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V.98-56374 (E)
I. MATTERS CALLING FOR ACTION BY THE COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS OR BROUGHT TO ITS ATTENTION

Recommendations adopted by the Fourth Meeting of Heads of National Drug Law Enforcement Agencies, Europe

1. The Fourth Meeting of Heads of National Drug Law Enforcement Agencies (HONLEA), Europe, made the recommendations below, which had been drawn up by its working groups. For the observations and conclusions of the working groups that led to the recommendations, see chapter III below.

Issue 1. Evaluation of the role of the police and drug law enforcement bodies on the demand and supply side, with a view to obtaining a balanced multidisciplinary drug policy

1. Tackling drug misuse and abuse is a shared responsibility and, to fight the drug problem, States should implement long-term, multi-agency, multidisciplinary strategies that target young people and that include all segments of society.

2. The success of the law enforcement agencies supporting the national strategies should be measured by the application of common performance indicators directed at assessing their impact on the availability of illicit drugs, in addition to the number and volume of drug seizures or drug-related arrest.

3. States should increase their efforts to cooperate at the international level in reducing both the supply of and the demand for illicit drugs and, where possible, should support the national strategies of other States.

4. The United Nations International Drug Control Programme (UNDCP) should have a higher profile and should have a role in coordinating the different national strategies to ensure that there is an effective multinational response to the issues involved.
**Issue 2. Status of international cooperation in the suppression of the illicit traffic by sea, as called for in article 17 of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988**

5. States that have not yet made provisions in their national legislation for the implementation of article 17 of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988 or have not yet established effective procedures to deal with the operational preconditions of that article are urged to take appropriate steps to do so.

6. In so doing, States should ensure that they establish a streamlined, effective and speedy procedure to fulfil requests promptly and thoroughly.

7. States should refer to the UNDCP models that have been drafted in support of national legislation and bilateral agreements when fulfilling their obligations under article 17.

8. States in central and eastern Europe should be encouraged to participate in existing reporting mechanisms, such as MAR INFO/YACHT INFO, and the establishment of other regional communication networks, such as the Black Sea Economic Corporation Organization, should be welcomed.

9. States should be encouraged to disseminate to other States, to the extent possible, timely, relevant information, whether directly or through the multinational customs system MAR INFO/YACHT INFO, the Regional Intelligence Liaison Office network of the Customs Co-operation Council (also called the World Customs Organization), the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol), Europol or any other regional channel, such as the Black Sea Economic Corporation Organization, in order to make possible the comprehensive integration of available intelligence.

10. States should encourage their drug law enforcement agencies to engage in:

   (a) Pursuing the signing of formal memoranda of understanding with trade partners such as carriers, shipping agents and freight forwarders;

   (b) Developing “human intelligence” programmes aimed at eliciting the vigilance and cooperation of the public, in support of risk assessment and targeting efforts;

   (c) Making full use of new and developing technology in intelligence collation, risk analysis and drug detection.

**Issue 3. Role of law enforcement agencies in controlling exports and imports of essential chemicals and precursors**

11. Close cooperation between the private sector (manufacture and trade) and those public authorities responsible for licensing, control and law enforcement should be strengthened among countries in the European region.

12. All States in the European region should implement the measures contained in General Assembly resolutions S-20/4 A to E of 10 June 1998, adopted by the Assembly at its twentieth special session, especially the measures contained in resolution S-20/4 B, on the control of precursors, and, in particular, those contained in paragraph 7 of the measures to prevent the illicit manufacture, import, export, trafficking and distribution of precursors used in the illicit manufacture of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances.
13. Manufacturers, brokers or companies that handle precursors should be obliged by law to report suspicious orders or transactions to the competent authorities.

14. Where they do not already exist, national focal points for precursor control and law enforcement should be established.

15. Precursor-producing and precursor-exporting countries in the European region should implement existing pre-export notification procedures in respect of all destination or transit countries, regardless of whether or not the importing or transit country has asked for pre-export notification.*

16. Mutual assistance between law enforcement agencies in the European region should be strengthened by:

   (a) Exchanging information periodically;

   (b) Providing relevant documents and evidentiary items;

   (c) Using modern technologies for the exchange of information;

   (d) Designating central authorities that may communicate directly with one another.

**Issue 4. Illicit production and abuse of psychotropic substances**

17. European initiatives to combat the illicit manufacture and abuse of psychotropic substances, such as the amphetamine profile project in Sweden, the LOGO project of Europol and the early warning system of the European Union, should be extended to other European States interested in participating in those initiatives, and consideration should be given to fulfilling any training needs that may arise as a result.

18. States should consider the experience of other States that have adopted a functional approach to dealing with the illicit manufacture and abuse of psychotropic substances, setting up centres providing expertise to specialists to act as focal points; regardless of the approach adopted, mechanisms should be considered for developing and sharing information from the industries manufacturing and dealing in the equipment and other instrumentalities used in the illicit manufacture of psychotropic substances.

19. States should consider the nature and extent of on-line measures to counter, minimize or neutralize material on the Internet that promotes the illicit manufacture of synthetic drugs, desensitizes the public or unduly influences the young.

20. Bearing in mind the seriousness of abuse of amphetamine-type stimulants, States should consider, as a priority in demand reduction efforts, introducing regulatory control of cultural events for youth that contribute to the abuse of and demand for psychotropic substances.

**II. PRIORITY ACTIVITIES FOR 1998-2000**

*The representative of the European Commission expressed his disagreement with recommendation 15.*
2. At its 1st and 2nd meetings, on 14 September, the Fourth Meeting of HONLEA, Europe, considered agenda item 3, entitled “Priority activities for 1998-2000”. The Meeting had before it, for its consideration, a document on the subject (UNDCP/HONEURO/1998/2). Statements were made by the representatives of Turkmenistan, Cyprus, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Belgium, France, Germany, the United States of America, the Russian Federation, Turkey, Hungary, Slovakia and Israel. The observer for Europol also made a statement.

3. It was noted that, during the previous three years, there had been a marked increase in illicit drug trafficking in Europe, particularly in eastern and central Europe. Radical political and social changes in the region, together with the opening of borders between eastern and western Europe and the globalization of trade, had provided trafficking organizations with new routes for smuggling drugs into Europe. Some representatives stated that illicit trafficking in narcotic drugs was expected to increase further in the next few years and that, therefore, it was necessary to mobilize resources in order to reinforce drug law enforcement controls on the borders of central Asian countries and some neighbouring countries in which most illicit drugs were being produced.

4. The criminal organizations involved in international drug trafficking were becoming wealthier and stronger and were no longer restricting themselves to smuggling only one type of drug. Several representatives reported that drug traffickers were increasingly using state-of-the-art, high-tech, electronic equipment to avoid law enforcement controls. Drug law enforcement agencies throughout eastern and western Europe were often not well equipped; they needed to be able to invest more resources in the latest technological equipment in order to intercept communications between traffickers and detect illicit drug consignments. European States would therefore have to devote more attention and resources to drug law enforcement agencies, providing them with computers, software programs, telecommunication equipment, container scanners and other high-tech equipment, as well as ensuring that training was provided to drug law enforcement officials to enable them to meet the challenge.

5. In the view of several representatives, there was a need to improve cooperation further in the form of joint undercover and cross-border operations, controlled deliveries, exchanges of intelligence and detection of money-laundering practices. Delays in the release of personal information, such as telephone numbers, were frequently encountered when such information was requested from other States. Similarly, the investigating officers of one State were sometimes denied the opportunity to be present when related investigations or interviews were taking place in another country. One representative proposed that each European State should conduct a national review (“security audit”) of its laws, systems and practices in the field of drug control so that areas of weakness might be exposed and dealt with. Such reviews not only would improve national capacities in the fight against drug trafficking, but could also lead to quicker harmonization of legislation at the regional level. The Meeting was asked to support a proposal to be made to the Council of Europe to make a critical review of the various bilateral police and judicial cooperation agreements a priority for the Council’s work programme for the next five years.

6. Several representatives reported on the successes of controlled delivery operations conducted jointly by drug law enforcement agencies from their countries and such agencies from other European countries. In some States, however, controlled deliveries were not carried out because of legislative constraints. Priority should be given, over the next few years, to the harmonization of legislation in Europe so that specific provisions would allow controlled delivery operations to be conducted in more States, resulting in larger seizures of illicit drug consignments and the arrest of key criminals. One representative reported on the successful deployment of mobile control groups to carry out coordinated control operations in cooperation with the drug law enforcement units of neighbouring countries. Another recent form of cooperation consisted of so-called “channel operations”, conducted on the border between the Russian Federation and Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and the Republic of Moldova, whereby drug control operations were simultaneously carried out by drug law enforcement agencies within their national borders. Such operations, which had led
to the seizure of significant illicit drug consignments and to the arrest of many traffickers, would be improved and expanded in the future.

7. Some representatives noted that more efforts should be made to improve maritime cooperation in order to limit the smuggling of drugs by sea. Mother ships conveying consignments of illicit drugs, which now include heroin, were remaining in international waters, thereby rendering themselves virtually immune to law enforcement action. Consideration should be given to amending the international law of the sea to make provision for interception and boarding by law enforcement authorities of vessels suspected of carrying illicit drugs, either on an open or restricted basis. At ports of entry, the analysis of information on cargo prior to its arrival and the use of specially designed software had recently proved useful in the detection of illicit drug consignments hidden in containers. In the view of one representative, joint efforts should also be made at the regional level to provide logistical or other assistance to those countries with free or large ports of entry through which drugs could be smuggled into other parts of Europe.

III. IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY THE THIRD MEETING OF HEADS OF NATIONAL DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES, EUROPE

8. At its 3rd meeting, on 15 September, the Fourth Meeting of HONLEA, Europe, considered agenda item 4, entitled “Implementation of the recommendations adopted by the Third Meeting of Heads of National Drug Law Enforcement Agencies, Europe, by States of the region”. It had before it a document on the subject (UNDCP/HONEURO/1998/3), which had been prepared on the basis of information provided by Governments on the implementation of those recommendations. Statements were made by the representatives of Ukraine, Turkey, Spain, Belgium, France, Hungary, Turkmenistan, Sweden, Cyprus, Latvia, Ireland, Finland, the Russian Federation, the Netherlands, Germany, Israel and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

9. With regard to measures to counter international drug trafficking organizations posing threats to democracy, most of the speakers reported on the amendment and/or strengthening of their legislation and judicial systems. Legislative, penal and administrative measures had been adopted to deal more effectively with the challenges posed to States, in particular those with economies in transition, by such international criminal organizations. The harmonization of legislation on narcotic drugs in member States of the European Community was considered a top priority by many States. In some cases, national committees had been established to follow up and evaluate programmes concerned with the dangers stemming from illicit drug trafficking and drug abuse that might affect economies and the normal functions of government. One representative mentioned the importance of cooperation activities involving drug liaison officers appointed in his country. Several representatives informed the Meeting of the recent introduction of a code of conduct in their legislation as a measure to counter corrupt practices. Many representatives also mentioned the efforts in their countries to support local and regional initiatives in the area of reducing demand for both illicit drugs and alcohol. Such demand reduction initiatives usually involved local communities, schools and families. Local communities and non-governmental organizations were generally encouraged to participate in initiatives to promote public awareness with regard to criminal activities and drug-related phenomena. In some countries, the reversal of the burden of proof was considered a useful legislative tool to be applied in appropriate circumstances when dealing with the confiscation of assets derived from drug trafficking. In other countries, the reversal of the burden of proof was against national legislation and in still others it was under consideration.

10. With regard to recent developments in central and eastern Europe that had had an impact on the illicit traffic in cocaine, some States had established systems, records or databases for monitoring profiles, with the names of individuals, vessels, air carriers and flights involved in smuggling, in order to improve the effectiveness of law enforcement agencies in tracking down cocaine consignments. Information on commercial enterprises with a high potential for involvement in the cocaine trade and/or other drugs was kept by drug law
enforcement authorities. International databases were in some cases available for consultation; in the view of some representatives, however, there was room for improvement in that area. Most representatives reported that the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol), World Customs Organization and Europol networks were being used regularly. Some representatives reported that information on cocaine routes was being developed within the framework of national information and analysis systems. The use of some countries as transit points for cocaine smuggling had increased during the previous three years. Some representatives reported that there was limited abuse of cocaine in their countries, even though data on the abuse of that drug and on the exact number of its abusers were not available in the majority of countries. Studies were currently being undertaken to determine the size of the illicit cocaine market in some countries.

11. With regard to measures to strengthen the drug interdiction capabilities of States in the region, agreements or protocols on cooperation to combat drugs and organized crime were reported by the majority of representatives. Cooperation had also increased among international organizations. Within the European Union and under the terms of the Schengen Agreement, collaboration and the exchange of information across borders were also increasing significantly. Several joint control operations had been conducted by customs within the framework of the European Union directed against the smuggling of drugs by sea. In all cases operational committees had been set up to facilitate such operations. In some countries, joint cross-border operations were being conducted on a daily basis. In a few cases, however, no joint exercises were being performed with drug law enforcement agencies of neighbouring countries. Cooperation among customs services with regard to control of direct flights was also reported.

12. The majority of the representatives reported the existence of a central authority responsible for drug law enforcement. In some countries, such central authorities did not yet exist; however, some forms of cooperation between national law enforcement agencies were reported. Drug liaison officers had been widely deployed in Europe in the previous years. Many States were planning to appoint drug liaison officers in various areas of the world in the near future. One representative stated that general policing competence (not restricted to knowledge of drug-related matters) on the part of appointed liaison officers was considered an asset in his country. One speaker reported on the tight links between drug smuggling and terrorism in his country and asked the Meeting to consider more elaborate and decisive measures to prevent criminal organizations from carrying out all criminal activities, including terrorism and drug smuggling. In a large number of countries, controlled delivery techniques were successfully being used. In many countries, legislation had been amended and controlled deliveries, as well as undercover operations, were considered legitimate but were kept under strict supervision. Officers participating in such operations received special training. Some States were introducing new legislation to bring the judiciary and police investigative units closer together.

13. With regard to the implementation of measures regarding money-laundering, the relevant provisions had been drafted, in some cases with assistance from UNDCP, and had been adopted in the majority of countries. Several representatives reported on the assistance received by the central financial institutions of their countries in detecting suspicious transactions. One representative reported that, in his country, legislation against money-laundering was still not adequate to ensure compliance with the provisions of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988, but new legislation was currently under consideration. He proposed that UNDCP issue guidelines with regard to banking activities. Legislation was currently being drafted in some countries on the confiscation of assets and other proceeds of crime. In one case, a national committee had been established to investigate and analyse questions concerning the possibility of seizing and confiscating the proceeds of crime.
IV. CONSIDERATION OF ISSUES BY WORKING GROUPS

14. At its 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th meetings, on 15, 16 and 17 September, the Meeting established working groups to examine four topics that had been identified at the Third Meeting of HONLEA, Europe. The observations made by the working groups and the conclusions reached after consideration of the issues are presented below. For the recommendations approved by the plenary, see chapter I above.

A. Evaluation of the role of the police and drug law enforcement bodies on the demand and supply side, with a view to obtaining a balanced multidisciplinary drug policy

15. The working group on issue 1 met once, on 15 September. In its consideration of the subject, the working group made the following observations:

(a) Drug misuse and abuse constituted a social problem primarily affecting young people;

(b) Drug misuse and abuse were often linked to criminal activity;

(c) Tackling drug misuse and abuse was not just an issue for law enforcement agencies: it was the responsibility of society as a whole;

(d) Tackling supply and tackling demand were of equal importance;

(e) Politically supported and coordinated efforts had more chance of success;

(f) Drug misuse and abuse constituted an international issue and international organizations such as UNDCP had a role to play in the coordination of national efforts.

16. The working group drew the following conclusions:

(a) There was a need for clear, long-term, multidisciplinary and multi-agency strategies at the national level, having full political support;

(b) Success in the fight against the drug problem was dependent on supply and demand being drastically limited and people’s initial contact with drugs made more difficult;

(c) The dissemination of information to groups at risk via the media was an important aspect of any strategy for fighting the drug problem;

(d) Any strategy for fighting the drug problem must include all segments of society, regardless of language, ethnic origin or religious persuasion;

(e) The measurement of the success of any strategy for fighting the drug problem should be clearly identified at the outset, and the impact of law enforcement activity on the availability of illicit drugs should be considered a better indication of success than the number and volume of drug seizures and drug-related arrests.
B. Status of international cooperation in the suppression of the illicit traffic by sea, as called for in article 17 of the Convention on Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988

17. The working group on issue 2 met on 16 September and made the following observations:

(a) The majority of States in the European region had integrated the provisions of article 17 of the 1988 Convention into their national legislation. Some had gone on to conclude bilateral agreements in that area with States both within and outside the region. Nevertheless, there were still significant procedural difficulties to be overcome in respect of the application of article 17. Those could be summarized as follows:

(i) Insufficient or inadequate procedures for the competent national authorities to follow when processing requests for interdictions under article 17;

(ii) Procedures, where they did exist, were often too slow and cumbersome, which could hinder or even jeopardize the success of operations;

(iii) Lists of competent national authorities were incomplete and often out of date;

(iv) Lack of procedures for dealing with suspect vessels when their flag States were unclear or in doubt;

(b) There were still States that had not yet adopted the appropriate national legislation to implement article 17. Even in States that had set up proper legal frameworks, weaknesses in their practical and operational application were evident;

(c) A number of European States needed expert assistance in order to integrate into their national legislation provisions enabling them to fulfil their legal obligations under article 17 and to initiate practical responses for their drug law enforcement agencies. UNDCP had responded by assisting States in the following manner:

(i) Drafting model legislation to help integrate the provisions of article 17 into national statutes;

(ii) Drafting model bilateral agreements to facilitate maritime cooperation and the fulfilment of interdiction requests;

(iii) Producing a maritime drug law enforcement training guide to assist States in their operational response to interdictions pursuant to article 17;

(d) The regional, multilateral MAR INFO/YACHT INFO system had proved its efficiency and effectiveness in the area of exchanging information related to maritime law enforcement in Europe. That kind of communication network seemed to be an efficient tool for combating illicit drug trafficking by sea. Reservations were made, however, concerning existing legal obligations in areas such as data protection or confidentiality that might raise obstacles when providing such information;

(e) The exchange of information through international channels such as the Regional Intelligence Liaison Office network of the World Customs Organization, Interpol and Europol or the newly established Black Sea Economic Corporation Organization should be enhanced;

(f) Regional cooperation in the exchange of information between all involved law enforcement agencies seemed to be an appropriate way to tackle the ongoing problem of smuggling drugs by sea. The exchange of
information within the framework of formalized reporting mechanisms could encourage States to contribute towards improved cooperation between law enforcement authorities;

(g) Communications and technological systems and procedures adopted by drug law enforcement agencies to combat illicit drug trafficking by sea continued to be developed and successes, good practices and experiences were shared between agencies and States;

(h) The development of intelligence on the criminal activities of those involved in illicit drug trafficking by sea, the vessels used, the modus operandi involved and the crews and associates employed in such activities was of particular importance to drug law enforcement agencies.

C. Role of law enforcement agencies in controlling exports and imports of essential chemicals and precursors

18. The working group on issue 3 met once, on 16 September. In its consideration of the role of law enforcement agencies in controlling exports and imports of essential chemicals and precursors,* the working group made the following observations:

(a) Illicit trafficking in precursors was increasing and was often controlled by organized criminal groups;

(b) Many of those groups were also engaged in the actual production or manufacture of, trafficking in and distribution of the finished illicit drugs;

(c) Among countries in the European region, cooperation aimed at countering the diversion of precursors was becoming increasingly important;

(d) Lack of stringent import and export controls in relation to precursors presented a significant weakness in efforts to prevent such chemicals from reaching persons engaged in illicit drug production or manufacture;

(e) There continued to be insufficient awareness in the chemical trade and industry as a whole regarding the diversion of chemicals to criminal groups for the purpose of illicit drug production or manufacture;

(f) The use of the technique of controlled delivery was an effective means of countering the smuggling of precursors and an alternative to suspending the shipment of suspicious consignments of such materials;

(g) The establishment of national focal points for precursor control and law enforcement coordinating efforts was crucial to achieving success in that area;

(h) Following the adoption by the twentieth special session of the General Assembly in June 1998 of the plan of action on control of precursors, the European Community had begun to implement article 12 of the 1988 Convention in respect also of two substances listed in Table II of that Convention, namely, acetic anhydride and potassium permanganate, in addition to those listed in Table I.

*The term “precursor” is used to indicate any of the substances listed in Table I or II of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988, except where the context requires a different expression. Such substances are often described as precursors or essential chemicals, depending on their principal chemical properties. The plenipotentiary conference that adopted the 1988 Convention did not use any one term to describe such substances. Instead, the expression “substances frequently used in the illicit manufacture of narcotic drugs or psychotropic substances” was introduced in the 1988 Convention. It has become common practice, however, to refer to all such substances simply as “precursors”; although that term is not technically correct, it is used in the present text for the sake of brevity.
D. Illicit production and abuse of psychotropic substances in Europe

19. The working group on issue 4 held one meeting, on 17 September. The working group made the following observations:

(a) The illicit market for amphetamine-type stimulants was expanding; it was growing exponentially in countries in eastern Europe and in countries with a significant tourist trade. Some of those countries had yet to build up experience and expertise in combating the phenomenon. Both the supply of and the demand for such substances had largely been contained in the region; special attention should continue to be paid to those aspects. In the not-too-distant future, it would become necessary to reset priorities and reassess the threat posed by amphetamine-type stimulants, which were generally misused by the younger generation. The “rave” culture and social scene, which were popular among a significant segment of the youth population, were contributing to the demand for such stimulants. Regulatory control of events contributing to the growing demand had proved successful. The abuse of such stimulants was becoming more widespread among certain members of society; its use by such persons resulted in them exhibiting extremely violent behaviour, for example, while committing criminal acts;

(b) The law enforcement response in some countries had been to set up units specializing in countering the phenomenon, to act as focal points for a multi-agency approach that included collaboration with the private sector. Information from manufacturers and dealers in tableting and other related equipment had led to the identification of clandestine manufacturers of psychotropic substances;

(c) New drugs or analogues (e.g. so-called “designer drugs”) were constantly being developed to enable illicit manufacturers to keep one step ahead of legislation. The Internet was a primary source of knowledge of all levels of production, from cottage industry to major manufacture. Profiles of the chemical characteristics of illicitly manufactured psychotropic substances had proved to be a vital intelligence tool, enabling seizures to be linked and potential sources to be identified. The development of such profiles, a Swedish initiative, was also taking place in other European countries;

(d) Europol, in its LOGO project, had developed an extensive database of intelligence on psychotropic substances, together with an extensive catalogue of types of such substances. Europol had also developed a guide on good practice, a systematic approach to all aspects of detecting and dismantling of illicit laboratories. To facilitate the exchange of information, assess risk and speed up consideration of any legislative response to new drugs or analogues, the European Union had developed an early warning system.

20. The working group drew the following conclusions:

(a) There was a need for a flexible approach to the increasing abuse of amphetamine-type stimulants. Legislation needed to be amended to cover new drugs or analogues. Sharing good practices, systems and procedures developed by States, Europol or the European Union would benefit all countries in the region, especially those that had yet to develop their expertise and experience through training and other forms of practical assistance;

(b) One approach adopted in some countries, the creation of a unit specialized in dealing with the abuse of synthetic drugs, offered many advantages. Other countries might wish to consider adopting that approach or tailoring it to meet their needs;

(c) The increasing use of the Internet to promote the illicit manufacture of psychotropic substances by making the requisite knowledge more easily available and to disseminate propaganda designed to desensitize public opinion was a disturbing development. Although little could be done to stop such undesirable activity,
it might be possible to minimize or even neutralize its effect. Thus, there was an information battle to be fought on the Internet.

V. CENTRAL ASIA AS A SOURCE OF OPIUM AND HEROIN FOR EUROPE

21. At its 8th meeting, on 17 September, the Meeting considered agenda item 6, entitled “Central Asia as a source of opium and heroin for Europe”. Statements were made by the representatives of the United Kingdom, Turkmenistan, Norway, Kazakhstan, the Netherlands, the Russian Federation, Uzbekistan, Hungary, Germany, the United States of America and Cyprus. A representative of UNDCP made a presentation on the subject.

22. Climatic conditions in all central Asian countries were favourable for the growth of opium poppy and cannabis, which were illicitly cultivated on small individual plots in villages or in remote areas in the mountains. Three central Asian States shared borders with Afghanistan, the largest illicit opium producer in the world. A portion of the opium illicitly produced in Afghanistan was consumed locally; however, it was assumed that at least one half of it was destined for export. Central Asian countries were considered major transit points by drug traffickers. Both heroin, which was cheaply produced in Afghanistan, and opium were generally shipped to Europe through central Asia, usually by rail and by road on large transport vehicles. The traditional routes to Europe were still used, even though drug traffickers had been increasingly using central Asian countries to export illicit drugs to European countries. Such developments had caused, in recent years, an increase in illicit drug demand in central Asian countries. International criminal organizations controlled the drug trafficking; their activities had increased because of the political and economic instability in the region.

23. In dealing with drug control issues, central Asian countries were faced with major problems such as the porousness of the borders of Afghanistan, limited law enforcement capacity, poor legal and technical infrastructure, the economic crises, inadequate intercountry communications, lack of equipment for making seizures and the secondary circulation of drugs. In the view of many representatives, increased cooperation, carried out with the support of UNDCP or on a bilateral or multilateral level as part of a joint effort to create a “security belt” around Afghanistan, would greatly facilitate drug control operations. Increased coordination and more concerted action could, in the view of several representatives, enhance efforts to combat drug trafficking in the region. Controlled delivery techniques, used in collaboration with neighbouring countries and with European countries, had proved successful in the past; they should be used more extensively in the future. Central Asian countries were in great need of technical assistance in the form of equipment and training for law enforcement and border patrol officers. One representative described the successful efforts of the border patrols of his country in the fight against drug traffickers. One speaker proposed the establishment of a single database for countries in the region to facilitate the work of drug control officers. Access to intelligence was considered to be extremely important in detecting illicit drug consignments early. Concern was expressed by some representatives over the increase in the smuggling of precursors. It was feared that the diversion of precursors from licit channels to the illicit market would continue to increase, owing to lack of controls and to the growth of the chemical industry in the region. One representative pointed out the need to concentrate efforts in providing the necessary technical assistance to central Asian countries, which were having serious difficulties in combating increased illicit drug trafficking through central Asia to Europe.

VI. ORGANIZATION OF THE FIFTH MEETING OF HONLEA, EUROPE

24. At its 8th meeting, on 17 September, the Meeting considered agenda item 7, on the organization of the Fifth Meeting of HONLEA, Europe. The Meeting had before it a note by the Secretariat (UNDCP/HONEURO/1998/4) drawing attention to certain questions that needed to be addressed concerning the Fifth Meeting and containing a draft provisional agenda for that meeting.
25. The Meeting was reminded that its next meeting was expected to be held in 2001 and that it was premature to identify in 1998 topics for discussion in the working groups in 2001. It was therefore decided that the Secretariat, in consultation with the members of the Bureau would, before the Fifth Meeting, identify topics for discussion in the working groups, as well as any other issue to be discussed at that Meeting.

VII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE MEETING

26. At its 9th meeting, on 18 September, the report of the Fourth Meeting of HONLEA, Europe (UNDCP/HONEURO/1998/L.1 and Add.1-7), including the reports of the working groups and the recommendations contained therein, was adopted.

VIII. ORGANIZATION OF THE MEETING

A. Opening and duration of the Meeting

27. The Fourth Meeting of HONLEA, Europe, was held at Vienna from 14 to 18 September 1998. The outgoing Chairman of the Third Meeting of HONLEA, Europe, opened the Meeting. The representative of the Executive Director of UNDCP addressed the Meeting.

B. Attendance

28. The following States members of the Economic Commission for Europe were represented: Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America and Uzbekistan.

29. The Holy See was represented in a consultative capacity.

30. The Islamic Republic of Iran was represented as an observer.

31. The Centre for International Crime Prevention of the Secretariat and the United Nations Development Programme were represented.

32. The following organizations sent observers: the European Commission, the Europol Drugs Unit, the International Criminal Police Organization and the World Customs Organization.

33. UNDCP acted as the secretariat of the Meeting.

C. Election of officers

34. At its 1st and 2nd meetings, on 14 September, the Fourth Meeting of HONLEA, Europe, elected the following officers by acclamation:

Chairman: Malcolm George (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)

Vice-Chairmen: Charles De Winter (Belgium)
                Edip Hilmi Aktas (Turkey)
Rapporteur: Arne G. Schneider (Norway)

D. Adoption of the agenda

35. At its 1st meeting, on 14 September, the Fourth Meeting of HONLEA, Europe, adopted the following agenda:

1. Election of officers.
2. Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters.
5. Consideration of issues by working groups:
   (a) Evaluation of the role of the police and drug law enforcement bodies on the demand and supply side, with a view to obtaining a balanced multidisciplinary drug policy;
   (b) Status of international cooperation in the suppression of the illicit traffic by sea, as called for in article 17 of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988;
   (c) Role of law enforcement agencies in controlling exports and imports of essential chemicals and precursors;
   (d) Illicit production and abuse of psychotropic substances in Europe.
6. Central Asia as a source of opium and heroin for Europe.
7. Organization of the Fifth Meeting of Heads of National Drug Law Enforcement Agencies, Europe.
8. Other business.
9. Adoption of the report.

E. Documentation

36. The documents before the Fourth Meeting of HONLEA, Europe, are listed in the annex.

F. Closure of the Meeting

37. Closing statements were made by the Representative of the Executive Director of UNDCP and by the Chairman.
## Annex

**LIST OF DOCUMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Title or description</th>
<th>Agenda item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDCP/HONEURO/1998/1</td>
<td>Provisional agenda, including annotations and provisional timetable</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDCP/HONEURO/1998/3</td>
<td>Implementation by States of the region of recommendations adopted by the Third Meeting of Heads of National Drug Law Enforcement Agencies, Europe</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDCP/HONEURO/1998/4</td>
<td>Organization of the Fifth Meeting of Heads of National Drug Law Enforcement Agencies, Europe</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDCP/HONEURO/1998/CRP.2-31</td>
<td>Country reports</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDCP/HONEURO/1998/L.1 and Add.1-7</td>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>