countries across Europe.

These specialised organisations, or drug squads, as they will be referred to in this report, in addition to enforcing drug laws and carrying out measures aimed at reducing drug supply, are the main sources of the information that is used to analyse the European drugs market. Understanding the key datasets produced largely by these units, such as drug seizures and reported drug supply offences, will be contingent on developing a reliable description of Europe's drug squads and how they fit into and operate with the drug law enforcement landscape.

Although statistics resulting from the activities of drug squads are not touched upon in the study reported here, establishing the context within which these organisations operate is a necessary step towards being able to interpret the data they produce on drug supply and the drugs market.

The study had two main objectives. The first was to provide an overview of the numbers, institutional affiliations and mandates of the specialised drug units operating in the EU Member States, Turkey and Norway. This exercise is necessary for the development of a European key indicator on drug supply reduction, since it provides a baseline against which future developments can be measured. In addition, it will provide insights that will help in the contextualisation of essential elements of the key indicators on drug markets and drug-related crime datasets, such as statistics on drug seizures and reported drug law offences. Secondly, as the EMCDDA's first attempt at collecting information about sensitive drug law enforcement organisations, the study is an important learning exercise on how to build trust and establish a partnership with key European law enforcement experts, a precondition for sustainable and methodologically sound monitoring activities in this field. In this sense, the study can be viewed as an investment for the future. The voluntary and often enthusiastic participation of law enforcement organisations from 26 countries in this project is ample evidence that these objectives are relevant to the practical needs of professionals in the field.

It is not really a surprise that the European drug law enforcement landscape emerging from the study is diverse and complex. Indeed, this was hypothesised at the beginning of the study and the questionnaire sent to the national respondents was designed with this diversity in mind. Drug law enforcement, even at national or local level, is a complex activity, the analysis of which must consider a wide range of

factors including legal traditions, geographical settings (for instance, in relation to drug producer regions) and the fact that drug law offences are consensual crimes, which means that law enforcement organisations need to work proactively and selectively.

This report is published in the scope of the EMCDDA's mission to provide factual, objective, reliable and comparable data on all aspects of the drug problem and, more specifically, under its mandate to provide an evidence base for policymakers in the area of drug supply and supply reduction. In addition to policymakers, this report may also be of interest to the scientific community, the public at large and law enforcement professionals, without whose enthusiasm, patience and commitment this project would not have been possible.

Institutional and political context

The EMCDDA has been collecting datasets pertaining to the supply side of the drug problem since its inception in 1995. Initially, and for many years, these data were viewed merely as providing context for the epidemiological key indicators covering drug consumption and its consequences. In recent years, however, a combination of initiatives in the drugs and security fields at European level has highlighted the importance of drug supply issues and the need for them to become a distinct area for monitoring. The present report is a direct result of these initiatives.

The recently expired EU Drugs Strategy (2005–12) (Council of the European Union, 2004), and its two action plans, created the initial momentum, as it confirmed that all EU Member States subscribe to the same set of basic principles, namely that there should be a balanced approach to drug policy, whereby equal importance is given to actions aiming to reduce the supply of drugs and those aiming to reduce the demand for drugs. Whereas the evaluation of the Drugs Action Plan 2005–08 (Council of the European Union, 2005a) pointed to 'a persistent lack of reliable data on drug supply', the following Action Plan (2009–12) (Council of the European Union, 2008) asked the European Commission, the EMCDDA and Europol to 'develop key-indicators for the collection of policy-relevant data on drug-related crime, illegal cultivation, drug markets and supply reduction interventions and to develop a strategy to collect them'. In this context, a number of activities were implemented, including two EU conferences on drug supply indicators (in 2010 and 2012) and three expert meetings (all in 2011). This resulted in the definition of three composite key indicators covering drug supply reduction, drug markets and drug-related crime. Each of these proposed indicators is made up of a number of datasets and analytical tools, which will be further defined in consultation with the Member States under the new Drugs Action Plan 2013–16 (Council of the European Union, 2013) within the EU Drugs Strategy 2013–20 (Council

of the European Union, 2012a). Although the study on drug squads in Europe is an important component of the key indicator on supply reduction, it will also make an important contribution to the other two drug supply key indicators (see below).

An equally important impetus resulted from the Treaty of Lisbon, which entered into force in 2009 (Council of the European Union, 2012b). The Lisbon Treaty continued to develop an area of freedom, security and justice in Europe. In view of the different legal systems and traditions of the various EU Member States, the Treaty highlights a need 'for coordination and cooperation between police and judicial authorities and other competent authorities', and consequently the setting up of 'a standing committee [...] within the Council in order to ensure that operational cooperation on internal security is promoted and strengthened within the Union' (Art. 67) (Council of the European Union, 2012b). The Standing Committee on Operational Cooperation on Internal Security (COSI) was established by the Council in early 2010, and launched the new EU policy cycle 2012–13 on internal security. A number of drug issues were identified as a threat to the internal security of the European Union and were the subject of several priorities under the policy cycle and related operational action plans ⁽¹⁾. This is likely to have an impact on both operational and organisational aspects of drug law enforcement in the EU Member States for years to come. The present study, which describes the situation of European drug law enforcement in mid-2012, will provide a useful baseline against which to monitor future developments in this field.

Following on from the Lisbon Treaty, the Stockholm Programme of the European Council (2010), which sets out the European Union's priorities for the area of justice, freedom and security for the period 2010–14, proclaims an 'open and secure Europe serving and protecting citizens' against threats such as 'serious and organised crime' including 'illicit drug trafficking'. In order to achieve this goal, the Programme sets six political priorities and puts forward nine 'tools'. Particular emphasis is put on achieving a 'European dimension' in the training of law enforcement and justice system professionals, while 'mutual trust between authorities and services in the different Member States' is considered as the basis for efficient cooperation. The European overview presented here of specialised law enforcement on drugs will be helpful for training purposes. For instance, the study has provided input for the European Police College (Cepol) training needs. This report will also facilitate the building of trust between the different professionals involved by improving mutual understanding of existing national instruments and

organisational arrangements. This is especially useful since the Programme calls for the identification of appropriate responses to security issues at European level. The prime objective of law enforcement cooperation in the European Union is to combat forms of crime that contain a cross-border dimension, which is often the case for drug supply. Finally, the Stockholm Programme invites the EMCDDA together with the European Commission and Europol to evaluate the EU Drugs Strategy for 2005–12 (see above) and this requires the collection of reliable data on drug law enforcement in Europe.

Drug supply reduction and drug law enforcement

Drug supply reduction is a broad, diverse and complex field where law enforcement plays a central role. However, drug law enforcement is a multifaceted activity involving many actors, organisations, methods and practices, and not all drug law enforcement is geared towards reducing drug supply. For instance, arresting drug users is a law enforcement activity but not necessarily a supply reduction activity. There is, therefore, a need to identify those law enforcement activities and institutions that contribute to reducing the supply of drugs in Europe.

It is likely that the bulk of drug law enforcement carried out by generalist policing organisations is focused on drug users, and therefore cannot be counted as drug supply reduction. However, an unknown proportion of this activity may be contributing to drug supply reduction. In contrast, across Europe, units specialising in enforcing the legislation on drugs possibly carry out most drug supply reduction activities. The nature and intensity of the efforts of the units may vary, depending on national legislation and its implementation, as well as on the resources and priorities of the institutions involved. Nevertheless, it may be assumed that a substantial proportion of the effort of these units is spent on disrupting the intermediary and wholesale levels of the drug supply chain, which contributes to reducing the supply of drugs.

For these reasons, a mapping exercise on drug squads is an appropriate first step in exploring the supply reduction landscape in Europe. It is also a prerequisite for the development of the drug supply reduction key indicator.

Drug law enforcement: consensual crime and priority setting

To understand drug law enforcement, it is necessary to consider the two key concepts of consensual crime and priority setting, which between them define the very nature of drug law enforcement. The following paragraphs attempt to explain in some detail how the nature of the crime and the need for setting response priorities combine to make drug law

⁽¹⁾ The priorities of the policy cycle are informed by Europol's Serious and Organised Crime Threat Assessment (SOCTA) based on data from the EU Member States and EU agencies.

enforcement a specific type of policing activity. Indeed, drug law enforcement, like all law enforcement activities dealing with other types of consensual crime — such as illegal immigration, illegal gambling and illegal prostitution — is characterised by a combination of proactive detection strategies and a structural uncertainty about the true extent of the crime.

For many types of crime, the offences committed mostly come to the attention of law enforcement institutions as a result of reports by the public. The proportion of committed offences that is reported varies between crimes, with, for example, most car thefts being reported whereas only a small proportion of sexual offences are (Feltes, 2009; van Dijk et al., 2006). These types of crimes, however, are often reported by the victim. Offences against drug laws, in contrast, usually take place in secret between consenting individuals — ‘consensual crime’ — or, in the case of drug consumption, can be regarded as victimless. Such offences will sometimes be discovered by chance (e.g. during a foot patrol) but, for the most part, detection of drug law offences is the result of proactive policing — initiatives undertaken by drug law enforcement institutions. It is inevitable that the police are unaware of a large number of drug law offences that are committed (‘chiffre noir’ or ‘dark figure’), and are by necessity selective in the types of drug offences they target and the drug-related activities that they attempt to stop (EMCDDA, 2009a, 2012).

The selection of the criminal activities that will be targeted is the result of a management process by which objectives are set for drug law enforcement organisations. This is commonly referred to as priority setting, and may be divided into ‘strategic’ priority setting and ‘operational’ priority setting, although the distinction may not always be clear.

Strategic priority setting first involves selecting a number of top-level priority targets for law enforcement, for instance drugs or one specific illicit drug. Here, drugs are, so to speak, in competition with other threats, such as terrorism, organised crime and illegal immigration, for selection as an area deserving of more law enforcement attention and resources than others. Secondly, this decision must be translated into

organisational terms, i.e. by selecting the organisations in charge of implementing the priority, or by setting up new organisational arrangements (e.g. creating a special police or customs unit or merging existing units). In addition, one or more territorial mandates are ascribed to the designated organisations. The third step is to allocate the resources available to implement the priorities selected. These are not only financial, but also include human resources (a number of police officers or of man hours), logistics (e.g. cars, surveillance technology, drug test kits) and legal resources (which may be ad hoc, to authorise specific activities, or more generic).

Operational priority setting is a translation of strategic decisions into actions performed by the organisations tasked with implementing the priorities, for instance a drug squad. It involves selecting specific targets for investigation, often in cooperation with the prosecutor or similar official, and allocating specific human, financial and logistical resources to perform the investigations (EMCDDA, 2012).

Law enforcement data, such as statistics on drug seizures, are an important tool in priority setting, especially in decisions regarding resource allocation. However, another important input in priority setting is the operational knowledge of drug law enforcement officers, which is based on experience, is implicit and is rarely recorded in databases. This type of knowledge, which may be referred to as ‘investigative experience’, is an essential component of police work. It plays a key role, especially in operational priority setting, which is usually embedded into the overall strategic priorities but relies on a combination of factors including daily organisational challenges and issues, available information on the crime situation and individual emphasis. The selection of operational priorities will have an important impact on the aggregated data that will eventually be made public, which will also affect the setting of priorities in the future (Stock and Kreuzer, 1998).

This report explores the areas that both frame and result from strategic priority setting for drug law enforcement in Europe, although fully understanding the European drug law enforcement landscape would also require exploring operational priority-setting areas.

Background, objectives and methods

Background and objectives of the study

The study reported here was designed on the basis of an internal EMCDDA report that laid out the conceptual framework for monitoring drug supply issues and drug supply reduction interventions in Europe (EMCDDA, 2009b). That report was intended to map the activities necessary to implement the EU Drugs Action Plan 2009–12, which called upon the EMCDDA and others to establish key indicators in the field of drug supply and drug supply reduction, especially in view of a lack of reliable data on drug supply issues (Council of the European Union, 2008).

The EMCDDA study on drug squads was intended as the first step towards the establishment of a typology that would improve our understanding of drug supply reduction activities, thereby helping to fill the information gap identified by the evaluators.

The typology should describe and help analyse the activities that are implemented to reduce drug supply. Concretely, it should explain *what* activities are implemented, *how*, by *whom* and *where*, and be tested against reality. Because gathering the information and developing a definitive typology of drug supply reduction activities is a huge task that will probably take many years and many resources, it was decided that this initial study — an exercise that had never been done before at the EMCDDA or elsewhere — would focus on the *who* by surveying specialised drug law enforcement units in Europe. In doing so, the study would also explore, to a certain extent, the *where*.

The rationale of its focus on *specialised European drug law enforcement units, or drug squads*, is as follows. In the absence of both a universally accepted definition of drug supply reduction and an official list of the organisations that contribute to reduce drug supply, the EMCDDA assumed that law enforcement was a key contributor to reducing the supply of drugs in Europe. However, it was also assumed that not all drug law enforcement activities contributed to drug supply. For instance, arrests for drug use or possession for use, which account for the majority of the drug law offences reported to the EMCDDA every year, reflect law enforcement activity, but probably do not contribute to reducing drug supply. The focus of the study was further narrowed by excluding law enforcement actors that are likely to contribute to supply reduction in Europe. Among these are foreign law enforcement organisations active in the region, such as the US Drug Enforcement Administration, European officers

posted abroad (liaison officers), foreign law enforcement organisations fighting drugs in their own countries (e.g. Moroccan or Venezuelan police forces) and European and international law enforcement organisations, for example Europol, Interpol and the World Customs Organization.

A questionnaire was designed to explore five main areas, covering the existence of drug squads, their organisational affiliations, their mandates, both legal and operational, and their staffing levels (see Annex). Two main difficulties were anticipated when designing the questionnaire. The first was how to phrase questions in a way that would be adapted to all national situations so that the survey would capture as much of the diversity of the European drug law enforcement landscape as possible. Secondly, there were worries that certain types of information might be seen as confidential by the respondents, and questions on these topics could have a negative effect on participation in the survey. Because of this consideration, some questions were not asked in the questionnaire. For instance, while a question about staffing levels of drug squads was included in the questionnaire, no budgetary information was requested. These doubts and difficulties were not all solved when the questionnaire was tested with three EU countries.

This serves as a reminder that the questionnaire was not only a tool to gather information, but, as the EMCDDA's first attempt at collecting data from and about sensitive policing institutions, the study was also an important learning exercise on how to build trust and establish a working relationship with a network of crucial national law enforcement partners. The project may therefore be viewed as laying some of the groundwork for the future of monitoring activities in the field of drug supply reduction at the EMCDDA, and one that will also prove useful in the fields of drug markets and drug-related crime.

Methods

The methodology for this study was designed to collect information in a sequential and logical manner. It allowed a broad scope for learning about drug squads from a range of European countries, as well as having a clear focus on how information about the organisational, operational and coordinating structures of drug law enforcement forces could inform the development of drug supply and supply reduction indicators in Europe.

In order to obtain insights into drug squads in Europe, we conducted several data collection processes. These are summarised in Table 1 and described in detail below.

TABLE 1
Summary of data collection processes

Step in data collection and analysis	Description
Development of the survey questionnaire	13 questions in five areas
	Reference to key documents
	Initial version piloted in three EU Member States
E-mail survey	National reference persons for 30 countries identified through the Reitox network of national focal points
	30 national reference persons invited to answer the questionnaire; 26 countries provided information
National reference person interviews	More than 300 informal interviews with national reference persons
Document review	Targeted review of organisational charts and publicly accessible resources
	29 organisational charts from 18 countries provided and examined
Expert meeting	Preliminary project analysis presented and discussed
	19 participants

Two main steps were involved in the development of the questionnaire. First, the key areas of study interest and initial questionnaire items were outlined. The main study areas were based on discussions with the project team members and other relevant individuals representing drug law enforcement and criminal justice expertise. From these discussions, and with reference to the relevant literature, an English-language questionnaire was developed that consisted of 13 questions in five areas.

Secondly, a pilot study was carried out, in which four drug law enforcement organisations (a mix of police and customs) from three different countries (Germany, France and Portugal) participated. A senior drug law enforcement officer from each agency took part in a one-to-one semi-structured interview, which was intended to:

1. determine the comprehensibility of the questions and the accuracy of the interpretation of key terms and definitions used in the survey questions;
2. determine the quality of the data collected with the survey questions — that is, to estimate the validity and reliability of the data;
3. establish the acceptability of the survey questionnaire for use in the collection of national data on drug squads in EU Member States.

All interviews followed a protocol developed by the project team. This initial test led to modifications being made to the terms and definitions used in the survey questionnaire. The final survey included questions on the availability, human resources, institutional affiliation and mandates of specialised drug units in each country (see Annex).

Following the pilot testing of the survey questionnaire, the project team sought to obtain a Europe-wide overview of specialised drugs units through an email survey. As a first step, the heads of the 30 Reitox national focal points were each requested to nominate a national reference person for

the project. The necessary qualifications for the position of national reference person included being institutionally suitably placed and being mandated to provide access to national data on behalf of all drug squads in their country. All 30 Reitox national focal points nominated a reference person, who were then formally contacted by the EMCDDA and were provided additional information about the project and its timescale. It was also made clear to the countries that participation in the study was voluntary.

In July 2011, the survey questionnaire was sent by email to the network of national reference persons. Correspondents from 26 of the 30 countries returned completed questionnaires during the following four months. Typically, participating reference persons occupied senior posts at central law enforcement organisations.

The responses to the survey questions form the backbone of the study in that they provided indications of the number of specialised drug units and their place in the general organisation of law enforcement bodies, as well as the legal, strategic and technical mandates of these units and their staffing patterns.

Based on the survey findings, areas were identified where further investigations could produce a more detailed understanding of the organisational aspects of Europe's specialised drug units. To this end, further information was collected using three approaches: interviews with reference persons; document review; and a two-day expert meeting with a number of reference persons.

As a complementary measure to the email survey, the national reference persons were contacted by telephone. An initial follow-up phone call was made to each of the reference persons immediately after the launch of the email survey questionnaire to resolve any practical issues relating to the completion and return of the survey questionnaire as well as to provide clarifications around issues such as confidentiality

and safe storage and handling of data generated through the project.

A further round of interviews was conducted with the 26 responding reference persons between September 2011 and July 2012. These interviews provided background information to the core data sourced through the survey, they informed a number of sections in the report and they helped identify possible areas for exploration.

These interviews were carried out in order to clarify and add to the information obtained in the survey, particularly regarding priority setting for Europe's drug squads and the relations between these bodies and other national agencies in the same country. Also covered in the interviews were the cultural perspectives on the occupation, the organisation and the policing of drugs. The interviews were organised around the principle of conducting a 'grand tour' of the subject matter, whereby national reference persons were guided towards a small number of destinations, but were encouraged to range freely across related issues in their responses to questions (Undheim, 2003).

Beyond exploring key topics and themes, the interviews conducted during the project fostered trust between the EMCDDA and drug law enforcement organisations laying the basis for future work.

Alongside conducting interviews with national reference persons, a document review of available organisational charts of the reported drug squads was carried out, supplemented by a review of a wide range of publicly accessible resources. The

organisational charts, typically of a non-confidential nature, were requested ad hoc from each reference person. In total, 29 organisational charts from 18 countries were examined for additional information about the structure and staff composition of the target units.

Furthermore, an expert meeting was held on 19–20 April 2012 in Lisbon, with the participation of members of the network of European drug law enforcement officers and experts from Ceuol (European Police College), the EMCDDA, Europol and MAOC-N (Maritime Analysis and Operations Centre — Narcotics). The purpose of the seminar was to explore the study's preliminary findings, and its outcome has informed various sections of the present report. For instance, brief descriptions of specific features of the approach taken to drug law enforcement in various countries, which were presented by national reference persons, are published as text boxes in the present report.

Preliminary results of the study were shared with more than 40 European law enforcement officers at meetings held in the framework of Ceuol's Exchange Programme, which took place in Lisbon in July 2012 and April 2013. The possible inclusion in the study results of complementary information gathered at these events was then discussed bilaterally with the national reference persons.

A draft report was prepared in the first half of 2013, and sent to all national reference persons for review and comments. A total of eight countries provided comments, most of which were integrated into the final report.

Key figures and institutional affiliations


This section presents key figures on the distribution, number and staffing of specialised drug law enforcement units in Europe, and analyses the institutional frameworks within which these units exist and function across Europe. Institutional affiliations of drug squads are described along two dimensions: (i) governmental institutions and (ii) reporting drug law enforcement authorities.

Participating countries

Twenty-six European countries took part in the project by returning a completed questionnaire and providing additional comments and details on their drug law enforcement structures and functions (Figure 1). Non-participating countries either failed to provide data (Greece, Croatia, Sweden) or, in the case of Belgium, provided information that could not be analysed within the framework of this project⁽²⁾.

Of the 26 countries providing information on the number of drug squads that existed in their territory, 17 reported precise figures and the remainder provided estimates. It should be emphasised that the resulting image is a

FIGURE 1
Countries participating in the study



⁽²⁾ In May 2013, Belgium reported 41 specialised drug law enforcement units with different territorial mandates. About 500 people worked in these units; almost all were police officers.

‘snapshot’, taken in September 2012, of a situation that is likely to change in the future given the ongoing reorganisation of national police forces in Europe, especially as regards drug law enforcement.

Before going on to present the results on the numbers and institutional affiliations of European drug squads, three preliminary remarks should be made. First, in the absence of a generally accepted definition, for the purpose of this project, a specialised drug law enforcement unit, or drug squad, was defined as follows:

‘A formally established official, state or governmental, law enforcement agency or sub-division thereof (such as, department, section, unit), the only or main mission of which is to detect and investigate breaches to the drug legislation and to bring the offenders to justice.’⁽³⁾

In addition, the questionnaire specified that these units could have an operational role, be specialised in intelligence or combine the two functions. The jurisdiction of the units could be local, regional, national or ‘international’. It also stressed that, although most such drug squads were likely to belong to police or customs services, drug squads potentially existing in other organisations such as intelligence or military organisations (e.g. gendarmerie, Guardia Civil, border guards) should also be counted and reported.

Secondly, the decisions on what units in each country should be counted and reported as drug squads were taken by the national reference persons. For example, Latvia, the Netherlands and Norway initially reported that there were no specifically mandated drug squads in their countries, but that drug law enforcement was implemented by other units (mostly serious and organised crime units). However, after broadening their interpretation framework to include the law enforcement units that work mainly on enforcing drug laws in these countries, the reference persons from the three countries eventually reported information on these units. This more inclusive approach had already been adopted by other countries, such as Bulgaria, Romania and Finland, without previous discussion with the EMCDDA.

Finally, 23 national reference persons provided exact or estimated numbers of drug law enforcement personnel and drug law enforcement officers in their country, based on a broad definition developed by the EMCDDA for the purpose of the study⁽⁴⁾.

⁽³⁾ The definition of drug squad was initially drafted by the EMCDDA, reviewed during pilot test interviews with selected national reference persons and eventually included in the survey questionnaire.

⁽⁴⁾ The definition of ‘law enforcement officer’ was initially drafted by the EMCDDA, reviewed during pilot test interviews with selected national reference persons and eventually included in the survey questionnaire.

Under this definition:

“Law enforcement officers” are officials who are permitted to arrest individuals, make seizures, conduct investigations and so on.’

The definition was intentionally broad to allow for the expected diversity in the actual attributions and powers granted to law enforcement officers in the 30 European countries invited to take part in the project. Since the majority of the national reference persons were law enforcement officers, it was deemed safe to rely mainly on their understanding of who should be counted among their peers and who should not. In addition, the national reference persons were encouraged to provide their own or other existing estimates in cases where exact numbers were not available.

Number of drug law enforcement units

All 26 participating countries reported the existence of drug squads within their law enforcement structures.

In September 2012, 1 145 drug law enforcement units were reported under the project ⁽⁵⁾. This number includes 15 multi-agency drug law enforcement (MDLE) units ⁽⁶⁾.

The number of drug squads reported by the participating countries ranged from 1 (Denmark, Cyprus, Malta) to 301 (Poland) (Table 2). Clearly, the number of drug squads in a country is not a direct consequence of its size or population. The numbers reported here are likely to reflect differences in a range of factors, including the interpretation of the definition of drug squads and national characteristics in political structure, the criminal justice system, legislation and drug policy.

TABLE 2

Number of drug law enforcement units per country

Country	Drug law enforcement units
Bulgaria	32
Czech Republic	2
Denmark	1
Germany	250
Estonia	6
Ireland	29
Spain	118
France	99
Italy	41
Cyprus	1
Latvia	3
Lithuania	12
Luxembourg	8
Hungary	2
Malta	1
Netherlands	5
Austria	10
Poland	301
Portugal	53
Romania	44
Slovenia	13
Slovakia	2
Finland	26
United Kingdom	54
Turkey	4
Norway	28
Total	1 145

⁽⁵⁾ Belgium reported 41 specialised drug law enforcement units, while Hungary and Slovakia each reported disbanding one drug squad in 2013. As a result, the total number of drug squads reported to the project in June 2013 is 1 184.

⁽⁶⁾ Not all the MDLE units reported under the project were considered when counting the total number of drug squads in Europe. Only the 15 ‘discrete’ MDLE units reported were taken into account (a total of 40 MDLE units were identified in Europe; see the subsection ‘Multi-agency drug law enforcement units’). An MDLE unit is considered ‘discrete’ if at least one of its participating agencies is not counted already as a drug squad. So for example, in Germany, only 1 of the 30 reported MDLE units was counted as a discrete unit, since the other 29 units were already counted as police or customs drug squads.

Drug law enforcement personnel in Europe

Information on staffing levels in the national drug squads was provided by 23 of the countries. Based on this information, it can be estimated that, in September 2012, drug squads in Europe had a combined staff of about 19 000 people. The majority of the staff, about 17 200, were law enforcement officers, while the remaining were administrative and technical staff, intelligence analysts or other staff (Table 3).

TABLE 3
Staff assigned to specialised drug law enforcement units in European countries

Country	Officers	All staff
Bulgaria	50	60
Czech Republic	210	236
Germany ⁽¹⁾	2 800	3 000
Estonia	100	100
Ireland	390	416
Spain ⁽¹⁾	3 350	3 900
France ⁽¹⁾	2 600	3 500 (3 000–4 000)
Italy ⁽¹⁾	500 (200–800)	500 (200–800)
Cyprus	179	179
Latvia	67	67
Lithuania ⁽¹⁾	100	100
Luxembourg	40	44
Hungary	80	80
Malta	47	47
Netherlands ⁽¹⁾	175 (150–200)	175 (150–200)
Austria ⁽¹⁾	350	350
Poland ⁽¹⁾	1 150	1 150
Portugal	589	589
Romania ⁽¹⁾	330	330
Slovenia ⁽¹⁾	70	80
Slovakia	85	85
Finland	210	250
Turkey ⁽¹⁾	3 750 (3 500–4 000)	3 750 (3 500–4 000)
Total ^(1,2)	17 222	18 988

⁽¹⁾ The reported figure is an estimate.

⁽²⁾ In the case of an estimated range, the mid-point was taken for calculating the general total.

Although almost 90 % of the reporting countries provided information on drug law enforcement staff numbers, the figures remain tentative owing to gaps in the available information. One of these concerns the United Kingdom, a country with a large population and presumably large numbers of drug law enforcement staff. Were data available for the United Kingdom, they would be expected to raise considerably the estimated number of drug law enforcement staff in Europe. Furthermore, the European total should also be read with the caveat that approximately half of the 23 responding countries provided estimates rather than true counts.


That said, the estimated number of drug squad staff in Europe is a key piece of information elicited by the project. This approximation is the first of its kind and, despite the limitations described above, is important in a number of ways.

Firstly, when compared with the total number of staff employed in national police forces, it gives an indication of the importance given to specialised drug law enforcement in Europe ⁽⁷⁾. For the 23 countries for which data are available, drug law enforcement officers represent between 0.2 % (Bulgaria, Italy and Hungary) and 3.3 % (Cyprus) of the total police forces. Overall, a weighted European average shows that about 1 % of all police staff in Europe are drug law enforcement officers (Figure 2). It appears that the police forces with the largest proportions of drug law enforcement officers tend to be found in territorially small or sparsely populated countries.

⁽⁷⁾ For the purpose of this calculation, data on the size of police forces are sourced from Eurostat (2013). It should be noted that the Eurostat dataset on the total number of police officers in the 23 countries reporting information is from 2009 (latest data available), while the data on drug law enforcement officers gathered by the EMCDDA are from 2012. However, an exploration of the data collected by Eurostat since 2000 shows that in the period 2000–09 there have not been substantial changes in the total number of police officers in the target countries and in Europe, with the figure remaining around 2 million in the 28 EU Member States, Turkey and Norway. Based on the assumption that no substantial changes to this figure occurred between 2009 and 2012, the latest figures available (2009) were used. In addition, the Eurostat data on the total number of police officers does not include civilian staff, tax police, secret service and other specific departments. Importantly, it also excludes customs services, which in 15 countries have been reported within the number of drug squads, although four countries only provided estimates or exact numbers of customs staff working in specialised drug law enforcement units. As a result, the Eurostat numbers are not immediately comparable to the number of drug law enforcement officers estimated in the project. In addition, two specific cases have to be considered: the Dutch Fiscal Investigation and Information Service (FIOD — 30 staff members), and the Italian Guardia di Finanza staff members working at the DCSA (no data available). These have been reported as drug squads. The total number of staff in these two organisations is presumed to be relatively small and is unlikely to influence the comparison noticeably.

FIGURE 2

Drug law enforcement officers as a proportion of police personnel



Secondly, and more importantly, knowledge of the number of staff assigned to the enforcement of drug laws is needed to improve our understanding of drug supply reduction. As the bulk of drug law enforcement work is performed at the initiative of drug law enforcement institutions, and most drug law offences are detected by these efforts, the number of drug law enforcement staff has a strong influence on the results of drug law enforcement work. These results are often presented in the form of statistics, such as the number of seizures made, the quantities of drugs seized and the number of reported drug law offences, which are routinely used as indicators of the drug market.

Ministerial affiliation

This subsection of the report reviews the governmental authorities responsible for Europe's specialised drug law enforcement units.

One key aspect of the organisation of Europe's specialised drug law enforcement units is their ministerial affiliation — under the responsibility of which ministries they operate. Although it was known from the outset of the project that interior ministries would be key players, the project

assumed that a certain degree of diversity would exist. Therefore, it was important to map out which other ministries were involved and to what extent, so that a picture could be constructed of all governmental departments involved and having a stake in drug supply reduction.

Data for this analysis are available from the 26 participating countries. In 12 of these countries, only one ministry is involved in drug law enforcement; in an equal number of countries, two ministries are involved; in the remaining two countries, three ministries are involved.

Where one ministry is involved in drug law enforcement, with the exception of Denmark (Ministry of Justice), this is the Ministry of the Interior, which in some cases (e.g. Cyprus, Malta and Norway) is organisationally aggregated under the name Ministry of the Interior and Justice. In all cases where institutional affiliation to two ministries was noted, this involved the Ministry of Interior in tandem with the Ministry of Finance. In the two other countries, the Netherlands and Portugal, the ministries involved in the supervision of drug law enforcement include the Ministry of Finance, together with the interior and justice ministries, albeit as the Ministry of the Interior and Justice in the Netherlands, where the Ministry of Defence is the third government department (Table 4).

TABLE 4
Ministerial affiliation of drug squads in Europe


Country	Interior	Justice	Interior and Justice	Defence	Finance
Bulgaria	X				
Czech Republic	X				X
Denmark		X			
Germany	X				X
Estonia	X				X
Ireland		X			X
Spain	X				X
France	X				X
Italy	X				
Cyprus			X		
Latvia	X				X
Lithuania	X				X
Luxembourg	X				X
Hungary	X				
Malta			X		
Netherlands			X	X	X
Austria	X				
Poland	X				
Portugal	X	X			X
Romania	X				
Slovenia	X				
Slovakia	X				X
Finland	X				X
United Kingdom	X				
Norway			X		
Turkey	X				X

NB: Names of the target ministries may differ across countries in Europe. Nonetheless, guided by the nature of their core work with relevance to drug law enforcement activities, this report uses four collective names for ministries: the Interior, Justice (the Interior and Justice in cases of organisational aggregation), Finance and Defence. In different countries, these ministries are recognised with a range of names listed as follows: Ireland, Justice and Equality; Spain, Economy and Finance; France, Budget, Public Account and State Reform; Cyprus, Justice and Public Order; Malta, Justice and Home Affairs; Netherlands, Justice and Security; Poland, the Interior and Administration; Portugal, Home Affairs — Guarda Nacional Republicana (GNR) and Polícia de Segurança Pública (PSP); Romania, Administration and the Interior; United Kingdom, Home Affairs; Norway, Justice and Police; Turkey, Customs and Trade.

Interior ministries (alone or in tandem with another governmental structure) are by far the government department most commonly involved in drug law enforcement in European countries, reported by almost all (24) of the participating countries. Reported by over half of the responding countries (14), the Ministry of Finance is the second most frequently mentioned governmental body involved in drug law enforcement in Europe, supervising mostly customs services. Justice ministries (alone or alongside another ministry) are responsible for drug squads in seven countries, and the Ministry of Defence is involved in drug law enforcement in one country.

Typically, a drug squad reports to one ministry only, although in some cases it may be subject to a multi-institutional setup

FIGURE 3
Ministerial responsibility of drug squads in countries where drug squads are affiliated with more than one governmental institution



involving several ministries. In many of the countries where more than one ministry is involved, the majority of drug squads are under the responsibility of the interior ministry (Figure 3). Although drug squads are linked to finance ministries in all of the countries represented in Figure 3, in most cases they make up a smaller share of the total, especially so in those countries with the largest numbers of drug squads, such as Germany (301), Spain (118) and France (99).

National law enforcement organisations

This subsection deals with the range of national law enforcement organisations within which drug squads are found. These organisations are responsible for implementing the political strategies of ministries, that is to say, translating strategic objectives into concrete organisational arrangements within which operational measures can be implemented. Typically, a drug squad is established within the structure of a single national law enforcement organisation, to which it reports.

From the survey, it appears that drug squads may be set up in four types of law enforcement organisations in European

countries: police forces ⁽⁸⁾, customs and tax services, gendarmerie-like organisations and coast guards.

In each of the 26 reporting countries, enforcement of drug laws is carried out mainly by units located within the police forces. In 16 countries, customs services play a role in drug law enforcement (see the box on customs services). Institutionalised forms of cooperation between police and customs are discussed in a later part of this section under the heading of 'Multi-agency drug law enforcement' (MDLE). Gendarmerie-like institutions are military bodies with powers to enforce national laws, and are found in six countries (France, Spain, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Turkey) (see the box on gendarmerie-like organisations). In four countries (Ireland, Spain, Romania, Turkey), coast-guard units are also involved in drug law enforcement (usually alongside police and customs), where they concentrate on countering drug smuggling in coastal areas and territorial waters.

At the European level, therefore, drug law enforcement is mostly carried out by police forces and customs services, with gendarmerie-like organisations a distant third. This reflects the

The role of customs services in European drug law enforcement

The available information shows that customs services are a key player in drug law enforcement in Europe. Although the information on customs services was, overall, less detailed than that for police organisations, key features of customs and their involvement in drug law enforcement are discernible. In Europe, customs services generally appear to operate at the national level (at least in 15 countries), although in two countries they also focus on international cases. Three countries reported that their customs services had a regional or local mandate, or were operating in restricted areas only, such as customs areas.

Much like police forces, customs perform a range of strategic functions including coordination, case management, intelligence and operations. Seven countries reported that customs services perform all of these functions, whereas in others they have a narrower field of operation. Specific drug law enforcement tasks performed by customs services across Europe include countering the production of synthetic drugs and the diversion of precursor chemicals, as well as scrutinising container and passenger traffic at ports and airports.

The role of gendarmerie-like organisations in European drug law enforcement

Gendarmerie-like organisations are militarised police forces with a key role in drug law enforcement in a number of European countries. They are mostly placed under the responsibility of interior ministries. As for customs services, data on these units were relatively limited compared with information on police forces. Nonetheless, the following picture emerged. Gendarmerie-like units appear to take responsibility within a local or district-wide area (in at least three countries), although they can also be found operating at national level (in at least three countries) or targeting specific locations such as harbours and airports (one country) as well as coastal and territorial waters (one country).

At least four of Europe's gendarmerie-like units perform criminal police functions — either general or focused on serious and organised crime. Diversity, however, can be noted, including special interventions aimed at the prevention of drug smuggling (two units in one country) and general policing, including surveillance and patrolling of public drug trafficking or consumption areas (one unit).

fact that the two principal governmental players in European drug law enforcement are the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Finance.

The survey showed that the operational layer of police forces may be made up of as many as four distinct branches, and drug squads can be established in any one (or more) of these domains of policing: judicial or criminal police, public security police, border police and general police. In addition, drug squads may exist in customs and gendarmerie-like organisations.

Twenty-five countries report the existence of drug law enforcement units within the judicial or criminal police (Table 5). In five countries, drug squads are established exclusively in the judicial or criminal police; in the remaining 20 countries multi-organisational systems exist involving the judicial or criminal police together with customs (eight countries), general police forces (three countries), gendarmerie and customs (three countries), public security police, gendarmerie and customs (two countries), general police and customs (three countries) and gendarmerie (one country).

Drug squads are established exclusively within the general police forces in one country. To our knowledge, no drug squad units have been set up within border police force structures, although this branch of police forces is active in transnational crime investigation.

⁽⁸⁾ General police, public security police, judicial/criminal police, border police.

TABLE 5

Location of drug squads within domains of police activity, customs and gendarmerie-like organisations

Country	Judicial or criminal police	Public security police	General police	Gendarmerie	Customs
Bulgaria	X				
Czech Republic	X				X
Denmark			X		
Germany	X				X
Estonia	X				X
Ireland	X				X
Spain	X			X	X
France	X	X		X	X
Italy	X			X	
Cyprus	X				
Latvia	X				X
Lithuania	X		X		X
Luxembourg	X		X		X
Hungary	X		X		
Malta	X				
Netherlands	X			X	X
Austria	X				
Poland	X		X		
Portugal	X	X		X	X
Romania	X				X
Slovenia	X		X		
Slovakia	X				X
Finland	X		X		X
United Kingdom	X				X
Norway	X				
Turkey	X			X	X

Organisational status of drug squads

The organisational status of units specialised in enforcing drug laws can be differentiated into three categories: dedicated drug squads; serious and organised crime-related drug squads; and law enforcement units with a primary focus on drugs.

Dedicated drug squads focus exclusively on drug trafficking and related crime. This type of drug squad is found in 21 of the

26 reporting countries. The drug squads related to serious and organised crime represent the second most frequently encountered type of specialised drug law enforcement unit in Europe, and are set up in 18 countries. In contrast, law enforcement units with a primary focus on drugs investigate drug-related crime as a primary task, but do not exist exclusively for that purpose. Such units are set up and operate in three countries: Spain and Turkey, with a primary focus on maritime and coastal areas; and Portugal, where they have a strong mandate to fight against street-level drug trafficking.

Netherlands: the programmatic approach of the Central Criminal Investigations Division

Introduced in the mid-2000s, the programmatic approach to law enforcement is specific to the Netherlands. Under the programmatic approach, rather than focusing on the particulars of an individual case, a type of crime is dealt with as a complex phenomenon, where many actors may bear responsibility. In contrast to traditional law enforcement, where the police and prosecution services are the two key parties assumed to have responsibility for countering any type of crime, the programmatic approach uses, in addition to contributions from criminal law enforcement, the input of other parties including government services, such as the tax services or municipal authorities, and businesses.

The programmatic approach is being applied in a growing number of areas. In the field of drug law enforcement, the first area subjected to a programmatic approach was the large-scale cultivation of cannabis — a flourishing business in the Netherlands, partly controlled by organised crime. Today, the approach has been extended to other drug supply activities including the trafficking of heroin and cocaine.

The programmatic approach is intelligence-led. It is based on validated data and information sourced by means of a quadrennial process involving the following steps:

1. An analysis of a particular type of crime addresses questions such as 'What is the scale of this type of crime?', 'What are the enabling and hindering conditions for this type of crime to occur?' and 'Which facilities and players are relevant?'

2. The output from the strategic analysis is used to determine, for each type of crime, strategic choices in terms of when and how best to use available crime-fighting resources.
3. In a next step, a strategic plan is put together collaboratively by the National Public Prosecutor Service and strategic partners such as Customs and Fiscal Intelligence and Investigations Services. The plan defines the parameters for action to all parties concerned with regard to different types of crime.
4. The final step is the translation of the strategic plan into a detailed tactical programme for each type of crime; tactical programmes are annual products, based on concrete targets.

Since January 2013, the Dutch police has been reorganised to combine the previously separate 26 police branches into one national police force, called the National Police of the Netherlands (NPN). The main implication of this reorganisation for the National Crime Squad, newly named Central Criminal Investigations Division, is visible at the level at which the Division officially operates. Historically, it was an exclusive force tackling 'level three' organised crime, but today it is placed on the same level as regional crime units.

The reorganisation of the Dutch police has implications for the programmatic approach too. Although the tactical programmes are currently exclusive to the Central Criminal Investigations Division, it is envisaged that they will become national programmes in the future.

TABLE 6
Types of drug squads existing in 25 countries according to their organisational status

	Type of drug squad		
	Dedicated drug squad	Serious and organised crime-related drug squads	Units with a primary focus on drugs ⁽¹⁾
Bulgaria		X	
Czech Republic	X		
Germany	X	X	
Estonia	X		
Ireland	X		
Spain	X	X	
France	X	X	
Italy	X		
Cyprus	X		
Latvia	X	X	
Lithuania	X	X	
Luxembourg	X	X	
Hungary	X	X	
Malta	X		
Netherlands	X	X	
Austria	X		
Poland	X	X	
Portugal	X	X	X
Romania		X	
Slovenia	X	X	
Slovakia	X	X	
Finland		X	
United Kingdom	X	X	
Turkey	X	X	X
Norway		X	

NB: An X indicates the existence of the type of unit in a country.

(1) Coast-guard and maritime units.

In 10 of the countries providing enough information, only one specific type of drug squad exists. In the remaining 15 countries, multiple types have been established (Table 6).

Multi-agency drug law enforcement units

The drug law enforcement landscape revealed by the results of this study is highly variable. More than 1 000 specialised units operate in Europe, spread across various police and other law enforcement bodies and answering to any of five different ministries. On the one hand, this diversity guarantees

that a wide range of law enforcement approaches are implemented, for instance to address the many different settings in which crime is committed such as urban and rural areas, border regions, territorial waters, airports and ships.

On the other hand, with diversity comes the risk of duplication of effort and therefore a need for coordination at the strategic and operational levels. Maintaining synergies at national level between law enforcement organisations with different technical backgrounds and different mandates, and coordinating their actions, is an ongoing challenge for national political and law enforcement decision-makers. Fostering synergies and coordination at European and international level, as required by the Treaty of Lisbon and the Stockholm Programme (Council of the European Union, 2012b; European Council, 2010), is probably an even bigger challenge ⁽⁹⁾. However, this is an important objective in order to achieve efficient use of resources and adequate flows of information at national, European and international levels.


This issue is often addressed at national level by establishing permanent or temporary multi-agency units, in which different law enforcement organisations (e.g. criminal police and customs) work together. To discover to what extent this approach is applied within the European drug law enforcement landscape, information on formally-established 'multi-agency approaches' was requested in the EMCDDA questionnaire. All 26 responding countries provided information, in some cases very detailed. This allowed the production, for the first time, of a European overview of multi-agency cooperation in drug law enforcement at national level.

There is no commonly agreed term to refer to this approach but, based on the answers provided by the national reference persons, the term adopted in this report is 'multi-agency drug law enforcement units' (MDLE units).

In Europe, 10 countries report a total of 40 formally established MDLE units (Figure 4), 30 of which are set up in Germany (see the box on MDLE units in Germany). The other nine countries each have one or two MDLE units (Table 7).

⁽⁹⁾ To address this issue, and as a compensatory measure for the abolition of internal border controls under the Schengen agreement, a European mechanism was established in 1995 allowing the creation of police and customs cooperation centres (PCCCs). Except in the case of Finland, the MDLE units reported in the context of this study are not PCCCs.

FIGURE 4
Presence of multi-agency drug law enforcement (MDLE) units in European countries



Typical composition of European MDLE units

Across Europe, MDLE structures typically involve the cooperation of police forces and customs. In Germany and Slovakia, MDLE units are based on the cooperation of police forces and customs services only. In contrast, in the United Kingdom and Italy, MDLE units are established and function without customs participation. However, in just under two-thirds of the countries with established MDLE units, multiple agencies work together including gendarmerie-like organisations, security and intelligence services and coast guards (Table 7).

All 10 countries reporting multi-agency drug law enforcement have established at least one central MDLE unit. Eight countries report the existence of a single, centralised unit (Ireland, Spain, France, Italy, Netherlands, Romania, Slovakia and Finland). In the remaining two (Germany, United Kingdom), there is a range of between 1 and 29 decentralised MDLE units alongside the central unit.

TABLE 7
Multi-agency drug law enforcement in Europe: units and participating organisations

Country	Number of units	Multi-agency drug law enforcement unit name	Participating agencies
Germany ⁽¹⁾	29	Gemeinsame Ermittlungsgruppe Rauschgift, GER (Joint customs/police narcotic investigation teams)	Police forces, customs
	1	Gemeinsame Grundstoffüberwachungsstelle, GÜS (Joint customs/police precursor monitoring unit at the Federal Criminal Police Office)	Police forces, customs
United Kingdom	2	Serious and Organised Crime Agency, SOCA	Police forces, customs, security and intelligence services
	2	Middle market drug unit	Police forces
Ireland	1	National interagency drug joint task force	Police forces, customs, coast guards
Spain	1	Centro de Inteligencia Contra el Crimen Organizado, CICO (Coordination and action department in organised crime investigations including drug trafficking)	Police forces, customs, gendarmerie, others
France	1	Office Central pour la Répression du Trafic Illicite des Stupéfiants, OCRTIS (Central office for the suppression of illicit traffic in narcotics)	Police forces, customs, gendarmerie
Italy	1	Direzione Centrale Servizi Antidroga, DCSA (Antidrug Central Directorate)	Police forces, gendarmerie, security and intelligence services, others
Netherlands	1	Centre of expertise for synthetic drugs and precursors ⁽²⁾	Police forces, customs, others
Romania	1	Service for countering organised criminality in maritime ports (SCCO)	Police forces, customs, security and intelligence services
Slovakia ⁽³⁾	1	Joint (dual agency) team of police and customs mandated to investigate illicit diversion and usage of precursors	Police forces, customs
Finland	1	National Police and Customs and Border Guard Centre (PCB – Police, Customs and Border Guard)	Police forces, customs

⁽¹⁾ In early 2013, two German MDLE units were merged into one, so that the total number of MDLE units in Germany has decreased to 29.

⁽²⁾ Since 2013, 'Team drugs and Dutch networks'.

⁽³⁾ In early 2013, the Slovakian MDLE unit was disbanded as a result of police reorganisation.


Functions of MDLE units in Europe

MDLE units perform a range of functions based on the mandates of the participating organisations. In practice, the two most important functions are operations and intelligence, although some case management may also be performed. Based on the nature of their prevailing functions, the profiles of MDLE units can be established. As shown in Figure 5, the majority of Europe's MDLE units are predominantly⁽¹⁰⁾ operationally oriented, with most of them (29) located in Germany, two in the United Kingdom and one in Ireland. Four established MDLE units have a predominantly intelligence-gathering character (Italy, Romania, Slovakia and Finland). Four MDLE units perform both intelligence and operational strategic functions and their profile is hence best described as a mixed one — Germany (GÜS), Spain, France and the Netherlands have each established one MDLE unit with mixed functions.

Furthermore, with regard to how MDLE units exert an effect on supply reduction, these units fall along a continuum, from having a direct effect through operations and case management (e.g. MDLE units in Germany) to occupying a coordination, information and technical-support function in the drug supply area (e.g. MDLE units in Romania and Finland), with a range intermediary roles, including networking and cooperation with other parties.

FIGURE 5

Profiles of multi-agency drug law enforcement units based on their prevailing functions



⁽¹⁰⁾ Given the common need to improve both information exchange and tactical cooperation a strict separation between intelligence and operational tasks is often not possible. Nevertheless clear operational predominance was identifiable for almost each MDLE unit.

Specific roles of MDLE units

A small number of the 40 permanently established MDLE units in Europe are tasked to perform two types of specific roles.

Three MDLE units play a dedicated central coordination role related to drug law offence investigations; these are located in Spain (CICO), France (OCRTIS) and Italy (DCSA). The relatively large numbers of drug law enforcement organisations in these three countries, compared with other countries with established MDLE units, may explain the need for more coordination and therefore the establishment of an MDLE unit with a dedicated central coordination role.

Three countries reported the existence of MDLE units that are exclusively mandated to monitor or investigate cases related to precursor chemicals and/or synthetic drugs production (the precursor monitoring office in Germany, the Centre of expertise in the Netherlands and the diversion of precursors unit in Slovakia). Other specific functions assigned to MDLE units include targeting serious and organised crime (SOCA, United Kingdom) and drug smuggling (Ireland).

Having described the units that populate the European drug law enforcement landscape, the next section will look at the mandates, both territorial and technical, that these bodies operate under and at how they are supervised.

Italy: the mandate of the Antidrug Central Directorate

The Antidrug Central Directorate (Direzione Centrale Servizi Antidroga, DCSA) is one of 17 central directorates and offices falling under the Public Security Department, which is under the authority of the Ministry of the Interior. It is a multi-force body, coordinating the activities of the police forces in the fight against drug trafficking. The DCSA is responsible for developing and maintaining relationships with foreign counterparts (including foreign liaison officers posted to Italy), as well as coordinating with national and international drug prevention bodies. Also included in its mandate are operational research, analysis and training. In drug-producing or transit areas, the DCSA manages a network of drug experts.

Germany: the multi-agency drug law enforcement approach

In Germany, the multi-agency drug law enforcement approach is shaped by the federal structure of the state. Responsibility for border security and prevention of cross-border crime coupled lies with the federal authorities, while internal security falls under the remit of the Länder or federal states. This approach is seen in the fight against drug precursor trafficking, in which a central monitoring unit (Gemeinsame Grundstoffüberwachungsstelle, GÜS) (Joint Precursor Monitoring Office) cooperates with operationally oriented multi-drug law enforcement initiatives (Gemeinsame Ermittlungsgruppen Rauschgift, GER) (joint customs/police narcotics investigation teams). The legal basis for this cooperation is shaped by an administrative regulation between the central office of the German customs investigation service and the Ministries of the Interior at federal and state levels.

The Joint Precursor Monitoring Office is located at the Federal Criminal Police Office (BKA) in Wiesbaden. It is, by law, the contact point for operators of the chemical and pharmaceutical industry and their associations (e.g. as recipient of information about suspicious inquiries) as well as the link between the federal medicines agency (Bundesinstitut für Arzneimittel und Medizinprodukte), the competent licensing and administrative control authority, and the investigation and control bodies (police and customs).

The joint customs/police narcotics investigation teams are located at the different State Offices for Criminal

Investigations. Currently, there are 29 such interagency units in Germany.

The MDLE approach in Germany was adopted in 1992. In each Land (state), the MDLE unit consists of a customs officer and an officer of either the state central drug crime squad or a regional headquarters drug squad. The customs officer reports to the federal central customs service investigation office.

The technical mandate of MDLE units relates to serious or organised drug crime offences and does not cover minor offences. Furthermore, illicit domestic drug production without an international dimension is not part of the mandate of MDLE units.

The staff of an MDLE unit is composed of an equal number of police and customs officers, although the total number of staff can vary. Each MDLE unit is under joint leadership, with the two chairs having equal power regarding technical issues such as operation, case management and intelligence. Administrative issues are solved by each wing separately. Because of the differences in background and training between the police and customs forces, since the late 1990s a common approach has been adopted whereby leaders of operations receive specific operational training. Another area where differences must be overcome concerns the databases, which, although customs and police each has its own, can be accessed by both forces.

Mandates and supervision

Three aspects of the legal framework that govern the activity of law enforcement units are examined in this section. The first two delineate the areas in which these units can operate: the territorial mandate in a geographical sense and the technical mandate in a task-oriented sense. As with all government agencies in a democratic state, those enforcing the law are subject to supervision by an independent authority. The final subsection looks at how this is carried out in European countries.

Territorial mandates

The term 'territorial mandate', in the context of a drug law enforcement unit, represents the territorial jurisdiction within which the responsibility and operations of a drug squad extend. It may be local, regional, national or international.

Information about the territorial mandates of national specialised drug law enforcement units is key to understanding how drug law enforcement is organised and implemented in Europe. Indeed, drug law enforcement is likely to be performed differently in different locations. Drug law enforcement is an activity that is, by necessity, applied on a specific piece of territory, on its population and on the activities that are carried out there. These three dimensions may contribute to determining what type of drug offences are likely to be committed, or are considered likely, in a particular location. This 'location' may be an entire country, a region, a city, a neighbourhood or a specific area such as a harbour, an airport, a motorway or territorial waters. In addition, the territorial organisation of national drug law enforcement may be a reflection, or a consequence, of how law enforcement in general is territorially organised in a country.

Whatever the case, the territorial mandate must be taken into consideration when attempting to define the 'style' of drug law enforcement performed in a country. This will, among other things, contribute to determining how different or how similar the national drug law enforcement approaches existing in Europe are. Knowledge of the territorial organisation of drug law enforcement can also help in contextualising and understanding existing routine datasets, such as reported drug seizures and drug law offences, which reflect law enforcement activities. Other benefits of gathering data on the territorial mandate include the facilitation of mutual understanding of and cooperation between drug law enforcement organisations across Europe, and the sharing of good practice, where the territorial dimension is very often essential.

Territorial mandates of drug squads are generally defined by legal frameworks. However, flexibility must exist in the implementation of territorial mandates, since operational

investigations may lead drug squads to reach beyond the territorial limits formally assigned to them.

Although legal frameworks set the geographical boundaries of a drug squad, they often leave scope to ensure suitable legal cover for all operations, including those for which there is limited regional responsibility. Indeed, since drug trafficking often implies cross-border activities, transnational investigations are frequently required in cases handled by regionally or locally mandated drug squads. Therefore, for practical reasons, local and regional authorities may be granted national or international jurisdiction, on a case-by-case basis (Eurojust, 2012).

This case-by-case approach poses challenges to the exercise of identifying territorial mandates within the current project. Whereas territorial mandates are primarily defined by law, and therefore presented as constant and established features of each drug law enforcement unit, there are also internal regulations that are used to guide decisions on territorial assignment in individual cases and specific circumstances. The interpretation of internal regulations may be equivocal. Nonetheless, a systematic approach was used to elicit relevant information on reference laws and internal regulations from each participating country to enable the identification of territorial mandates.

This study found that European drug squads may be assigned one of the four following territorial mandates: international, national, regional or local.

An international mandate allows a European drug squad to collaborate with a foreign authority in order to advance its investigation of a case, usually by requesting the foreign authority to perform an action on behalf of the requesting unit. It does not confer powers on the unit to operate in or enforce its national laws in a foreign country. With very few exceptions, drug law enforcement, like all other law enforcement activities, remains country-bound, with national institutions working to enforce national laws within their own borders. (This is often described as a major impediment to efficient law enforcement against drug traffickers, who are said to 'know no national borders' while law enforcement officers are bound by them.) In this sense, the term 'international mandate' as it is used here has a slightly different meaning from the other types of territorial mandates described in this report. Indeed, national, regional and local mandates all mean that the organisations that enjoy them can act directly within the territory to which they have been assigned.

In 20 of the reporting countries, at least one drug law enforcement unit exists with a permanent responsibility for international drug trafficking cases. All 26 participating countries report the existence of at least one drug law enforcement unit with a national mandate.

National mandates are put into practice in a variety of ways in Europe. One approach involves the establishment of local field offices (e.g. Czech Republic, Cyprus), whereby field units, specialised, for example, in laboratory investigation, diversion of precursors or money flows, are tasked with operating on a local scale within a national jurisdiction, while reporting to a national central crime office. In Turkey, under the 'split mandate' approach, central units task local police or gendarmerie units with taking responsibility over target localities. Although the Czech Republic, Spain, Cyprus and Turkey officially apply a national centralised approach to drug law enforcement, the above practices suggest an implicit approach that may be regional or local in nature. Similarly, in the United Kingdom, although in principle drug law enforcement is a national responsibility, in practice, regional or district responsibility is assumed by regional or local chief constables, who nonetheless operate within a national mandate in accordance with reference laws.

Finally, in Romania and Turkey, surveillance of K7GKDG3A waters and coastal areas is conducted by drug law enforcement units with a national mandate. In other countries, this type of surveillance is also performed, but not by specialised drug law enforcement units.

In addition to international and national mandates, European countries have a range of drug squads officially mandated to operate within regional or local territorial units. Seventeen countries have assigned regional mandates to at least one drug squad, while drug squads tasked to investigate drug-related cases locally exist in 11 countries.

Our analysis thus reveals that the 26 reporting European countries have assigned two (13 countries), three (four countries) or four (nine countries) territorial mandates to their drug squads.

In nine countries, drug squads may be assigned one or more of the four different territorial mandates, allowing the drug law enforcement units of these countries to intervene in international, national, regional and local cases (Table 8). International cases may also be pursued by drug squads in a further 11 countries, where both international and national mandates are assigned; in three of these countries, regional mandates are also reported. In the remaining six countries, in addition to national mandates assigned to drug squads, five countries report regional mandates, three countries report local mandates, and one country reports both regional and local mandates.

TABLE 8

Territorial mandates assigned to drug law enforcement in Europe

	International	National	Regional	Local
Bulgaria		X	X	
Czech Republic	X	X		
Denmark		X		X
Germany	X	X	X	X
Estonia		X	X	
Ireland		X	X	
Spain	X	X	X	X
France	X	X	X	X
Italy	X	X		
Cyprus	X	X		
Latvia	X	X	X	
Lithuania		X	X	X
Luxembourg		X	X	
Hungary	X	X	X	X
Malta	X	X		
Netherlands	X	X		
Austria	X	X	X	X
Poland	X	X	X	X
Portugal	X	X	X	X
Romania	X	X	X	X
Slovenia	X	X	X	X
Slovakia	X	X		
Finland	X	X	X	
United Kingdom	X	X		
Turkey	X	X		
Norway	X	X	X	

The survey indicates that the territorial organisation of drug law enforcement in Europe is characterised by a dual emphasis on the national and sub-national levels. All 26 countries have established at least one drug squad with a mandate to enforce drug laws across the entire country. At the same time, 18 countries have also established drug squads with regional or local mandate. In addition, although eight countries report that their drug squads have national jurisdiction but are not assigned regional or local mandates (Table 8), five of these appear to maintain a regional presence through the use of field offices, split mandates or seconded officers. Thus, 23 European countries have effectively granted regional or local mandates to their specialised drug law enforcement units, which would indicate that specialised drug law enforcement is, to a large extent, perceived as a local response to local problems.

Portugal: the joint drug law intelligence protocol — composition and mandate

Portugal is one of the countries in Europe with the largest numbers of drug law enforcement authorities and therefore coordination is essential. To facilitate coordination among the different law enforcement organisations and authorities in the country, a joint drug law intelligence protocol was set up in 1995 with a dual purpose regarding drug trafficking: (i) coordination and sharing of information; and (ii) operational coordination and joint action. Under this protocol, which operates under the coordination and strategic direction of the Judicial Police (Polícia Judiciária), regular meetings are held which serve to resolve the conflicts that may arise between the different law enforcement organisations and investigating authorities.

These meetings are held with representatives of the Judicial Police and other relevant agencies, including the National Guard (Guarda Nacional Republicana), Public Security Police Service (Polícia de Segurança Pública), Immigration and Border Authority (Serviço de Estrangeiros e Fronteiras), Tax Authority and Customs (Autoridade Tributária e Aduaneira) and the Maritime Authority (Autoridade Marítima). Quarterly national and regional meetings are held in the following regions: Northern region (Porto), Central region (Coimbra), Lisbon region, Southern region (Faro), Madeira (Funchal) and the Azores (Ponte Delgada).

The existence of a permanent international mandate, as reported by 20 countries, is a reflection of the international and European dimensions of contemporary national drug law enforcement, due for instance to the United Nations conventions on drugs and European treaties and programmes, such as the Prüm Convention (Council of the European Union, 2005b) against cross-border crime and the Stockholm Programme on police cooperation. Agreements between countries for bilateral law enforcement are common. Cooperation with international organisations such as Interpol, Europol and the World Customs Organization is also among the tasks performed by national drug law enforcement organisations. The need to deal with these international obligations is often translated into the establishment of a central unit at national level. These central units, in turn, also often require a national mandate in order to fulfil their country's international obligations. In practice, however, units that are not assigned a formal, permanent international mandate may still be involved in international cooperation on an ad hoc basis.

Technical mandates

The term 'technical mandate' in this report represents the range and scope of activities that drug law enforcement units can carry out with reference to two sets of documents: legal acts, or drug laws (technical jurisdiction); and internal regulations that interpret or complement legal acts.

Technical jurisdictions are, by definition, more general than internal regulations. Although they must be consulted in order to determine the overall legal framework within which drug law enforcement units operate, an examination of the internal regulations reveals how relevant laws are interpreted and applied by law enforcement. Internal regulations may also indicate relevant regional or local and organisational specifics that may influence the application of reference drug laws. Although drug laws are public documents, their informative value about the technical mandate of drug squads remains limited without supplementary information contained in internal regulations, which are, however, generally not available for public consultation. This subsection is informed by both sets of documents, and presents a unique insight into the technical areas of operation as well as the professional orientation of specialised drug law enforcement units across Europe.

Information about the technical mandates of national specialised law enforcement units on drugs is essential to understanding how drug law enforcement is implemented, and to some extent, organised in Europe. Indeed, technical mandates refer to specific drug law enforcement tasks that must be performed based on specific types of knowledge, know-how and experience. The range of tasks to be performed may vary from country to country as a result of historical, geographical or legal factors. For instance, in the years after the fall of the Berlin wall, most of the former Communist countries felt the need to set up drug law enforcement organisations, as drug use emerged as a problem for them. In another illustration, countries where illicit synthetic drug production has been a long-standing issue have felt the need to create a specific mandate to investigate illicit production or to dismantle illicit production facilities. Such a mandate may not exist in other countries. In addition to reflecting some specific features of national drug markets, technical mandates may also reflect drug and security policies as well as political decisions.

For these reasons, the technical mandate must be considered when defining the 'style' of drug law enforcement that is performed in a country. The various technical mandates existing in European countries help determine the differences and similarities between the national drug law enforcement approaches. Additional benefits of gathering information about technical mandates include the fostering of direct communication between investigators in different countries,

facilitating the practical organisation of controlled deliveries or of the use of covert human intelligence sources ⁽¹¹⁾. Such mapping of technical mandates may also prove interesting for the sharing of useful experience (good practice).

The organisational affiliation of drug squads within law enforcement structures (e.g. criminal police, border police, organised crime units) or other drug law enforcement authorities (e.g. customs) does not necessarily correspond to particular technical mandates. For instance, serious and organised crime units in the United Kingdom are generally mandated to conduct drug investigations alongside investigations of other types of crime such as murder or fraud. The organisational affiliation of a drug squad is predominantly the result of organisational considerations, whereas its technical mandate derives from law as interpreted by internal regulations. In practice, however, these considerations merge and, to some extent, influence one another.

The allocation of technical mandates represents a formal decision, typically taken by the responsible ministry, based on law enforcement experience and knowledge and consideration for both past and projected future criminal activity in the target geographical area.

The categorisation of the technical areas for drug law enforcement is not standardised and the terminology differs across countries in Europe. Nonetheless, for the purposes of this report the following categories, based on those defined by Kaiser (1997), will be used: type of drug law offence and level

in the drug supply chain; type of offender; trafficking modus operandi; type of incriminating good. In each of these areas, a number of technical activities can be located, as outlined in Table 9.

Two-thirds of the countries (18) report a technical mandate that encompasses all possible technical areas; this mandate is comprehensive in that it is not bound by technical limitations. Although the formal technical scope defined by this type of mandate may be wide-ranging, it is likely that it will be mitigated in practice by the priority-setting process, which may require drug squads to concentrate a large proportion of their resources and know-how on specific crimes (e.g. cocaine trafficking).

Thirteen countries have tasked drug squads — notwithstanding organisational affiliation — to investigate organised drug crime networks. Import or export of drugs is the focus of drug law enforcement units in a further nine countries, whereas the remaining identified mandates were reported by a smaller number (one to five) of countries (Figure 6).

Drug law enforcement units have a single technical mandate in 10 countries, of which eight are comprehensive (Table 10). Where data are available (in four out of these eight countries), the number of drug law enforcement units with a single comprehensive mandate ranges from one (Malta) to 12 (Lithuania).


TABLE 9

Areas of drug law enforcement that may be included in technical mandates: some examples

Area of drug law enforcement	Examples
Type of drug law offence and level in the drug supply chain	Production Trafficking Distribution At different levels of the market including import/export, wholesale, intermediary and retail
Type of offender	Individual (e.g. a mule, supporting criminals) Group (e.g. gang crime, organised crime)
Modus operandi	Container smuggling Concealment methods (e.g. body-packing) Trafficking and transportation methods
Type of incriminating good	Illicit psychoactive substances Drug precursors Adulterants Cash Related goods (e.g. weapons, electronic equipment)

FIGURE 6

Technical mandates of drug squads in European countries



⁽¹¹⁾ Covert human intelligence sources include undercover officers, public informants and people who make test purchases (Home Office, 2012).

TABLE 10

Technical mandates assigned to drug law enforcement in Europe

	Bulgaria	Czech Republic	Denmark	Germany	Estonia	Ireland	Spain	France	Italy	Cyprus	Latvia	Lithuania	Luxembourg	Hungary	Malta	Netherlands	Austria	Poland	Portugal	Romania	Slovenia	Slovakia	Finland	United Kingdom	Turkey	Norway
Comprehensive	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X		X		X	X				
Offender type																										
Organised crime network	X	X		X									X			X		X	X			X	X	X	X	
Incriminating good																										
Specific illicit psychoactive drug		X														X										
Drug precursors (and related chemicals)		X		X							X					X		X				X				
Production and trafficking																										
Production (including labs)	X	X														X										
Import/export		X		X		X	X									X			X	X			X		X	
Wholesale trafficking														X												
Intermediary trafficking																		X								
Retail distribution																	X	X		X						
Unspecified	X																			X				X		

In Hungary, the two drug squads have a single mandate focused on wholesale trafficking⁽¹²⁾, whereas in Norway the existing 28 drug law enforcement units are all mandated to target organised crime networks and activities.

In seven countries, drug law enforcement units fall under two technical mandates, and in six cases one of these is comprehensive. In Ireland and Spain, this mandate is coupled with a mandate on import/export, suggesting differences in mandate based on institutional affiliation. For example, it is likely that units based in customs services (Ministry of Finance) are giving priority to investigating import/export cases. In four other countries, whereas some drug law enforcement units have a comprehensive mandate, others have mandates on organised crime networks (Luxembourg, United Kingdom), on precursors (Latvia) and on retail drug distribution (Slovenia). Slovakia is the only country with two technical mandates (one on organised crime networks and one on precursors) where neither of the mandates is comprehensive.

Four countries (Poland, Romania, Finland and Turkey) report the existence of three technical mandates. In all of these countries, one of the mandates is on organised crime networks, confirming their implementation of drug law enforcement through a *serious and organised crime* approach (see Organisational status of drug squads). In two cases, this is supplemented with a mandate on intermediary trafficking and retail distribution (Poland) and unspecified trafficking and import/export (Romania). In two further cases, the organised

crime mandate is coupled with a mandate on import/export and a comprehensive mandate (Finland) or a focus on unspecified trafficking (Turkey).

Czech Republic: performance indicators based on proven quantities of trafficked drugs

Data on amounts of seized drugs and number of arrests are often used to monitor the effectiveness of law enforcement activities against drug-related crime. In the Czech Republic, these indicators are supplemented with data on evidenced amounts of drugs sold by an offender during their criminal activity. These data on proven quantities of trafficked drugs are viewed as an additional objective indicator of effective police work and represent a distinctive feature of the monitoring of drug law enforcement in this country.

In the Czech Republic, drug-related data collection falls under the National Drug Headquarters of the National Police and follows instructions issued by the Police President. A range of district and regional directorates provide data each month. At present, data are collected on the amount of drugs seized during operations, as well as the amount of trafficked drugs confirmed in cooperation with a state prosecutor during criminal proceedings.

⁽¹²⁾ From 2013, the two drug squads merged into one central drug squad with the same technical mandate on wholesale trafficking.

In Bulgaria and Germany, four different mandates are assigned to drug squads, including a comprehensive mandate and a focus on organised crime. In addition, Bulgaria also reports a mandate on drug production and on unspecified trafficking. In Germany, most likely because of the prominent role of customs in drug law enforcement, some drug squads are specifically mandated to address issues related to drug precursors and to import/export of drugs.

Finally, in the Czech Republic, the Netherlands and Portugal, five different technical mandates can be assigned across national drug squads. In all three countries, drug squads are mandated on organised crime networks, drug precursors and import/export, with additional mandates on specific substances and drug production in the Czech Republic and the Netherlands and on comprehensive and retail distribution mandates in Portugal.

| Drug law enforcement functions

The day-to-day activities of drug law enforcement units can be grouped into three main functions: intelligence management, operations and case management.

Intelligence management is the process by which relevant information is obtained, processed and made available for drug law enforcement purposes. In some cases, the intelligence function is performed in a dedicated unit. Traditionally, however, intelligence management is part of the daily work of every drug squad and is a precondition for the other two functions to be performed.

The term 'operations' is used in this report to describe overt and covert drug law enforcement activities mainly aimed at reducing drug supply by making arrests, seizing drugs, dismantling illicit drug production sites, deploying officers to disrupt local drug markets and so on.

Case management refers to the provision of evidence for prosecution. Typically, this involves drafting and transmitting a written report to the prosecution service or the court. The report usually brings together all the elements gathered by law enforcement organisations through intelligence management or operations, and which are necessary for the legal prosecution of a case.

By performing these functions, drug law enforcement units fulfil their technical mandates. In practice, drug squads are usually pursuing multiple targets in parallel, and case management, intelligence work and operations can all be starting points for investigations.

France: The National Database of Drugs Targets

In order to optimise the actions of drug services, the French authorities have created a National Database of Drugs Targets (Fichier national des objectifs en matière de stupéfiants, FNOS). The development of this database incorporates improvements to existing law enforcement databases. Launched in the second quarter of 2013, the system will collect data from a number of organisations with responsible for drug law enforcement in France, including the National Police (judicial and public security police), the Gendarmerie Nationale and the customs service. The aim is to allow investigators from a range of administrative backgrounds to register cases within a common system and receive alerts if and when these cases are under investigation by multiple services.

In the FNOS, a case is an individual for whom there is plausible reason to suspect involvement in drug-trafficking offences. Under the supervision of a prosecutor or an examining magistrate, cases can be conducted in the context of a preliminary investigation, in a procedure of 'flagrante delicto', in a letter rogatory or in a customs investigation.

The new tool is expected to improve coordination between the services investigating a target — for example, through the early detection of duplicate activities in the investigations. Also, it is envisaged that the new tool will facilitate a better distribution of means and resources, potentially leading to improved services outcome.

The operation of the database is underpinned by the principles of confidentiality and equality of all partners accessing and working with the database. In addition, there is a common regulation defining the objectives of the database as well as its management and use. Finally, the database has received a favourable opinion from the Commission nationale informatique et liberté (CNIL), the French data protection agency.

Although some drug law enforcement units perform only one of the three main functions, the majority of units perform multiple functions. Usually, those units that are mandated to carry out operations have a parallel mandate to perform case management. On the basis of their functional orientation, European drug squads can be grouped as follows: (1) drug squads dedicated to carrying out operations and conducting case management; (2) drug squads focusing exclusively on intelligence gathering; (3) drug squads mandated to performing a comprehensive set of functions, i.e. case management, operations and intelligence gathering.

Drug law enforcement units that are mandated to carry out all three functions are reported by 21 countries, while units tasked solely with the gathering of intelligence and units with a dual focus on case management and operations are reported by fewer countries (Figure 7).

To put these results into perspective, it should be noted that drug law enforcement activities do not always aim at providing conclusive evidence usable for prosecution purposes (case

FIGURE 7
Functional orientation of drug law enforcement units in European countries



NB: Some countries report the co-existence of units with different functional orientations.

management). Producing solid information on supply and demand structures (intelligence) is given at least as much attention as tackling and controlling illegal drug markets and, ideally, preventing, reducing and stopping breaches of drug legislation (operations). Not every drug offence or offender discovered by drug law enforcement is necessarily reported to the prosecutor or the justice system. Whether or not a detected offence is reported depends on a number of factors, including what legal principle (discretionary or mandatory) rules the law enforcement agency and the priorities set for the unit (EMCDDA, 2012).

An exploration of the range of different types of drug law enforcement units, based on their functional orientation, reveals some diversity, and possibly some reporting artefacts. In two-thirds of the countries providing information, only one type of functional orientation is reported. In most (15) of these countries, all drug squads are reported to have a comprehensive orientation, fulfilling the three functions. In the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Turkey, however, despite the data indicating that all drug squads are oriented to case management and operations only, it is likely that intelligence gathering is embedded within the other two functions.

In six countries, two types of functional orientation are reported for drug squads. In four cases, one of these is towards intelligence management, while the other is either a comprehensive orientation (Italy, Netherlands) or towards operations and case management (Bulgaria, Finland). In Ireland and Latvia, drug law enforcement units are oriented towards case management and operations or have a comprehensive orientation.

Finally, Poland and Portugal are the only countries reporting that each of the three functional orientations is held by at least one unit.

In Europe, based on available data, it may be concluded that the majority of countries empower most, and in many cases all, of their drug law enforcement units with a comprehensive set of functions. Thus, most drug squads in Europe perform all three drug law enforcement functions, with little evidence of specialisation at the level of unit (Table 11).

TABLE 11
Number of drug law enforcement units by type of function

	Case management/ operational units	Intelligence-oriented units	Comprehensive units	Total number of units
Bulgaria	31	1		32
Czech Republic	3			3
Denmark			1	1
Germany			250	250
Estonia			6	6
Ireland	1		28	29
Spain			118	118
France			99	99
Italy		1	40	41
Cyprus			1	1
Latvia	1		2	3
Lithuania			12	12
Luxembourg			8	8
Hungary			2	2
Malta			1	1
Netherlands		1	4	5
Austria			10	10
Poland	17	1	283	301
Portugal	10	9	34	53
Romania			44	44
Slovenia			13	13
Slovakia	2			2
Finland (†)	15	4		26
United Kingdom			54	54
Turkey	4			4
Norway			28	28

(†) The information provided for Finland did not make it possible to ascertain the functions that were assigned to seven of the 26 drug squads.

It is important to understand how the three functions are distributed within the European drug law enforcement landscape. Whereas in the past each unit performed all three functions, and many still do, there is an international trend towards the differentiation of law enforcement functions, including drug law enforcement, between different units. This points to an increasing specialisation within drug law enforcement organisations, especially as regards intelligence and operations. Examples of this in practice include the model of intelligence-led policing, which would require a specific professional profile focused exclusively on intelligence and therefore ill-suited to perform the other functions to the same high standards. Similarly, the increased use of technology in drug law enforcement operations, for instance for the surveillance of a suspect's communications, and the development of methodologies and guidelines to perform specific tasks such as using covert human intelligence, and accompanying legal requirements, all push towards the specialisation of the professional profiles of drug law enforcement officers or drug law enforcement units. Finally, the increased use of violence towards law enforcement officers promotes the development of units specialised in the arrest of potentially violent suspects.

All this implies that the field of drug law enforcement functions is more in flux than other domains, for instance the territorial mandate, and therefore particularly suitable for monitoring changes in the drug law enforcement landscape.

Supervising external authority

All policing activities in democratic societies ruled by law are subject to supervision by an external authority independent of national policing organisations, usually located within the justice system. The purpose of such supervision is to balance the fundamental rights of citizens with the needs of the institutions in charge of fighting crime. Such oversight is all the more necessary in the case of drug law enforcement, which, because it is tackling consensual crime, is largely proactive in nature and often involves the use of intrusive means while maintaining low levels of transparency. The justice system is, in the majority of European countries, the external supervising authority of drug law enforcement work, given the need to ensure that national formalities and procedures are respected.

Finland: the supervisory roles of the Parliamentary Ombudsman and of the Chancellor of Justice

Drug law enforcement practice in Finland is unique in that it is subject to the regulation and supervision of the Parliamentary Ombudsman and of the Chancellor of Justice.

The Parliamentary Ombudsman has the key role of exercising oversight to ensure that authorities, officials and others performing tasks of a public nature adhere to the law and perform their duties accordingly. Additionally, the Ombudsman pays special attention to respect for fundamental and human rights. Related to this is the Ombudsman's focused attention on the manner in which the police employ coercive measures affecting telecommunications and their conduct of undercover operations.

The Chancellor of Justice endeavours to ensure that the courts of law, other authorities and other individuals or organisations assigned to perform public tasks comply with the law and fulfil their assigned obligations. The Chancellor of Justice supervises the authorities by handling any written complaints arising from their actions. A complaint may be filed with the Chancellor of Justice if the complainant believes that an authority, civil servant or public official or

other person or body assigned to perform public tasks has acted in an unlawful or otherwise wrongful manner or failed to fulfil their responsibilities. The Chancellor of Justice can also open an investigation on an issue on his own initiative, such as matters brought forth in the media.


The Chancellor of Justice is entitled to perform inspections of those authorities, institutions, offices and other units that fall within the scope of his supervisory authority. In practice, the Deputy Chancellor of Justice performs any necessary inspections. Over recent years, about 30 inspections per year have been carried out. The Chancellor of Justice is entitled to request and access any necessary information from authorities and other public bodies for the purpose of ensuring the legality of their actions. The Chancellor of Justice can order the initiation of a police or preliminary investigation for the purposes of clarifying a particular matter.

More information can be accessed at: <http://www.okv.fi/en/chancellor/duties-and-activities/supervision-authorities/>; <http://www.oikeusasiamies.fi/Resource.phx/eoa/english/ombudsman/tasks/index.htx>

All 26 participating countries provided information on the external authorities supervising drug squads. Based on these data, each country ensures that one or more authorities are supervising, and in some cases authorising, drug law enforcement activity within its territory. In a majority of countries, supervisory authorities are located outside law enforcement, mostly in prosecution structures.

The supervisory function can be assumed by a range of authorities within the justice system (e.g. prosecution, courts), police authorities or other authorities (e.g. government offices, parliamentary bodies). As shown in Figure 8 and Table 12, prosecution structures play a supervisory role in most of the reporting countries (23), while the other institutions are reported by fewer (one to six) countries.

FIGURE 8
Authorities supervising drug squads



NB: Prosecution structures include the following: prosecutor, prosecution service, public prosecutors, district attorneys and special prosecution office against drugs.

TABLE 12

Authorities supervising drug law enforcement in European countries


Country	Authorities
Bulgaria	Prosecution
Czech Republic	Prosecution
Denmark	Prosecution
Germany	Prosecution, courts
Estonia	Prosecution
Ireland	Police authorities
Spain	Courts
France	Prosecution, courts
Italy	Prosecution
Cyprus	Government office
Latvia	Prosecution
Lithuania	Prosecution, courts
Luxembourg	Prosecution, courts
Hungary	Prosecution
Malta	Prosecution
Netherlands	Prosecution, police authorities, government office
Austria	Prosecution
Poland	Prosecution
Portugal	Prosecution
Romania	Prosecution
Slovenia	Prosecution, courts
Slovakia	Prosecution
Finland	Police authorities, parliamentary body
United Kingdom	Prosecution ⁽¹⁾ , police authorities
Turkey	Prosecution
Norway	Prosecution, police authorities

⁽¹⁾ Scotland only: Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service.

Two-thirds of the countries (17) report that drug law enforcement units operate under the external stewardship of one authority, while in the remaining countries supervision is shared between two or three authorities (Figure 9).

Of the 16 countries reporting one supervising authority, all but two report that the prosecutor performs this role. The exceptions are Ireland, where the supervising authority is a

FIGURE 9

Number of supervising authorities per country

police authority, and Cyprus, where it is a governmental office (Ministry of Justice and Public Order).

Seven of the other countries report the involvement of a prosecutor in tandem with either a court (Germany, France, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Slovenia) or a police authority (Norway, Scotland in the United Kingdom) (see the box on the Norwegian approach). In Finland, the work of drug units is monitored by police authorities and parliamentary institutions (see the box on the Finnish system).

Only in the Netherlands is the responsibility for the oversight of drug law enforcement split between three authorities: a prosecutor, a police authority and a local or national government office (Ministry of Justice and Safety).

Norway: a two-track system for the supervision of drug law enforcement decisions and the role of the police prosecutor

Most countries in Europe have a clear dividing line between the police authority and the public prosecuting authority. In Norway, uniquely, these two authorities are integrated into a two-track system. The rationale for this arrangement is that it is easier to supervise an investigation where the prosecutor and the investigating officer work in closer geographical proximity.

A police prosecutor works within the prosecuting authority and is subordinate to the Director General of Public Prosecution and the District Attorney's office. The police prosecutor, a lawyer, is typically a member of the police force at management level and outranks most police officers.

The role of the police prosecutor includes performance of duties as head of investigation and prosecutor in court. Police prosecutors have prosecution powers in minor offences. During the course of an investigation, the prosecutor can decide to issue a charge sheet, carry out a search at an address or issue a warrant of arrest, as well as making an application to the court about custody proceedings. As a head of an investigation, the police

prosecutor is responsible for the termination or continuation of a prosecution (investigation).

Police lawyers act as prosecutors in most city court criminal proceedings (lower level), and the District Attorney's office acts as prosecutor in cases concerning more serious matters in the higher court of law (higher level). The Director General of Public Prosecution can, on rare occasions concerning matters of principle, act as prosecutor in the Supreme Court.

At the time of writing, the model of police organisation applied in Norway is under debate. Among the stronger arguments raised by opponents is the potential adverse impact exerted by a prominent prosecuting presence on the objectivity of the investigation. In contrast, the main advantage of the two-track system is that it fosters close cooperation between police lawyers and investigating police officers. Whereas lawyers are in a position to identify which circumstances should be examined for the investigation, investigators are best equipped to provide the necessary information through interviews and a range of information channels.

Conclusions

This study reported here set out to provide a comprehensive picture of the organisation and mandate of specialised drug law enforcement in Europe, which had hitherto been lacking. The information presented in this report establishes a key starting point to a better understanding of the diverse and complex reality of drug supply reduction in the region.

At the time of the survey, September 2012, the 26 European countries participating in the project reported a total of about 1 100 drug squads. About 90 % of the estimated total staff (19 000) in the 23 countries providing information were law enforcement officers (17 000). These officers would represent about 1 % on average of all police staff in Europe, though the national proportions vary between 0.1 and 3.5 %. The largest proportions of drug law enforcement officers are found in territorially small or sparsely populated countries.

Although these results are best viewed as estimates, and should be interpreted with caution, they are the first overall figures on drug law enforcement to be produced at European level, and they provide a baseline for future monitoring of drug supply reduction activities in Europe. For monitoring purposes, the number of drug law enforcement officers is likely to be more useful than the number of units, as the interpretation of drug squad may differ between the various national reference persons. Although this may also be true of the number of drug law enforcement officers, this number is less dependent on whether some units are counted as discrete drug squads. Furthermore, the number of drug law enforcement officers has greater potential as an analytical tool, since it can be put into perspective with other numbers, such as the total number of police officers in a country or region, or the size of a population.

Furthermore, if used cautiously, this number could contribute to the interpretation of other numbers routinely reported as indicators of drug-related crime and drug supply, which are the result of drug supply reduction activities: reported drug supply offences and drug seizures.

At national level, political decisions on drug law enforcement are mainly in the hands of interior ministries (in charge of police and gendarmerie-like forces), which have responsibilities over drug squads in 24 of the 26 participating countries. Closely connected to Member States' interior ministries, the Standing Committee on Operational Cooperation on Internal Security (COSI) and Europol are key players for priority setting on drug supply reduction at European level.

Ministries of finance and trade, which are reported by 14 countries, should also play a significant role in this field, mainly through the involvement of customs services. Customs organisations are especially important for issues related to

cross-border trafficking and seizures at importation level, but also drug precursors. However, the study produced less information on customs, largely as specific information on customs was reported by fewer countries.

The importance of finance and trade ministries is also a reminder that drug supply reduction is not a matter exclusively for law enforcement organisations, as is often thought to be the case. For instance, drug precursors control is now recognised as a shared responsibility between law enforcement and the chemical industry.

Ministries of justice have direct responsibility over specialised drug law enforcement units in seven countries. Their role in drug law enforcement is much stronger than this number may indicate, since in many countries drug investigations are supervised and/or headed by justice ministry staff, especially prosecutors. In fact, fully understanding drug supply reduction actors and activities in Europe requires mapping out and analysing the contribution made by the justice system alongside law enforcement.

The diversity in the organisation of law enforcement in Europe is reflected in the distribution of drug squads across different sets of law enforcement organisations, depending on the country. Drug squads have been established in the judicial or criminal police of 25 of the 26 responding countries, and in the customs services of 16. However, drug squads are also reported to exist in other types of police forces and gendarmerie-like organisations in a smaller number of countries, resulting in a complex array of national configurations. By contrast, the organisational status of drug squads is somewhat less diverse. Two models dominate the European landscape for carrying out the specialised drug law enforcement function: dedicated units, i.e. units with an exclusive focus on drugs (the archetypal drug squads) exist in 21 countries; while serious and organised crime-related drug squads are reported in 18 countries. These models are not mutually exclusive, as 11 countries report the coexistence of both types of drug squads.

The study has not adequately explored the involvement of customs organisation in European drug law enforcement, for reasons that have already been explained. However, it is clear that future monitoring efforts should seek to learn more about customs services, first, in order to better understand the impact of customs interventions on drug seizures and reported drug law offences statistics, and, secondly, as the role of customs services in European internal security matters is likely to grow in the future.

This is especially the case because customs services are often key players in MDLE units. At the time of the survey, September 2012, 40 such units were established in 10 countries. The majority (30) of these MDLE units were

reported in Germany, where they are made up of police and customs officers. In the rest of the countries but two, the reported MDLE units also bring together police and customs. Formally established units where police and customs organisations, and in some cases additional agencies, cooperate on drug issues do not exist in almost two-thirds of the European countries participating in the study. It would be interesting to better understand how the cooperation between different organisations is implemented in the countries where no MDLE units exist.

In eight countries, drug law enforcement is performed by granting all drug squads a comprehensive technical mandate, which enables them to intervene in all areas of drug law enforcement, while in five countries only a specific technical mandate (e.g. wholesale trafficking) is assigned to the national drug squad. In a majority of European countries, drug law enforcement combines comprehensive and specific technical mandates. This finding of the study raises the question of whether or not the strategic priorities mirrored in the technical mandates assigned to drug squads answer a need to address specific national drug problems.

In the 26 countries participating in the study, a central drug squad is assigned a national territorial mandate. In 20 countries, the nationally mandated drug squad also has a mandate to pursue cross-border investigations. In a majority of countries (18), however, most drug law enforcement units operate under a local or regional territorial mandate. In addition, three of the seven countries that assign solely a national mandate maintain a regional or local presence through a variety of means.

It appears, therefore, that, in Europe, the preferred approach is to give a concrete drug law enforcement response at local levels. This implies that, even if the drug phenomenon has a transnational dimension, the perception is that it requires first and foremost a local response.

Drug law enforcement activities in Europe are overwhelmingly supervised by the justice system, and only in a handful of countries do other authorities carry out the supervising function. In this sense, drug law enforcement is not different from other areas of policing and is embedded within the overall system of checks and balances characteristic of democratic states ruled by law. However, it is particularly important to understand supervision arrangements, since these have a strong influence on the priority-setting process and, therefore, on the activities and results of drug law enforcement organisations. Supervision arrangements are also particularly important here, as drug law enforcement often makes use of intrusive techniques (such as wiretaps and undercover measures), which require closer supervision than

other policing activities. Although this study could not cover this area, it should be included in future monitoring efforts.

Drug law enforcement activities fall under three main functions: intelligence gathering, operations and case management. The fact that operations and case management are reported as standard drug squad functions comes as no surprise. However, 24 out of 26 countries providing information to the project reported that drug law enforcement included an intelligence-gathering function, mostly within drug squads and sometimes within independent drug intelligence units. Further monitoring efforts should endeavour to analyse the management of the drug law enforcement intelligence function in Europe in connection with the ongoing development of intelligence-led policing at national and European levels.

This study is the first result of the EMCDDA's efforts at monitoring drug supply reduction in Europe, with the help of national law enforcement partners. It provides an initial overview of important but hitherto unexplored aspects of drug law enforcement, and so may be viewed as a baseline against which future changes can be monitored. However, as is often the case with first-time surveys, the initial set of questions and the answers to them gave rise to new questions and helped identify gaps in our knowledge. In particular, it is now clear that improving our understanding of drug supply reduction in Europe will require more accurate mapping of all the institutions involved, especially customs services. Other important areas on which more information is needed include the financial resources allocated to drug law enforcement and the drug law enforcement operations and techniques used by drug squads.

In taking this forward, it will be necessary to collect data regularly within the framework of the key indicator on drug supply reduction. Indeed, this study is a core element of the European key indicator on drug supply reduction, which is under development at the EMCDDA. It will also help to contextualise and further analyse essential datasets such as drug seizures and reported drug law offences. In this way, this study will also make an important contribution to the development of the other two European key indicators on drug markets and drug-related crime. Improved monitoring of law enforcement strategies and practices will be one of the aims of a European network, to be set up shortly, that will be tasked with reporting qualitative data on drug supply and supply reduction issues. The success of these initiatives in improving our monitoring and understanding of developments in the area of drug supply reduction in Europe will rest on the building of a sound relationship between the EMCDDA and European drug law enforcement professionals. This study has laid some of the groundwork towards that goal.

References

- | Council of the European Union (2004), *EU Drugs Strategy (2005–2012)*, CORDROGUE 77/SAN 187/ENFOPOL 178/RELEX 564, 15074/04.
- | Council of the European Union (2005a), 'EU Drugs Action Plan (2005–2008)', *Official Journal of the European Union* C 168, pp. 1–18.
- | Council of the European Union (2005b), *Prüm Convention*, CRIMORG 65, ENFOPOL 85, MIGR 30, 10900/05.
- | Council of the European Union (2008), 'EU Drugs Action Plan (2009–2012)', *Official Journal of the European Union* C 326, pp. 7–25.
- | Council of the European Union (2012a), *EU Drugs Strategy (2013–2020)*, JAI 901/CORDROGUE 101/SAN 324/JAIEX 124, 17547/12.
- | Council of the European Union (2012b), *Consolidated versions of the Treaty on the European Union and the Treaty on the functioning of the European Union and the Chapter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union*, REV 7, 6655/7/08, Brussels.
- | Council of the European Union (2013), *EU Drugs Action Plan (2013–2016)*, CORDROGUE 37/SAN 177/ENFOPOL 158/RELEX 439, 9963/13.
- | EMCDDA (European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction) (2008), *Towards a better understanding of drug-related public expenditure in Europe*, Selected issues, EMCDDA, Lisbon.
- | EMCDDA (2009a), *Annual report 2009: The state of the drugs problem in Europe*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
- | EMCDDA (2009b), *Cross unit project on drug supply and supply reduction*, final report, Lisbon, December (unpublished).
- | EMCDDA (2012), *Annual report 2012: The state of the drugs problem in Europe*, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
- | Eurojust (2012), *Strategic project on enhancing the work of Eurojust in drug trafficking cases — final results*, Eurojust, The Hague.
- | European Council (2010), 'The Stockholm Programme: An open and secure Europe serving and protecting citizens', *Official Journal of the European Union* C 115, pp. 1–38.
- | Eurostat (2013), *Police officers*. Available at http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=crim_plce&land=en
- | Feltes, Th. (2009), 'Aussagewert der polizeilichen Aufklärungsquote', *Kriminalistik* 63, Hüthig GmbH, pp. 36–40.
- | Home Office (2012), *Protection of Freedoms Act 2012: Changes to provisions under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA)*, Home Office, London.
- | Kaiser, G. (1997), *Kriminologie. Eine Einführung in die Grundlagen*. 10., neubearbeitete und ergänzte Auflage, UTB Verlag, Heidelberg.
- | Stock, J. and Kreuzer, A. (1998), 'Die polizeiliche Arbeit aus kriminologischer Sicht', in: Kreuzer, A. (editor), *Handbuch des Betäubungsmittelstrafrechts*, Beck, München, pp. 1028–1100.
- | Undheim, T. (2003), 'Getting connected: How sociologists can access the high tech elite', in *The qualitative report* 8:1. Available at: <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR8-1/undheim.html>. Retrieved on 15 February 2013.
- | Van Dijk, J., Manchin, R., Van Kesteren, J., Nevala, S. and Hideg, G. (2006), *The burden of crime in the EU: A comparative analysis of the European Crime and Safety Survey (EU ICS) 2005*, The Gallup Organization Europe.
- | Additional institutional information for the project was obtained from the following online resources:
www.guardiacivil.es/documentos/pdfs/mapaZonasGC.pdf
www.guardiacivil.es/documentos/pdfs/organigramadirector.pdf
www.guardiacivil.es/es/institucional/estructuraorganizacion/index.html
www.interpol.int
www.policia.es
www.politi.dk

Annex

Questionnaire sent to national reference persons



European Monitoring Centre
for Drugs and Drug Addiction

I. Introduction

First and foremost we gratefully acknowledge your willingness to support this mapping exercise on drug squads in Europe. Answers to the questionnaire should provide an overview of those law enforcement forces which aim to reduce the supply of illicit drugs across Europe, in terms of their organisational, operational and coordinating structures. This should in turn help to deepen the EMCDDA's technical knowledge, which is a precondition to fulfilling our mandate to develop indicators on drug supply and drug supply reduction in Europe.

The questionnaire was pre-tested with four different national law enforcement agencies, namely officials of specialised drug law enforcement units (police and customs) and the results helped us to improve the questionnaire.

The 13 questions address five areas of drug law enforcement in your country:

- The existence of drug squads
- Drug squads in the general organisation of law enforcement
- The legal and technical mandate of drug squads
- The strategic and tactical mandate of drug squads
- The staff of drug squads

Definitions of 'drug squads', 'law enforcement', 'technical mandate' and 'enforcement officers' are provided below the respective questions.

Section III of the questionnaire gives you the possibility to make additional comments and recommendations, should you wish to, and to name additional institutions or persons that we may contact for further information on drug squads in your country.

You received this questionnaire via e-mail (pdf-format). Please provide responses to the questions in Section II and III in the available text boxes. There is no limit to the size. In the near future the EMCDDA will give you a phone call to introduce the questionnaire and its contents and discuss the answering procedure. The EMCDDA is happy to provide any help you may require at any stage of the project; do not hesitate to contact the Project Manager, Mr. Rainer Kasecker, by email (Rainer.Kasecker@emcdda.europa.eu) or by phone (tel. +351 211 210

253). The questionnaire should be answered in English and by 15 September 2011 at the latest. Please send back the completed questionnaire via e-mail to the following address:

Rainer.Kasecker@emcdda.europa.eu

II. Questions on drug squads

AREA 1: The existence of drug squads

1. Are there any drug squads in your country?

Definition: In the context of this project, 'drug squad' has been defined as:

'a formally established official, state or governmental law enforcement agency or sub-division thereof (i.e. department, section, unit, etc.), the only or main mission of which is to detect and/or investigate breaches to the drug legislation and to bring the offenders to justice. It may be an intelligence and/or an operational law enforcement unit with local, regional, national or international jurisdiction. Although most such 'drug squads' are likely to belong to Police or Customs organisations, drug squads potentially active in other institutions including for instance intelligence or military institutions (Gendarmerie, Guardia Civil, Border Guard, etc.) should also be taken into account'

Yes No

If the answer is No, please go to **III. Final Remarks** at the end of this questionnaire.

AREA 2: Drug squads in the general organisation of law enforcement

Definition: 'Law enforcement' includes police, customs, but also any other agency that is enforcing laws (including for example some military organisations such as Gendarmerie, Guardia Civil, etc.).

2. Which ministry or ministries do drug squads in your country report to (in other words, where are they located)?

Please list all ministries concerned and indicate the drug squads that are located within each one.

.....
.....

In which agencies are the drug squads located (e.g. Judicial Police Force, Customs Service, etc.)?

Please list all concerned agencies and indicate the drug squads located within each.

.....

3. Is there a multi-agency approach (for example, drug squads made up of both police and customs officials)?

Please name the multi-agency organisation(s) and describe briefly the institutional and organisational framework(s) within which they are located.

.....

AREA 3: The legal and technical mandates of drug squads

4. What are the technical mandates of the drug squads in your country?

Definition: 'Technical mandate' means: can the unit address all types of drug offences or is it limited to intermediary or wholesale level or focussed on specific operations such as importation, smuggling, dismantling illicit laboratories or cultivation sites?

Please describe briefly the technical mandates of the different drug squads in your country. Should they vary according to the type of drug squad, please specify.

.....

Do the drug squads have different territorial responsibilities (local, regional, national, international) and which ones are responsible for international, national, regional and/or local cases?

Please describe briefly the territorial responsibilities of the different drug squads in your country. If they vary according to the type of drug squad, please specify. Wherever possible, provide an estimation of the number (or percentage) of drug squads for each of the territorial responsibilities identified.

.....

Who is the external decisional authority supervising the law enforcement efforts made by drug squads?

Please tick an option, or describe briefly, as appropriate. Should the external decisional authority vary according to the type of drug squad, please specify.

Prosecutor

Court

Other (please specify):

Additional comments:

AREA 4: The strategic and tactical mandates of drug squads

5. Are there any drug squads which are pure case management units without operational tasks?

Yes No

If **Yes**, how many: ...

If you **do not know** the exact number, please skip to **Question 12**.

6. Are there some that are also operationally oriented (for example, making arrests, implementing undercover operations or surveillance operations, etc.)?

Yes No

If **Yes**, how many: ...

If you **do not know** the exact number, please skip to **Question 12**.

7. Are there any drug squads that are pure law enforcement intelligence units?

Yes No

If **Yes**, how many: ...

If you **do not know** the exact number, please skip to **Question 12**.

8. Are there drug squads that are a mix of these different law enforcement functions?

Yes No

If **Yes**, how many:

If you **do not know** the exact number, please skip to **Question 12**.

9. If you were not able to provide exact numbers for Questions 8, 9, 10 and 11, could you please try to provide an estimate of the proportion of each type of drug squads (or mixed ones) there are in your country?

Please provide estimates as percentage of total number of drug squads. Feel free to use approximate percentages.

Should they vary according to the type of agency or ministry they are located in, please specify.

Pure case management units:
% of total number of drug squads

Both case management and operationally oriented:
% of total number of drug squads

Pure law enforcement intelligence units:
% of total number of drug squads

Mix of law enforcement functions:
% of total number of drug squads

Other type(s):
% of total number of drug squads

AREA 5: Staffing of drug squads

10. Could you provide us with an idea of the total number of staff working in drug squads (according to the different types of drug squads), and in particular how many within these are law enforcement officers?

Definition: 'law enforcement officers' are officials who are permitted to arrest individuals, make seizures, conduct investigations, and so on.

In the absence of exact numbers, please provide estimates. Whenever possible, provide a breakdown of number of staff/enforcement officers by type of drug squad.

Total number of staff in drug squads:
.....
.....

Total number of law enforcement officers in drug squads:
.....
.....

III. Final remarks

The questionnaire is now nearly finished. However, we would like to ask you a few additional questions in order to complete the picture.

- Is there any other complementary information you would like to provide on drug squads in general, or in your country?
- Is there any additional comment you wish to make?
- Is the overview you provided us with representative of the situation across your country?
- Is there anyone else in your country with knowledge of drug squads you think we should contact? If so, please provide their full name and title and contact details (e-mail or telephone number).

IV. Sharing answers and analysis

1. Can the results you have provided to this survey be divulged to other respondents?

Sharing answers to the questionnaire between respondents may prove a good option and be a useful source of information and knowledge for all participants. For respondents who wish to share answers, the EMCDDA will set up a secure website (accessible with a password) which will display the answers of the respondents who have agreed to share them. It will be regularly updated.

It is essential that you let us know whether you agree to share your answer with the other respondents (on a secure website):

Yes No

2. What will the EMCDDA do with the information from the questionnaires?

The EMCDDA aims to collect responses from its network of reporting countries including the 27 Member States of the European Union, Norway, Croatia and Turkey. The information obtained will be the subject of an analysis on specialised drug law enforcement in Europe. Preliminary results will be discussed with a selection of respondents during a technical meeting early 2012 in Lisbon, Portugal. At all stages of the analysis, we may contact you for clarification in relation to the answers you provided. A draft of the analysis will be sent to all respondents for comments during the first half of 2012 in order to allow them to correct potential misunderstandings and complete information where deemed appropriate. The final report on the drug squads project is expected to be ready by the end of 2012.

Thank you very much for your patience and efforts.

Acknowledgements

Project coordination: Rainer Kasecker

Authors: Laurent Laniel, Rainer Kasecker, Teodora Groshkova and Chloé Carpentier

The EMCDDA would like to extend special thanks to the national reference persons of the following countries: Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Estonia, Ireland, Spain, France, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Hungary, Malta, the Netherlands, Austria, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, the United Kingdom, Turkey and Norway, for their generous support to the drug squads project and for providing invaluable information without which this report could not have been written. The national focal points of the Reitox network should also be thanked for their support. Our gratitude also goes to Cepol, Europol and the Maritime Analysis and Operations Centre — Narcotics (MAOC-N) for their active support to the project.

Other contributors: Vaughan Birbeck, Marco Costa, Andrew Cunningham, Paulete Duque, Marisa Gomes, Paul Griffiths, Brendan Hughes, Silke Kübler, Linda Moloney, Jane Mounteney, Kobie Mulligan, André Noor, David Penny, Eoghan Quigley, Luis Royuela, Roumen Sedefov, Athanasios Stamos.

About the EMCDDA

The European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction is the hub of drug-related information in Europe. Its mission is to provide the European Union and its Member States with 'factual, objective, reliable and comparable information' on drugs and drug addiction and their consequences. Established in 1993, it opened its doors in Lisbon in 1995, and is one of the European Union's decentralised agencies. The Centre offers policymakers the evidence base they need for drawing up drug laws and strategies. It also helps professionals and researchers pinpoint best practice and new areas for analysis.

Related publications

EMCDDA

| First European conference on drug supply indicators: key conclusions, 2010

EMCDDA and Europol

| EU drug market report: a strategic analysis, 2013

| Amphetamine: a European Union perspective in the global context, 2011

| Cocaine: a European Union perspective in the global context, 2010

| Methamphetamine: a European Union perspective in the global context, 2009

These and all other EMCDDA publications are available from www.emcdda.europa.eu/publications

Legal notice: The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the official opinions of the EMCDDA's partners, the EU Member States or any institution or agency of the European Union. More information on the European Union is available on the Internet (europa.eu).

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union
doi:10.2810/22289 | ISBN 978-92-9168-674-2

© European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction, 2013
Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

This publication is only available in electronic format.

EMCDDA, Praça Europa 1, Cais do Sodré, 1249-289 Lisbon, Portugal
Tel. (351) 211 21 02 00 | info@emcdda.europa.eu
emcdda.europa.eu | twitter.com/emcdda | facebook.com/emcdda

ISBN 978-92-9168-674-2



Publications Office