

9260/98

SEMDOC

Statewatch European Documentation &
Monitoring Centre on justice and home
affairs in the European Union

PO Box 1516, London N16 0EW, UK
tel: 0181 802 1882 (00 44 181 802 1882)
fax: 0181 880 1727 (00 44 181 880 1727)

LIMITE

CRIMORG 98

NOTE

from : Presidency

to : Multi Disciplinary Group on organized crime

No. prev. doc.: 6166/98 CRIMORG 3
8792/98 CRIMORG 80

Subject: Report on the meeting of the Contact and Support Network on 27 May to discuss
the production of the 1997 EU Situation Report on organized crime

Introduction

1. The conclusions of the meeting of the Contact and Support Network held in Brussels on 9 January 1998 are set out in doc. 6166/98 CRIMORG 3. During that meeting it was announced that a further meeting of the Contact and Support Network would take place on 27 May and document 8792/98 CRIMORG 80 was issued as the basis for the discussion at the May meeting.

Aims of the meeting

2. The aims of the meeting were clearly set out in CRIMORG 80 and followed directly from the conclusions of the January meeting. Four outcomes were sought:

- a) *Validation of national contributions*
- b) *Identification of priorities for action at national and EU level*
- c) *Security classification of the report*
- d) *Enhanced role for the Contact and Support Network*

3. Although outcome c) was agreed by the meeting, outcome d) was subject to a number of scrutiny reserves, and further discussion was deferred to a meeting to be held later this month at EDU/Europol to discuss the further development of the Europol Intelligence Model.

4. It was impossible to make any significant progress on outcome a) because a number of national contributions to the 1997 Situation Report were still outstanding. The previously agreed deadline for the submission of national contributions to EDU/Europol was 1 May 1997. Additionally, only a limited number of Member States had undertaken the necessary preparatory work to take part in validation checks during the meeting.

5. To ensure that validation took place, the meeting agreed that each Member State would provide a list to EDU/Europol containing details from their national contributions of activities by nationals of other Member States or on the territory of other Member States. EDU/Europol would collate this material and pursue any discrepancies with the Member States involved.

6. The discussion concerning outcome b), 'identification of priorities for action at national and EU level', was also inconclusive. The results are summarised in the Annex to this document. A number of Member States were unable to offer any information concerning priorities, and other Member States were concerned about the absence of a methodology to determine priorities, both at a national and EU level.

Conclusions

7. The Presidency is concerned that the meeting produced few conclusive results. The aims for the meeting had been discussed and agreed during the January meeting of the Contact and Support Network. In turn, the January meeting had built upon the Multi-Disciplinary Group's discussions of the 1996 Situation Report which took place in October 1997.

8. During those discussions, the Multi-Disciplinary Group had agreed the need to both maintain and to further improve the quality of the annual Situation Report. Building on the work done by earlier Presidencies, the aim would be to produce a Situation Report of sufficient quality for use in helping to determine the EU's overall strategy, policy and priorities in the fight against organised crime.

9. Validation of the material contained in national contributions, and identifying priorities for action from the material contained in the national contributions are seen by the Presidency as small but necessary steps in the process of improving the quality of the Situation Report.

10. Delegations are invited to note the outcome of the meeting on 27 May as described in this document. Delegations should also note that a meeting of Heads of Europol National Units and senior operational experts will take place at EDU/Europol on 19 June 1998 (CRIMORG 34 refers). This meeting will examine operational priorities; look to identify bi- and multi-lateral operational projects which could be developed later with support from EDU/Europol. The meeting will also contribute to the task of considering how the next EU organised crime Situation Report could be further developed to provide a more coherent assessment and act as a better vehicle for identifying strategic priorities and directions. It will be important to ensure that all national delegations to that meeting have a copy of their national contribution to the 1997 Situation Report when they attend the meeting.

11. The future Austrian Presidency has signalled its intention to make further use of the Contact and Support Network in producing the 1997 Situation Report. Delegations are invited to offer comments on any additional steps which might need to be taken to sustain the improvement in the quality and value of the annual Situation Reports.

National responses on priorities for action against organised crime based on national contributions to the 1997 EU Situation Report

Austria

- drugs related crime; economic crime, particularly investment-related fraud; computer crime;
- focus on foreign groupings, especially those from Eastern Europe;
- need to consider methodology.

Belgium

- policymakers decide priorities, although police have a role;
- in the context of national reforms of law enforcement structures will have a National Security Plan which will determine priorities. Strategic analysts (local and federal) will undertake threat analysis and report to JHA policy makers who implement action the following year;
- in the long term, will produce plans based on predicted trends but current priorities based on previous year's experience;
- Government currently considering projects on Russian, Italian, Turkish and Asian criminals and those involved with vehicle crime;

Denmark

- no national structure to determine priorities but greatest current concern with motorcycle gangs and drugs.

Finland

- unable to offer anything.

France

- drugs and related problems;
- more traditional types of crime;
- organised crime groupings - Colombian, Russian, Far Eastern and Chinese.

Germany

- determine what criminal groups focus on - and concentrate efforts on that;
- look at which nationalities are involved;
- look at where legislation has been aimed;
- extend methods used for Situation Reports and look at the political aspect of what needs to be tackled.

Greece

- Government sets priorities, after considering law enforcement views;
- forged passports obtained by Russian language groups - have set up task force to deal with Russian organised crime;
- illegal immigration, drugs, car theft, money laundering (have set up new administrative body to monitor suspicious transactions);
- improving co-operation by formal agreements and new tripartite forum with Bulgaria and Romania.

Ireland

- no formal method of establishing priorities;
- however drugs and computer component crime of greatest current concern;
- asset seizure (multi-agency approach - have established Criminal Assets Bureau).

Italy

- priorities set by policy makers - no strategy for 1997 but police priorities are:
- attacks against property, clandestine immigration, money laundering,
- safeguarding financial/administrative transparency, establishing co-operation mechanisms;
- geographical priorities are lower Adriatic, north Africa and Mediterranean.

Luxembourg

- majority of effort concentrated on responding to Commission Rogatoire letters;
- Eastern European crime should be EU-wide priority;
- other priorities Chinese groups, procurement and subsidy fraud.

Netherlands

- existing priorities include Turkish crime, drugs, Eastern European and Southeast Asian groups, Colombian, Mafia, EU fraud, environmental crime, transport;
- new priorities: trafficking in human beings and synthetic drugs.

Portugal

- unable to offer anything.

Spain

- Government sets priorities, after considering law enforcement views;
- drugs, terrorism, money laundering, organised crime related petty crime;
- Bill currently before Parliament to determine competencies in tackling organised crime;
- new units established 1997 to deal with organised crime and money laundering - will be sent to areas most affected by these types of crime.

Sweden

- not able to offer anything in this forum;
- no formal structure to establish priorities, Government provides direction. New formal structure to be put in place Autumn 1998.
- useful to have uniform EU-wide system for priority setting
- suggest discussion of possible models at next CSN meeting.

UK

- priorities indicated in individual sections of the national contribution;
 - no existing formal national process to establish law enforcement priorities, but work in hand to improve co-ordination mechanisms;
 - methodology required to draw up list of priorities;
 - suggest that the 'characteristics of organised crime' criteria in ENFOPOL 35 REV2 could be weighted to provide the basis for a possible model to establish priorities
-