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# Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AST</td>
<td>Service d’Action Socio-Thérapeutique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATF</td>
<td>Chemical Action Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CePT</td>
<td>Centre de Prévention des Toxicomanies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Commission d’admission et de surveillance (CHDP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFSP</td>
<td>Common Foreign and Security Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHNP</td>
<td>Centre Hospitalier Neuro-Psychiatrique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CICAD</td>
<td>Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMO</td>
<td>Comprehensive Multidisciplinary Outline (UN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CND</td>
<td>Commission on Narcotic Drug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNDS</td>
<td>Comité National de Défense Sociale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNER</td>
<td>Comité National d’Éthique de Recherche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNPD</td>
<td>Commission Nationale de Protection des Données</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPG</td>
<td>Centre Pénitentiaire de Givenich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPL</td>
<td>Centre Pénitentiaire de Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPOS</td>
<td>Centre de Psychologie et d’Orientation Scolaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP-HT</td>
<td>Centre de Recherche Public - Henri Tudor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP-Santé</td>
<td>Centre de Recherche Public - Santé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTM</td>
<td>Centre Thérapeutique de Manternach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEA</td>
<td>Drug Enforcement Administration (United States)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWS</td>
<td>Early Warning System on New Synthetic Drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GID</td>
<td>Groupe Interservices Drogue (de la Commission européenne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIT</td>
<td>Groupe interministériel «Toxicomanies »</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMCDDA/OEDT</td>
<td>European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMEA</td>
<td>European Medicines Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUPOL</td>
<td>European Police Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation (United States)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FED</td>
<td>Fond Européen de Développement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATF</td>
<td>Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEDER</td>
<td>Fond Européen de Développement Régional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLCFC</td>
<td>Fonds de Lutte Contre certaines Formes de Criminalité</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAT</td>
<td>Heroin Assisted Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDG</td>
<td>Horizontal Working Party on Drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honlea</td>
<td>Heads of National Drug Law Enforcement Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICPO/Interpol</td>
<td>Interministerial Commission on Drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICPO/Interpol</td>
<td>International Criminal Police Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCB</td>
<td>International Narcotic Control Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDH</td>
<td>Fondation Jugend- an Drogenhüllef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNS</td>
<td>Laboratoire National de Santé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSF</td>
<td>Médecins Sans Frontières</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDLEA</td>
<td>National Drug Law Enforcement Administration (Nigeria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFP</td>
<td>National Focal Point of the EMCDDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIDA</td>
<td>National Institute on Drug Abuse (United States)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAS</td>
<td>Organization of American States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCDE</td>
<td>Organisation de Coopération et de Développement Economiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OGD</td>
<td>Observatoire Géopolitique des Drogues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLAF</td>
<td>European Anti-Fraud Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONDCP</td>
<td>Office of National Drug Control Policy of the White House (United States)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PECO</td>
<td>Pays d’Europe Centrale et Orientale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIS</td>
<td>Réseau Luxembourgeois d’Information sur les Stupéfiants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REITOX</td>
<td>European Information Network on Drugs and Drug Addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>Southern African Development Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPT</td>
<td>Semaine Européenne de Prévention des Toxicomanies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SID</td>
<td>Système d’Information Douanier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>Système d’Information Schengen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNJ</td>
<td>Service National de la Jeunesse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPG</td>
<td>Système de Préférences Généralisées</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPJ</td>
<td>Service des Stupéfiants de la Police Judiciaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STSJ</td>
<td>Service Thérapeutique Solidarité Jeunes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDCP</td>
<td>United Nations International Drug Control Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGASS</td>
<td>United Nations General Assembly Special Session on Drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCO</td>
<td>World Customs Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZePF</td>
<td>Zentrum für Empirische Pädagogische Forschung – Universität Landau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AVANT-PROPOS

Le rapport 2013 sur l’état du phénomène de la drogue au Grand-Duché de Luxembourg (RELIS) vise à situer le contexte dans lequel s’inscrivent l’usage et le trafic illicites de drogues et les toxicomanies au niveau national en proposant une vue d’ensemble des évolutions historiques et des tendances actuellement observées en la matière.

Les experts suivants ont été consultés: Dr Arno Bache (Direction de la Santé), Sophie Hoffmann (Ministère de la Justice), Jean-Paul Schirtz (Administration des Douanes), Jean-Paul Juchem (CNS), Dr Ferdy Kasel (CHNP-BU-V), Dr Annette Mühe (CHL), Jean-Marie Schanck et Guy Reinart (Direction de la Santé), Steve Schmitz (Police Judiciaire – Criminalité organisée), Vincent Theis (CPL), Dr Serge Krippler (Direction de la Santé), Claude Frieden (CNS), Robert Welter (Parquet), Dr S. Schneider et Dr M. Yegles (Laboratoire National de Santé) ainsi que l’ensemble des ONG spécialisées en matière de prise en charge.

FOREWORD

The 2013 edition of the national report on the state of the drugs problem in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg aims to describe the framework in which drug use and drug trafficking evolve at the national level by providing a comprehensive overview of historical developments and recent trends.

Thanks are due to the following experts consulted in the framework of the 2013 edition of the report: Dr Arno Bache (Directorate of Health), Sophie Hoffmann (Ministry of Justice), Jean-Paul Schirtz (Customs Administration), J.-P. Juchem (CNS), Dr Ferdy Kasel (CHNP-BU-V), Dr Mühe (CHL), J.-M. Schanck and Guy Reinart (Ministry of Health), Steve Schmitz (Judicial Police), Vincent Theis (CPL), Dr Serge Krippler (Directorate of Health), Claude Frieden (CNS), Robert Welter (Public Prosecutor’s Office), Dr S. Schneider and Dr M. Yegles (National Laboratory of Health LNS) as well as all national specialised NGOs.
Depuis sa création en 1994, le Point Focal Luxembourgeois (PFN) de l’Observatoire Européen des Drogues et des Toxicomanies (OEDT) maintient et développe le dispositif de surveillance épidémiologique en matière de drogues et de toxicomanies, connu sous le nom de Réseau Luxembourgeois d’Information sur les Drogues et les Toxicomanies (RELIS).

RELIS repose sur une architecture d’information multisectoriel incluant les centres nationaux de traitement spécialisé ambulatoires et résidentiels, les centres de consultation, certains hôpitaux généraux, ainsi que les instances judiciaires et pénales compétentes.

Les efforts déployés depuis plus de 15 années ont permis de constituer une base de données nationale annuellement mise à jour, permettant notamment:

- de situer la prévalence, l’incidence et l’évolution de l’usage problématique de drogues illicites au niveau national;
- de servir de support scientifique et de base de données pour l’activité de recherche;
- d’évaluer les tendances nouvelles et l’impact de certaines interventions sur les comportements et caractéristiques de la population d’usagers problématiques de drogues (UPD) et de faciliter l’analyse des besoins et le processus décisionnel au niveau politique lors de la mise en place de plans d’action et de stratégies d’intervention en matière de lutte contre la toxicomanie.

Orientations politiques et budgétaires

Le gouvernement a confié la coordination des actions de réduction de la demande et des risques associés à la drogue et aux toxicomanies au Ministère de la Santé, ce qui a donné lieu à la désignation d’un Coordinateur National « Drogues » en 2000.


Une stratégie anti-drogue qui veut faire face aux défis actuels repose prioritairement sur deux piliers, à savoir la réduction de la demande et la réduction de l’offre ainsi que sur quatre axes transversaux : 1. la réduction des risques, dommages et nuisances, 2. la recherche et l’information, 3. les relations internationales et 4. les mécanismes de coordination. Le coordinateur national « drogues », en collaboration avec le Groupe Interministériel « Toxicomanies » (GIT), suit et ajuste les processus de mise en œuvre du plan d’action en matière de lutte contre les drogues et les addictions.
Le budget global du Ministère de la Santé alloué aux services et programmes du domaine des drogues et des toxicomanies, est passé de 2.066.000.- EUR en 2000 à 8.590.033.- EUR en 2012 ce qui équivaut à un taux de progression de 316%. En 2000, le nombre de postes ETP conventionnés par le Ministère de la Santé et alloués aux structures spécialisées issues du domaine des toxicomanies s’élevait à 30,75; il a atteint 90,75 ETP en 2012. De façon générale, les dépenses publiques en matière de lutte contre les drogues et les toxicomanies sont actuellement estimées à 38,5 millions EUR (Origer, 2010). Les dépenses allouées exclusivement aux traitements des problèmes liés à l’usage de drogues illicites représentaient 16,2 millions EUR en 2012.

Indicateurs épidémiologiques

En référence aux données de prévalence de 2011 (UNODC, 2013), le nombre global de personnes âgées de 15 à 64 ans ayant consommé au moins une drogue d’origine illicite au cours de l’année écoulée est estimé entre 167 et 315 millions. L’usage à caractère problématique de drogues illicites concerne 15 et 39 millions de personnes de la population mondiale dans cette même tranche d’âge. La prévalence de l’usage illicite de drogues et le nombre d’usagers problématiques de drogues sont restés stables.

Le cannabis reste de loin la drogue la plus consommée au monde (180,6 millions de personnes équivalent à 3,9 % de la population mondiale telle que définie) ce qui représente une légère augmentation par rapport aux estimations de 2009. L’usage des stimulants de type amphétamine (STA) s’élèverait à 33,8 millions de personnes (0,7%). La prévalence de « l’ecstasy » en 2011 (19,4 millions de personnes ou 0,4% de la population) a diminué par rapport aux données de 2009. Le nombre de consommateurs d’opiacés est resté stable et se situerait autour de 16,5 millions de personnes (0,4%).

Au sein de l’UE selon les dernières données de l’OEDT issues du Rapport européen sur les drogues 2013, 85 millions de personnes ont consommé au moins une drogue illicite au cours de leur vie. Toutefois, on observe une baisse des nouveaux usagers d’héroïne, une diminution du recours à l’injection, le recul des décès liés à la drogue et une utilisation moindre et en régression de l’usage de cannabis et de cocaïne dans certains pays. Aussi des niveaux records du nombre de personnes en traitement ont été observés (1,2 millions d’Européens en 2011) et on constate que l’infection par le VIH liée à la consommation de drogues continue à décroître. Les amphétamines et l’ecstasy demeurent les stimulants de synthèse les plus fréquemment consommés en Europe. Des données récentes suggèrent toutefois que l’usage d’amphétamines est stable ou en baisse chez les jeunes adultes.

En ce qui concerne le cannabis, quelque 3 millions d’Européens (de 15 à 64 ans) en consomment quotidiennement ou presque quotidiennement.

Aussi le nombre, le type et la disponibilité des nouvelles drogues en Europe sont en hausse. La mondialisation, les avancées technologiques et l’internet ont contribué au développement d’un marché ouvert notamment aux nouvelles drogues synthétiques.

A l’échelle micro-géographique, les tendances au Grand-Duché de Luxembourg reflètent dans les grandes lignes celles observées au sein de l’UE, avec toutefois de variations locales en matière de prévalence plus ou moins prononcées et une tendance à la baisse du taux de prévalence générale de l’usage de drogues d’origine illicite parmi les jeunes et des taux d’usage problématique.

1 La prévalence et taux de prévalence par produit se rapportent à la consommation au cours de l’année écoulée de personnes âgées de 15 à 64 ans.
Prévalence d’usage de drogues illicites en population générale au G.-D. de Luxembourg

Prévalence d’usagers de drogues au sein de la population scolaire

Des données comparables issues d’enquêtes scolaires menées entre 1999 et 2010 témoignaient d’un taux de prévalence « vie » (consommation au moins une fois au cours de la vie) généralement décroissante en ce qui concerne la consommation de drogues illicites, toutes catégories confondues. Une analyse plus approfondie révèle une baisse tangible de la prévalence-vie de l’usage de drogues illicites entre 1999 et 2006 suivi d’une stabilisation subséquente. Tous types de drogues illicites ont suivi cette même tendance à l’exception de la cocaïne qui a connu une popularité croissante surtout en matière d’expérimentation parmi les jeunes âgés entre 15 et 16 ans. L’usage d’opiacés par les jeunes (16 à 20 ans) continue toutefois de témoigner d’une prévalence basse.

Bien que le cannabis demeure la drogue illicite la plus consommée parmi les jeunes de 12 à 18 ans, une baisse au niveau de l’usage-vie à partir du début du 21ème siècle a pu être observée. Les taux de prévalence de l’usage récent ou actuel de cannabis parmi ces mêmes jeunes ont affiché une tendance à la baisse manifeste entre 1999 et 2006 pour se stabiliser ensuite.

L’âge moyen lors de la première consommation de cannabis et de drogues illicites en général par les jeunes âgés de 12 à 18 ans a augmenté de plus au moins 6 mois depuis 2006. En 2010, 9,44% des jeunes questionnés ont rapporté une première consommation de cannabis avant l’âge de 15 ans alors que ce même taux était de 12,03% en 2006.

Prévalence de l’usage problématique de drogues illicites (UPD)2

Contacts institutionnels et recours aux institutions sanitaires pour des problèmes liés aux drogues illicites


Caractéristiques socio-démographiques de la population nationale d’UPD

Le sex-ratio (M/F) de la population des UPD est actuellement de 4:1. Sur les dix dernières années on constate que la proportion de ressortissants étrangers parmi les usagers recensés a témoigné d’importantes fluctuations affichant cependant une tendance à la hausse à partir de 2003, qui s’est stabilisée entre 2008 (52%) et 2012. La population des non-luxembourgeois(es) est principalement composée de citoyens

2 Le terme ‘UPD’ sera utilisé pour désigner des ‘Usagers problématiques de drogues d’acquisition illicite’ tout au long du présent rapport.

3 Dans ce recensement les comptages multiples sont inclus ce qui signifie qu’une personne donnée a pu être indexée deux fois ou plus si on tient compte de l’ensemble des institutions spécialisées établies sur le territoire national. Dès lors, ce chiffre ne représente pas la prévalence (la taille) effective de la population d’UPD au niveau national (qui elle, se détermine par des méthodologies différentes).
d’origine portugaise dont la proportion (38% de l’ensemble des UPD non-luxembourgeois) est actuellement comparable à celle observée au sein de la population générale (37,1%). Les UPD d’origine française et africaine occupent respectivement le deuxième (17%) et troisième (13%) rang. Les citoyens allemands occupent le 5 rang (5%) et les UPD d’origine italienne qui occupaient la troisième place au cours des 10 dernières années parmi les personnes interpellées pour infraction(s) à la législation nationale sur les stupéfiants, ne représentaient plus que 4% en 2012 (rang 6).

L’âge moyen des usagers recensés est passé de 28 ans et 4 mois en 1995 à 33 ans et 2 mois en 2012. L’âge moyen des UPD masculins a augmenté plus rapidement que celui des femmes. L’écart entre les usagers les plus jeunes et les plus âgés s’est stabilisé récemment. L’augmentation dans la classe d’âge 40 années et plus des usagers et une diminution des personnes âgées de moins de 30 années, tendance observée au cours dernières années, ne s’observe plus. L’âge moyen des UPD luxembourgeois est inférieur à celui des non-luxembourgeois. On retiendra également l’accroissement significatif de l’âge moyen des victimes de surdoses mortelles au cours de la dernière décennie et une proportion stable de mineurs parmi les prévenus pour infraction(s) STUP depuis les quatre dernières années (2012 : 10% ; 2011 : 6% ; 2010 : 9% ; 2009 : 6%).

**Prévalence de l’usage problématique de drogues (UPD) et tendances de consommation**


**L’usage intraveineux d’opiacés** associé à une polyconsommation généralisée constitue de loin le comportement le plus observé au sein des usagers répertoriés par le réseau institutionnel. Le ratio entre usagers intraveineux et non-intraveineux s’est stabilisé à 2 :3 en 2012. La prévalence de l’usage de cocaine en tant que drogue préférentielle affiche une tendance discontinuée à la baisse depuis 2006. En 2012, après une augmentation notable en 2011, la tendance préalable d’une stabilisation de la cocaïne comme première drogue préférentielle s’est confirmée (12,2%).

Le nombre de personnes en contact avec le réseau institutionnel spécialisé pour usage (préférentiel) de cannabis représente actuellement 29,5% (hausse importante). Les substances de type amphétamines et ecstasy sont faiblement représentées, ce qui toutefois ne renseigne nullement sur la prévalence de leur usage en population générale étant donné que les données RELIS portent sur l’ensemble des usagers problématiques actuels et ne recensent dès lors pas la totalité des usagers récréationnels.

Offres de traitement des toxicomanies

Les structures spécialisées en matière de traitement des toxicomanies sont soumises à l’obligation de disposer d’un agrément à accorder par le Ministre de la Santé et sont pour la plupart conventionnées par l’Etat. Ces deux mécanismes permettent, en association avec d’autres instruments, d’une part le contrôle de qualité et de l’autre le financement ou le cofinancement des structures visées.

Une hausse significative s’observait entre 2008 et 2010 au niveau du nombre de demandeurs de traitement de substitution ainsi que le nombre de contacts avec l’ensemble des structures d’accueil à bas-seuil (2012 : 127,080 ; 2011 : 123,465 ; 2010 : 140,093 contacts). Par contre en 2011 et 2012, le nombre de demandeurs de traitements de substitution s’est stabilisé et le nombre de contacts rapportés par les services de réduction de risques a même connu une baisse. Tous centres et services de traitement confondus, 9,7% des clients ont formulé leur première demande d’aide en 2012. Une tendance qui semble se confirmer est une baisse de la proportion de patients en traitement de substitution âgés de moins de 25 ans et une hausse au niveau de celle regroupant les personnes âgées 40 ans et plus.

Morbidity and mortality linked to illicit drug consumption


La proportion moyenne d’usagers intraveineux de drogues parmi les personnes nouvellement infectées par le VIH, accuse une tendance longitudinale discontinue à la baisse. Entre 2004 et 2008, cette même proportion a évolué dans des marges allant de 7% à 14% alors qu’en 2012 elle affichait 9,88%. Le taux d’infection VIH parmi les usagers intraveineux se situe actuellement autour de 4% (stabilisation par rapport aux données 2011).

La concrétisation des plans d’action nationaux en matière de drogues et des addictions a été accompagnée d’une baisse discontinue mais tangible du taux de décès par surdose au Grand-Duché de Luxembourg (8 cas en 2012). Exprimée en nombre de cas de surdose par rapport à la population générale du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg, cette proportion correspondait à 5,9 décès par surdose pour 100.000 habitants âgés entre 15 et 64 ans en 2000 (2007 : 5,67). En 2012, 1,5 surdoses aiguës pour 100.000 habitants ont été enregistrées (2010 : 3,5), représentant une tendance décroissante. Les données médico-légales de 1992 à 2012 confirment que la quasi-totalité des décès impliquaient la consommation d’héroïne suivis par les substances prescrites dans un contexte de polyconsommation.

Pour les victimes, il s’agissait pour 2012 de 87% d’hommes et l’âge moyen au moment du décès a connu une hausse discontinue mais sensible sur les dernières vingt années (1992 : 28,4 années et 2012 : 37,75 années). Bien que la moyenne d’âge ait augmenté, le nombre de victimes âgées de moins de 20 ans est resté relativement stable. Aucune victime mineure d’âge n’a été rapportée en 2012.

Une majorité confirmée de 75% (83%) des victimes était de nationalité luxembourgeoise ce qui représente une légère augmentation comparée à 2011. Une description détaillée de victimes de surdoses fatales depuis 1994 ainsi que l’impact du facteur genre sur la survenue de surdoses à fait l’objet d’une étude à grande échelle dont les résultats ont été publiés en 2013 (Origer et al., 2013)\(^5\)

---

Conséquences sociales et mesures de réintégration

Les corollaires sociaux de l’usage de drogues et de la dépendance y associée sont multiples et se répercutent aux niveaux familial, professionnel, financier et légal.

Le niveau d’enseignement des usagers recensés est pour la plupart faible et incomplet. Leur situation résidentielle affiche toutefois une amélioration au regard des années précédentes. Si en 1995, 31% des usagers disposaient d’un logement stable, cette proportion se situe actuellement autour de 70%, ce qui est en partie le mérite d’une série de projets d’aide au logement pour personnes dépendantes mis en place dans le cadre des plans d’action « drogues ». Les chiffres les plus récents tendent cependant à confirmer que même si l’offre en logements encadrés pour la population visée continue à être développée, la demande pour ce genre de logements s’accroît également sur la toile de fond de la situation économique des dernières années.

Le taux de chômage au sein de la population cible (63%) tend à stagner. Cependant, la proportion d’UPD professionnellement actifs présentant une situation d’emploi stable a sensiblement diminué les dernières années, ce qui doit également être apprécié à la lumière des paramètres économiques actuels.

Mesures de réduction des risques


Depuis la mise en place du programme national d’échange de seringues, on notait une augmentation continue du nombre de seringues stériles distribuées jusqu’en 2006 et depuis lors, une décroissance discontinue a été observée (2012 : 211.439). Le taux global de retour de seringues usées a augmenté pendant la période de référence et se situe actuellement à 95%. Un nombre croissant d’injecteurs (+/- 76%) se procurent leurs seringues auprès de structures spécialisées suivies des pharmacies et, de moins en moins auprès des distributeurs automatiques.

Indicateurs de réduction de l’offre

Saisies de substances illicites au niveau national

D’importantes variations au niveau de l’évolution des quantités saisies s’observent depuis le début des années 90 et ceci pour presque tous les types de produits. Une analyse longitudinale indique une tendance générale à la baisse des quantités d’héroïne, de cocaïne et une augmentation discontinue de résine de cannabis. Comparé à la situation observée en 2000, on note une hausse des saisies d’herbe de cannabis. Les données les plus récentes font toutefois état d’une baisse importante des quantités de cannabis saisies et une hausse très remarquable des quantités de cocaïne saisies sur le territoire national en 2011, ce qui n’est toutefois pas confirmée par les données 2012.

6 Sauf indication contraire, les données présentées se rapportent à l’année 2012. À défaut d’autres indications, les données entre parenthèses se rapportent à l’année 2011.
7 Les drogues en transit exclues ; uniquement les quantités destinées au marché national.
Le nombre de prévenus impliqués spécifiquement dans le trafic illicite de drogue a montré une tendance générale à la hausse jusqu’à 2002 et montre depuis lors une tendance à la baisse. La quantité de cannabis saisie a augmenté en 2012. Nonobstant les quantités de cannabis et de cocaïne saisies, le nombre de saisies a augmenté de façon discontinue depuis 1990. Ceci suggère, qu’un nombre plus élevé de saisies portant sur des quantités réduites ont été enregistrées. Depuis 2008, le nombre de saisies de cannabis et de cocaïne a augmenté, tandis que le nombre de saisies d’héroïne a diminué de façon discontinue. Aussi, le nombre total de personnes impliquées dans les saisies a montré une tendance générale à la baisse. Le nombre total de personnes impliquées dans le trafic illicite de drogues a montré une augmentation continue jusqu’à 2010 pour afficher une régression en 2011 et en 2012. (2000 : 1,758 ; 2012 : 1,782). Une majorité confirmée des prévenus impliqués dans le trafic de cannabis sont de nationalité luxembourgeoise.

Aucune saisie de crack n’a été rapportée à ce jour par les instances répressives bien que les associations de terrain rapportent sporadiquement la pratique du free-basing par certains usagers.


Mesures judiciaires et pénales


La population des prévenus se compose de 90% d’hommes, proportion qui variait entre 79% et 89% durant les dix dernières années. 808 prévenus nouveaux ont été enregistrés en 2003 ; 720 en 2012. Le pourcentage de prévenus mineurs (< 18 ans) a connu une légère tendance à la hausse entre 2010 (7%) et 2012 (8,1%). L’héroïne et la cocaïne sont les principales substances impliquées dans les premières infractions.

Depuis 1998, les personnes originaires d'autres pays que le Luxembourg (52% en 2012) ont représenté la majorité des prévenus (52-68%). 40% (41%) des cas enregistrés sont des premiers auteurs.

Les données statistiques fournies par l’administration pénitentiaire pour l’année 2012 font état de 950 (856) nouvelles entrées au CPL dont 306 (32,2%) pour infraction(s) à la loi modifiée du 19 février 1973 (Code : DELIT-STUP); une proportion qui représentait 42,6% en 1996.

Disponibilité et qualité des drogues illicites au niveau national

La production nationale de drogues illicites est jugée très limitée en termes de quantité et qualité. En 2012, aucun laboratoire clandestin de drogues n’a été démantelé. Selon les données fournies par la Police Judiciaire et par l’ensemble des unités décentralisées de la Police Grand-Ducale (sections de recherche), la grande majorité des drogues illicites consommées au Grand-Duché de Luxembourg sont originaires des Pays-Bas (production de cannabis et transit d’autres drogues) suivis de la Belgique (production d’ecstasy et d’amphétamines) et du Maroc (production de cannabis). L’importation de cocaïne depuis l’Amérique latine se fait souvent par le sud de l’Europe (Espagne, Portugal) pour être acheminée ensuite via la France, la Suisse, l’Autriche et l’Allemagne en direction des Pays-Bas, tandis que l’héroïne suit toujours la route du Balkan (Roumanie et Bulgarie) ou des dérivés de celle-ci (Pologne, Turquie, Bélarusse) et le pays producteur principal reste l’Afghanistan.
Au cours des dernières années des réseaux de distribution mieux organisés ont vu le jour sur le plan national. L’expansion de ces réseaux plus structurés a contribué à une hausse sensible de la disponibilité de drogues, particulièrement en ce qui concerne l’offre de cocaine et de cannabis. Les nouvelles drogues synthétiques (Legal highs) sont à surveiller de façon rapprochée. Un phénomène plus récent consiste par ailleurs dans le fait que les groupements ethniques ont davantage tendance à interagir et à se concerter au niveau de l’organisation de la vente de la drogue, tandis qu’auparavant, aucune filière criminelle ne cherchait le contact avec les autres groupes. Par ailleurs, ils œuvrent à délocaliser leurs points de vente vers des endroits moins visibles à la police, tels qu’appartements privés ou cafés. La proportion de trafiquants de drogues non-luxembourgeois est restée stable les dernières années.

Au vu de la position géographique du Luxembourg, la Police Grand-Ducale travaille en étroite collaboration avec ses pays voisins et les Pays-Bas. Dans le cadre d’accords de coopération policière internationale, des opérations à grande échelle sont régulièrement organisées afin de lutter contre le trafic de drogues. Dans le cadre de ces opérations, la Police met en place un dispositif de surveillance, d’observation et d’interpellation afin de combattre les flux illicites de stupéfiants en provenance des Pays-Bas et les phénomènes de trafic et de consommation régionale de stupéfiants.

Comparée à la situation de 2006, la pureté de la cocaïne a baissé et une diminution plus nette encore de la pureté de l’héroïne a été observée en 2011 et confirmée en 2012.

Toutefois, il s’agira de suivre attentivement les variations importantes au niveau des purités minimales et maximales et plus particulièrement les concentrations de THC dans différentes variétés de cannabis saisies au Luxembourg les dernières années.

Les prix de rue de l’héroïne, de la cocaïne et du cannabis connaissent des marges de plus en plus importantes, ce qui est dû partiellement aux différences de plus en plus marquées de la qualité de l’ensemble des drogues de rue.

**Tendances essentielles**

Tous indicateurs de tendances confondus, les données actuelles confirment une diminution du nombre d’usagers problématiques de drogues au Grand-duché de Luxembourg et les résultats les plus récentes d’études de prévalence suggèrent que la prévalence de l’usage intraveineux de drogues s’est stabilisée. Depuis la dernière décennie un nombre de plus en plus important d’UPD ont commencé un traitement ou profitent des offres bas-seuil et un nombre décroissant d’usagers entrent en contact avec les forces de l’ordre. La proportion de mineurs interpellés par la police pour infraction à la législation nationale en matière de drogues suit une faible tendance à la hausse qu’il s’agira de suivre de près les années à venir.

L’usage intraveineux d’héroïne associé à une polyconsommation demeure le mode de consommation préférantiel des usagers répertoriés par le réseau institutionnel. Toutefois selon les données les plus récentes la pratique de l’inhalation (chasing) semble gagner du terrain sur l’usage intraveineux.

La qualité des drogues vendues sur les marchés illicites au niveau national a connu une dégradation importante ce qui a eu comme conséquence une augmentation généralisée de la polyconsommation. Le nombre de victimes de surdoses mortels a diminué depuis 2007 (27 cas) pour atteindre 8 cas en 2012.
Bien que la prévalence UPD récente témoigne d’une tendance à la baisse, de nouveaux phénomènes sont apparus dont l’ivresse précoce, le "binge drinking" chez les jeunes et l’usage de nouvelles drogues de synthèse et de produits contenant ces dernières. Ces nouveaux phénomènes doivent être observés de près aussi en raison de l’impact important qu’ils peuvent avoir sur l’incidence PDU à l’avenir.


Le marché illicite au niveau national se caractérise par des techniques de vente et de stratégies de distribution plus agressives notamment dû à une collaboration plus organisée entre des groupes criminels d’origines ethniques différentes qui auparavant ont opéré de façon indépendante. Dans ce contexte on a observé que les points de vente sont devenus moins visibles pour les forces de l’ordre, p.ex. des appartements privés ou des bars. Une attention particulière doit aussi être portée à l’égard des différences accrues observées dans les puretés minimales et maximales des drogues de rue ainsi qu’à la concentration maximale du THC dans les saisies de cannabis les dernières années. Les différences de qualité des drogues de rue ont tendance à augmenter ce qui suggère des mécanismes plus diversifiés de distribution et qui pourrait expliquer les variations de prix importantes observées au cours des dernières années. L’ensemble des indicateurs disponibles suggèrent par ailleurs que les consommateurs de drogues illicites s’approvisionnent de plus en plus sur le marché national.

Les développements en termes de réponses apportées aux problèmes associés à l’usage problématique de drogues sont à mettre en lien direct avec la mise en exécution de la stratégie nationale « drogues » et des plans d’action y associés. Au cours des dernières années, les services de consultation et de traitement spécialisés ont été largement adaptés aux réalités et défis nouveaux, ce qui a eu comme conséquence positive et documentée que plus de personnes commencent leur premier traitement à un moment plus précoce de leur carrière d’usager. Une planification pluriannuelle concertée a permis par le biais de plans d’action concrets et transparents d’atteindre une mobilisation de ressources budgétaires significativement plus élevées que lors des années précédant cette première. Si la prévention primaire est au premier plan, on retiendra également des améliorations visibles au niveau des mesures d’intervention précoce. Des efforts importants ont par ailleurs été entrepris au niveau des mesures de réduction de risques et dommages et de la diversification des offres de prise en charge. Les mesures de réintégration socioprofessionnelle ont porté leurs fruits au vu des données récentes en la matière. L’offre de traitement de substitution, et les structures bas seuils se sont développées et continueront à se développer sur la toile de fond de la décentralisation à l’échelle nationale.

Actuellement, un nombre croissant de clients en traitement contrastent avec un nombre décroissant de prévenus pour infraction à la législation en matière de drogues. On retiendra également une diminution des traitements aigos en milieu hospitalier au bénéfice des traitements spécialisés extrahospitaliers.

Des mécanismes de coordination ont été renforcés entre les ONG et les autorités nationales et des mécanismes d’évaluation sont en place. Il a été procédé à une première évaluation externe du plan d’action drogue et les résultats ont été intégrés, ensemble avec les recommandations issues d’une série de groupes de travail d’experts nationaux et de résultats d’enquêtes auprès des usagers/clients, dans l’élaboration de la nouvelle stratégie anti-drogue et plan d’action 2010-2014.
Concordance entre indicateurs

Les indicateurs de réduction de la demande concordent majoritairement avec les données de la réduction de l’offre (fig.4.3). La plupart des indicateurs indirects de prévalence UPD reflètent aussi les tendances documentées par des études de prévalence détaillées.

Le nombre absolu de surdoses fatales a atteint un niveau plus faible comparé aux années précédentes. Il doit être noté que des changements au niveau de chiffres absolus peu élevés peuvent induire des variations non négligeables au niveau des pourcentages et qu’une comparaison des taux de surdosages au cours des dernières années permet d’entrevoir plus clairement la tendance actuelle à la baisse.

Les statistiques d’admission des services bas-seuil dépendent en grande partie des capacités d’accueil de ces services ainsi que de l’accessibilité de ces derniers au niveau national. Ceci dit, bien que les offres bas-seuil ont été développées continuellement au Luxembourg, le nombre de contacts avec ces derniers tend à diminuer comparé à la situation observée en 2010.
Drug policy: legislation, strategies and economic analysis

In 1999 the government entrusted the Ministry of Health with the overall coordination of drug-related demand and risk reduction actions. This led to the creation of a national drug coordinator’s office in 2000.

The 2009 governmental programme has set the framework for the elaboration of the third national strategy and action plan (2010-2014) for the fight against drugs and addictions. The **national strategy and action plan 2010-2014** rely upon the priorities of the Ministry of Health and a sustained collaboration with field actors and civil society. In order to optimize its impact, the new action plan has taken into account relevant issues from EU and EC treaties, the **EU anti-drugs strategy 2005-2012** and the **EU drugs action plan 2009-2012**. The general aim of the national strategy and action plan is to contribute to a high level of protection in terms of public health, public security and social cohesion.

The national drug strategy relies on **two pillars**, namely on demand reduction and supply reduction and on **four transversal axes**:
1. Risk, damage, nuisance reduction,
2. Research and information,
3. International relations and 
4. Coordination mechanisms.

The national drug coordinator, jointly with the Interministerial Committee on Drugs (ICD), follows up and steers the implementation process of the national drugs action plan.

The **global budget of the Ministry of Health** granted to drug demand reduction related services and programs went up from 2,066,000.- EUR in 2000 to 8,590,033.- EUR in 2012, thus witnessing a progression rate of 316%. Overall public expenditures in the field of drug demand and drug supply reduction per year are currently estimated at 38,500,000.- EUR (Origer, 2010). Expenditures exclusively allocated to drug-related treatment reached 16,231,609.- EUR in 2012.

Epidemiological Indicators

Globally, UNODC\(^8\) (2013) estimates that, in 2011, between 167 and 315 million people used at least one illicit substance during the past year. The prevalence of the use of illicit drugs and the number of problematic drug users has stabilized.

Cannabis remains the most widely consumed drug worldwide (180.6 million people or 3.9% of the population aged 15 to 64 years) which represents a slight increase compared to the estimations of 2009. The use of amphetamine-type stimulants reached 33.8 million people (0.7%). The prevalence of “ecstasy” in 2011 (19.4% million people or 0.4% of the population aged 15 to 64 years) has decreased compared to 2009 data. The number of opiate users has stabilized and situates around 16.5 million people (0.4%).

According to the European Drug Report 2013 published by the EMCDDA, 85 million people have used at least one illicit drug during lifetime in Europe. Positive evolutions are to be seen in the decline of new heroin

---

\(^8\) Extracts from the World Drug Report 2013 (UNODC, 2013)
users, the decrease of the number of people who inject drugs, the reduction of the mortality associated to drug use and the decrease of the use of cannabis and cocaine in certain countries. In addition, record levels of the number of people in treatment have been observed (1.2 million of Europeans in 2011) as well as a continuing decrease of the HIV infection associated to drug use. Amphetamines and ecstasy remain the synthetic stimulants mostly used in Europe. Recent data suggest however a stable and declining use of amphetamines by young adults.

Concerning cannabis, around 3 million Europeans (aged 15 to 64 years) use cannabis daily or nearly on a daily basis. Also the number, type and availability of new substances in Europe continue to increase. Globalization mechanisms, technical progress and the use of the internet have contributed to a market open for new drugs mostly of synthetic origin.

### National drug prevalence in the general population

Serial school survey data (HBSC 1999 – 2010) reveal a decrease in the prevalence of any illicit drug use from the end of the 20th century to 2010. In-depth analysis shows an overall decline in prevalence between 1999 and 2006 and a fair stabilization afterwards. All common illicit drugs follow declining prevalence trends with the notable exception of cocaine witnessing an increase, particularly in age group 15 to 16 years. Opiates’ use in school-aged children has been consistently low over the last decade.

Even though cannabis is still the most used illicit drug by youngsters aged 12 to 18 years, an obvious decline has been observed from the beginning of the 21st century as far as lifetime prevalence is concerned. Recent and current cannabis use prevalence rates have been declining remarkably between 1999 and 2006 and seem to have stabilised since then.

Also, the mean age at first use of cannabis and illicit drugs in general has increased (+/- 6 months) between 2006 and 2010. In 2010, 9.44% of youngsters aged 15 years reported first cannabis before having reached 15 years, whereas this same proportion figured 12.03% in 2006.

### National prevalence of problem drug use (PDU)

The annual number of PDU person-contacts indexed by national institutions figured 4,739\(^9\) in 2012 (2002: 4,701).

2,383 users have been indexed by national specialised drug demand reduction agencies and 2,318 drug law offenders by supply reduction agencies in 2002. In 2012 the same agencies have indexed 2,937 and 1,802 persons respectively. Overall the number of persons showing drug-related contacts with DR or SR agencies has discontinuously increased until 2010 and witnesses a first decrease in 2011 and an even more important downward trend in 2012. This decrease is primarily due to a decrease of the number of contacts with law enforcement agencies. Also, the number of inpatient drug treatment demanders in hospital care settings

---

\(^9\) In this figure double counting is included meaning that a given person could have been indexed twice and more by different institutions. It is thus not representing the actual prevalence, which has to be assessed by other methods.
has been decreasing in recent years, whereas specialised non-hospital based treatment and substitution treatment have gained in importance. Worth mentioning is also the decrease in 2011 and 2012 of national low threshold agencies’ contacts.

Socio-demographic profile of PDU

The male/female ratio of the PDU population currently sets at 4:1. Over the last decade the proportion of indexed non-native PDU has been showing strong variations but a clearly increasing trend since 2003 and has shown signs of stabilisation from 2008 to 2012. The population of non-native drug users largely consists of Portuguese nationals (38% of total number of non-native PDU), representing a proportion that is comparable to the one observed in general population (37.1%). Citizens of French and African origins occupy the second (17%) and third (13%) rank respectively. German citizens rank at 5th position (5%) and Italian citizens, who occupied the third place in non-native drug law offenders over many years, represented 4% in 2012 (rank 6).

The mean age of indexed PDU has been evolving from 28 years and 4 months in 1995 to 33 years and 2 months in 2012. Mean age of male PDU has been increasing faster than for females. The gap between youngest and oldest PDU has been stabilised in recent years, after years of increase as one observed a long-term increase of the population of PDU aged 40 years and more and a sensitive decrease in PDU aged less than 30 years. The mean age of native PDU is consistently lower than the one observed for non-natives. Worth mentioning is also the significant increase of the average age of overdose victims over the last decade and a fairly stable proportion of minors among drug law offenders over the last four years (2012: 10%; 2011: 6%; 2010:9 %; 2009: 6%).

Problem drug use prevalence and consume trends

National data are provided by serial prevalence studies on PDU aged between 15 and 64 years performed in 1997, 1999, 2000, 2007 and 2009 data (Origer, 2012)10. The estimation study performed on 2009 data provides an absolute prevalence of problem drug users (PDU) of 2,070 persons (C.I. (95%): 1,553 to 2,623). In terms of prevalence rates estimates for the same age categories, 6.16 out of 1,000 habitants aged between 15 and 64 years show problem drug use. According to available serial data for the years 1997 to 2009, absolute prevalence and prevalence rates of PDU have been showing an increasing trend until 2000. After a brief plateau, a decrease has been observed from 2003 onwards. Absolute prevalence and prevalence rates of intravenous drug use (IDU) in the national population aged 15 to 64 years have been increasing between 1997 and 2007 to show first signs of decline in 2009.

Injecting heroin use associated to poly-drug use has been reported being the most common consume pattern in PDU. The ratio of injecting opiates use to the inhalation mode has reached 2:3 in 2012. The prevalence of the use of cocaine as primary drug increased until 2006 and from there on discontinuously decreased. In 2012, following a sensible increase in 2011, the previous trend of cocaine stabilising as primary drug is confirmed (12.2%).

The number of persons in contact with the national specialised network for (preferential) cannabis use currently represents 29.5% (important increase). Amphetamine type substances and ecstasy related treatment demands are only weakly represented, which, however, does not inform on their prevalence in the general population as RELIS data refer to PDU and not to the overall population of recreational drug users.

Drug-related treatment

The most remarkable increases between 2008 and 2010 have been observed in substitution treatment demanders and in the number of contacts in low threshold facilities (2012: 127,080; 2011: 123,465, 2010: 140,093 contacts). In 2011 and 2012, however, the number of OST treatment demanders has showed a stable trend and low threshold contacts have even declined. 9.7% of respondents are first treatment demanders, all treatment centres included. A confirmed trend has to be seen in the decrease of the proportion of substitution patients aged less than 25 years and the increase of the proportion of patients aged 40 years and more.

Health correlates and responses to consequences

The 

HIV/AIDS prevalence

in PDU has been stable in 2012, while the infection of HCV (hepatitis C) has been showing a decrease in 2012, compared to 2011 data. Data from the National Laboratory of Retrovirology suggest a long term and discontinuous decreasing tendency of the average proportion of IDU in newly diagnosed HIV cases. From 2004 to 2008 this proportion has been varying between 7 and 14% and figured 9.88% in 2012. HIV infection rates in IDU situate around 4 percent, which also stands for a stabilisation, compared to 2011 data.

The implementation of the 2005-2009 and 2010-2014 action plans has been accompanied by a discontinuous but significant overall decrease of fatal overdose cases in the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg (2012: 8 cases).

In terms of number of overdose cases in the general population of the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg, this proportion figured 1.76 overdose deaths per 100,000 inhabitants aged 15 to 64 years in 2005 (2000: 5.9 cases per 100,000 inhabitants and 2007: 5.67). In 2012, 1.5 acute OD cases per 100,000 inhabitants have been registered, showing a decreasing tendency. Forensic data from 1992 to 2012 show that the most frequently involved substance in drug-related death is heroin, followed by prescription drugs consumed in a polyuse context. 7 victims were male (87%) in 2012 and the mean age of victims has been showing a discontinued increase over the past 20 years (in 1992: 28.4 years and in 2012: 37.75 years). Although the mean age of drug overdose victims has been increasing, the number of victims aged less than 20 years has remained relatively unchanged. No underage victim was reported in 2012.

As regards the nationality of overdose victims in 2012, 75% (83%) were natives, representing a slight decrease compared to the previous year. An in-depth description of fatal overdose (FOD) victims since 1994 as well as the impact of gender on the occurrence of FOD has been addressed by a nationwide study (Origer et al., 2013) published in 2013.

Social correlates and social reintegration

Social correlates of problem drug use are manifold and touch upon family, professional, financial and legal areas.

The educational levels of PDU are low and mostly incomplete. The residential status of the latter has improved over the last years. In 1995, 31% of drug users reported stable accommodation; currently the same proportion situates around 70%. This improvement is partly due to various accommodation and housing offers for addicted people set up in the framework of the drug action plan. Recent figures tend to confirm that although specialised accommodation offers have been further developed, the current economic situation has created an even higher demand for this type of housing.

The unemployment rate (63%) tends to plateau. However, the proportion of active respondents reporting a stable job situation (e.g. long term contract) has sensibly decreased over the last 4 years, which should also be put in the context of the current economic parameters.

Harm reduction activities

The number of contacts indexed by national low threshold agencies has increased dramatically until 2010 and decreased for the first time in 2011 (2011: 123,465 / 2005: 47,739). In 2012, 127,080 contacts have been registered. Approximately 44% of clients are aged between 25 and 34 years, and 50% of clients aged 35 and more is observed. Between 50 and 60% of clients are natives.

The number of syringes distributed in the framework of the national needle exchange programme (2012: 211,439 / 1996: 76,259), peaked in 2006 and has been decreasing discontinuously onwards. Return rates of used syringes have been increasing during the referred period and reached 95% in 2012. An increasing majority of injectors (76%) procure their syringes in specialised agencies followed by pharmacies and decreasingly automatic dispensers.

Law enforcement indicators

Seizures of illicit substances at the national level

Great variations have been observed as to the quantity of illicit substances seized since the beginning of the nineties. A longitudinal data analysis from 2000 onwards indicates a general decreasing tendency in heroin and cocaine seizures, whereas cannabis resin seizures are showing a discontinuous increase. Quantities of herbal cannabis seized have increased compared to the situation observed in year 2000. Latest data however, show an important decrease of cannabis in terms of quantities and a very significant increase of cocaine seized in 2011, not confirmed, however by 2012 data.

The total number of persons involved in traffic has followed a constant upward trend until 2002 and showed a decreasing trend line since then. Quantities of seized cannabis went up in 2012. Notwithstanding the quantities of cannabis and cocaine seized, the number of seizures has grown discontinuously since 1990. This suggests that more seizures of smaller quantities have been reported. Since 2008 the number of cannabis and cocaine seizures has clearly increased, while the number of heroin seizures discontinuously decreased. Also, the number of offenders involved in seizures has been showing an overall decreasing trend. The total
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13 If not specified, data refer to 2012. Figures in brackets refer to 2011 if not otherwise specified.
14 Non–transit drugs destined to the national market
The number of persons involved in drug trafficking has followed a constant upward trend until 2010 and a fair regression in 2011 and 2012 (2000: 1,758 (2012: 1,782) persons). A confirmed majority of offenders involved in cannabis traffic are natives.

Crack (cocaine-base) seizures have not been reported to date by national authorities, although freebasing has been reported sporadically by field agencies. The first national seizures of ecstasy type substances (MDMA, MDA, etc.) were recorded in 1994. The availability of ecstasy has been stable since 1996 but seized quantities increased remarkably in 2009 followed by a decrease in the past years.

**Drug law offenders and prison sentences**

The number of police records for presumed offences against the modified drug law of 1973 went from 764 in 1995 to 1,802 in 2012. As regards the number of drug law offenders one observes a similar downward trend than in the number of records since 2010 (2012: 1,782). In 2012, 169 arrests (225 in 2006) for presumed drug offences have been reported.

The population of drug law offenders comprises 90% of males, a proportion that has been varying between 79% and 90% during the past decade. 808 first drug law offenders were reported in 2003 and 720 in 2012. Also the percentage of minors (< 18 years) among drug law offenders, has been slightly increasing between 2010 (7%) and 2012 (8.1%). Heroin and cocaine are the main drugs involved in registered first drug offences.

Since 1998, non-natives (52% in 2012) have been representing the majority of drug law offenders (52-68%). 40% (41%) of the registered cases were first drug law offenders. National prison data of 2012 refer to 950 (856) new admissions of which 306 (32.2%) were related to drug law offences; a proportion that represented 42.6% in 1996.

**Profile of the national drug market**

The national production and culture of illicit drugs appears to be irrelevant in terms of quantities and quality. In 2012 no clandestine drug-manufacturing laboratory has been dismantled at the national level. According to observational data provided by the Judicial Police and all decentralised national police units, a majority of illicit drugs consumed in the G.-D. of Luxembourg originate from the Netherlands (cannabis production and transit of other drugs), followed by Belgium (ecstasy and ATS production) and Morocco (cannabis production). Cocaine found on the national market is originating from Latin America and mostly transits South of Europe (Spain, Portugal) to reach the Netherlands via France, Switzerland, Austria and Germany. Heroin follows the main Balkan route and its derivate (Poland, Turkey, Belorussia).

In recent years more organised distribution networks have been developing nationally. The expansion of these structured distribution networks by criminal associations thus contributed to a significant increase in drug availability, and particularly in the supply of cocaine and cannabis. More recently different ethnic groups have created synergies in drug distribution and traffic, whereas previously these groups have been operating separately. Moreover, it has been noted that traffickers tend to delocalize their selling points to locations or settings less visible for police as for instance private flats, bars or motorway rest areas in order to meet their clients halfway and sell gross quantities. The proportion of non-natives involved in drug trafficking has been stable in recent years.
Compared to the situation in 2006, purity of cocaine has been decreasing and a remarkable decrease in average heroin purity was observed in 2011 and in 2012. In 2012, the maximum concentration of THC in herbal cannabis was 29.36%. Attention has to be paid to the striking differences in maximum and minimum purities as well as to a high maximum concentration of THC in cannabis products seized in Luxembourg in recent years. Prices move within increasingly broader ranges for heroin, cocaine and cannabis, which is partly due to increasing differences in quality of street drugs.

**Most Relevant Trends**

All indicators included, a decrease in PDU prevalence rates has been observed over recent years and results from latest prevalence studies suggest that IDU prevalence has stabilised. Over the last decade an increasing number of PDU entered treatment or use low threshold offers and fewer come in contact with law enforcement agencies.

Injecting opiate use, combined with polyuse, is the predominant PDU pattern. However, recent data suggest that the inhalation mode (chasing) is becoming increasingly popular. The overall quality of street drugs decreased, which resulted in an overall increase of polydrug use. The number of acute drug deaths went down to 8 cases in 2012 (27 cases in 2007).

Although current PDU prevalence shows a decreasing trend, new phenomena such as early drunkenness, binge drinking in youngsters and use of new synthetic drugs and products containing the latter must be monitored closely since they may have a relevant impact of PDU incidence in the future.

There is also great concern about infectious diseases in drug users and in particularly IDU. HIV rates in PDU have been low and stable from 2000 to 2008, but showed an increasing tendency in 2009 and 2010, to stabilise again around 3 to 4% in 2011 and 2012. However, hepatitis C has been increasing continuously from 2000 to 2008, slightly decreasing in 2009 and 2010, as well as in 2012 after a significant increase observed in 2011. Latest research results based on serological testing (Origer & Removille, 2009) suggested HCV infection rates over 70% and even higher prevalence rates in prison populations in 2007.

The national drug market is led by more aggressive selling techniques and distribution strategies due to improved collaboration between criminal groups of different ethnic origins previously operating independently. A tendency to move selling points to locations or settings less visible for police as for instance private flats or bars is also observed in this context. Attention has finally to be paid to the striking differences in maximum and minimum purities of street drugs as well as to a historically high maximum concentration of THC in cannabis samples seized over the last years. Quality ranges of street drugs tend to increase which suggest more diversified distribution mechanisms and may explain the important price variations observed during recent years. Available indicators suggest that users increasingly acquire illicit drugs on the national market.

The most relevant developments at the response side result from the implementation of the national drug strategy and its associated action plans. Over the last years counselling and specialised care networks have been developed, which had as a positive and documented consequence that PDU start treatment at an earlier stage of their drug career. Drug action plans have allowed disposing of financial means that have known an important increase compared to the time preceding drug action plans. If primary prevention is considered most important, there have been visible improvements in early intervention measures. Major efforts have also been made in the diversification of care offers and finally harm reduction measures have been significantly developed. Housing offers and reintegration programmes have obviously contributed to improve socio-professional situations as documented by recent RELIS data. Substitution treatment and low threshold offers have been decentralised and continue to be so.
In recent years an increasing number of drug users in treatment contrast with a decreasing number of drug law offenders. Moreover, treatment episodes in hospital settings have been dropping, whereas, specialised outpatient treatment and substitution treatment demands have been increasing in recent years.

Coordination mechanisms have been reinforced between NGOs and national authorities and evaluation mechanisms are in place. A first external evaluation of the national drugs action plan has been performed and outcomes have been integrated together with recommendations from a series of national expert groups and outcomes of user/clients surveys in the elaboration of the new drugs strategy and action plan 2010-2014.

**Consistency between Indicators**

Demand reduction indicators are mostly consistent with supply reduction data (fig. 4.3). Most indirect PDU prevalence indicators also reflect trends documented by in-depth PDU studies.

Moreover, the absolute number of fatal overdoses has reached a fairly low level compared to previous years. It should be stressed that changes in small figures may produce great variations in percentages and that comparison of overdose rates over the years make the downward trend more obvious.

Admission statistics in low threshold drug agencies depend of course on the capacities of low threshold offers and the level of access to harm reduction measures at the national level. This said, even though harm reduction offers have been further developed in Luxembourg, the number of contacts with the latter tend to decrease when compared to the situation observed in year 2010.
INTRODUCTION

Given the complex nature of drug use and its correlates, national drug policies are based on shared political competencies and responsibilities. Furthermore, in terms of intervention strategies, the more holistic concept of addictive behaviour has gained in importance and influences increasingly policy debates. This tendency is reflected by the enlargement of ICD (Interministerial Committee on Drugs) competences and its increased external visibility as well as the general framework set by the new national drugs strategy 2010-2014 on addictions (and not exclusively on illicit substances’ related problems).

The governmental programme 2009\textsuperscript{15}, foresees to further develop the national drugs action plan and specifically refers to the decentralisation of care and harm reduction structures, to further improve surveillance mechanisms in drug substitution treatment, to the creation of a heroin assisted treatment programme and to the extension of post-therapeutic offers. Further efforts are to be invested in effectiveness and efficiency evaluations of drug treatment offers and services.

The 2010 – 2014 national action plan on drugs and addictions built upon the outcome of the external evaluation of the national drug strategy and action plan 2005-2009 performed by the Trimbos Instituut\textsuperscript{16} (NL) in 2009.

GENERAL LEGAL FRAMEWORK\textsuperscript{17}

**Drug legislation and recent drug-related laws**

The basic national drug law, namely: ‘Loi concernant la vente de substances médicamenteuses et la lutte contre la toxicomanie\textsuperscript{18}’ regulates both, the selling of controlled medicaments and the fight against drug addiction and dates back to the 19 February 1973. It has been last amended by the law of 27 April 2001\textsuperscript{19}. Besides the decriminalisation of cannabis use, alleviation of penalties for simple drug use, and an enhanced overall differentiation of penalties according to the type of drug offences and the nature of controlled substances involved, the law of 27 April 2001 foresees a legal framework for a series of treatment and harm reduction measures, namely, drug substitution treatment, needle exchange and shooting galleries (state accredited and, in addition to article 13 of the Grand ducal decree of 30 January 2002 (see below), Heroin Assisted Treatment (HAT)).

\textsuperscript{17} Legal texts prevail on selectively produced summaries. The integral national legislation on drugs and drug addiction is available under: http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/eldd  
\textsuperscript{18} Official gazette A 1973, p.319  
\textsuperscript{19} Official gazette A 2001, p.1180 (Adoption: 27/04/2001, Entry in force: 17/05/2001)
No new law related to drugs or precursors has been voted in 2011 and 2012.

Grand Ducal Decrees

As regards regulation mechanisms on the control of substances and precursors, the national drug legislation mainly relies on the following Grand ducal decrees, amended (text or annexes) according to decisions on new substances’ inscription into national law:

- Grand ducal decree of 4 March 1974 regarding certain toxic substances
- Grand ducal decree of 20 March 1974 regarding certain psychotropic substances
- Grand ducal decree of 26 March 1974 establishing the list of controlled narcotics
- Grand ducal decree of 8 May 1993 regarding commerce of narcotics and psychotropic substances
- Grand ducal decree of 2 February 1995 regarding the production and distribution of certain substances used in the illicit production of narcotics and psychotropic substances
- Grand ducal decree of 6 February 1997 regarding substances listed in schedules III and IV of the UN Convention on psychotropic substances of 21 February 1971
- Grand ducal decree of 30 January 2004 modifying the grand ducal decree of 2 February 1995
- Grand ducal decree of 13 February 2007 on the surveillance and commerce of drug precursors

The full text of the current basic national drug law as well as recent decrees can be accessed through the following web sites: [http://www.legilux.public.lu](http://www.legilux.public.lu) or [http://eldd.emcdda.europa.eu](http://eldd.emcdda.europa.eu).

**CHANGES IN 2012**: The grand ducal decree of July 21, 2012 puts the following substances and plants under national control:
- MDPV (3,4 méthylène-dioxy-pyrovalerone)
- Salvia Divinorium (Salvinorine A)
- Mytragyna Speciosa, Kratom (Mytragynine, 7-Hydroxymitragynine)

Furthermore it regulates the modalities for the incorporation of certain cannabinoids in recognized medicaments as well as the cultivation of certain cannabis varieties for agricultural, non psychoactive purposes.

**CHANGES IN 2013**: The grand ducal decree of January 29, 2013 puts the following substances under national control:
- MDMC (Methylone)
- 4-MA (Methyamphetamine)
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20 Official gazette A 2004 (Adoption: 13/02/2007, Entry in force: 22/02/2007). See also ELDD.
21 Official gazette A 2007 (Adoption: 30/01/2004, Entry in force: 13/02/2004). See also ELDD.
22 Règlement grand-ducal du 21 juillet 2012 modifiant :
- le règlement grand-ducal modifié du 19 février 1974 portant exécution de la loi du 19 février 1973 sur la vente des substances médicamenteuses et la lutte contre la toxicomanie ;
- l’annexe du règlement grand-ducal modifié du 4 mars 1974 concernant certaines substances toxiques ;
- l’annexe du règlement grand-ducal modifié du 20 mars 1974 concernant certaines substances psychotropes ;
- l’annexe du règlement grand-ducal modifié du 26 mars 1974 établissant la liste des stupéfiants
23 Règlement grand-ducal du 29 janvier 2013 modifiant :
- le règlement grand-ducal modifié du 19 février 1974 portant exécution de la loi du 19 février 1973 sur la vente des substances médicamenteuses et la lutte contre la toxicomanie ;
- l’annexe du règlement grand-ducal modifié du 4 mars 1974 concernant certaines substances toxiques ;
- l’annexe du règlement grand-ducal modifié du 20 mars 1974 concernant certaines substances psychotropes ;
- l’annexe du règlement grand-ducal modifié du 26 mars 1974 établissant la liste des stupéfiants
(Adoption : 29.01.2013, Entry in force : 01.02.2013)
Legally speaking, police has no discretionary power: each offence, once disclosed, must be reported. However, depending on the case, (e.g. first offence for cannabis use) it may occur that no further action is taken. Once a drug law offence case has been reported to the Public Prosecutor, the latter decides on the opportunity to prosecute or not. The legal concept of ‘prosecution opportunity’ may be applied, which implies a case-by-case decision.

Narcotic-related offences are covered by the law (concerning the sale of medicinal substances and the fight against drug addiction) of 19 February 1973 (hereinafter referred to as ‘the 1973 law’) that was modified by the law of 27 April 2001.

The modified 1973 law essentially remains a repressive law, towards drug consumers as well as dealers. Even though the 1973 law does not specifically provide for alternative measures to prison for drug-addicted law offenders, the following options exist.

In accordance with article 23 of the 1973 law, cases involving personal use of drugs (individually or in a group) and/or cases involving offences against article 8 of the 1973 law are dropped if the offender, before the illegal use was disclosed, undertook treatment for drug addiction. Moreover, the public prosecutor can offer the offender the option of voluntary treatment of his/her addiction.

According to the terms of article 24 of the 1973 law, when preliminary charges are brought for personal use of drugs and when it is established that the offender is the subject of medical treatment, the investigative judge may order treatment for drug addiction at the request of the prosecutor or the accused person.

Article 25 of the 1973 law makes provision for the juvenile court to refer an addicted minor to treatment.

Article 26 of the 1973 law provides for the courts to order a drug addict to undergo treatment, in which case the verdict can be postponed. If the accused person meets all conditions imposed by the courts, the charges for illegal use may be dropped.

The above measures are only available to drug users and no other categories of offenders.

In addition to the special measures set forth in the 1973 law, the courts can still avail of the reformed sentencing measures or of any of the extenuating circumstances which are an option for all offences, as outlined in the Code of Criminal Law and the Code of Criminal Investigation. The extenuating circumstances outlined in Articles 73 to 79 of the Code of Criminal Law allow the judge the option of ordering community service or a fine, or even to forgo sentencing in favour of a police fine (between EUR 25 and 248).

Articles 619 to 634 (1) of the Code of Criminal Investigation allow the judge the option of either postponing the verdict, with/without a trial period, or suspending the sentence, with/without probation and with a trial period.

The law of 27 April 2001 modifying the basic drug law of 19 February 1973 by decriminalising cannabis use, and enhancing the differentiation of penalties according to the type of drug offences and the nature of controlled substances involved and the grand ducal decree of 30 January 2002 on substitution treatment, have largely contributed to increase the congruity between drug legislations and prosecution routines. Also, current drug legislation and prosecution policies put higher priority on drug dealing and trafficking than on
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drug consumption and promote harm and risk reduction measures. The creation of a national supervised drug consumption room is a sound example of this holistic approach.

As a legal principle, the reaction to an offence committed by a drug user must be proportional to the harm it aims to prevent. In fact, as long as the drug addict remains a simple user, any damage caused is to himself/herself and the legal response remains minimal as long as public order is not greatly disturbed. However, if the drug addict causes harm to others, the response will become firmer according to the seriousness of the offence.

**NATIONAL ACTION PLAN, STRATEGY, EVALUATION AND COORDINATION**

**Coordination mechanisms**

The coordination of drug demand reduction, risk reduction and related research is a competence of the Ministry of Health. Since 2000 a National Drug Coordinator, appointed by the Minister of Health, has been mandated with the overall coordination (including interministerial coordination) in the domains of drug-related demand and harm reduction and represents Luxembourg at the international level. Supply reduction and international cooperation aspects remain a competence of the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs respectively.

At the national level, the coordination among the competent ministries takes place in the *Inter-ministerial Commission on Drugs* (ICD), chaired by the National Drugs Coordinator. The ICD is composed of official delegates from involved governmental departments and constitutes the top advisory level with respect to coordination and orientation of actions. Both, the ICD and the Ministry of Health are responsible for the implementation of national drugs strategies and action plans. The ICD, has an advisory role and addresses issues ranging from illicit drug use and “legal highs” to alcohol use and prescription drugs under the general heading of addictive behaviour and its consequences.

The National Drug Coordinator is also the head of the national delegation within the Horizontal Drugs Group (EU Council) and the national permanent correspondent within the Pompidou Group (Council of Europe). Furthermore, he has been nominated chair of the national substitution treatment surveillance commission in 2010 and is member of the national AIDS surveillance committee.

**National plan and strategy**

Having taken into consideration the EU drugs strategy 2005-2012, the EU drugs action plan 2009-2012, the national strategy and drugs action plan are meant to contribute to a high level of health protection, public security and social cohesion and rely on two policy pillars, namely supply reduction and demand reduction. More precisely, it is designed to contribute to reduce initiation of drug use, to develop and maintain diversity and quality in care and treatment offers, to tangibly reduce drug use prevalence in the general population as well as health and social damage generated by illicit drug use and drug trafficking.
Furthermore the 2010-2014 national action plan\(^{26}\) includes, in addition to international cooperation and research, information, evaluation (retained by the EU action plan), two more cross-cutting themes: coordination and harm, risk and nuisance reduction. Luxembourg considers the latter two activity fields to be essential and of transversal nature.

The new governmental drugs strategy builds upon a more holistic approach than the previous ones. It addresses addictive behaviour as a whole and not only illicit drugs and drug addiction. Thus alcohol, tobacco and psychotropic pharmaceutics dependence as well as addictive behaviour not associated with substance use are now an integral part of an unique strategy. Specific action plans have been conceived or are currently under preparation in order to integrate the framework of a global national policy on addictions.

Operational objectives are as follows:

1. To contribute to the maintenance of individual and collective well-being.
2. To increase means for action and to improve coordination mechanisms and synergies between available resources in order to guarantee their best possible use.
3. Reduce the burden for the community by promoting a rational culture of investments, allowing to generating sustainable achievements.
4. To adequately update drug-related legislation and other regulatory instruments according to emerging evidence on drugs and drug use pattern as well as on commercial strategies that are building upon new opportunities created by new consumer trends.
5. To increase the knowledge base on drugs and addictive behaviour by promoting research and the broadest possible diffusion of objective information to the general public and specific target groups.
6. To consolidate mechanisms that allow to critically analyse actions and achievements, and by doing so, improve drug policy making, action planning and implementation.

The national plan lists 60 separate actions associated to a clear definition of tasks, involved management actors, financial requirements, deadlines and performance indicators. Some of the referred actions are submitted to a series of conditions to fulfil by the action manager in order to be proposed for financing. The action plan reflects priorities set by the government: primary prevention (4 projects), treatment and care (7), socio-professional reintegration (5), reduction of risks and damages (9), research, evaluation and information (8), supply reduction (18), coordination and international relations (9). Special focus is placed on primary prevention, offers of accommodation and housing, socio-professional reinsertion measures, diversification and access to therapeutic offers and quality management.

The selection of specific actions, projects or programmes has occurred on basis of a 6 criteria matrix including: pertinence, opportunity, feasibility, cost–benefice/quality factors, quality assurance mechanisms and measurability of results or impact.

Implementation of policies and strategies

The outcome of a national drugs action plan highly relies on the way it has been elaborated. The successive action plans reflect the general strategy of the Ministry of Health in order to optimize the overall interventions in the fight against drugs and drug addiction in the light of stated priorities, assessed needs and available resources. It constitutes an open framework meaning that complementary projects can be included if required.

In 2009, in order to best meet current needs in the elaboration of the 2010-2014 action plan, the national drug coordinator has launched a third multilateral consultation process involving ministerial departments, specialised NGOs and civil society. A special working group, chaired by the Ministry of Health, performed a needs assessment and elaborated national recommendations focusing on specialised drug care and rehabilitation offers. A more restricted group composed of representatives of the Ministry of Health and the National Addiction Prevention Centre drafted the action plan in the framework of primary prevention strategies. The priorities set by the Ministry of Health were discussed and, if necessary, complementary measures were added. A consensus on priority rankings of listed actions has been reached among involved parties. Finally, all retained actions were structured in an output oriented way as follows: ‘1. Description/ objective of action – 2. Responsibilities – 3. Budget – 4. Outcome – 5. Deadlines for outcome and evaluation’.

The active involvement of specialised NGOs / civil society from the very start of the conceptualisation work and consensus making prior to the implementation phase have shown to be a major criterion to guarantee an effective implementation process. Summarily, one should stress that the multilateral involvement of competent actors and the fact that most agencies involved in the implementation process are financed and controlled by the centrally coordinating Ministry of Health highly promote the effectiveness of the national strategic model.

Evaluation of policies and strategies

The implementation progress of the drugs action plan has been on the political agenda since its start in 2000 and consequently the visibility of achievements was continuously high. Media also contributed to this enhanced awareness and activity boosting, especially since they have been able to identify a central personalised key actor in the person of the national drug coordinator. Another positive side effect of consecutive drugs action plans is an increased commitment of NGOs / civil society in the drug policies as they have been involved since the very beginning of the process. The general public has equally welcomed the drug action plans since it enables them to follow up public efforts to fight a problem of great concern and to compare announced objectives with achieved actions.

Beside efforts made by all involved actors and networks, the positive outcome has also to be related to the considerable increase of the budgetary means allocated to the fight against drug addiction. An increase of more than 300% of the budget invested by the Ministry of Health in drug demand reduction occurred between 2000 and 2012.

Budgetary means invested allowed to increase resources in terms of primary prevention, to extend admission capacities of low threshold services, to increase the number of post-therapeutic offers, to further regionalize ambulatory treatment offers, to improve technical control measures related to substitution treatment, to reduce risks and damages, especially related to synthetic drugs and the transmission of certain infectious diseases, endemic to the population of PDU, to reduce the rate of drug overdoses and finally to promote research activities in the field.
Over the last 10 years the concept of implementation follow-up, evaluation and external evaluation strategies have gained in importance in the field of drugs and drug addiction. In the beginning of 2010, the Minister of Health jointly with the National Drug Coordinator has presented the new drug strategy and action plan 2010 – 2014. The referred action plan is based on the evaluation outcome of previous action plans and the assessment of current and future needs. In this context and for the first time nationally, a final external output and progress evaluation of the national drug strategy and action plan 2005-2009 has been performed (Trimbos Instituut) in 2009.

The contractual scope of the evaluation was a critical analysis of the implementation of the National Drug Action Plan 2005-2009. It builded upon the above mentioned mid-term evaluation of the Drug Action Plan. The aim was to serve policy relevant information to the stakeholders involved in making and implementing drug policy in Luxembourg. The following questions were addressed:

- **Priorities**: Does the Action Plan address in an appropriate way the priorities put forward by the different stakeholders, e.g. by clear problem definitions and clearly defined actions?
- **Conditions**: Were conditions given to realise the actions formulated in the Action Plan, e.g. by serving the necessary instruments and resources, and by dividing and defining the responsibilities and by facilitating cooperation between the different stakeholders? Has the existing coordination structure proved to be appropriate and efficient?
- **Results**: Did the implementation of the National Drug Action Plan result in the realisation of the envisaged actions?
- **Process**: Did the process of policy formulation and implementation go well (managed appropriately, allowing and taking-up input from all stakeholders, etc.)?

In implementing the evaluation the following guiding principles were applied:

- The evaluation is based on reliable and verifiable facts/results;
- The evaluation process is transparent to all stakeholders;
- All relevant parties are invited to participate in the evaluation process;
- All these parties must feel free to express their opinions;
- The evaluation is meant to formulate concrete recommendations that could lead to improvement of the quality, efficacy and efficiency of the Luxembourg drug policy;
- The evaluation does not take a stand in the political debate in Luxembourg.

The evaluation report also lists a set of recommendations regarding the new National Drug Action Plan, the coordination structure and the policy-making process. Main results and recommendations were presented in the 2010 edition of the national drugs report. In addition to the recommendations of previously referred to working groups, the final output of the external evaluation exercise has been serving the National Drug Coordinator and the Interministerial Commission on Drugs to elaborate the new national drugs action plan 2010-2014.

Other drug policy developments: Initiatives in Parliament and civil society

No projects or propositions of law in relation with drugs or drug addiction were introduced in 2012 and no specific Parliamentary debates or initiatives in the field of illicit drugs are to be reported.

Special topics addressed by the GIT in 2012 were:
- regulatory means to prohibit the selling and use of substances able to reduce levels of drug concentration in urine or blood of drug users and thus to distort test results;
- the spread of shisha smoking;
- cannabis cultivation for agricultural, non psychoactive, purposes;
- use of certain canabinoids for pharmaceutical purposes;
- substitution treatment and diacetylmorphine assisted treatment;
- the phenomenon of research or designer drugs and their diversion. Creation of new legal instruments to fight the phenomenon of “legal highs”. Regulation of selling and confiscation of psychoactive substances not yet controlled.

ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

Public expenditures

The fight against drugs is multidisciplinary. Thus, in Luxembourg: 11 ministries and 13 departments are involved to a different extent in the enforcement of national drug policies. As in most EU Member states, the structure of the national state budget does not allow for a drug budget allocation analysis exclusively based on labelled expenditures. Following are some of the preliminary problems one typically is confronted with in a public expenditure study:

- Budget lines may be generic (legal & illegal drugs), aggregated (addiction prevention), over inclusive (social solidarity) or unidentifiable (others),
- Apportionment of budgets may not be provided,
- Difference between provisional budget, voted budget and final expenditure (provisional budget often more detailed than voted budget),
- Expenditures may be annual, multiannual, unique, ordinary, extraordinary, etc. If they occur during the study reference year, they should be included even though they might give a biased picture of average or routine expenditures, especially when they are important (e.g. investments in real estate)\(^{29}\),
- In terms of follow-up: budget lines may be restructured, integrated or divided over time,
- In the field of public health, expenditures may result from direct state financing or social security reimbursement,
- Lack of clarity due to national mixed (Multi-ministries) financing (e.g. Public research Centres – multi projects’ financing) or national & EU & International shared financing,
- Eligibility of cooperation projects vs. variability of yearly contributions,
- Assessment of impact of general education and educational interventions (e.g.) on DDR impossible.

\(^{28}\) See related chapter in Part B

\(^{29}\) In order to highlight the different status/nature of budget lines, the following abbreviations have been used in the expenditure tables: S. : Standard budget (annual expenditure / budget line) I: Investments (unique year dependant expenditure)
This list is not exhaustive. Nevertheless drug-related public expenditure studies are feasible although they demand a considerable amount of analytical work for labelled or dedicated budget lines as they require a certain degree of creativity as far as non-labelled expenditures are concerned. Researchers may be forced to take decisions whether to include or not a series of expenditures. It is important that those decisions are taken according to reproducible standards and, even better so, according to harmonized and ultimately widely recognized methodological benchmarks.

In order to tailor and fine tune a methodology that fits the national context and in line with the work-plan of the EMCDDA, a national study on direct economic costs of drug policies and interventions has been performed from 1999 to 2002 and refers to data from 1999 (Origer 2002 b). (Etude du coût économique direct des interventions et de la politique publique en matière de drogues et de toxicomanies). The original research report can be accessed under: http://www.relis.lu. In the framework of 2006 EMCDDA contractual requirements, an update of the Origer 2002 study has been performed. A detailed description of the methodology applied in 2002 can be consulted in the original study. The same methodology has been applied for the present and other yearly updates.

**Methodology**

In the 2013 edition of the present report an overall estimation of direct public expenditures based on studies performed respectively in 1999 and 2009 is reported (Origer 2002b, 2010). Main results of these former comparative studies are summarised in tables 1.3 and 1.4. To date the represent the only overall drug-related public expenditures studies at the national level. As a matter of fact, exhaustive public expenditure studies are highly time and cost-consuming exercises and can therefore not be performed routinely. This said, trends surveillance of dedicated public budgets may rely transitionally on partial indicators such as direct public health expenditures for the fight against drugs and drug addiction (drug-related prevention and treatment costs).

The constituent concepts are defined as follows:

**DIRECT:** Excluding ‘costs of indirect consequences’ (e.g. loss of income, taxes) and ‘non quantifiable costs’ (e.g. loss of welfare) as well as expenditures related to the acquisition of illicit drugs by the consumer him- or herself.

**ECONOMIC:** Monetary impact and not social impact (costs) or loss of life quality e.g.

**COSTS:** Expenditures and not revenues created by illegal drug market.

**NATIONAL DRUG POLICIES:** Public finances and not private expenditures or investments.

**DRUG-RELATED TREATMENT:** ‘... any activity that directly targets individuals who have problems with their drug use and which aims to improve the psychological, medical or social state of those who seek help for their drug problems. This activity often takes place at specialised facilities for drug users, but may also occur in the context of/in general services offering medical and/or psychological help to people with drug problems’ (EMCDDA, 2000). The harm reduction approach directly targets drug addicted persons and aims to improve their psychological, health and social state or situation. In the national understanding, drug-related treatment therefore also includes harm reduction interventions.

The applied methodology refers to the concepts of the ‘Cost of Illness’ (C.O.I.) theory in opposition to "Cost-Benefit” approach. **COFOG and REUTERS** classifications were applied as recommended by the EMCDDA. The following techniques have been applied and combined according to existing contexts:
- Analysis of state budget and provisional state budget
- Clarification meeting with involved financial authorities
- Qualitative interviews
- Analysis of activity reports of ministerial departments and NGOs
- Analysis of state conventions and financial statements of specialized NGOs
- Detailed financial breakdown and budget apportionment provided on demand by a series of institutions (NGOs, Social Security, Hospitals)

**Main data sources:**
- Laws and projects of law regarding the budget of revenues and expenditures of state
- Annual ministerial activity reports
- Activity reports of specialised agencies
- State conventions with NGOs
- Annual financial statements of specialised NGOs
- Statistical outputs and financial breakdowns of the CNS

**Main reference documents:**


National estimates of labelled and non-labelled public drug demand reduction expenditures (2012)

**Table 1.1: Comparative analysis of drug demand reduction costs in Luxembourg 1999 vs. 2009 /2011/2012 (EUR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure</td>
<td>6,903,203.‐</td>
<td>15,458,853.‐</td>
<td>15,688,739.‐</td>
<td>16,231,609.‐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per inhabitant per year</td>
<td>16.‐</td>
<td>31.‐</td>
<td>30.6.‐</td>
<td>30.1.‐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per PDU</td>
<td>2,937.‐</td>
<td>7,468.‐</td>
<td>7,579.‐</td>
<td>7,841.‐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of GNP</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of state budget</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Origer 2002, PF OEDT, REITOX report 2009/2012


**Table 1.2 Overall expenditure in fiscal year 2009 by 1st level COFOG functions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COFOG 1st level function</th>
<th>Labelled expenditures</th>
<th>Non-labelled expenditures</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 General public services</td>
<td>122,000.‐</td>
<td>59,100.‐</td>
<td>181,100.‐ (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Public Order and Safety</td>
<td>4,838,543.‐</td>
<td>17,057,430.‐</td>
<td>21,895,973.‐ (57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Housing and community amenities</td>
<td>627,430.‐</td>
<td>0.‐</td>
<td>627,430.‐ (1.52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Health</td>
<td>7,968,789.‐</td>
<td>7,750,146.‐</td>
<td>15,718,935.‐ (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Recreation, culture and religion</td>
<td>0.‐</td>
<td>2,000.‐</td>
<td>2,000.‐ (0.01%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Education</td>
<td>0.‐</td>
<td>13,045.‐</td>
<td>13,045.‐ (0.07%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>38,438,483.‐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.3: Comparative analysis of overall direct drug-related public expenditures in Luxembourg 1999-2009 according to various indicators (EUR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>1999*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure</td>
<td>38,438,483.‐</td>
<td>23,345,000.‐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per inhabitant</td>
<td>77.‐</td>
<td>54.‐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per PDU</td>
<td>15,562.‐</td>
<td>9,934.‐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of GNP</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of state budget</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Origer 2002/2009
Budget

The NFP follows up the annual budgetary evolution by means of the most accessible and specific indicator, which is the annual budget of the Ministry of Health allocated to drug-related activities. Figure 1.1 shows the budgetary progression since the implementation of the first drugs action plan in 2000 and figure 1.2 summarises the annual progression of budget of the Ministry of Health and human resources allocated to drug-related activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget (EUR)</td>
<td>2,066,000.-</td>
<td>6,196,000.-</td>
<td>8,321,620.-</td>
<td>8,590,033.-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative progression rate</td>
<td>Reference year</td>
<td>200%</td>
<td>303%</td>
<td>316%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget (EUR)</td>
<td>5,771,000.-</td>
<td>6,584,000.-</td>
<td>7,991,583.-</td>
<td>8,321,620.-</td>
<td>8,590,033.-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual progression rate</td>
<td>Reference year</td>
<td>6.27%</td>
<td>9.65%</td>
<td>4.13%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual cumulative progression rate</td>
<td>Reference year</td>
<td>14.09%</td>
<td>38.48%</td>
<td>44.20%</td>
<td>48.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated human resources Full Time Equivalent (FTE)</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>69.25</td>
<td>83.75</td>
<td>88.75</td>
<td>90.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual progression rate</td>
<td>Reference year</td>
<td>9.06%</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual cumulative progression rate</td>
<td>Reference year</td>
<td>16.39%</td>
<td>40.76%</td>
<td>49.16%</td>
<td>52.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Funding arrangements

Funding of drug-related interventions is centralised at state level. There exist no specific regional or local funding mechanisms. Few drug prevention activities are subsidised by council districts on an ad hoc basis. Respective ministries or governmental departments, according to their attributions, are co-ordinating the creation, the implementation and the funding of required infrastructures. Governmental departments directly rely on the state budget while NGOs involved in drug treatment or research activities have either signed a so-called ‘convention de collaboration’ with competent ministries or are financed or co-financed on basis of regular subventions. A governmental delegate follows-up activities and functioning of a given NGO by attending a mandatory ‘coordination platform’.
The funding of the drug action plan is subject to an annual budgetary decisions process. Specific local projects designed by non-governmental actors requiring external financial support are generally submitted to respective ministries or to other national funding sources (Fund Against certain Forms of Criminality, Foundations, private funds, etc.) or international bodies (EU, EMCDDA, etc.).

**Social costs**

Origer (2002) assessed the direct economic costs of policies and interventions in the field of illicit drug use referred to year 1999 (see www.relis.lu). An update of the Origer 2002 study has been performed according to data for 2007 and results have been presented in the 2008 edition of the national report.

In July 2006, the STATEC (Central service of statistics and economical studies) published a study estimating the economic impact of the illegal drugs related activities in Luxembourg over the period 1999 to 2004 (Statec, 2006). The study was carried out within the framework of a European project intended to improve the comparability and the coverage of national accounting. Results were presented in the 2009 edition of the national report.
2. DRUG USE IN THE GENERAL POPULATION AND SPECIFIC TARGETED GROUPS

INTRODUCTION

Drugs referred to in the present report include narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances covered by the international drug control conventions (the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961, as amended by the 1972 Protocol, the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 and the Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988). Drugs not listed in the latter UN conventions are addressed by the present strategy only in the context of their associated use to listed drugs.

‘Drug use’ is hereinafter defined as the self-administration of a psychoactive substance, that, when ingested, affects mental processes. Psychoactive substances may be of licit or illicit production, sale, or use and associated risks may be considered more or less important.

Prevalence estimations on drug use in the general population are based on data collected in more (e.g. schools) or less (general population: age group 15-64 years) targeted and representative samples of the national overall population. According to the most recent surveys, cannabis and derivates are by far the most common illicitly used psychoactive substances in the national population followed by cocaine and Amphetamine Type Stimulants (ATS). Cannabis use in youngsters has been decreasing over the last 10 years but still shows the highest prevalence regardless age categories, whereas the prevalence of other psychoactive drugs varies according to age and data collection setting factors. Most recent school survey data presented in the present report stem from the HBSC study 2010.

DRUG USE IN THE GENERAL POPULATION

To date, no national, large-scale (representative) general population survey on drug use has been conducted. Several community or targeted population surveys however allow estimating current prevalence. The NFP managed to agree with members of the national epidemiological working group on health behaviour on the necessity to include illicit drug use in the national version of EHES (European Health Examination Survey). A data protocol based on EMCDDA requirements has been approved and tested. Special attention was also paid to new psychoactive substances and related questions were included in the EHES questionnaire. First results of the EHES survey should be available by the end of 2014.

A primary prevention pilot project at community level was launched by the CePT in 1995. In 2000, 13 council districts participated in this project. In the framework of this project a non-representative survey on drug use in the general population (reference 1: “Fischer 1999 study”) was conducted.
A second survey organized by the CePT was published in 2000 ("Fischer 2000 study"). Even though cannabis consumption was the main subject of the study, several other substances have been taken into account. The samples have been drawn on the one hand from a cinema visitor’s population in Luxembourg City (ref.:2.1) and on the other hand from a population of 6 council districts (ref.:2.2).
**REFERENCE 2.1**  
*Cannabis in Luxemburg – Eine Analyse der aktuellen Situation, CePT, Luxembourg. EN.: Cannabis in Luxembourg*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year of data collection</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single/repeated study</td>
<td>Single study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Drug Prevention – Public Health – Cross sectional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area covered</td>
<td>Cinemas in Luxembourg-City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range</td>
<td>15-64 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data coll. Procedure</td>
<td>On-site interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>991 valid cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling procedure</td>
<td>Random sampling of cinema customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remark</td>
<td>Detailed results of both surveys are provided in EMCDDA standard tables</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 2.2**  
*Current and lifetime prevalence of cannabis use according to age: Cinema sample (valid %) (Fischer 2000)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Lifetime Prevalence</th>
<th>Current Use Prevalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-16 years</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-25 years</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40 years</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60 years</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing the prevalence of cannabis use by age group for cinema samples](image-url)
### REFERENCE 2.2

**Fischer U. CH. (2000)** Cannabis in Luxemburg – Eine Analyse der aktuellen Situation, CePT, Luxembourg. **EN.:** Cannabis in Luxembourg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of data collection</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single/repeated study</td>
<td>Single study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Drug Prevention – Public Health – Cross sectional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area covered</td>
<td>6 district councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range</td>
<td>12 to 60 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data coll. Procedure</td>
<td>Mail questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>486 valid cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling procedure</td>
<td>Random sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 2.3** Current and lifetime prevalence of cannabis use according to age. Sample: Council districts (valid %) (Fischer 2000)

![Graph showing cannabis prevalence](image)

As can be seen in figures 2.2 and 2.3, cannabis prevalence rates show relevant differences according to type of recruitment settings.
### LIFETIME PREVALENCE: SCHOOL POPULATION

**EN.**: Students and Drugs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of data collection</th>
<th>1992</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single/repeated study</td>
<td>Repeated study 1983 – 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area covered</td>
<td>Nation wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of school</td>
<td>5th years of all types of secondary school classes at the national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range</td>
<td>16-20 years (AGE ENTERING 5TH CLASS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data coll. Procedure</td>
<td>Anonymous self-administrated questionnaires in school classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>1,341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 2.4** Lifetime prevalence of drug use according to age (valid %)  
(Matheis, Prussen 1995)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>0-16 years</th>
<th>17 years</th>
<th>18 years</th>
<th>19 years</th>
<th>20 years and more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulants</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvents</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecstasy</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Year of data collection
1997

### Single/repeated study
Single

### Context
Public Health – primary drug prevention

### Area covered
Nation wide

### Type of school
2nd and 6th years of classical (N: 311) and technical (N: 355) secondary schools

### Age range
13-22 years (13-14: N347; 15-17: N193; 18-22: N118)

### Data coll. Procedure
Self-administrated questionnaires

### Sample size
666

### Sampling frame
Schools participating in the "European 'Health-Schools' network"

### Response rate (M, F, T)
100%

#### Fig. 2.5  Lifetime prevalence of drug use according to age groups (valid %)

(Meisch 1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>15-17</th>
<th>18-22</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvents</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecstasy</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REFERENCE 3


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of data collection</th>
<th>1999 / 2006 / 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single/repeated study</td>
<td>Repeated study (intended each 4 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Health and Health Behaviour among Young People – WHO cross-national study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area covered</td>
<td>Nation wide, representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of school</td>
<td>Secondary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range</td>
<td>12-21 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data coll. Procedure</td>
<td>Anonymous self-administrated questionnaires in school classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>7,000 – 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate (M,F,T)</td>
<td>Over 95 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2.6  Lifetime and last 12 months prevalence of any drug. Age 12-18 years (valid %) (HBSC 1999 - 2010)
Lifetime and last 12 months’ prevalence rates of illicit drug use in youngsters, aged 12 to 18 years, have been showing a harshly decreasing trend between 1999 and 2006 and a fair stabilisation towards 2010.

**Fig 2.7** Lifetime prevalence of illicit drug use according to type of drugs.
*Total school population aged 12-18 years (valid %) (HBSC 1999 - 2010)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug Type</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XTC type</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opiates</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvents / glue</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mushrooms</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig 2.8** Lifetime prevalence according to age and type of drugs (valid %) (HBSC 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Cannabis</th>
<th>XTC type</th>
<th>STA</th>
<th>Opiates</th>
<th>Cocaine</th>
<th>Solvents / glue</th>
<th>LSD</th>
<th>Mushrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A comparison of serial HBSC data from 1999 and 2010 reveals highest prevalence rates of cannabis use, irrespectively of age and year of survey. Lifetime cocaine use is the only to show a consistently higher prevalence in 15 to 18 years aged schoolchildren in 2010 compared to 1999. Opiates’ use in youngsters has been remaining consistently low over the same period.
Fig 2.11 Longitudinal lifetime prevalence data according to type of drugs in age group 13-14 years. (valid %)

The HBSC surveys (1999 / 2006 / 2010), the Fischer study (1999) and the serial surveys by Matheis (1985/95) provide trends in lifetime prevalence between 1992/1997 and 2010 applied to age groups 13-16. Compared to the end of the 20th century, most recent data from HBSC surveys indicate decreasing lifetime prevalence rates for all substances with the notable exception of cocaine use in 15 to 16 years old students witnessing a tangible increase.

LAST 12 MONTHS PREVALENCE: SCHOOL POPULATION

Fig 2.12 Last 12 months prevalence of illicit drug use according to type of drugs. Total school population aged 12-18 years (valid %) (HBSC 1999 - 2010)
**Fig 2.13** Last 12 months prevalence according to age and type of drugs (valid %) (HBSC 2010)

Latest 12 months’ prevalence data (HBSC 2010) confirm highest rates for cannabis use followed by stimulant type amphetamines and cocaine in schoolchildren aged 12 to 18 years.

**Table 2.1** HBSC 1999 / 2006 / 2010: Trend analysis according to age and type of drug (last 12 months prevalence)
Serial HBSC surveys (1999, 2006, 2010) provide last 12 months national prevalence figures in 12 to 18 (respectively 13 to 17) years aged schoolchildren. Results mirror respective proportions of lifetime prevalence rates with particular emphasis on high cannabis prevalence in all age groups followed by XTC type products and cocaine.

Table 2.1 shows prevalence trends between 2002 and 2010. A vast majority of substances show declining last 12 months prevalence rates in all age groups. Cocaine use in 15 to 16 years aged youngsters, however, has been showing a notable increase during the referred observation period.

**LAST 30 DAYS PREVALENCE: SCHOOL POPULATION**

*Fig 2.14 Last 30 days prevalence according to type of drugs: school population - 13-20 years (Fischer 2000)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cannabis</th>
<th>Heroin</th>
<th>Cocaine</th>
<th>Ecstasy</th>
<th>LSD</th>
<th>Psilocybin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fischer (2000)</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REFERENCE 4**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Year of data collection</strong></th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single/repeated study</strong></td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td>Cannabis prevalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area covered</strong></td>
<td>Nation wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of school</strong></td>
<td>2nd and 6th years of secondary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age range</strong></td>
<td>13-20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data coll. Procedure</strong></td>
<td>Self-administrated questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample size</strong></td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sampling frame</strong></td>
<td>Schools selected on basis of their geographical situation (national representativity), exhaustive student sampling within the selected schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response rate (M, F, T)</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fischer (1999) provides last 30 days prevalence figures for 13 to 20 year old school children. Cannabis and ecstasy prevalence figure 13.8% and 1.1%, respectively. Heroin, cocaine and LSD prevalence rates are close to last 12 months prevalence rates. Gender breakdowns are currently not available. HBSC surveys did not include questions on last 30 days use of different drugs, except for cannabis. Last 30 days cannabis use is addressed below.

**IN-DEPTH DATA ON CANNABIS USE PREVALENCE IN SCHOOL-AGED CHILDREN**

![Fig 2.15](image-url)  
**Lifetime, last 12 months and last 30 days prevalence of cannabis use. Age 12-18 years (valid %) (HBSC 1999 - 2010)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lifetime</th>
<th>Last 12 Months</th>
<th>Last 30 Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>24.57%</td>
<td>20.76%</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>19.15%</td>
<td>13.81%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.2 HBSC 2010: Cannabis prevalence rates according to age categories 11 – 15 years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.8*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>18.2*</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.0*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.8*</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant gender difference at p<0.05

30 Discrepancies between national data of 2010, presented in the present report, and the international HBSC report do exist and are mainly due to different procedures in age calculation, in incoherent answers’ management and supplementary data not yet available at the time of data submission for the international report.
Fig 2.16  Lifetime prevalence of cannabis use according to gender. Age: 15 years. (HBSC 1999 - 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>23.99</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>21.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>21.73</td>
<td>19.38</td>
<td>20.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>15.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant gender difference at p<0.05

Fig 2.17  Last 12 months prevalence of cannabis use according to gender. Age: 15 years. (HBSC 1999 - 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>21.84</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>19.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>17.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig 2.18 Last 30 days prevalence of cannabis use according to gender. Age: 15 years. (HBSC 2006 - 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>11.91</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>9.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant gender difference at p<0.05

Fig 2.19 Last 30 days cannabis prevalence according to age (valid %) (HBSC 2010)

Cannabis use last 30 days:
- 12 years: 0.7
- 13 years: 1.3
- 14 years: 4.4
- 15 years: 7.1
- 16 years: 10.1
- 17 years: 10.8
- 18 years: 13.7
Lifetime, recent and current cannabis use prevalence rates in 15 years old youngsters have been declining remarkably during the first decade of the 21st century. The most relevant differences according to gender are lower cannabis prevalence figures for females. These differences appear to be statistically significant (p<0.05) for lifetime and last 30 days prevalence in 2006 and for lifetime prevalence in 2010.

**DRUG USE AMONG TARGETED GROUPS**

In 2007, the National EMCDDA focal point published the results of action research on HIV and hepatitis infections in drug users (Origer and Removille, 2007).

**REFERENCE 5**


EN: Prevalence study on HIV, HCV, HBV and HAV in PDU in Luxembourg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single/repeated study</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>HIV, HCV and injecting drug use prevalence national PDU population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area covered</td>
<td>In- and outpatient drug agencies and national prisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type sample</td>
<td>Random sampling during 8 months in 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range</td>
<td>&gt; 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data coll. Procedure</td>
<td>ANONYMOUS SELF-ADMINISTRATED QUESTIONNAIRES AND SEROLOGICAL TESTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling frame</td>
<td>Random sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate (M, F, T)</td>
<td>33.96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MAIN RESULTS:**

- 67.21% of PDU reported at least 1 prison stay during the last 10 years
- of which 56.1% report drug use in prison
- of which 54.3% report IDU in prison

Furthermore, a study on “Drug addiction in the working environment: Prevalence of psychoactive substances’ use and its relationship to high-risk occupation and stress” (S. Krippler and F. Kittel, 2011) has been published in April 2011. The aim of the study was to explore the prevalence of licit and illicit psychoactive substances use among employees aged between 18–39 years in the private sector in the G.D. of Luxembourg as well as its relationship to high risk occupations and other potential risk factors in occupational settings, (e.g. high-stress tasks). For this purpose, a self-administered questionnaire containing validated tools from the EMCDDA concerning street drugs, the AUDIT-C for alcohol use and the Siegrist Effort-Reward-Imbalance questionnaire on stress were distributed during occupational medical check-ups during June and July 2008. Alcohol, cigarettes, amphetamines, cocaine, heroin, ecstasy, LSD and psychotropic drugs use were investigated together with socio-demographic and professional factors. Among the 1358 respondents, 8.4% consumed illicit substances, cannabis accounting for 8.2%. High-risk occupations are significantly related to illegal substance use. Age (young), gender (men), smoking and family situation (bachelor living alone) show the same relationship. No effect was found for stress on illicit drug use while there was a significant effect

on alcohol and prescription drug use in bivariate analysis only.
A new Flash Eurobarometer N°330 (for more details see chapter 3) was carried out in May 2011 on the
request of the European Commission among young people aged 15-24. Among others, one item referred to
self-reported use of cannabis and another to the experience with legal substances that imitate the effects
of illicit drugs (“legal highs”).

Q10. Have you used cannabis yourself?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes – in past year</th>
<th>Yes – but more than one year ago</th>
<th>No, I have never used</th>
<th>Don’t want to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU 27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. In certain countries some new substances that imitate the effects of illicit drugs are being sold as legal substances in the form of – for example – powders, tablets/pills or herbs. Have you ever used such substances?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No, I never used</th>
<th>Yes, I have used such substances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU 27</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Eurobarometer N°330

Concerning self-reported use of cannabis, more young people in Luxembourg (77%) declared not having used cannabis compared to the European average (72%). All in all, however, there was no significant variation with regard to self-reported cannabis use among Luxembourg youngsters and the EU average.

Concerning “legal highs”, in most EU countries not more than 1 in 20 young people reported having used legal substances imitating the effects of illicit drugs. In Luxembourg self-reported use was 7% and higher than the EU average (5%).
3. PREVENTION

INTRODUCTION

Capacity building, awareness raising and mobilization of individual resources and promoting protective factors are the main benchmarks as far as national prevention strategies are concerned. Measures may target the general public or selective, specific or risk populations or communities.

The present chapter provides a summary of recent universal and selective prevention measures undertaken at the national level. More detailed information and examples of good practice can be found in the EDDRA / Best practice database of the EMCDDA under: http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/themes/best-practice/examples.

The national drugs action plan 2010-2014 addresses primary prevention as a main intervention area. The priorities of the drug prevention action plan and the GIT as approved in 2010 are as follows:

- Multidisciplinary training programmes and training of multipliers;
- Interventions in school and youth environments, peer education;
- Prevention in homes for youngsters and socio-educative facilities;
- Intervention in recreational and festive venues;
- Cannabis, alcohol, shisha and designer drugs use in youngsters;
- Mass media campaigns;
- Documentation strategies.

The National Addiction Prevention Centre (CePT), which has started its activities in 1995, covers drug addiction as well as the prevention of different types of addictive behaviour. Legally speaking the CePT is a foundation co-financed by the Ministry of Health.

Training interventions in drug demand reduction are increasingly developed at the national level. A special department named ‘Trampolin’ has been set up within the CePT, to ensure the development of training activities and instruments covering national needs. Target groups are professionals from the educative, social, psychological and medical fields as well as parents and other interested stakeholders.

A second important player in the field of primary drug prevention is the Division of Preventive Medicine of the Directorate of Health. Although the latter coordinates activities in the larger field of public health promotion and prevention, it plays a major role, jointly with the CePT in the definition of the overall framework of addiction prevention.

The overall coordination of counselling, treatment and low threshold interventions is within the competence of the AST (Department of Directorate of Health, future division of Drug Addiction and Social Medicine) and the national drug coordinator’s office. The AST has coordination and financial control missions (supervision of financial contract implementation of subsidised NGOs) in the field of drug addiction and psychiatry. Furthermore, the national drug coordinator is responsible for the conceptualisation and the implementation of activities included in the drugs action plan 2010-2014 (see 1.1).
Direct drug prevention expenditures reached 672,000.- EUR in 2000 and 1,050,000.- EUR in 2012. These figures include staff and operating costs of agencies and the ministerial department specialised in drug prevention.

The CePT publishes an annual training directory including training activities ranging from evaluation methodologies to demand reduction action-research strategies targeted at drug prevention and public health actors, educators, youth animators and teachers. The ‘Recherche et Innovation Pédagogiques et Technologiques (SCRIPT)’ department is actively involved in the referred training activities. The Department for Scientific and Applied Research may finance training activities following request.

As regards ad-hoc continuous training of national field actors, most of the involved structures are conventioned by the government and, as such, rely on the Ministry of Health’s regulation on continuous training.

**UNIVERSAL PREVENTION**

**School**

Addiction prevention programmes in schools are not mandatory. National drug prevention activities integrated within national school programmes have mainly resulted from corporate actions of different governmental and non-governmental actors: Ministry of Family and Integration – National Youth Service (SNJ), Ministry of Health - Division of Social and Preventive Medicine, Ministry of National Education – Service of Coordination of Research and of Pedagogical and Technical Innovations (SCRIPT)/Psychological Care and Educational Orientation Department (CPOS) and since 1995, the National Addiction Prevention Centre (CePT).

The CPOS is permanently represented in all secondary schools by at least one trained psychologist and several ad hoc teachers. In major schools there are supplementary trained social workers. Among other tasks, they are supposed to detect, at the very early stage, problems or behaviours in relation to substance abuse. Drug and addiction topics are included in more general courses as for instance, hygiene or ethics, which might not be mandatory. However, on the school director’s demand, trained staff from the CePT does intervene. Furthermore, the Grand-Ducal Police organises school courses for the 6th classes of primary school and 7th classes of secondary schools provided by specialized police teams out of regional police units and from the drug department of the Judicial Police.

In 2000, the CePT in collaboration with the SCRIPT started a pilot project called ‘d’Schoul op der Sich’ (School on quest) (see EDDRA) running for two years and having been evaluated in 2003. The aim of this participative project consisted in creating so-called prevention groups among all participating secondary schools in order to initiate a process of reflection on drug-related themes. In 2004, the CePT managed to set up a primary prevention tool adjustable to the needs of the different secondary schools. Prevention groups are now operating routinely in several secondary schools in order to find solutions that fit each particular context.

In this context a further development stage has been reached in 2009 by the launch of the CePT Toolbox. This ‘box’ includes the necessary tools to understand and promote life competences of children and teenagers from 3 to 15 years and accompany them on their way to autonomy. The tools are designed for three age categories: 3-6, 7-11 and 12-15 years. The referred instruments are primarily meant to serve educators, pedagogues, psychologists and teachers to assist them in their professional activities. The CePT also offers theoretical estimation of prevention related costs is speculative since multiple factors influence the development of a youngster. Education, leisure activities, sport, etc. may have a positive impact on resources building; they, however, cannot be quantified in terms of exclusive input.
trainings on how to use these tools. The CePT toolbox can be downloaded at: http://cept.lu/fr/trampolin/formations/materiel-didactique.

In the context of the MAG-Net in school (which is a part of the INTERREG IVA project MAG-NET), two primary schools have participated in this pilot project. All in all, 13 members of the school staff, 120 students as well as students’ parents were involved. Three modules of two hours were proposed to the students in class. The subjects touched upon during these interventions were the following: emotions and empathy, needs and capabilities, the strict use of rules and limits, as well as personal decisions and opinions. Between the modules, the teachers have revised the new notions with the students by proposing them creative activities and practical exercises. The interventions in class were evaluated by meetings between educational staff and the instructor and by questionnaires for the students, the parents and the educational team. The final report with a documentation of the project MAG-Net in school and a collection of tools for schools was published in 2012. In this framework, an interregional conference of two days focussing on best practise examples and the exchange with 40 participants from the Greater Region has been organized in February 2012.


In 2012 the CePT acted within the scope of different basic trainings. Most of these modules are in the meantime well-established for several years.

For teachers and professionals from the educative, social and psychological fields in schools the CePT-Trampolin-Department organized further trainings namely in the framework of the collaboration with the SCRIPT. In 2012, there were several trainings on psychotropic substances, different methods and tools available for the prevention of addictions. In addition to its further education programme, the CePT offers trainings at the University of Luxembourg (Bachelor en Sciences de l’Éducation ; Bachelor en Sciences Sociales et Éducatives). In 2011 and 2012, the CePT was also involved in the module of the pedagogical training of the secondary school teachers in the framework of biology courses.

A new module was elaborated by the CePT in 2011, for the professionals acting in the education of children and adolescents. The aim of this training was the communication with youngsters regarding psychotropic substances.

In 2012, the CePT also offered introductive courses on prevention of addictions at the school for health professions, at the Luxembourgish Police academy and also for the youth leaders of the Luxembourgish Young Firefighters Association in the framework of their leadership trainings.

In cooperation with the SNJ the CePT organized trainings for professionals of youth associations and youth clubs, focussing different topics of addiction prevention work. The CePT continued its close collaboration with the National School for Physical Education and Sports (ENEPS) in the framework of a project called ‘Give strength to children’. Sportive activities combined with elements of art pedagogy are used as a framework and a tool for preventive action. The main goal of this project consists in stimulating self-confidence of adolescents and to strengthen them. More information is available under:

In 2012, a training workshop, called “Fairy tales on drugs”, was organised for the staff of the “Lycée Technique d’Esch-sur-Alzette”, the “Lycée Technique Bel-Val” and the “Division de la Médecine Scolaire de la Direction de la Santé”. In many fields wrong or incomplete information on drugs and addictions are circulating. This workshop aimed at reconsidering the actual knowledge on the subject. The workshop was also proposed as advanced training by the SCRIPT for a group of teachers from different secondary schools and by the SNJ for a group of educators of youth houses. Another advanced training which was proposed in 2012 had the following theme: “Legal Highs – Spice, Bath Salts & co.”.
A new training workshop has the objective to educate a group of teachers or educators to use the educational tool « Cannabis – Quo vadis? ». This tool consists of exercises which allow approaching the issue of cannabis consumption with school class and adolescents. These exercises help to communicate neutral information on cannabis such as the psychoactive effects of the substance and its legal state. This tool is available for free at CePT: www.cept.lu/fr/trampolin/formations/materiel-didactique. In 2012, this training workshop was held for teachers, educators and psychologists from different secondary schools by the advanced training offer of the SCRIPT.

In 2012 several exchange meetings of the social MAG-Net (which is part of the INTERREG IVA project MAG-Net) for the professional representatives of the social sector of the Greater Region, attracting more than 100 experts, were hold.

In 2012, the 13th edition of the competition “Mission do not smoke” took place in Luxembourg at the same time as the 15th edition in Europe. The competition addressed all the school classes of the country with students aged between 12 and 16 years. A total of 123 classes (2,517 students) participated in this contest, but only 82 classes accepted the challenge of not smoking during 6 months.

Within the scope of the forum on prevention of drug addiction, dangerous habits and violence, organized by the association "Péitenger Jugendhaus a.s.b.l." in November 2012, different workgroups have been held. More than 350 students from the local secondary schools have participated in this workgroup.

A mobile interactive and prevention instrument called the ‘Extra-Tour Sucht’ and aiming to reach students aged 15 to 18 years in secondary school settings was further developed and adapted for instance to new trends such as shisha smoking. It was specifically designed for the Luxembourgish school settings by the German company KomPass. Interactive intervention modules are applied alternatively and allow for a participation of 60 pupils. Currently the following thematic sessions are proposed:

- Tobacco – Lust for life
- Dependence and pleasure
- Life skills – Fit for life
- Norms – New world
- Alcohol – To win and to loose

“Extra-Tour Sucht” was evaluated in 2012. 107 questionnaires, mainly completed by class teachers and personal from the SPOS of different schools, were analysed (return rate : 81%). The main results are described in the following summary:

- The tool was deemed to be adequate as an academic instrument of prevention of addiction (91.4%) and the basic concept is considered to be appropriate (93.9%).
- 28% of the moderators were participating for the second time or more often in the “Extra-Tour Sucht”.
- The assessments for the individual stations reached an average of 90% approval. The stations of tobacco and alcohol newly developed in 2009, were considered to be meaningful by 94.5% of respondents.
- The moderator’s instructions communicated for most people important knowledge of the content and the practice.
- Related to questions on the moderator’s folder, 76.4% indicated, that they felt motivated to dwell on prevention of addiction. The didactic materials were considered to be a good facility for the postprocessing in class (78%).
- The reactions of the students were mainly positive, especially related to interactive methods (91.8%) and to the encouragement of the personal reflexion (89.3%).
- The tool motivates to discuss prevention of addiction and enables academic actors to act. Almost all (97.1%) indicated to recommend the tool respectively to participate again.
- 92.6% of the moderators were motivated to pursue such offers or to make own bids in future.

Analysing data on participation, the following numbers are retained: per year 5 to 7 applications take place on average, so that approximately 1,500 students and 60 formed moderators are reached.


A further component of the CePT’s work is the promotion and implementation of addiction prevention projects in cooperation with schools and youth clubs. The project ‘Nach emmer Allc‰l’ was developed jointly by the CePT, the National Theatre of Luxembourg (TNL) and SCRIPT for the secondary schools. The outcome was a theatre play, addressing prevention of alcoholism presented in secondary schools from January to March 2009 reaching approximately an audience of 1,300 persons. After the 1st edition in 2009, a new edition of the project ‘Nach emmer Allc‰l’ took place in November 2011. A DVD was produced by the Ministry of National Education in 2012, which is part of didactic material for alcohol prevention in school elaborated by the CePT as an educational workbook to be published by the SCRIPT in 2013. An evaluation by questionnaire took place in January 2012, to get feedback on the project. Results will be published in the annual report 2014.

Finally, trained police staff periodically visits various schools of the country, to inform students on drugs and their risks. These prevention officers meet every year around 6,000 students.

Family

Even though interventions aiming at the promotion of positive life experiences within the family and the kindergarten are not expressively addressed in the national drug prevention action plan, there are local or regional initiatives focusing on information and advice providing to organisation of parents’ evenings during which educational and health topics are discussed.

Active collaboration between the CePT and parents’ associations at each education level does exist: Fédération des Associations de Parents d’Elèves du Luxembourg - FAPEL ; Kannerschlass Foundation - ‘Parents’ School’ ; Ombuds-Comité fr d’Rechter vum Kand – ORK; Entente des Foyers de Jour a.s.b.l.- EFJ.

In 2001 CePT has released the so called ‘prevention boxes’ including didactic material destined to potential multipliers as for instance teachers, parents and youth animators. The first prevention box, targeting 3 to 6 years old children has been released in September 2001. Due to its success, the 3-6 years prevention box will be reedited and a second one for children aged 11 to 15 years has been released in 2002. In 2004, seminars on the ‘prevention boxes’ took place in different communities participating in the project of addiction prevention in local communities. Also, the CePT collaborates with the Kannerschlass Foundation, in the framework of the project ‘Parents’ School’.

To date, there exists no outreach prevention programme specifically aiming at parents, pregnant women, childbirth or young parents.
Community

As most of drug-related interventions and strategies prevention in community settings are organised centrally and nationwide, projects are rarely initiated by the local community level without close collaboration of national authorities.

Generally speaking, local and regional communities do rarely dispose of a comprehensive addiction prevention strategy. Commonly, a given national agency initiates projects, defines the general intervention framework and seeks active collaboration with community authorities in order to meet local needs. At present only one agency focuses on interventions in recreational settings, namely the CePT (community project 33).

The CePT is continuously developing the project ‘adventure circuit’, an instrument for interactive and tangible drug prevention targeting general population. This itinerant exhibition has been prepared in 2004 by more than 40 volunteers who since then have fine-tuned and further developed the concept for national prevention tours. In 2008/2009 a performance tour was organised in Mondorf Group regions entitled ‘The Quest of happiness’.

SELECTIVE PREVENTION IN AT–RISK GROUPS AND SETTINGS

At-risk groups

In 2006, MDs without frontiers - Youth Solidarity (currently Solidarité-Jeunes asbl) in collaboration with the Public Prosecutor’s Department of Youth Protection and the Judicial Police- Drugs Unit launched a new project called CHOICE, which is based upon a pilot project of ‘early intervention of first drug offenders’ (FreD) initiated by the Federal Ministry of Health and social security of Germany. The target group consists of youngsters aged 12 to 17 who entered in conflict with drug law. The overall aim of CHOICE is to offer youngsters an early and short-term intervention in order to prevent further development of drug abuse and drug addiction. An ‘in-take’ interview allows assessing whether a participation in the CHOICE project or an individual psychological follow up is indicated. A CHOICE group consists of four interactive sessions (6 to 8 participants) which provide information on drugs, legislation and treatment services, promote auto-reflexion, reinforcement of personnel skills and motivation to change attitudes towards drugs. In a first phase, the project is regionally limited to the judicial district of Luxembourg City. Police officers hand out CHOICE flyers to youngsters in breach with drug law including all information on the intervention and inform the Public Prosecutor’s department of Youth Protection. The youngsters and eventually their parents contact the CHOICE team within two weeks and the latter inform the Public Prosecutor on the participation level. A certificate testifies the participation of the youngster.

In the beginning of 1995, a pilot project on community-based drug prevention has been launched by CePT (see EDDRA). The main idea was to focus prevention activities on the very environment and daily life experiences of young people. Various demand reduction activities have been undertaken, either developed by CePT, SNJ and several youth centres, or initiated by the respective District Councils. 13 district councils and 150 volunteers are currently involved in the project. The funding of this community project is jointly ensured by the involved district councils, the EU (Drug Prevention Programme DG-V) and CePT. The primary aim of the project is to improve communication skills on drugs, to increase participants’ abilities in handling conflicts, stress and frustration (age range: 12 to 65 years) and to set up autonomous groups to continue implementing local prevention measures. In each participating municipality, prevention groups were composed of local volunteers who were asked to organise local drug-prevention activities related to their specific needs. Cornerstone concepts of the project are as follows: - Multidisciplinary drug prevention, - Tailor-made community solutions, - Health promotion with regard to risk and protective factors, - Holistic and systemic approach, - Target groups oriented, - Routine evaluation.

The community-based prevention network is an ongoing project, which is expected to develop its proper dynamic over the time. The idea was to switch from a centrally coordinated pilot project to routine and autonomous local programmes.
In 2012, the STSJ elaborated a new intervention program called “ProST – Program for self-responsible drinking”, a program similar to the CHOICE program, but specifically designed for alcohol misuse.

In 2009 Aidsberoding Croix-Rouge in collaboration with the Ministry of Health and the CHL launched a project called ’DIMPS’ (Intervention mobile for the promotion of sexual health) in the framework of the national action plan on Aids 2006-2010. DIMPS is meant to inform on risk behaviour and provide free and rapid testing of selected infectious diseases in difficult-to-access populations. Among other interventions, rapid tests for HIV and HCV and HBV are proposed. Currently the DIMPS van visits low threshold drug agencies, gay meeting places, red light spots and asylum seekers’ facilities.

From 2010 to 2013 the CePT participates in an EU project called ‘Promotion of social and personal competences in socially unprivileged persons’ – PRO SKILLS 2 in the framework of the Grundtvig - Programme, that aims to develop and to test a train-the-trainer concept with a lot of didactic material for multipliers working in the field of the promotion of social and personal competences, jointly with nine institutions from eight European countries: Germany, Finland, Greece, Italy, Slovenia, Hungary, Switzerland and Luxembourg. In 2012, the CePT organized a European workshop in Luxembourg for all project partners and also a national pilot training with different domestic institutions. Before the end of the project in May 2013 a European exchange meeting will take place, where experiences and results of the national trainings will be presented and discussed.

Finally, a targeted survey ‘Youth attitudes to drugs’ (Eurobarometer, no 330) was conducted for the European Commission, from the 9th to 13th of May 2011. Telephone interviews were conducted in each of the 27 EU countries. Each national sample was representative of the general population between 15 and 24 years. Sample size varied between 250 and 500 respondents. The main results are briefly presented hereinafter:

**Information on illicit drugs and drug use - Potential sources of information**

Likewise results from the previous 2008 Flash Eurobarometer study, the *internet* was the most popular source of information, with 64% (EU) (LU: 59%) of 15-24 year-olds, who said they would use the Internet when looking for general information about illicit drugs and drug use. The second preferred source were *friends* (EU: 37%; LU: 48%) and on third position, *parents or relatives* (EU: 28%; LU: 35%) as well as *doctors or nurses* (EU: 28%; LU: 35%). The same order has been observed in the Luxembourgish sample.

![Figure 3.1 Potential sources of information about illicit drugs and drug use](source: Eurobarometer 330)
Information channels reaching youngsters in the past year

When asked through which information channels young people had been informed on the effects and risks of illicit drug use during the past year, 39% of respondents referred to the internet (LU: 42%), compared to 46% who reported media campaigns (LU: 43%) and 41% who mentioned school prevention programmes (LU: 57%).

Twenty-six percent said they had discussed these issues with friends (LU: 41%) in the past year, and roughly a sixth (17%) of respondents had been informed by their parents or other relatives (LU: 24%). A minority of respondents said they have been informed on effects and risks of drug use by police (EU: 8%; LU: 22%) or via drug and/or alcohol helpline (EU: 2%; LU: 2%). Finally, 10% of respondents reported not to have been informed at all (LU: 7%) about the effects and risks of illicit drug use in the 12 months prior to the survey.

In both surveys, conducted in 2008 and 2011, the most frequently mentioned information channel was media campaigns, followed by school prevention programmes and the internet. Compared to 2008, the gap between the proportion of young people who mentioned school prevention programmes and those who referred to the internet has decreased – this suggests that the internet has become somewhat more important as a source for drug-related information. Most popular information channels for the youngsters in Luxembourg are: school prevention programmes, followed by media campaigns and the internet.

How should drug problems be tackled?

As in the 2008 Flash Eurobarometer, the largest proportion of respondents considered that public authorities should tackle problems on the supply side: 64% mentioned tough measures against drug dealers and traffickers (LU: 69%) as one of the most effective ways to reduce drug problems.
As far as drug demand reduction is concerned, young people thought that other measures, such as prevention or treatment and rehabilitation of drug users, would be more effective than repressive measures. Nearly half of respondents (49%) referred to information and prevention campaigns (LU: 57%) as one of the most effective ways of reducing drug problems; the treatment and rehabilitation of drug users followed, with 37% (LU: 43%) of respondents choosing this as an effective measure. By comparison, tough measures against drug users were considered to be a valuable way of dealing with drug problems by a third of respondents (EU: 33%; LU: 34%).

Reducing one of the possible primary causes of drug abuse – i.e. poverty and unemployment – was mentioned by 24% (LU: 29%) of interviewees. A similar proportion (EU: 23%; LU: 22%) thought that offering more leisure opportunities would be an effective way of dealing with drug problems. As in 2008, legalisation of drugs was thought of to be the least effective way of fighting drug problems: 13% (LU: 19%) of young people, however, put forward this measure as one of the most effective ones.

Fig. 3.3 How should society’s drug problems be tackled?

Source: Eurobarometer 330

At-risk families

Since 2003, the Youth-and Drughelp foundation (JDH) is running a parental project with the aim to provide psycho-social aid to drug-dependant parents and their children. The primary objective of the project is to ensure security and well-being to children and to strengthen parents’ educative capacities. This long term project is based upon contractual commitments, co-intervention, home visits and functions in close collaboration with involved services. In 2012, these interventions have reached 108 parents as well as 55 children living with their parent(s) and 49 children, who did not live with their parent(s). An essential part of the project constitutes the outreach work. Meetings and interviews are held within the natural environment of the family (at home). In 2012, 71 (70) situations were registered, which required 1,489 (1,377) interventions.
Moreover the CePT, in collaboration with JDH organized training courses for drug-dependant mothers in 2011 in order to build up their capacities as parent and improve mother-child relationship. (Project: O Mamm O Kanner, which was renamed “1-2-3 lass” “1-2-3 go!” in 2009.) In 2012 the CePT finalized the train-the-trainer handbook for the parental project of JDH describing the topics and the methods of the courses.

Recreational settings

Youngster do spend an important share of their time in leisure, recreational or social activities and numerous programmes in recreational settings take place at the community level, church and youth organisations or sport-oriented clubs. The latter are not necessarily drug-specific and as such difficult to list exhaustively.

Since its creation in 1995, the CePT, has initiated projects in the field of active leisure organisation: anti-drug discos, art performances, theatre, media supports (films, cartoons, etc.), seminars, ambulatory exhibitions, travel experiences, etc. The CePT increasingly ensures the national coordination of such activities integrating the addiction prevention topic as one of the various components of Health education. The latter approach is believed to have more impact on youngsters (users and non-users) than a drug-centred approach. Indeed, human interactions in daily life situations as for instance adventure or sports activities are most adequate as a conceptual framework for the progressive integration of drug-related prevention initiatives.

In this respect, the demand reduction activities organised by the ‘Mondorf Group’ (joint initiatives of border regions of France, Germany, Belgium and Luxembourg) jointly with the CePT and SNJ combine a non drug-centred approach with intercultural components in organising corporate leisure activities for youngsters from border countries based on the concept of ‘adventure pedagogy’. The annual ‘adventure weeks’ do fit in a broader programme named ‘Adventure pedagogy and primary addiction prevention’. With prevention concepts of adventure and nature pedagogy or cultural approaches such as theatre pedagogy and music education, the activities primarily aim to provide the opportunity to youngsters to experience group dynamics, conflict management, limit and risk assessment as well as the feeling of solidarity within a group of socially and culturally different people. The programme further aims at the reduction of risk factors and the enhancement of protection factors, by focussing on youngsters and their environment, rather than on drugs and addiction. Regional teams specialised in drug prevention meet in autonomous working and training groups and report activities to the Mondorf Group.

In 2012, the Mondorf Group organized an inter-regional project for youngsters in difficulties with art workshops, called “Show yourself! – you’ve got the right!” and a further training for the professional staff. Concerning Luxembourg, the professional staff of the State Socio-Educational Centre of Schrassig (CSEE Schrassig) was participating in the project. Youngsters of the participating institutions of the 4 Mondorf Group regions were offered sculpture, music and magic workshops. The objectives were to stimulate interaction with youngsters, the prevention of addictions and to promote the reinforcement of their personality and especially their social skills.

Currently there exists no genuine legal framework regulating prevention and harm reduction interventions in recreational settings such as on site information providing or pill testing. Discussions and a related parliamentary motion during the amendment process of the national drug legislation (amended in 2001) did not bring up a final decision on the matter. Prevention material and info flyers on synthetic drugs and multiple drug use are provided to bars and nightlife establishments by the initiative of CePT or on demand. There remains, however, an obvious lack of interventions in the referred settings.

34 See EDDRA
Since May 2008, the CePT is an active member of several projects on the topic of health promotion and harm reduction in nightlife settings, as ‘Democracy, Cities and Drugs II’ (www.democitydrug.org/safernightlife), the ‘Club Health – Healthy and Safer Nightlife of Youth’ (http://club-health.eu) project, or the ‘Nightlife Empowerment and Well-being Implementation Project’ (NEWIP – http://www.safernightlife.org/). The main objectives of these networks and projects are to improve existing interventions reducing drugs related harm in nightlife and party settings and to facilitate their transferability, evaluation and implementation.

In the context of his partnership with the project NEWIP, organizer of the “European Party friends night”, the CePT participated the 24th November 2012 in this European event and in particularly in the action "party friends tip" which provides advice on taking care of friends while celebrating, and this under the slogan “Keep an eye on your friends”.

As nightlife settings provide privileged environments for recreational drugs use, the CePT launched MAG-Net Party, under the INTERREG IV A Programme: Grande Région 2007-2013, Project 52GR33100 (www.mag-net.eu) which is a harm reduction project targeted at recreational drug users in the party scene of Luxembourg and the surrounding Greater Region. The referred project includes the creation of a network of experts from Germany, France, Belgium and Luxembourg aiming to develop preventive measures for school, recreational and social settings. The duration of the project covers June 2009 to May 2012. In the framework of the MAG-Net project, a directory of all the counseling and help services related to drugs and addictions was published for the Greater Region. This directory can be accessed electronically at: www.mag-net.eu. In July 2011, the portal www.mag-net.eu was presented to the general public during an interregional press conference in Luxembourg.

Party MAG-Net’s booths are part of most national music festivals since 2011. These interventions in the party scene focus on keeping in line with the party spirit of the targeted events while adequately managing risky situations. Besides information on psychotropic substances, the recreational Mag-Net point of presence also provides earplugs and information on auditory risks, condoms with and without lubricant, breath tests, but also disinfecting soap, sun screen or drinking water. The public also can find time schedules of public transports or contact details of the facilities available in the region. The main focus is on information and is provided in situ by a team of trained peers. Fancy trilingual postcards are made available to the public, including information on alcohol, cocaine, cannabis, synthetic cannabinoids, tobacco, XTC, LSD, ketamine, GHB/GBL, heroine, speed and information on road safety and risky sexual behaviours in relation to drug use.

In 2012, the Mag-Net stand was present at the most popular national music festivals and events, which were attended by a total of more than 80,000 visitors. At the same occasion, the CePT organized a small survey with the festival goers, as already in 2011, covering age, gender, transportation means, languages skills, as well as the recent use of legal and illegal drugs. 4,284 valid questionnaires were collected in 2012, of which 2,113 were completed by female and 2,171 by male festival goers. These data will allow the CePT to best aim the programmed actions for 2013. The mean age of the 4,284 persons responding to the questionnaire was 22.6 years, while the mean age of women was lower (22 years) than the one of men (23.2 years). Analyzing the means of transport for returning home, 74% were driving home by car, 19% by bus, 12% by train and 11% by foot. In 2012, 10,550 earplugs, 9,000 condoms and 4,200 leaflets on psychotropic substances were distributed.
The campaign "Keen Alkohol änner 16 Joer – Mir haalen eis drun" ("No alcohol under 16 years – We stick on it"), in collaboration with the Ministry of Health started in 2007 foremost in community settings and was re-launched with a press conference, in June 2011. This campaign focused on the adult population and the promotion of their responsibility. The focus was laid on the responsibility of the vendors of alcoholic drinks and the prohibition of selling alcohol to minors under 16 years. In 2011, the CePT appealed to the responsibility of the adults on the verge of the summer festivities and especially the festivity of the national holiday. The message was spread by the media and transported by several materials and a lot of collaborating partners. The campaign has continued his course consistently down to the present. The scientific evaluation of parts of this campaign especially in 4 communities was realized by the University of Luxembourg in the framework of the research project SORES ("Social responsibility as a strategic concept of prevention work", 2009-2012). The results were published and presented by the University of Luxembourg on the 11th December 2012 as a document called "Local network creation as strategic concept in the prevention – Evaluation of an awareness campaign concerning alcohol consumption in adolescence". The minister of
Health and representatives of different ministries, experts, police members and members of associations acting in the field of alcohol prevention participated at this presentation. The study dealt in particular with themes of social responsibility, network strategy and intergenerational behaviour. A major objective of the campaign was to reach adults as multiplicators to promote health and individual responsibility among children and youngsters.

Results show that, concerning the intergenerational behavior, youngsters expect model behavior and responsibility adoption from the adult generation. Overall, research results confirm the effectiveness of the prevention campaign in regard to the network strategy and the mutiplicators. The conclusions of the evaluation are important for the development of future prevention campaigns.

With the “European Action on Drugs” the European Union wants to approach a growing problem, concerning the whole European society, in a determined, balanced and coordinated manner. For this purpose a charter was created, in which national and local public authorities, schools, public services, consortia or organisations of any size campaign for elucidation and take a concrete approach against drug abuse. In Luxembourg, the European action plan is coordinated by the “Responsible Young Drivers”. Interventions do not only address youth, but also people at risk of dependence, of all age categories.

### Occupational settings

In cooperation with the human resources department of the City of Luxembourg, the CePT runs a pilot project to prevent addiction behaviour and its consequences in City employees based on a preliminary situation and needs assessment.

### INDICATED PREVENTION

#### Children at risk with individually attributable risk factors

Three basic mechanisms are in place in order to prevent the onset of problem drug use related to behavioural problems including for instance ADHD. Outpatient psychiatric care by trained psychiatrist or by specialist consultation centres is a first option. In more severe cases the national juvenile psychiatric service may provide in-patient care. More specifically targeting drug use the parentality service of JDH is aiming to assist drug dependant parents to take care of their children and to build up capacities helping them to deal with potential related problems.

A special CD-Rom has been developed by the Ministry of Education providing information on ADHD in school settings and to parents. Teachers are also trained to recognise ADHD symptoms and to react adequately.

### NATIONAL AND LOCAL MEDIA CAMPAIGNS

A special department of the CePT, called « Fro No » (i.e., Check It), offers since September 2007, a phoneline (+352 49 77 77 55, accessible every working day from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.) as well as an online service (frono@cept.lu). The Fro No department can be contacted concerning all matters related to drugs, addictions and prevention work. This department provides only information and is not a drug-counselling center.
The FRO NO department registered 236 (151 by phone, 85 mails) demands during the year 2012, compared to 237 contacts in 2011 and 209 contacts in 2010. Another 14 demands were registered by people dropping in the CePT, to get informed and documented. As the year before, the majority of the demands are still formulated by females (n=187). More than the half of the requests (n=165) are made from colleagues working in the educational, social or health field. 71 demands originated from family members, who were worried about the drug use of a third person, or directly from individuals concerning their proper drug consumption.

Furthermore, a series of leaflets on drugs (i.e. alcohol, cannabis, cocaine, magic mushrooms, tobacco) and on hypnotics and anxiolytics, informing the general public on the effects, legal issues and risks were diffused to a broad national public being dispatched through counseling services, MDs (i.e. general practioners, neurologists, psychiatrists) and secondary schools. These leaflets were available in French and German since 2009 and are edited since September 2011 also in English and Portuguese. All the leaflets and a large collection of specialized literature on drugs, addictions and addiction prevention are available at: http://cept.lu/fr/frono.

Additionally, the Fro No department edits two directories listing all the counseling and help services related to drugs and addictions (Les services spécialisés dans le domaine des drogues et toxicomanies au Luxembourg) and to childhood, youth and parents (Les services de consultation pour enfants, jeunes et leurs parents). These directories were updated and re-published in 2012. In the framework of the MAG-Net project, a directory of all the counseling and help services was published for the Greater Region. This directory can also be accessed electronically at mag-net.eu. All this information is also available through the CePT homepage cept.lu, which facilitates the access to even a broader public.

A flyer on solvent abuse was exclusively addressed to adults taking care of children and adolescents. A rapid assessment survey within different professional groups conducted by a newly created department of CePT (2009) (MeSH http://cept.lu/fr/cept/65-articles-cept/540-enquete-sur-labus-de-solvants) provided a better insight in this phenomenon in Luxembourg. 2,700 short questionnaires were sent out to MDs,
teachers in primary schools, counselling services in secondary school and Police district offices. The return rate only reached 5 % and the non-published results are therefore to be considered with caution.

The survey report concluded: 'In contrast to the alarming scene depicted by the media, our results show very localised and isolated occurrences of inhalant abuse in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg. Furthermore, very few reports concern primary school pupils.

Well intentioned dissemination of information and hazard warnings can easily backfire and, instead of preventing inhalant abuse, turn into a publicity stunt for these products. On the basis of our results of this poll we refrained from launching a widespread information campaign and decided to publish instead a fact sheet for professionals working with children and teenagers.'

In June 2009, CePT launched a new awareness raising campaign on what dependency actually is about. Without further explanation, yoyos with the inscription 'I make dependent', the phone number and the e-mail address of the national prevention centre were distributed next to the central railway station and in the pedestrian area of Luxembourg City. Additionally, newspaper articles with provocative questions on different consumption behaviours were published: Chocolate makes dependent? Cannabis makes dependent? Mobile phones make dependent? Alcohol makes dependent? Yoyos make dependent? The main objective of this campaign was to tackle interest of the general public, to motivate them to ask questions and to realise the versatility of the concept of addiction.
4. PROBLEM DRUG USE

INTRODUCTION

At the national level ‘problem drug use’ (PDU) or ‘harmful use’ is defined according to the WHO Lexicon of Alcohol and Drug terms (Geneva, 1994): ‘A pattern of psychoactive substance use that is causing damage to health, physical or mental. Harmful use commonly, but not invariably, has adverse social consequences [...]’.

In contrast to the EMCDDA definition, the mode of administration (injection) is not a selective criterion in the national definition although types of substances involved are identical. Regular / long duration use of heroin via inhalation is thus included. According to the national definition, problem drug use is associated to a high probability of intervention or the need of involvement of a third party from the law enforcement or the care sector. This approach is consistent with the fact that PDU surveillance systems in Luxembourg are based on the institutional contact indicator and not exclusively on the treatment demand indicator.

Data on PDU in this chapter originate from the national drug monitoring system RELIS developed and maintained by the national EMCDDA focal point. The RELIS network includes specialised drug agencies (100% coverage), law enforcement agencies, national prisons and since 2009, psychiatric departments of general hospitals nationwide.

According to the latest serial and multi-methods prevalence study (Origer, 2012 35) performed on 2009 data, national prevalence of PDU sits at 2,070 persons (C.I. (95%): 1,553 to 2,623). A decreasing trend in PDU prevalence has been observed from 2003 onwards. A similar evolution occurred also for problem heroin use (2007: 1,900 PDU: 5,90/ 1000). The prevalence rate of intravenous drug use (IDU) in the national population aged 15 to 64 years has stabilised during the same period. Almost all indirect PDU prevalence indicators reflect trends documented by in-depth PDU studies.

Intravenous heroin use associated to poly-drug use has been reported as the most common consume pattern in PDU. Low quality cocaine use in combination with heroin continues to be observed. Ecstasy-like substances and Amphetamine type stimulants are still popular even though seizure figures did suggest an inverse trend. Methamphetamine use in Luxembourg is still very limited. No evidence exists thus far on the presence of crack (although freebasin has been reported sporadically by field agencies) or desomorphine on the national market. The use of most ‘new synthetic/emerging substances’36 recently detected in other EU Member States has not been reported thus far with the exception of mephedrone and 4-MA seized in 2010 and methylone seized in 2012. Cannabis use of clients in contact with services (institutional contact indicator) has been on the increase for the last 3 consecutive years. Also, cannabis showing high THC concentrations (2012 max: +/- 31%) is increasingly found on the national market.

36 Substances such as MBD,B, 4-MTA, Ketamin, PMMA 2C-I, 2C-T-2, 2C-T-7, 2C-D, 2CE, TMA-2, BZP, TFMPP, 5-MeO-DIPT, 5-MeO-DMT, AMT, ALEPH 7, DXM, DPT.
PREVALENCE AND INCIDENCE ESTIMATES OF PDU

NATIONAL PREVALENCE DATA

Data presented in the present chapter have been provided by serial drug prevalence studies on PDU aged between 15 and 64 years performed on 1997, 1999, 2000, 2003, 2007 and 2009 data (Origer, 2001, 2012). The latest study, published in 2012, was performed on 2009 data and allowed to assess the evolution of PDU prevalence over the last decade, by means of comparable methodologies and data sources.

The research strategy relied on the methodological framework of the Luxembourgish Information System on Drugs and Drug Addiction (RELIS), set up in 1995 by the national focal point of the EMCDDA. RELIS stands for a nationwide multisectorial information network and was built upon the methodological assumption that data exclusively from drug treatment settings may not provide an accurate picture of problem drug use as these notably exclude out-of-treatment users whose drug use has generated conflicts with law enforcement only. Hence, to approach the genuine heterogeneity of the drug misuse phenomenon, RELIS routinely compiles data from all existing specialised in- and out-of-treatment sources, in- and outpatient service sources, low threshold agencies, psychiatric departments of general hospitals, substitution treatment programme, prison, and law enforcement agencies. Also, RELIS relies on the ‘institutional contact indicator’, as an alternative to the more commonly used ‘treatment demand indicator’. As such, it provides for the most comprehensive and reliable data on problem drug users indexed by national institutions.

In compliance with RELIS case definitions, the present study specifically aims at the prevalence estimation of problem use of illicitly acquired high risk drugs (HRC) in the national population aged 15 to 65 years.

The following methods have been applied: Case finding (CF), capture-recapture on 2, 3 and 4 sources (CR 2,3,4), truncated Poisson model associated to Zelterman’s and Chao’s estimators (tPm), and four different multiplier methods using data from law enforcement sources, drug mortality registers (D1,2,3) and treatment agencies (T).

**Fig. 4.1** Absolute prevalence estimates of problem drug use and injecting drug use – Grand Duchy of Luxembourg (1997 – 2009)

Source: Origer, 2012

Downloadable at http://www.relis.lu
M1: multiplier method; police and drug-related deaths registers.
M2: multiplier method: number of drug law offenders / law enforcement contact rate of drug offenders.
M3: multiplier method; number of fatal overdose cases / drug-related mortality rate.
M4: extrapolation from treatment data.
M(IDU/HIV): multiplier method; number of HIV infected IDU / rate of HIV infections among IDU.

Tab. 4.1. Absolute prevalence and prevalence rates according to selected sub-groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL POPULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National population on 1st January</td>
<td>418,300</td>
<td>429,200</td>
<td>435,700</td>
<td>448,300</td>
<td>476,200</td>
<td>493,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National population aged between 15 and 64 years on 1st January</td>
<td>281,100</td>
<td>287,100</td>
<td>291,000</td>
<td>300,800</td>
<td>322,000</td>
<td>336,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROBLEM DRUG USERS (PDU)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDU mean prevalence</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,625</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>2,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean C.I. (95%)</td>
<td>1,900-2,300</td>
<td>1,994-2,758</td>
<td>2,246-3,295</td>
<td>2,144-3,293</td>
<td>1,945-3,433</td>
<td>1,553-2,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mean prevalence rate - PDU</td>
<td>5 / 1000</td>
<td>5.48 / 1000</td>
<td>6.02 / 1000</td>
<td>5.64 / 1000</td>
<td>5.19 / 1000</td>
<td>4.19 / 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mean prevalence rate - PDU-age:15-64</td>
<td>7.47 / 1000</td>
<td>8.19 / 1000</td>
<td>9.02 / 1000</td>
<td>8.41 / 1000</td>
<td>7.67 / 1000</td>
<td>6.16 / 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INJECTING DRUG USERS (IDU)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDU mean prevalence</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>1,745</td>
<td>2,173</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate margins</td>
<td>1,528 – 1,785</td>
<td>1,686 – 1,828</td>
<td>1,610 – 1,920</td>
<td>1,735 – 1,755</td>
<td>1,924 – 2,422</td>
<td>1,524 – 2,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mean prevalence rate - IDU</td>
<td>3.96 / 1000</td>
<td>4.09 / 1000</td>
<td>4.05 / 1000</td>
<td>3.89 / 1000</td>
<td>4.56 / 1000</td>
<td>3.86 / 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mean prevalence rate-IDU-age:15-64</td>
<td>5.89 / 1000</td>
<td>6.12 / 1000</td>
<td>6.07 / 1000</td>
<td>5.80 / 1000</td>
<td>6.75 / 1000</td>
<td>5.68 / 1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Origer, 2012
Fig. 4.2: PDU prevalence rates according to selected sub-groups (1997 – 2009) per 1,000 inhabitants aged 15-64 years

The mid-point estimation performed on 2009 data provides an absolute prevalence of problem HRC drug users (PDU-HRC) of 2,070 persons (C.I. (95%): 1,553 to 2,623). In terms of prevalence rates estimates for the same age categories, 6.16 out of 1,000 inhabitants aged between 15 and 64 years show problem drug use.

According to serial data available for the period 1997 to 2009, absolute prevalence and prevalence rates of PDU-HRC have been showing an increasing trend until 2000. After a short stabilisation phase, a decreasing trend has been observed from 2003 onwards.

Absolute prevalence and prevalence rates of intravenous drug use (IDU) in the national population aged 15 to 64 years have been increasing between 1997 and 2007 to show first signs of decline in 2009.

The stabilization and subsequent decrease of national PDU prevalence occurred within the implementation phase of the first and second national drug action plans, having started in 1999. The observed trends are also confirmed by most of pertinent indirect indicators related to demand and supply reduction.

Indirect indicators of PDU prevalence trends

In order to validate PDU estimates and follow up prevalence trends between two successive prevalence studies a set of indirect indicators have been compiled and analysed.
Demand reduction indicators are mostly consistent with supply reduction data (see fig. 4.3). Most indirect PDU prevalence indicators also reflect trends documented by in-depth PDU studies.

The number of fatal drug-related overdoses has peaked in 2007 and has been witnessing an obvious decrease since then. Likewise other EU Member States, the evolution of the referred indicator is known to show fairly important variations due to factors such as quality of available drugs, consume patterns, availability of harm reduction services, etc. Moreover, the absolute number of fatal overdoses has reached a fairly low level compared to previous years. Changes in small figures may produce great variations in percentages. Comparison of overdose rates over the years would probably make the downward trend more obvious, which is in concordance with national prevalence figures.

Admission statistics in low threshold drug agencies depend of course on the capacities of low threshold offers and level of access to harm reduction measures at the national level. This said even though harm reduction offers have been further developed in Luxembourg, the number of contacts with the latter tend to decrease if compared to year 2010.

A new research project has been launched in 2009 on the consolidation and validation of PDU estimates by indirect indicators. A correlation matrix including 18 indirect trend indicators has been conceived to follow-up trends and strength of association between these indicators and between PDU/IDU prevalence figures. First results will be available in the course of 2014.

Local or regional prevalence studies

Due to the specificity of the national drug scene and the geographical dimension of the country, local prevalence studies are not considered being a priority.
Characteristics of indexed PDU

Relying on a multi-sectorial data network including specialised in- and outpatient treatment centres and low threshold facilities, general hospitals as well as law enforcement agencies and national prisons, RELIS enables the assessment of new trends in the problem drug users population in general as well as in drug treatment demanders in particular. NFP has opted for a holistic monitoring of the drug population. The following data are provided by RELIS thus referring to all HRC drug users indexed by the national specialised treatment and law enforcement network and, as such, defined as problem drug users.

The number of problem PDU person-contacts indexed by national institutions in 2012 figured 4,651 (2002: 4,701) (in this figure double counting is included meaning that a given person could have been indexed twice and more by different institutions. It is thus not representing the actual prevalence, which has to be assessed by other methods).

More precisely, 2,383 users have been indexed by national specialised drug demand reduction agencies and 2,318 drug law offenders by supply reduction agencies in 2002. In 2012 the same agencies have indexed 2,937 and 1,802 persons respectively.

Table 4.2 Main characteristics of PDU indexed by the national drug monitoring system, RELIS (valid percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natives</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-natives</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- of which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29Y4M</td>
<td>31Y2M</td>
<td>31Y8M</td>
<td>31Y9M</td>
<td>32Y4M</td>
<td>33Y4M</td>
<td>33Y8M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26Y10M</td>
<td>28Y4M</td>
<td>28Y5M</td>
<td>28Y3M</td>
<td>28Y9M</td>
<td>30Y1M</td>
<td>30Y6M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28Y9M</td>
<td>30Y6M</td>
<td>30Y11M</td>
<td>31Y2M</td>
<td>31Y7M</td>
<td>32Y8M</td>
<td>33Y2M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary drug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opiates</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polydrug use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary opiates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iv</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-iv</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infectious disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCV</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The male/female ratio of the PDU population is stable at 4:1. During the last ten years the proportion of indexed non-native PDU has shown strong variations but a clearly increasing tendency since 2003. The population of non-native drug users largely consists of Portuguese nationals, whose proportion is for the first time in recent years not consistently higher than the one observed in general population. The remarkable and continuous increase of PDU of French origin over the last 8 years has been interrupted in 2009 and again in 2012, after an increase in 2010 and 2011.

The mean age of indexed PDU evolved from 28 years and 4 months in 1995 to 33 years and 2 months in 2012. Mean age of male PDU has been increasing faster than for females. In reference to years 2004 to 2012 a discontinuous decrease of minors in the overall PDU population has been observed in polite data.

The mean age of native and non-native problem drug users tends to balance. One observes an average aging of the population of long-term drug injectors and a sensitive decrease in age referred to “new” PDU.

Worth mentioning is also the overall, yet discontinuous increase of the average age of overdose victims during the last twelve years. PDU tend to contact drug treatment facilities at an earlier stage, which may be due to a more diversified offer currently available.

Intravenous heroin use associated to poly-drug use has been reported as the most common consume pattern in PDU allthough non-iv use has been reported to be more common for the first time in 2012. The proportion of poly drug use 54% has reached stabilisation after a record level in 2004 (93%) and is even decreasing in 2011 and 2012. In contrast to 1995 data, the switch to intravenous drug use occurs earlier in 2012. The ratio of intravenous opiates consume to the inhalation mode is 2:3 in 2012. Provision of ‘blowing paraphernalia’ (e.g. aluminium foils) by specialised drug agencies may have influenced consume patterns. The prevalence of the use of cocaine as primary drug shows an increasing trend since 2000, but tends to stabilise in 2009 and 2010. Following a sensible increase in 2011, this previous trend of cocaine stabilising as primary drug is confirmed by 2012 data. Ecstasy-like substances and ATS use appears to be stable which however does not inform on prevalence in general population as RELIS data refer to PDU and not to the overall population of recreational drug users.

All indicators on cannabis use (problematic and recreational) have been showing a discontinuous decrease for several years. The number of persons in contact with the national specialised network for (preferential) cannabis use shows, however, an important increase in 2012 (29.5%).

PDU show fairly stable infection rates of HIV (4%) between 2000 and 2012, whereas the HCV prevalence rate (54%) is fairly stable since 2004.

The residential status of indexed respondents has improved over the last years. In 1995, 31% of the users reported stable accommodation; currently the same proportion situates 70%. This improvement is partly due to various accommodation and housing offers for addicted people set up in the framework of the drug action plan.

The unemployment rate (63%) tends to plateau. However, the proportion of professionally active respondents reporting a stable job situation (e.g. long term contract) has sensibly increased in 2012, compared to previous years, which should also be put in the context of the current economic crisis.
DATA ON PDU FROM NON–TREATMENT SOURCES

Data on PDU from non-treatment sources are mainly provided by the national specialized drug unit of the Judicial Police. The profile of these users is similar to PDU from treatment settings knowing that the national drug monitoring system indexes both sources.

The ratio of male and female PDU is almost identical to PDU from treatment sources (86.7% male, 13.3% female offenders). Their mean age is 33.7 years, women being slightly younger than men (34 years for male and 31.4 years for female offenders).

39% of the offenders are natives. Likewise 2011, most non-natives were Portuguese citizens (39%) followed by French native offenders (18%).

Most offenders 83% (73%) are recidivists (had more than one drug-related police record during their lifetime). 20% were arrested for drug dealing, 36% were charged with illegal drug possession and 44.5% for other (or unknown) crimes related to drugs. Drug-law offenders (who are also problematic drug users) are mostly arrested for heroin and cocaine. A vast majority are reported polydrug users.
INTRODUCTION

Drug treatment is the ‘use of specific medical and/or psychosocial techniques with the goal of reducing or abstaining from illegal drug use and thereby improving the general health of the client’\(^{38}\).

Specialised drug treatment infrastructures are relying on state financing and on ministerial control and quality assurance mechanisms. Treatment offers are decentralised and most commonly provided by state accredited NGOs.

For the purpose of the present chapter, drug treatment is divided in the following categories:

- **Outpatient treatment**: the patient receives drug treatment without staying overnight, pharmaceutically assisted or not\(^{38}\);
- **Inpatient treatment**: the patient is staying overnight, pharmaceutically assisted or not (including detoxification);
- **Substitution treatment**: a type of medical treatment provided to opiate addicts primarily based on the delivery of a similar or identical substance to the drug normally used. Substitution treatment may be accompanied by psycho-social care.

Drug treatment is monitored and quality assurance occurs via a series of mechanisms that are described under the treatment system section. The external evaluation of the 2005-2009 national drugs action plan recommends to draw an inventory of current quality assurance mechanisms regarding drug treatment. Outcomes of this inventory, will allow to further harmonise existing routines.

DRUG TREATMENT STRATEGIES AND POLICY

In the mid-seventies the cooperation between State and NGOs working in the social field has progressively gained structure. The first (financing) convention between the Ministry of Family and a series of NGOs, signed in 1975, was the starting point of what is known today as the “Conventionned sector”. Over the years the collaboration schemes between State and NGOs evolved and were extended to the Public Health sector. In 1998 the so-called ASFT law\(^{40}\) entered in force, regulating the relationship between State and private organisations working in the social, family and therapeutic fields.

Treatment needs’ assessment as well as quality control largely rely on the ASFT legal framework and the existing network of conventionned service providers who have to meet a series of quality standards to be granted a special accreditation from the Ministry of Health. The elaboration of the demand reduction section of the national drugs strategies and action plans builds upon the expertise and involvement of the referred network. A detailed description of collaboration and control mechanisms in place is provided below.

---

\(^{38}\) SOURCE: Classification of drug treatment in EU member states and Norway, Expert meeting, 8-9 February 2002

\(^{39}\) ‘Drug free treatment focus on psycho-social and therapeutic techniques and is not primarily based on the routine prescription of a substance or medicament with the goal of reducing or abstaining from illegal drug use thereby improving the general health of the client’

\(^{40}\) Loi du 8 septembre 1998 régulant les relations entre l’Etat et les organismes œuvrant dans les domaines social, familial et thérapeutique (entry in force: 24/09/1998)
The first specialised drug agency (JDH) was created in 1986 and addressed both drug addiction and Youth. Originally services developed bottom-up and were seeking financial support of the State. Preliminary work done in the framework of the first drug action plan 1999-2004 allowed to better assess national needs and to initiate and develop interagency coordination mechanisms. To date, treatment agencies are specialised whether in polydrug use including illegal drugs, in alcohol abuse, or gambling, etc. As far as illegal drugs are concerned, drug care providers address the whole range of substances meaning that no specialised offers exist according to a given type of substance or problems related to it.

As far as national expenditures for drug treatment provision are concerned please refer to chapter 1.

**TREATMENT SYSTEMS**

**Organisation and quality assurance**

All specialised drug treatment services are relying on governmental support and control. Specialised agencies need an accreditation to sign a convention with the ministry of Health that guarantees their annual funding. Outpatient drug treatment is provided free of charge by specialised agencies. Inpatient treatment and detoxification is covered by health insurance schemes. As far as substitution treatment is concerned, health insurance takes in charge medical interventions and counselling and State covers pharmaceutical costs and pharmacy fees.

NGOs involved in drug treatment fall under the obligation of the above referred to ‘ASFT’ law (8/09/98) and the subsequent grand ducal decree of 10 December 1998 41, both regulating the relation (duties and rights) between State and NGOs or organisations providing psycho-medico-social and therapeutic care. The overall management of the referred agencies is ensured by a ‘coordination platform’ that includes a maximum of 3 members of the concerned institution and at least one representative from the competent ministry. All major decisions have to be approved by the coordination platform. All referred institutions work in close collaboration and have to be viewed as an interdependent therapeutic chain. A series of formal collaboration agreements have been signed in 2008 and 2009 between various agencies in order to insure rational use of resources and through-care. The 2010-2014 national drugs action plan foresees to further develop this synergy by creating a national network of unique reference persons for each drug treatment demander entering the specialised care system.

The **governmental quality standard** certification, as foreseen by the law ‘ASFT’ of 8 September 1998, represents the main instrument of a standardised quality control of drug treatment offers. General guidelines on setting requirements and human resources/clients keys are set by a grand-ducal decree of 10 December 1998 regarding the accreditation of services from the medical, social and therapeutic field. Funding is, however, not a direct function of mandatory evaluation or outputs requirements. The quality standard certification commits respective NGOs to undertake necessary evaluation measures of their activities by means, however, they deem adequate. Drug treatment agencies have developed proper **evaluation strategies** mostly in collaboration with external evaluators. Recent examples are the evaluation of current offers in the field of socio-professional integration, which future development has been promoted by the national drugs action plan, the implementation of a computer based evaluation procedure by the national substitution programme and prevention interventions in schools by CePT. The external evaluation of the drugs action plan also significantly contributes to assess the functioning and the gaps of the national treatment network.

---

41 Règlement grand-ducal du 10 décembre 1998 concernant l’agrément à accorder aux gestionnaires de services dans les domaines médico-social et thérapeutique (entry in force 18/12/1998)
An external assessment of quality management mechanisms run by specialised NGOs has been foreseen by the national drug action plan and has become available in 2011. Outcomes have shown that current quality assurance routines implemented within involved drug agencies are highly diversified and differ in terms of coverage and complexity ranging from internal activity assessment procedures to EFQM certifications for instance. These outcomes are highly valuable for future improvement of quality assurance and documentation routines of drug-related care services.

Also, the RELIS database on problem drug users provides relevant data for evaluation purposes since it includes detailed data on drug consume patterns, socio-economic situation, risk behaviour and treatment or law enforcement contacts, etc. In the long run, drug ‘careers’ can be analysed by means of the RELIS indexing system, which allows following up treatment demands and law enforcement contacts of indexed drug users. These data can be used to assess the impact and the performance of specific treatment approaches. A practical example of the application of evaluation results is to be seen in the conceptualisation and external evaluation of the national drug action plan 2005-2009, which did greatly rely on RELIS data and ad hoc evaluation initiatives from field institutions.

Table 5.1 records admission and contact statistics of national drug treatment agencies according to applied typology from 1994 to 2012. **Intra-institutional multiple counts** are excluded meaning that all treatment demanders indexed by a given agency are only indexed once by the referred agency during a reporting year. **Inter-institutional multiple counts** are not excluded since a given treatment demander may have contacted several national agencies during a given year. More detailed admission data, including low threshold agencies are provided in respective sub-chapters.

### Availability and diversification of treatment

As can be seen on map 5.1 drug treatment facilities are regionalised showing, however, a high concentration and diversity within the area of Luxembourg City. All listed services are specialised with the exception of regional general hospitals providing detoxification treatment via their respective psychiatric departments. In July 2005, the first ‘consumption room’ has been opened in Luxembourg City. It has been integrated in the ABRIGADO centre providing day care, night shelter and low threshold services to drug addicts.

It should be stressed that no national drug treatment service exclusively targets a given type of substance use and its correlates. Currently national services provide care for persons presenting problems related to heroin, cocaine, amphetamine, cannabis, etc. and polydrug use.
The following treatment typology is applied:

**Outpatient: services and offers for adults**

The most relevant national outpatient treatment facility is the ‘JDH Foundation’. Regional antennas of JDH are respectively implemented in Luxembourg City, in the South and in the North of the Grand Duchy and are entirely financed by the Ministry of Health. Quai57 (Arcus asbl) implemented in Luxembourg-City is primarily a counselling and referral agency.

A third specialized outpatient service is also implemented in Luxembourg-City (Alternative Counselling Centre). The main objectives of the referred centre are the following:

- Establish a first contact with the drug-addicted clients.
- Help the drug-addicted clients in the development of a therapeutic project with orientation either towards the intermediate-term structures, or towards residential therapy centres.
- Organization of detoxifications in local psychiatric services or further psychotherapeutic interventions.
- Informative and therapeutic discussions with the drug-addicted clients and their families before and after the detoxification.

Further agencies provide social care or therapeutic settings that are attended by drug addicts. These agencies, however, rarely provide drug specific treatment and separate data breakdowns are not available.

**Outpatient: services and offers for minors**

Specialised drug care agencies for minors exist in the centre and since 2007 in the north of the country. Although drug counselling agencies accept underage treatment demanders, part of the latter are referred to a specialised service established in the centre of the country (Service Thérapeutique Solidarité Jeunes – Solidarité Jeunes asbl).

**Outpatient: substitution treatment**

Substitution treatment is currently defined as a medical assisted treatment with opioids’ agonists and with antagonists (and antagonistic agonists). The objectives of substitution and maintenance treatment are manifold. They range from no-digressive dose, out-patient low threshold maintenance to abstinence oriented (digressive doses) rehabilitation offers. The primary goal is the psychosocial and medical stabilisation of the patient by replacing ‘street’ drugs by quality controlled substitution drugs. The further development and outcome of the treatment is assessed individually. Both components, condition of the patient and reduction of public nuisance are considered.

Substitution treatment is provided at the national level since 1989 (JDH). Until the beginning of 2001, however, there has been no legal framework regulating drug substitution treatment. The law of 27 April 2001 modifying the basic drug law of 19 February 1973 introduced a legal framework for substitution and maintenance treatment. The grand ducal decree of 30 January 2002 regulates the practical modalities of substitution. The referred law regulates drug substitution treatment in general rather than it legalises a single national substitution programme. The law does this by means of substitution treatment licenses.

---

42 The decree of 30 January 2002 regulating the modalities of substitution treatment can be downloaded at: http://www.eldd.emcdda.org
granted to MDs and specialised agencies, the application of training requirements for prescribing MDs and adequate control mechanisms of multiple prescriptions (i.e. centralised register of substituted patients). It should be stressed that following the application of the new legal framework, there still exists a structured and multidisciplinary substitution treatment programme (JDH - mainly liquid oral methadone provided by specialised agencies) and a lower threshold substitution treatment offer provided by freelance state licensed MDs (MEPHENON®, METHADICT® and SUBUTEX®).

Until 2001 methadone and buprenorphine have been prescribed as part of a long-term treatment with a medium or long-term abstinence goal. There are, however, a series of cases in which substitution treatment has to be considered rather as a harm reduction or maintenance measure than an abstinence oriented therapeutic action. The grand-ducal decree of 30 January 2002 lists medications as well as preparations containing methadone (liquid oral form in programme and pill form in lower threshold prescription) and buprenorphine if the notice mentions substitution treatment as a possible therapeutic indication. Furthermore, morphine-based (salts) medications can be prescribed if the listed substances are deemed inadequate by medical authority. Finally, the decree allows for heroin prescription in the framework of a pilot project managed by the Directorate of Health. The list of substitution substances may be rapidly modified by amending the referred decree. In addition to drug prescription and medical care, the grand ducal decree on drug substitution treatment (30/01/2002) defines a series of psychosocial counselling services to be provided by licensed specialised centres. Licensed MDs may refer substitution patients to licensed treatment centres for more in-depth psychosocial counselling.

Diverted MEPHENON® (methadone in pill form prescribed by accredited MDs) is found on the national black market. Given that the centralised substitution treatment register did not yet reach full prescriber coverage, multiple prescriptions (a given patient visits more than one prescriber) may not be fully avoided. In that respect, a central substitution register is about to be implemented jointly by the ‘Surveillance Commission on Substitution Treatment’43, the national drug coordinator and involved specialised treatment centres. At the moment of writing, a test phase is running in order to find the best way to make the implementation of the substitution register and other surveillance mechanisms compatible with daily medical practice. The substitution treatment surveillance commission has been reformed by the Minister of Health and since August 2010 it is chaired by the National Drug Coordinator.

### Outpatient: low threshold services and offers

Currently two agencies offer harm reduction services in the Centre, the South and the North of the country including offers such as day and night shelter and supervised injection facilities (currently only in the centre). A new integrated low threshold centre for drug addicts is planned to be implemented in the main city of the South of the country. The further development of harm reduction services in the North is part of the national drug action plan. In this context a needs assessment on low threshold offers has been assessed, state budgetary means increased and adapted responses are currently being implemented.

### Inpatient: detoxification services and offers

Physical drug detoxification is provided by 5 different hospitals via their respective psychiatric units. The formerly most important detoxification unit implemented within a specialised department of the CHNP (15 detoxification beds) has been restructured and does not provide detoxification treatment anymore. The ‘Centre Hospitalier du Kirchberg’ has joined the list of national institutions providing detoxification

---

43 The decree of 30 January 2002 replaces the former ‘Methadone Commission’ by the ‘Surveillance commission on substitution treatment’ mandated to control all aspects of substitution treatment at the national level. Established in 2002, it is composed of delegates from the programme, the Directorate of Health, two pharmacists and two GPs affiliated to the programme, and is in charge of admissions, releases and exclusions of substitution treatment demanders or patients. The composition of the new commission is similar to the one of the former Methadone commission.
treatment in 2005. Medical interventions and psychosocial support are provided to control and reduce withdrawal symptoms in the framework of a 1-2 week detoxification programme. Ideally, detoxified patients are referred to more psychotherapeutic oriented institutions.

Detoxification treatment is provided by psychiatric units within five general hospitals:
Centre Hospitalier du Nord – Ettelbrück (North)
Centre Hospitalier Emile Mayrisch – HVEA (South)
Centre Hospitalier de Luxembourg – CHL (Centre)
Hôpital Ste. Thérèse (Centre)
Centre Hospitalier du Kirchberg (Centre)

### Inpatient: services and offers for adults

The national residential therapeutic centre called ‘Syrdallschlass’ (CTM-CHNP) is situated in the East of the G. D. of Luxembourg. The therapeutic programme of the CTM is divided into three progressive phases. The duration of a therapeutic stay varies from 3 months to 1 year.

In addition to individual and group therapies, the centre offers the opportunity to follow training activities in several professional domains and also offers post therapeutic accommodation facilities. The final objective is the psychological, professional and social reintegration of treated clients. The latter is highly facilitated by the quality of provided professional training to patients. The collaboration with several employers willing to employ ex-drug addicts and the active involvement of social services offer a fair social and professional framing to released patients.

The national drug action plan 2000-2004 had foreseen the extension of CTM offers by creating a network of modular therapeutic annexes for specific target groups as for instance pregnant women, drug addicted couples, treatment demanders on methadone, etc. These annexes are operational since September 2002 and are situated in the vicinity of the main centre (see map 5.1) in order to take advantage of training and social reintegration facilities offered by the CTM. Based on past experience, the 2005-2009 drugs action plan has foreseen the further development of these annexes. In 2008 a new annexe providing therapeutic offers to specific target groups such as mothers with child/children or patients in the last therapy phase has become operational on the very site of the main centre.

The CHNP runs a residential facility with a capacity of 15 beds called “mid-term unit” in the North of the country. Its mission is defined as follows:

- Contribute to the physical and mental stabilization of the patient after clinical detoxification.
- Supervise the patient during the period going from the clinical detoxification to the admission in therapy or offer him a protected area to develop his project of social reintegration/rehabilitation.
- Free capacity of regional psychiatric services by admitting detoxificated patients for further care.

As the national inpatient therapeutic facilities are limited and not covering the whole spectrum of drug-related symptoms (e.g. double diagnosis) a series of patients are referred to specialised institutions abroad. If approved, related costs are covered by the national social security schemes.
A specialised residential centre for problematic youngsters has been opened in the beginning of 2007 in the North of the country under the management of CHNP. A new project defined as a residential referral and rehabilitation centre for minors in a rural setting is in its planning phase. The referred case management programme will contribute to fill current gaps in the care system for minors.

CHARACTERISTICS OF TREATED CLIENTS AND TRENDS OF CLIENTS IN TREATMENT

Table 5.1 summarises drug-related institutional contacts of PDU. Inter-institutional multiple counts are not excluded meaning that a given PDU could be indexed twice and more. Hence, these data do not provide the national prevalence of PDU but they allow following up the increase or the decrease of the latter.

The present section is divided in a general description of the drug treatment population and a more in-depth analysis of clients’ characteristics and observed trends. Both parts are based on RELIS data and on in-house statistics of specialised drug treatment agencies at the national level.

Overall the number of persons showing drug-related contacts with national DR or SR agencies peaked in 2010. While the number of drug treatment demands discontinuously increased since 2000, contacts with law enforcement agencies have been decreasing since 2011. The number of substitution treatment demands begun to plateau around 2002 and showed a tangible increase in 2009 to stabilise anew between 2010 and 2012. The number of adult out- and inpatient clients is highest since reported. Since 2009, the most remarkable increase has been observed in outpatient drug free treatment demands. OST treatment demanders have shown a stable trend since 2009. The number of contacts in low threshold facilities has been decreasing since 2011 (2010: 140,093 contacts; 2012: 127,080 contacts). Around 8% (7.5%) of respondents are first treatment demanders, all treatment centres included. As far as first treatment demanders are concerned, 7% are female for 93% of males.

Of clients in drug treatment (all treatments and all types of unit), 81% (80.4%) are male for 19% (19.6%) females. The mean age of treatment demanders has significantly increased during the last ten years (1997: 28 years, 2012: 32.6 years) and this mainly because of an observed increase in average male age (1997: 28Y2M/2012: 33Y3M). The mean age of the female clients is slightly lower (2012: 29Y8M). Respectively 45.2 (63.3) % of clients in treatment are natives. The population of non-natives consists for the vast majority of Portuguese nationals, followed by French, Italian, Belgian and German, citizens.
### Table 5.1 Drug-related institutional contacts (inter-institutional multiple counts included)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ADMISSIONS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF CONTACTS (Low threshold)</th>
<th>NUMBER OF DRUG TREATMENT DEMANDERS (intra-institutional multiple counts excluded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTPATIENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Drug Free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Substitution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPATIENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Drug free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Hospital care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW THRESHOLD AGENCIES</td>
<td>13,083</td>
<td>29,536</td>
<td>39,526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DEMAND REDUCTION: SPECIALISED DRUG TREATMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING</th>
<th>SUB TOTAL A: Number of drug treatment demanders (Multiple counts not excluded)</th>
<th>SUB TOTAL B: Number of drug law offenders (Multiple counts not excluded)</th>
<th>TOTAL NUMBER OF PERSONS SHOWING DRUG-RELATED INSTITUTIONAL CONTACTS (Multiple counts not excluded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OUTPATIENT</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INPATIENT</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW THRESHOLD AGENCIES</td>
<td>13,083</td>
<td>29,536</td>
<td>39,526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SUPPLY REDUCTION: LAW ENFORCEMENT INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National prisons</th>
<th>Police - Judicial</th>
<th>Police - Customs</th>
<th>SUB TOTAL B: Number of drug law offenders (Multiple counts not excluded)</th>
<th>NATIONAL DRUG REPORT GRAND DUCHY OF LUXEMBOURG New developments, trends and in-depth information on selected issues Edition 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>2,318</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RELIS 2013 / CNS
Regarding the educational level of the clients in treatment, 74.4% have completed primary or complementary school, 23.4% have completed secondary school and 2.2% obtained a higher degree. 16.4% of respondents reported stable employment (important decrease - 1997: 65%) against 62.2% who are inactive or unemployed. Furthermore, 6% are students or engaged in a training contract. 35.7% (41.2%) of indexed treatment demanders had experienced one or more overdoses. As far as the exchange of syringes is concerned, 25% (32.9%) reported that they never shared syringes during their lifetime, 44.6 (51.7%) during the last month. IDU combined to polydrug use is the most observed consume pattern in drug treatment demanders.

Below is presented a more detailed analysis of treatment demands and trends according to type of treatment:

**Outpatient: services and offers for adults**

**RELEVANT TREND:** Increase of male treatment demanders (75% male, 25% female). Increase of the proportion of clients aged 30 and more (2012: 61.9% / 2008: 61%). A current trend is also to be seen in the increasing number of young mothers or couples with their child/children seeking out- and inpatient treatment.

After several years of stability, national outpatient drug counselling centres have been showing decreasing admission rates from 2011 onwards and decreasing first treatment rates intra and inter-agency wide. Gender distribution showed an overall increase of male clients over the last 10 years. Age distributions are varying according to the geographical situation of treatment centres. All in all, however, the proportion of treatment demanders aged 30 years and more has sensibly increased during recent years (2012: 61.9% / 2006: 57%). Treatment demands from underage clients tend to decrease until 2007 and stabilised since then, mainly because specialised agencies for minors have been implemented meanwhile. Treatment demands for problem i.v. opiate use associated to multiple-use is the main demand pattern (2012: 65% / 2011: 60% / 2009: 61% / 2008: 53% / 2007: 57% / 2006: 51%). Cannabis-related demands have shown a clear upward trend since 2009. The prevalence of cocaine use-related treatment demands is stable, however, bearing in mind that the exact prevalence is difficult to assess as in most PDU concomitant use of heroine is observed.

**Outpatient: services and offers for minors**

**RELEVANT TREND:** Stabilisation of the number of episodes partly due to the development of new treatment capacities for underage users and/or offenders.

A decreasing majority (66.9%) of clients are male. Cannabis use is the main reason of treatment demands (76.8%) witnessing a currently increasing trend. However, the use/abuse of licit drugs and polydrug use is increasingly reported as reason of treatment. An increasing proportion of youngsters presenting psychiatric symptoms and/or socially deviant behaviour in addition to drug abuse are reported by specialised field agencies.

**Outpatient: substitution treatment**

**RELEVANT TRENDS:** Between 2005 and 2012 decrease of number of patients in structured JDH substitution programme and slow increase in substitution treatment prescribed by licensed MDs - stabilisation of gender ratio (3 males / 1 female) - Increase of substitution treatment demanders being aged between 45 and 49 years.

The number of patients admitted to the national multidisciplinary substitution programme (JDH) has been sensibly decreasing from 2005 to 2012, 78 patients in 2012, which is supposedly due to the increasing access and admissions to lower threshold substitution treatment provided by independent yet specially
licensed MDs. 18% (29%) of clients were first substitution treatment demanders in 2012. The proportion of female substitution treatment demanders (+/- 25% stable) is higher than the proportion of female PDU in the overall drug treatment population. 22% (18%) of the clients in substitution treatment are aged under 30, 41% (48%) are between 30 and 39, while 37% (34%) are over 40 years old. The mean age of clients has significantly increased over the last 10 years (35.7 years), which is consistent to the overall aging trend of PDU. Polydrug use is the most observed consume pattern in substitution treatment demanders.

The number of patients who did receive substitution treatment by prescription from independent and licensed practitioners has known a steep increase between 2008 and 2009 [(1,158 patients in 2010 and 1,128 patients in 2009 multiple counts excluded (2008: 961)]. Since 2009 a stabilisation in the number of OST demanders has been recorded (2012: 1,076).

The National Health Found (CNS) annually provides the number of patients receiving referred substitution drugs on prescription as well as the number of prescribing MDs. One observes a sound increase of substitution demands addressed to accredited liberal MDs until 2010 and an overall decrease of the number of patients choosing the multidisciplinary JDH programme, more demanding in terms of treatment constraints. Over 95% of prescriptions delivered in the framework of substitution treatment refer to methadone followed by buprenorphine.

**Table 5.2 Outpatient prescription of substitution drugs by the national network of licensed MDs (1999-2012)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of indexed patients (double counting excluded)</strong></td>
<td>745</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>1,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of prescribing GPs (double counting excluded)</strong></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CNS 2013

**Table 5.3 Age distribution (%) of patients substituted by the national network of licensed MDs (2008-2012)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE CATEGORIES</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CNS 2013 – data reformatted by NFP
The proportion of patients aged less than 30 years has been decreasing and the proportion of patients aged 45 and more increasing between 2008 and 2011.

### Outpatient: low threshold services and offers

**RELEVANT TRENDS:** The number of contacts indexed by low threshold agencies has increased dramatically between 2006 and 2010 (2010: 140,093 / 2005: 47,739), and showed first signs of decrease in 2011 confirmed by 2012 data. 200,000 to 250,000 sterile syringes are distributed and recollected yearly by the same agencies (decreasing trend in recent years). The proportion of new clients within low threshold settings is on the decrease. Approximately 47% of clients are aged between 25 and 34 years, 31% of clients between 35 and 44, and 15% between 18 and 24.

### Inpatient: hospital care (detoxification treatment)

**RELEVANT TRENDS:** Drug detoxification units throughout the country have been showing a continuous increase regarding number of patients until 2006 (484) and then onwards a constant decrease to 265 patients in 2012. Gender distribution has remained fairly unchanged between 2002 and 2012. Multiple drug use, including heroin, is the main reason for detoxification demands.

### Inpatient: services and offers for adults

**RELEVANT TRENDS:** The number of inpatient treatment demanders (detoxification treatments excluded) has been showing a fairly stable trend over the last 10 years. The proportion of first treatment demands sets around 7%.

Heroin as preferential substance is reported by 60.4% (66%) [(35% (60%) i.v. / 65% (40%) non-i.v.)] of drug treatment (all treatment) demanders monitored by the national drug surveillance system RELIS whereas cocaine is only reported by 10% (19.5%) as first substance of use (33% i.v. / 67% non-i.v.) The average age at the first use of the preferred drug figures around 18.5 (18.7), whereas the mean age of the first i.v. consumption is 21 (21.3). 74 (74%) of the clients consume drugs more than once a day.

In 2009, a weak decrease in preference for intravenous heroin use (1997: 60%, 2009: 49%) was observed compared to 2008 (52%). This trend has been confirmed in 2010 (38%) and 2012 (24%) The heroin inhalation mode (2012: 35%, 2011: 20%, 2009: 20%) has becoming more prevalent compared to 2008 (14%). Polydrug use is the most observed consume pattern (64%). The i.v. heroin sub-population shows the highest mean age (36.4) of all treatment groups.

Cocaine use as main reason of treatment demand showed a significant increase from 2004 to 2006 and decreased again in 2007 (2012: 10% 2011: 19.5% 2010: 14%). Mean age of preferential cocaine using treatment demanders in 2012 was 34.2. Cocaine prevalence as secondary drug has decreased from 43% in 2004 to 34% in 2009. In 2010 however, a slight increase is observed: 40% of inpatient clients reported cocaine as secondary drug, in 2011, still 34% report cocaine as secondary drug (most reported secondary drug). Crack has been reported only once as secondary or occasional drug.

The percentage of treatment demands related to cannabis use is increasing (24.2% in 2012 and 12.5% in 2011). Treatment demands related to ecstasy use are rare (1-3%) and have shown a fair stability over the last years. The same comments apply to ATS use.
6. HEALTH CORRELATES AND CONSEQUENCES

INTRODUCTION

At the national level two drug-related deaths indexing routines do currently exist:

1. The Special Drug Unit of the Judicial Police (SPJ) maintains a register on acute drug deaths (RSPJ). The RSPJ indexes all direct overdose cases due to illicit drug use documented by forensic evidence. As police forces are routinely informed by medical emergency services in case of a suspected overdose case, they are able to collect evidence at the site of the incident and confirm or not, in combination with post mortem toxicological evidence, the suspected overdose. RSPJ applies the following definition of acute/direct drug-related death:

   ‘Lethal intoxication, voluntary, accidental or of undetermined intent, confirmed by forensic and contextual evidence, and caused directly by the use of illicit drugs or by any other drug(s) if the victim has been known to be a regular consumer of illicit drugs. Death has occurred due to an adverse somatic reaction to substance intake’.

2. The statistical department of the Directorate of Health maintains the General Mortality Register (GMR) indexing all deaths that occurred on the national territory by means of death certificates provided by MDs. Since 1998 the GMR applies the 10th revision of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-10). Special software jointly developed by the statistical department and the national focal point allows extracting drug-related death cases from the GMR by the application of a predefined standard (e.g. DRD).

Both sources are independent, meaning that for the SPJ register data collection occurs via police records and forensic evidence, while the GMR is updated according to information contained in death certificates. Discrepancies between the referred registers mainly originate from different encoding routines (e.g. death certificates often only mention primary cause of death) explaining the fact that the DRD v 0.3 systematically underestimates the SPJ based number of drug-related deaths as can be seen in figure 6.6.

Even though DRD based data is provided to the EMCDDA, national figures on drug induced deaths published in the national annual drugs report are, for reasons explained above, based on the RSPJ whose case definition is compatible with the EMCDDA definition: [...] deaths that are caused directly by the consumption of drugs of abuse. These deaths occur generally shortly after the consumption of the substance(s). (EMCDDA)

Infectious diseases, including HIV and viral hepatitis have to be reported (notification procedure) when diagnosed to the Directorate of Health (Ministry of Health) that compiles data and is in charge of nationwide epidemiological follow up. These data do however not allow to breakdown infection prevalence according to PDU status. The national drug monitoring system RELIS therefore allows to gather self-reported data on infectious diseases in PDU. Furthermore specific diagnosed based studies provide complementary information. The report includes data from the latest study on infectious diseases in PDU (Origer & Removille, 2007) based on serological test results to assess current prevalence rates and apply vaccination schemes when medically indicated.
Injecting drug use continues to drive the expansion of the HIV epidemic in many countries around the world. In 2013, UNODC estimates that there are 14 million people who inject drugs worldwide, and of these, 1.6 million are living with HIV, representing a global prevalence of HIV of 11.5% among people who inject drugs.

Data on drug-related infectious diseases are centralised at national level. No regional data sets exist. Official data from the national Retrovirology Laboratory of the CRP-Santé provide the number and proportion of IDU in HIV infected patients. Between 1984 and 2012, 1,168 HIV infected persons have been registered at the national level; 133 of the former were reported IDU, which leads to an average proportion of IDU in the national HIV population of 11.39% since the registration of the first HIV case in Luxembourg in 1984.

Currently intravenous drug use appears to be the third most reported transmission mode of new HIV infection since 1989 (homo/bisexual and heterosexual transmission are currently in first and second position respectively). The proportion of intravenous drug use transmission has noticeably decreased between 1998 (23%) and 2012 (9.88%). The lowest proportion of IDU transmission mode ever recorded was observed in 2011.

**Fig. 6.1 Proportion (%) of IVDU in newly infected HIV patients (1985 - 2012)**

[Graph showing the proportion of IVDU in newly infected HIV patients from 1985 to 2012, with a decrease from 30.4% in 1985 to 9.88% in 2012.]

Source: Laboratoire de Retrovirologie – CRP-Santé. 2013 (data formatted by NFP)

The Origer and Removille study (2007) assessed the national HIV, HCV, HAV and HBV in the population of problematic users of illicitly acquired drugs prevalence via serological test results. Furthermore, the authors performed a cross sectional analysis of the relation between the studied infections and selected observable factors, to increase the national vaccination coverage and to refer infected persons towards appropriated medical treatment centres.

---

44 Downloadable at: http://www.relis.lu
### Table 6.1: Prevalence of hepatitis B surface antigens (HBsAg), antibodies to hepatitis B core antigen (anti-HBc), hepatitis C virus (anti-HCV), and HIV (anti-HIV 1 and 2) in PDU and ever-injectors according to national recruitment settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total number of respondents †</th>
<th>Anti-HBc and/or HBsAg* N‡, n (%; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Anti-HCV N, n (%; 95% CI)</th>
<th>Anti-HIV 1 and 2 N, n (%; 95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total sample</strong></td>
<td>362</td>
<td>310 (21.6; 17.1 to 26.2)</td>
<td>343 (71.4; 66.6 to 76.2)</td>
<td>272 (2.9; 0.9 to 4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ever injectors §</strong></td>
<td>310</td>
<td>239 (24.7; 19.6 to 29.8)</td>
<td>268 (81.3; 71.4 to 91.2)</td>
<td>202 (2.5; 0.2 to 4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outpatient drug treatment centres</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>147 (16.3; 10.3 to 22.3)</td>
<td>158 (58.2; 50.5 to 65.9)</td>
<td>158 (1.9; 0.0 to 4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inpatient drug treatment centres</strong></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>53 (15.1; 5.5 to 24.7)</td>
<td>61 (75.4; 64.6 to 86.2)</td>
<td>49 (0.0; 0.0 to 0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prisons</strong></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>110 (31.8; 23.1 to 40.5)</td>
<td>124 (86.3; 80.2 to 92.3)</td>
<td>65 (7.7; 1.2 to 14.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Two respondents with valid blood test serology were HBsAg positive only
† Number of respondents for whom valid blood test serology for at least one infection (HBV, HCV or HIV) was available
‡ Number of respondents for whom valid blood test serology for HBV was available
§ Respondents that have injected at least once in their lifetime a drug for non-therapeutic reasons


Concerning HAV prevalence, no case has been identified in the referred study. It should be stressed, however, that 43% of the participating PDU were not protected against hepatitis A.

Since 1996, the national drug monitoring system RELIS allows for breakdowns of HIV and AIDS data by IDU and treatment status. In 2012, (N=305) 81% of RELIS indexed PDU reported a HIV test during the last 12 months. The testing rates of female PDU were slightly lower than those of male PDU.

### Fig 6.2 Synopsis of national data on HIV infection rates in drug using populations (valid %)

Source: RELIS 2013 / Origer & Removille, 2007
Table 6.2: Synopsis of national data on HIV infection rates in drug using populations (valid %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIV rate in problem drug users (RELIS self-report)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV rate in problem drug users (serology-based) (Origer &amp; Removille, 2007)</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV rate in drug treatment demanders (DTR) (RELIS self-report)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV rate in current IDU (RELIS self-rep.)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV rate in current IDU treatment demanders (RELIS self-report)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV rate in life-time IDU (serology-based) (Origer &amp; Removille, 2007)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV rate in current IDU prisoners (Schlink, 1998)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RELIS 2013

Table 6.3: Synopsis of national data on AIDS rates in drug using populations (valid %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS rate in problem drug users (RELIS)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS rate in drug treatment demanders</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RELIS 2013

HIV rates in current PDU have been varying over the last ten years although in quite narrow margins figuring 3 to 5%. In 2010, however, based on self-reported data from RELIS, the HIV rate increased for all categories figuring 6 to 8%. In 2011 and 2012 however, HIV rates stabilised again around 3 to 5%.

From 2005 to 2010, the HCV infection rate decreased for all PDU and for drug treatment demanders, but the same rate shows variations for IDU. In 2012, HCV infection rates stabilise at high level for IDU and drug treatment demanders while HCV for all PDU decreases. AIDS rates in drug treatment demanders have also been decreasing during the last years.

Table 6.4: Synopsis of national data on HCV infection rates in drug using populations (valid %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported HCV rate in drug users (RELIS)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59.92</td>
<td>64.55</td>
<td>64.94</td>
<td>64.95</td>
<td>64.06</td>
<td>63.39</td>
<td>50.55</td>
<td>49.61</td>
<td>61.45</td>
<td>54.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCV rate in PDU (Origer &amp; Removille)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported HCV rate in drug treatment demanders</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60.49</td>
<td>66.16</td>
<td>66.22</td>
<td>63.23</td>
<td>63.08</td>
<td>61.11</td>
<td>53.79</td>
<td>50.47</td>
<td>62.31</td>
<td>60.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCV rate in IDU prisoners (saliva tests)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reported HCV rate in IDU (RELIS)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67.97</td>
<td>74.14</td>
<td>74.38</td>
<td>69.58</td>
<td>72.02</td>
<td>65.48</td>
<td>58.94</td>
<td>62.63</td>
<td>74.81</td>
<td>74.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCV rate in ever-injectors (Origer &amp; Removille)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCV rate in ever-injectors (RELIS)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RELIS 2013 (Origer & Removille 2007)
Summarily, HCV prevalence in PDU show fair variations. After a sensible decrease in 2009 and 2010, it has increased again in 2011. In 2012 however, a new decrease is observed.

The existing prevention efforts have to be completed putting particular emphasis on young and new drug users. Although the study confirms a low compliance of the target population, screening and vaccination facilities have to be further developed. In this context the authors put forward a series of approaches that may contribute to reduce incidence of infectious diseases and related risks in PDU (see Origer, Removille, 2007).

OTHER DRUG–RELATED HEALTH CORRELATES AND CONSEQUENCES

Psychiatric co-morbidity (Dual diagnosis)

To date any genuine study on co-morbidity patterns in PDU has been performed at the national level. Data presented in the present chapter have been provided by specialised drug agencies and the RELIS drug monitoring system and thus reflect experiences and trends as observed during recent years.

Most common mental disorders observed in clients seeking help in specialised drug agencies or in contact with other institutions are: anxiety, depression, neurosis, psychosis and borderline behaviour. Residential drug care settings estimate that 10% of their clients show psychotic symptoms. Furthermore, Post Traumatic Stress Disorders (PTSD) are most common and show great similarities with borderline behavioural aspects as for instance rapidly changing mood and auto-destructive tendencies.

According to annual data provided by the national drug monitoring system RELIS the following picture can be drawn:

Fig. 6.3: Previous contacts with psychiatric services of RELIS indexed drug users. 1998–2012

SOURCE: RELIS 2013
At the national level, most of detoxification treatments are provided by psychiatric departments of general hospitals.

Data from 1996 to 2011 reveal a fluctuating but a fairly stable long term proportion of PDU showing a psychiatric history, reaching however an historical minimum in 2012.

There seems to be no significant differences of psychiatric profiles in clients according to the type of institutional settings. Multiple drug use is observed in almost all DD patients.

DD patients are considered as drug treatment demanders with specific and highly diversified needs that are difficult to encounter in traditional drug care agencies. The concept of ‘multiple vulnerabilities’, that is, concomitant vulnerabilities to drug abuse and mental disorders, tends to be recognised by professionals. DD patients very often present a lack of behavioural structure or stability. Usually those patients are unable to function in a regulated environment. Moreover, the requirement of most therapeutic settings include that the patients submit to detoxification treatment prior to admission. This latter requirement is often impossible to meet with DD clients as drug intake often represents a kind of self-managed auto-medication, dangerous to change radically at the beginning of a therapeutic process. It is therefore most difficult to integrate DD patients in traditional drug care settings also in terms of consistency of rules to be respected by all drug treatment demanders. To date, no care facilities specialised in drug addiction co-morbidity exist at the national level. The Department of Medical Control of Social Security Administration, in collaboration with drug agencies, assesses whether a given patient should be referred to specialised institutions in foreign countries. Agreements between the latter administration and a series of specialised care agencies abroad have been made. If the referral demand is approved, related costs are reimbursed by Social Security.

As far as treatment of DD patients in prison is concerned, a collaboration convention between the national prison administration (CPL) and the national neuro-psychiatric hospital (CHNP) has been signed in 2002. The convention sets the framework for the creation of a psycho-medical department within prison and regulates prevention, care and referral of mentally disabled as well as alcohol and drug dependent inmates.
Therapeutic care, substitution treatment and counselling is provided ad hoc. In case of severe mental disorders, imprisoned patients are referred to a high security department within the CHNP. Compulsory treatment or confinement does only occur if there is a proved offence against the law by which the offender is declared irresponsible of his/her own behaviour. This only occurs following a legal psychiatric expertise.

In line with the recommendations of the previously referred to expert group ‘Therapeutic chain’ discussions held in the framework of the new drugs action plan 2010-2014 currently address the idea to create small supervised housing facilities where care is provided to DD patients on a case management basis.

**Somatic co-morbidity**

Health indicators retained by RELIS suggest a stabilisation of the general health state of indexed PDU except for HCV prevalence. In 2012, 80 (80) per cent of problem drug users reported a self-perceived satisfying general health condition against 53% in 1997. 64% (58%) report no non-fatal overdose(s) during lifetime which represents a small increase compared with the previous year.

**Pregnancies and children born to drug users**

See sub-chapter at-risk families in chapter 3.

**DRUG–RELATED DEATHS AND MORTALITY OF DRUG USERS**

**Direct overdoses and indirect drug-related deaths**

Methodological information and Drug-related Deaths (DRD) data collection and processing routines can be found in the introduction of the present chapter and in annex I under ‘Databases and information systems’.

As can be seen in figure 6.6 the DRD v.3.0 standard (selection B) appears to be fairly weak proxy of direct, indirect and total drug deaths as indexed nationally by the RSPJ. Overall drug-related mortality, however, should not be assessed by the same standard as far as Luxembourg is concerned. Cases not filtered by selection B mainly include combined X49 codes, followed by Y34 and T65.9 codes. A very high to perfect agreement is observed between the RSPJ register and selection D (DRD v.3.0).

The number of **fatal acute overdoses** indexed at the national level has shown an overall discontinuous decrease since the beginning of the 21st century. In 2000, 26 acute drug deaths were registered whereas 8 cases were reported in 2012. Indirect drug-related deaths have known broad variations in number during the same period (2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 data not available).
Confronted to most recent national prevalence figures on problem drug users referring to data of 2009 (N = 2,070), (Origer, 2012), overdose rate in PDU situates at 0.29 % cases / PDU (1.1 % in 2000). The overdose rate in the national general population figured 6.43 overdose deaths per 100,000 inhabitants in 2000. In 2012 overdose rates of 1.52 and 2.21 per 100,000 inhabitants and 100,000 inhabitants aged 15 to 64 years respectively have been observed. International comparison should be considered with caution since methodologies used to determining prevalence of DRD deaths are not necessary comparable throughout EU as shows for instance the structural underestimation of the number of acute drug death based on the EMCDDA DRD v.3 standard.

45 All age groups
The overall discontinuous decrease of acute overdose cases from 1994 onwards has been associated to the regionalisation and extension of the methadone substitution programme as well as to the further development of low threshold facilities. The decreasing trend from 2000 to 2002 is thought to be a medium term consequence of the higher proportion of non-i.v. opiate users observed during that same period followed by a stabilisation around 4.5 percent. The positive evolution of direct drug deaths is to be associated to the implementation of a drug consumption room in 2005. Considering that since the opening in 2005 of the drugs injection room almost 1,400 overdose victims could be assisted and reanimated in this same facility, the life-saving effectiveness of such an offer is proven.

A retrospective study (1992-2006) on drug-related death cases performed in 2007 allowed a better understanding of risk and protective factors (Origer, 2008). Forensic data by the department of National Toxicology Laboratory on Health show that the most frequently involved substance in overdose cases is heroin, followed by methadone and cocaine. To stress that since 2000, methadone presence in blood samples of overdose victims has been increasing.

75% of the victims are male and their mean age at the moment of death shows an increase over the past 20 years (in 1992: 28.4 years and in 2012: 37.75 years). Although the mean age of drug overdose victims has been increasing, the number of victims aged less than 20 years remains relatively unchanged during the referred observation period (no case in 2012).

Also worth mentioning is that a majority of acute drug death victims are known by law enforcement agencies (+/- 80%) for their drug user ‘career’. As far as the place of death is concerned, since 2004 approximately 50-65% occurred at the victims’ home, followed by public place.

**Fig. 6.7: Gender distribution of direct drug-related death cases (1992 - 2012), (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: RELIS 2013
Table 6.5: Age distribution of direct drug death cases indexed from 1992 to 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Age

- Male: 38.3
- Female: 32.8

| Source: RELIS 2013 |

In 2012, the mean age of male overdose victims showed an important increase compared to previous years. The youngest victim was aged 28 years and the oldest was 49 years. No underage victim was reported in 2012. Considering the nationality of overdose victims, the majority (75%) were natives. Recently, one could observe a rather stable number of victims from the frontier zone (BE, DE, F) and a decreasing number of victims of Portuguese origin. In 2012, no Portuguese citizen has been reported.

Fig. 6.8: Mean age of acute drug overdose victims (1992-2012)
Mortality and causes of deaths among drug users

The above mentioned study (Origer & Delluci, 2002)\(^{47}\), has revealed that, as far as the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg is concerned, the mere application of the DRD standard does not allow for a valid computation of drug-related death cases. Therefore, the authors did compute the total number of drug-related deaths by adding cases of the SR that were not indexed by the application of the DRD standard to the GMR. The figures resulting from corrected DRD v.3.0. data are referred to as 'national selection' and provide the annual total number of controlled drug-related fatalities at the national level (8 direct/acute death cases in 2012).

In 2000, a first cohort study on the mortality in the national drug population has been performed by the NFP in the framework of a multi-methods prevalence study (Origer & Pauly, 2000). The cohort included 242 opiate drug addicts followed from 1991 to 1999. Mortality data have been collected from treatment agencies, the RELIS database, the GMR and the Special Overdose Register of the SPJ. In accordance to applied methodologies, results show mortality rates varying between 2.36 and 2.51 per cent.

Since the implementation of ICD-10 coding by the GMR (1998), a vast majority of acute drug death cases have been recorded as ‘accidental poisoning’ \((\text{X40} - \text{X49})\), which is consistent with the national definition of an acute overdose death. To date over 60 % overdose cases have been indexed as follows: \text{X42.}-, \text{T40.}-, \text{T42.-}, \text{T43.-}. At a more restricted level the code sequence: \text{X42.}-, \text{T40.-} includes around 70% of all reported overdoses.

\(^{47}\) A full text version of the study can be downloaded under: http://www.relis.lu
7. RESPONSES TO HEALTH CORRELATES AND CONSEQUENCES

INTRODUCTION

Responses to health correlates and consequences of drug use aim at minimising the resulting damage for the drug users and their environment, and at increasing individual/collective resources. The concept of risk and harm reduction is directly linked to health consequences of drug use, whereas nuisance reduction is seen as a correlate of the latter.

Health care offers to drug users are provided by specialised drug care agencies as well as by the general health care system. Major efforts have been undertaken in recent years to improve data on drug treatment demands from general healthcare providers by including psychiatric departments of general hospitals in the RELIS data collection network and the pilot implementation of a national substitution treatment register. In addition to the national drug surveillance system RELIS, these new data sources and tools will allow to draw a more accurate picture of intervention outcomes.

In September 2011 a new national HIV/AIDS action plan (Ministry of Health, 2011) covering the period 2011 to 2015 has been launched by the Ministry of Health. The action plan is based on 8 pillars including prevention of infectious diseases and harm reduction in drug using populations. It builds upon the external evaluation results of the 2006-2010 national HIV/AIDS plan and complements or enhances infectious diseases' reduction measures included in the national drugs action plan 2010-2014. The document can be downloaded under http://www.ms.etat.lu.

Furthermore the Ministry of Health, jointly with competent field actors, is elaborating a national action plan on hepatitis, to be finalised in the course of 2014.

As far as availability of service is concerned, currently two agencies offer harm reduction services in the Centre, the South and the North of the country including offers such as day and night shelter and a supervised injection facility (currently only in Luxembourg City). The governmental programme 2010-2014 foresees the decentralisation of respective offers by implementing new integrated low threshold centres for drug addicts in the South of the country and by further developing harm reduction measures in the North. A second supervised drug consumption room should be opened in the South of the country by the beginning of 2015.

PREVENTION OF DRUG–RELATED EMERGENCIES AND REDUCTION OF DRUG–RELATED DEATHS

Research and recommendations

In the framework of the first national drugs action plan 1999-2004 foundations have been laid for a comprehensive nation-wide strategy for the reduction of health consequences of drug use. A specific study (Origer & Dellucci, 2002) has been addressing the issue of the reduction of drug-related mortality. The following recommendations have been retained:
- 1. Opening of supervised injection rooms according to the national drugs action plan.
- 2. Heroin assisted treatment (foreseen by the national drugs action plan).
- 3. First aid training courses provided to users and their relatives and partners.
- 4. Gender and ethnic specific interventions.
- 5. Creation of ‘transition centres’ for ex or current PDU leaving institutional settings.

More recently national research focused on fatal overdoses in the context of gender and socio-economic determinants (Origer et al., 2013).

**Drug injection room and low threshold shelters**

A **drug injection room** is defined as a facility allowing IDU who meet certain criteria to inject their own drugs in a medically supervised environment. Drug consumption (user) rooms meet the same definition; in terms of target population; they, however, give access to IDU and non IDU meeting the admission criteria.

The implementation of a first drug injection room in 2005 has to be seen as a part of a broader harm and nuisance reduction oriented strategy. The national drug action plan refers to the creation of low threshold emergency shelter facilities for drug addicts to be implemented regionally.

A low threshold emergency centre for drug addicts (ABRIGADO) was inaugurated in December 2003 and initially provided day care and night shelter. In July 2005, the first supervised injection room at national level has become operational and has been integrated in the ABRIGADO centre which from then on has been providing the whole range of harm reduction services, counselling facilities, accommodation, washing and laundering facilities. It should be added that the night accommodation is not to be seen as a permanent housing facility; there is a daily admission procedure. The target population for the consumption room are primarily IDU. The main objective of the project is the reduction of drug-related harm; nuisances’ reduction being a secondary objective. More precisely it aims at reducing the risks of overdoses, infectious diseases, public nuisance in the neighbourhood, facilitating contact making with difficult to reach addicts, provision of special designed night shelter facilities and avoiding unnecessary prison journeys overnight. The project was designed with the support of the Public Prosecutor’s Office and law enforcement agencies.

The national drugs coordinator’s office elaborated the operational concept of the injection room based on available international experience and evaluations. In terms of management, all involved parties meet regularly (called ‘the Monday round’) to assess the current situation and emerging problems related to the functioning of the consumption room. Incidents, nuisance reports, trends, quality assurance, workload, technical improvements and safety issues are addressed by the ‘Monday round’ in order to promote rapid solution finding and continuous adaptation to fast changing clients’ profile and consume patterns.

Table 7.1 provides an insight in clients’ and occupation statistics of the ABRIGADO services since their opening and for 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 respectively:

---

Table 7.1: Clients statistics of ABRIGADO centre services (2005-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of user contracts signed</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of users episodes</td>
<td>178,411</td>
<td>36,558</td>
<td>33,017</td>
<td>26,929</td>
<td>37,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of injections</td>
<td>208,581</td>
<td>43,871</td>
<td>39,960</td>
<td>31,588</td>
<td>40,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of non-fatal overdoses</td>
<td>1,386</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With loss of consciousness</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without loss of consciousness</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fatal overdoses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical emergency interventions</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of clients</td>
<td>406,267</td>
<td>77,333</td>
<td>65,307</td>
<td>62,925</td>
<td>55,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night shelter</td>
<td>December 2003 – December 2012</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of different residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In January 2012, Abrigado moved into new premises and since February 2012 a blowroom has been added to the existing offer. Currently the night shelter is open 7 days a week from 22:00 to 07:30 with a capacity of 42 beds. The ABRIGADO day centre, the injection room (7 injection tables) and the blowing room (5 tables) are open 6 days a week (3 days from 13:00 to 20:00 and 3 days from 08:00 to 15:00). ABRIGADO facilities are mostly used by men (82%); the most commonly used drugs were heroin (95%), cocaine (3%) or both of them (2%). Cocaine use has obviously decreased in 2011 and 2012. Age category 25-34 is mostly represented (44%).

No fatal overdose has occurred until the end of 2012 but almost 1,400 overdoses have been registered since the opening of the injection room and due to the immediate intervention of ad hoc staff all victims could be assisted, reanimated and their life saved. The drug scene of Luxembourg-City adheres to a great extent to the ABRIGADO concept with the positive effect that public nuisance has significantly decreased. The increasing number of users attracted by the ABRIGADO services posed, however, a problem of clients’ management. Therefore, a new centre was opened in the beginning of 2012. Its implementation site is the immediate vicinity of the previous centre. Architectural planning of the replacement structure has built upon past experience and a supervised drug inhalation facility (blowroom) was included in the existing offer. The concept of the drug injection room has been revised accordingly.

As most relevant drug scenes concentrate in the City of Luxembourg and in the main city in the South of the country, the governmental programme has foreseen the creation of an integrated low threshold offer (including a supervised injection room) also in the city of Esch-sur-Alzette. Its opening is scheduled for the beginning of 2015.

As far as the northern region of the country is concerned, a needs’ assessment, commissioned by the Ministry of Health, (JDH, 2011) clearly emphasised the need of a tailor made low-threshold offer in the region. However, the type of offer needed appears to differ from those currently existing in bigger cities such as Luxembourg and Esch/Alzette. The drug user population living in the northern region is not locally concentrated and non-intravenous use is reported to be far more prevalent than IDU. Large scale syringes exchange programmes are not a first priority and may even be counterproductive in a sense. This said, the
phenomena of stigmatisation, isolation and marginalisation of drug users is far more concerning. Also, the development of region wide outreach work in addition to community offers appears to be a promising strategy for the northern region. A new low threshold day centre will open its doors in Ettelbrück in December 2013.

**Heroin assisted treatment (HAT)**

The future implementation of a heroin assisted treatment programme, as foreseen by the national drugs action plan 2010-2014, should further contribute to reduce drug-related health damage. In 2008 a feasibility study and an operational framework concept (Origer, 2008), partly inspired by the Swiss guidelines on Heroin Assisted Treatment (Bundesamt für Gesundheit, 2006) has been submitted to the Minister of Health. The main conclusions of these reports can be found in the 2009 edition of the present report. It should be underlined that the HAT is not conceptualized as a low threshold measure. It is intended to be implemented in the broader framework of the national drug substitution treatment strategy with clearly defined medical and psycho-social components.

A drug scene survey was performed in 2008 (JDH, 2009) in order to investigate perceptions and opinions regarding the implementation of HAT. 174 drug users in contact with drug care institutions were interviewed. 85% of respondents consider HAT to be a useful complementary offer for the following reasons (in order of importance): reduction of criminality and petty crime, clean quality controlled heroin, reduction of drug-related mortality, social stabilisation and reduction of harm and health damage. 62% of interviewees declared themselves to be personally interested to enter HAT if available.

By the time of writing the general HAT concept was approved and agreement was reached with a specialised agency in terms of future management of the programmes. First resources have been allocated already in 2010 and study visits to several countries running HAT facilities have been undertaken. National experts have been fine-tuning the existing concept in order to operationalise this new treatment alternative. Also the necessary steps are currently being taken to determine the import, management, stocking and preparation procedures of diacetylmorphine. Currently the search of an appropriate location for the HAT programme is still going on.

**New specialised care structures foreseen in the framework of the 2010-14 action plan**

The new low threshold agencies in the South and the North of the country have been described above.

The lack of national detoxification capacities has become a growing problem in the drug care network in recent years. According to international standards the number of detoxification slots in general hospitals revealed to be sufficient, however, waiting lists of new treatment demanders became consistently longer partly due to long duration stays. To further improve peri-hospitalisation procedures, it is planned to set-up a so called diagnostic, referral and follow-up mechanism (DDOS). The main idea is to attribute a single (freely chosen by the treatment demander) reference person (social worker, etc.) to each treatment demander. This reference person organises jointly with the patient and care institutions treatment interventions, follows up progression and guarantees access to after-care offers. The reference person also represents a single contact person for involved care institutions. A small scale pilot phase involving a series of specialised actors has been launched in order to gather experience until the necessary resources will be allocated to implement a referent system nation-wide.

A mobile medical care unit, providing primary medical care to clients of all specialised low threshold agencies has been launched in 2012. Its objective is to increase access to medical care and further referral of hard to reach drug using population.
Prevention

Interventions aiming at the prevention of drug-related infectious diseases as for instance needle exchange and substitution programmes have been initiated and developed prior to the set-up of a specific legal framework. The drug law amendment of 2001 did not only allow maintaining and to further developing existing harm reduction offers but also set the foundation for the implementation of new services such as supervised drug injection rooms and medically assisted heroin distribution as foreseen by the national drugs action plan.

The objective of these interventions is straightforward, that is an optimised management of risk factors and mental/physical damage associated to drug use. Reduction of public nuisance is a secondary objective. Both IDU and non IDU are target groups of HR interventions. The planned inclusion of a drug inhalation facility in the new ABRIGADO centre is a sound example of the national approach. Furthermore infectious diseases prevention does not focus specifically on IDU as shows a recent action-research project on HIV and hepatitis infection among PDU (Origer A and Schmit JC, 2010).

The most relevant measure in the field of prevention of infectious diseases in drug users is the national needle exchange programme established in 1993 and co-ordinated by JDH. In addition to free of charge needle provision by specialised drug and AIDS agencies, automatic syringes dispensers/collectors have been placed in the most appropriate locations in five different cities of the Grand Duchy.

Regarding the quantity of distributed syringes, table 7.2 shows that the number of distributed syringes peaked in 2005 and has been significantly decreasing from 2006 onwards, although the return rate remained consistently high. From 2008 onwards quantities of syringes distributed through NEP have been increasing anew to decrease again from 2011 onwards. The number of re-collected used syringes exceeded in 2009 the number of distributed syringes via the national NEP, (vending machines excluded), which suggests that users also bring along syringes bought in pharmacies or originating from vending machines, which is considered to be a highly positive evolution. In 2010, 2011 and 2012, the number of collected syringes has been ranging between 90-97%.

According to RELIS data, one third of IDU procure their syringes primarily in pharmacies. This proportion has remained fairly stable over recent years and does not directly impact on trend figures from specialised needle exchange points.
Table 7.2: National needle exchange programme (NEP) 1996-2012 including specialised agencies, vending machines and supervised injection room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Distributed syringes</th>
<th>Collected used syringes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>76,259</td>
<td>28,646 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>109,743</td>
<td>58,886 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>189,413</td>
<td>112,625 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>254,596</td>
<td>211,621 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>435,078</td>
<td>376,491 (87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>332,347</td>
<td>282,909 (93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>259,607</td>
<td>249,400 (96%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td><strong>289,555</strong> of which 45,529 via injection room and 13,353 via vending machines</td>
<td>301,895 (104%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td><strong>308,350</strong> of which 44,830 via injection room and 8,109 via vending machines</td>
<td>297,400 (96.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td><strong>246,858</strong> of which 35,761 via injection room and 5,169 via vending machines</td>
<td>221,975 (90%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td><strong>211,439</strong> of which 29,362 via injection room and 1,336 via vending machines</td>
<td>201,510 (95%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: RELIS 2013

A syringe and needle exchange programme has started in the national prison (CPL) in August 2005. Demanding inmates are seen by medical staff and if indicated, an initial injection kit containing sterile injection paraphernalia is handed out. Sterile replacement syringes are delivered on presentation of the used ones and the initial kit. The program is placed under medical secret.

Table 7.3 Needle exchange programme (NEP) in prison (CPL) 2005-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Distributed injection kits</th>
<th>Distributed syringes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/2005 – 12/2006</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1,383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CPL 2013
Quality assurance and follow-up of new injection paraphernalia on the market is ensured by a special expert group chaired by the National Drugs Coordinator. SEPs agree on common standards within the referred expert group.

Moreover, outreach interventions targeted at (drug using) sex workers aiming at establishing contact and to prevent dissemination of infectious diseases have taken place. According to EMCDDA’s key indicators and with a view to improve quality of national data on infectious diseases, the NFP has performed an action-research with the objective to estimate HCV and HIV prevalence in PDU and IDU based on medical diagnosis data (blood testing) and to recommend the implementation of required health care measures. The development of new measures to reduce drug-related infectious diseases (e.g. rapid testing, DIMPS, inhalation rooms) largely built and still build upon the recommendations of the referred report published in September 2007 (Origer & Removille, 2007). The final report may be downloaded at http://www.relis.lu. Several related articles have been published in peer-reviewed journals since then.

**Counselling and testing**

The 2011-2015 HIV/AIDS action plan proposed the implementation of 2 new free testing sites in the North and the South of the country thus regionalising free testing opportunities. These new testing offers have been launch in 2013.

Under the previous national HIV/AIDS action plan 2006-2010 a mobile intervention facility for sexual health (DIMPS) has been set up. DIMPS, run by the HIV Berodung (RED CROSS), may be described as an outreach offer for specific target populations and vulnerable groups aiming to access difficult-to-reach populations and provide prevention counselling and infectious disease testing on site. The project, started in May 2009, provides free rapid testing of HIV, hepatitis and outreach counselling targeting among others drug users’ scenes, sex workers and asylum seekers.

Finally, it should be stressed that HAV, HBV, HCV and HIV testing and vaccination for HAV and HBV is proposed to each person entering prison by intra muros medical staff.

**Infectious diseases treatment**

The national service for infectious diseases, implemented within the CHL, provides specialised treatment in collaboration with the counselling staff of the HIV Berodung/Red Cross. In case the patient has no or no valid health insurance, treatment costs may be covered by state.

Since 2009 a specialised medical department for transmittable diseases (COMATEP) is operational within the CPL (prison).

**Interventions related to psychiatric co-morbidity**

The number of confirmed DD patients is estimated at 40-50 people (adults) nation-wide. These patients show explicit psychiatric disorders, are often socially disintegrated and need individual follow up although they tend not to be attracted by existing care offers. Furthermore, the staff of specialised associations must be specifically trained to take care of DD clients. Instead of creating a specialised and centralised care infrastructure, a better follow-up of patients within existing outpatient services is needed in the first place, knowing that the referred clients only integrate with difficulties in structures with compulsory residential character. The ‘Therapeutic Chain’ expert group has recommended in this context to fine-tune the concept of supervised / accompanied housing in order to move towards a case management approach in a private and individualised environment, knowing that DD patients often have difficulties to adapt to community oriented settings and offers.
RESPONSES TO OTHER HEALTH CORRELATES AMONG DRUG USERS

Somatic co-morbidity and general health related treatment

According to longitudinal RELIS data, the general state of health of drug users appears to have improved during the last decade, which could be partly due to the significant development of harm reduction and treatment referral offers.

The vast majority of specialised out- and inpatient and low threshold drug care facilities include medical or paramedical care in their service provision. If needed, patients are referred to specialised treatment. Related costs are covered by health insurance schemes or by the Ministry of Health in case the patient has no valid insurance.

In the framework of the new drugs action plan 2010–2014, a mobile medical service providing free and on site medical care to drug users independently of the institutional setting they are in (except hospitals) has been implemented.

Non-fatal drug-related emergencies

No specific data on drug-related emergencies are currently available at the national level. Figure 7.1 refers to RELIS data on previous non-fatal and medically assisted drug overdose self-reported by PDU. The proportion of indexed drug users reporting at least one overdose (as defined) appears to be decreasing 2008 onwards. These figures have to be seen in the light of the significant number of overdose incidents that have occurred in the national supervised drug injection room without fatal consequences, due to immediate assistance (more than 1,400).

Fig. 7.1: Non fatal, medically assisted drug overdoses in RELIS respondents (2004-2012) (valid %)

Source: RELIS 2013
Prevention and reduction of driving accidents related to drug use

The law of 18 September 2007 modifies the national traffic code and introduces testing of illicit drug use in vehicle drivers. The homologation of respective road side tests has been regulated by a grand-ducal decree of November 18, 2011. For more details on the new legislation please refer to chapter 1 (laws).

Interventions concerning pregnancies and children born to drug users

In the context of the development of social paediatrics at national level, child care professionals and paediatricians call for the implementation of specialised care structures for children at risk. The approach of social paediatrics considers a child in his global context including physical, psychological, social and cultural health, family and environmental context and promotes coordination and collaboration between different social and medical services.

Due to the improvement of, and the better access to drug-related treatment and especially the spread of substitution treatment, the birth rate in drug users has increased over recent years. According to data from the national drug surveillance system, the proportion of drug users having children has progressively increased over the last 10 years (RELIS 2012). This evolution has been leading to the first parental project launched by JDH in 2003 with the aim to provide psycho-social aid to drug-dependant parents and their children. The primary objective of the project is to ensure security and well-being to children and to strengthen parents’ educative abilities. This long term project is based upon contractual commitments, co-intervention, home visits and functions in close collaboration with involved services. An essential part of the project constitutes the outreach work. Meetings and interviews are held within the natural environment of the family (at home).
8. SOCIAL CORRELATES AND SOCIAL REINTEGRATION

INTRODUCTION

Social correlates of drug use typically involve Justice, Health and Educational competences. The Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Family and of Integration both intervene by financing measures to reduce social consequences ranging from early detection of drug use to social-professional rehabilitation interventions. The reduction of drug-related crime involves the Ministry of Justice, focuses on supply reduction activities and the Ministry of Health implements measures targeting socio-professional re-integration aiming at reducing daily expenses and depths of drug addicts and thus the prevalence of acquisition crimes.

SOCIAL EXCLUSION AND DRUG USE

Social exclusion among drug users

The question whether substance abuse leads to social degradation and exclusion or social factors (e.g. family situation, poverty, low education or job perspectives) lead individuals to substance use is an unsolvable one, although it tends to raise competence issues between ministries. Obviously a vast majority of homeless and socially excluded people also present to various extends licit and/or illicit substance abuse. Also, economic parameters tend to have a tangible impact on drug use prevalence and patterns as well as on the level of acceptance and perception of drug addicts by the general population.

A sound example of how social rejection and drug abuse are dynamically linked might be seen in the national results of the 4th wave of the European Values Study 49. 55% of national respondents (N: 1,610) described drug addicts as most unwanted neighbours. In 1999 drug addicts still occupied the second position (43%).

Also, providing medical and psychological care to drug dependent persons is not enough as the social situation of these people needs to be improved before sustained outputs in drug treatment is expectable. This said, the national strategy of care for socially excluded people is based on the principle of progressive reintegration through capacity building and the improvement of the social abilities and environment. Associations as ‘Stëmm vun der Strooss’ (Street voice) and Quai 57, financed by the Ministry of Health, try to involve the target population again in active life by providing a safe and common environment and respecting individual capacities and resources by applying case management methodologies further described below.

Drug use among socially excluded groups

Homelessness

According to latest estimations around 700 persons are currently homeless in the Grand Duchy of

The study reported a proportion of 54% males and 46% females and a relatively young age of homeless population. Half of the population of homeless people is aged 18 to 34 years and only 9% are aged more than 55 years.

More specifically, housing status of registered drug users has markedly improved during recent years and tends to stabilise over the last years. Since 1995, the proportion of persons disposing of a stable accommodation has more than doubled. Currently 70 percent of PDU report a stable housing situation (RELIS 2013). This positive evolution may be linked to an increased awareness of the housing problem and the set-up of new housing networks for socially deprived people by the Ministry of Health and specialised agencies. Recent figures also tend to confirm that although specialised accommodation offers have been further developed, the current economic situation has created an even higher demand for this type of housing.

![Fig. 8.1 Last known housing situation of problem drug users. (1995-2012)](chart)

Youngsters aged less than 25 and living in the street are referred to as a quite new phenomenon. Societal changes as the increase of mono parental families, an increased number of divorces, increasing youth jobless rates and the necessity to work for economic reasons for the two partners of a parental couple are likely to have a negative impact on youngsters' psychological development, education and perspectives.

**Unemployment**

The unemployment rate (63%) shows a weak decrease for 2011 and 2012. However, an in-depth analysis shows that the proportion of active respondents reporting a stable job situation (e.g. long term contract) (16%) has sensibly decreased over the 4 last years, which might be partly due to the ongoing economic crisis.
Data on revenues confirm observed trends in occupational status:

- decrease of social dependence associated to a stable financial autonomy. The Guaranteed Minimum Income constitutes the primary source of revenue of PDU.

- illegal activities as main revenue have witnessed an ongoing downward trend since 1995, although they have gained in importance in 2009, 2011, and 2012.
**School drop out**

The study of *School leave in Luxembourg*51 (2006) surveyed a population of 37,347 secondary school students during 1st November 2004 and 30 April 2006. A total of 2,422 students left school without a professional certification (temporary stay offs from school have also been taken into consideration). The study refers to a proportion of 6.5% of ‘school leavers’. This proportion figures 3.6% if one is considering the total number of students having been reached but did not reintegrated a school in Luxembourg. Concerning this category of school leavers, composed of students attending courses abroad, being employed, following professional insertion measures and those without occupation (N=1,357), the situation was as follows: 41.2% of students who dropped school have integrated the job market (work or professional insertion measure), 39.8% didn’t work nor went to school and 19% attended school courses abroad. In general, boys, youngsters from abroad and aged more than 15 years (age of school obligation in 2006) are more vulnerable to the risk of early school leave.

![Fig. 8.4 Educational level of RELIS respondents (2012)](image)

Source: RELIS 2013

Regarding PDU, the **educational level** of the latter, low and mostly incomplete, has been showing a creeping deterioration since 1999 according to baseline data from RELIS. However, an increasing proportion of respondents start secondary school without bringing their studies to term. The average age at the end of studies shows a global decreasing tendency and currently situates at 17.6 years. Lower levels are particularly observed as regards acquired secondary and high school diploma.

**Financial problems**

The RMG (Guaranteed Minimum Income) (24%) and the proper salary (23%) represent the main income sources of PDU. Between 1997 and 2012, strong variations have been observed in relation with these two revenues. RMG as a primary source of revenue has known a remarkable increase from 1997 onwards, however a decrease is observed in 2012, in contrast to the proper salary, which decreased during the last years has increased in 2011 and 2012. Money provided by parents as first source of income has also decreased (18% in 1997 to 5% in 2012).

Concerning secondary income sources, 50% referred to ‘illegal activities’52 and 15% were provided money by parents.

As for 2011, the degree of social dependence shows a decreasing tendency (58.4% in 2012 – 64.6% in 2011 – 42% in 1995) which correlates with an inverse trend as far as financial autonomy is concerned.

---

51 Ministère de l’Éducation nationale et de la Formation professionnelle (2006). Le décrochage scolaire au Luxembourg. Luxembourg
52 Mainly selling of drugs
SOCIAL REINTEGRATION

Housing

Social reintegration measures, and in particular improvement and diversification of housing offers for drug addicts, have been one of the priorities of the 2000-2004 national drugs action plan. The 2005-2009 drugs action plan has foreseen the expansion of existing projects and the implementation of new decentralised reintegration measures based on the previously described principle of progressive reintegration through capacity building and the improvement of the social abilities and environment.

In the framework of the 2000-2004 action plan, the Ministry of Health, jointly with the City of Luxembourg opened a night shelter (called ‘Nuetseil’) for drug addicts in December 2003 which has evolved in an integrated low threshold care centre for drug addicts (ABRIGADO) including day and night shelter offers, accommodation and a supervised drug injection facility.

A project called ‘Les Niches’ functions as a social real estate agency for drug addicts. Approximately 35 flats and apartments are rented by a drug-counselling centre and provided to drug addicts in need by means of tailor made renting contracts. One of the medium term aims of the project is to allow demanding drug addicts to take over the renting contract on basis of their own financial means and thus dispose autonomously of a stable accommodation. The project is jointly financed by the Ministry of Health, National Fund against certain Forms of Criminality, and the City of Luxembourg (VDL). The vast majority of real estates are rented by the JDH from private proprietors; the remaining ones belong to the national housing Fund (Fonds de logement) or to municipalities.

A network of supervised housing facilities for specific target groups as for instance pregnant women, drug addicted couples, treatment demanders on methadone are operational since September 2002 and are situated in the vicinity of the main centre in order to take advantage of training and social reintegration facilities offered by the CTM. The CTM also offers educational aid in several domains as well as professional training opportunities. 25 persons benefit from the referred offer that builds upon apartments and houses situated in 6 different municipalities.

In both programmes, apartments are subcontracted by the JDH foundation or CTM to clients and the former are liable to the actual proprietors. This avoids immediate conflict situations in case a client has transitional problems to pay the monthly rent. Rents are also typically lower than general real estate market prices. In the framework of these programmes, beneficiaries are also offered the possibility of financial management and follow-up in case of debts for instance. In the medium and long term, residents may be able to sign a proper rental contract or move to an autonomous housing. The supervised housing projects have allowed thus far to stabilise most of beneficiaries, to avoid relapse and to create the necessary conditions for a socio-professional (re-)integration.

Education, training

Aiming professional reintegration, a series of residential drug care centres offer oral and written language courses in order to provide clients with basic language skills (if necessary) or to improve their writing skills.

‘D’Sëmm vun der Strooss’ association (‘Street voice’ association) primarily takes care of homeless people providing them with low threshold facilities and offering social and professional reintegration activities such as literacy courses (provided by volunteers) and workshops (in journalism and radio broadcasting) held by
professionals. ‘The voice’ (‘d’Stëmm’) monthly broadcasts a one and a half-hour programme on a local radio. Providing clients with the opportunity to widen their knowledge and introducing them to different or less common professions has led to a fair success in terms of interest of participants and retention rates.

**Employment**

Another reintegration project run by the referred association is the therapeutic writing board, where homeless people are given the opportunity to editing, printing, publishing and distributing an in house magazine. This activity is supervised by professionals (one educator and one pedagogue). Addressing social matters is supposed to help clients to regain a sense of responsibility and to increase the level of acceptability in the general public (therapeutic aim). Another aim is sensitizing a wider public and helping homeless people familiarize with new technologies. PDU constitute a significant fraction of their clients.

Additionally clients are offered task and job opportunities in the laundry service called ‘Schweessdrëps’ (Drop of sweat) which covers the south of the country and is specialised in washing sports teams’ uniforms. For the last years, 2 social workers, 3 educators and 30 clients have been working on average for 275 sports teams. Besides these two main work-opportunities, the service also offers a therapeutic workshop called ‘Dressed for success’. The service has been managed by 2 clients (offering them a job opportunity and responsibility). Their main task was to organise (collect, wash, store, etc.) clothes offered by donors.

A new occupational project foreseen for 2014 and run by the ‘Street voice’ (‘Stëmm vun der Strooss’) association should further close the gap in occupational offers for drug addicts at the national level. The residential centre will be offering temporary accommodation and day jobs for homeless and dependant people in a rural setting.

Co-financed by the Ministry of Labour and Employment and the European Social Fund, ARCUS association launched the project ‘START’ in 2007, targeting progressive re-integration of drug users into the first job market (G. Lambrette, 2009). The applied methodology combined case oriented follow-up and job coaching and aimed at helping beneficiaries to find a work or professional training place (e.g. establishing contact with companies, preparing job interviews, editing of resumes, etc.) and to assist them in their daily work routine (definition of tasks, conflict management, mediation between employee and employer, motivational follow-up, etc.). Intermediate feedback and final evaluation contributed to improve autonomy of clients and are ideally leading to a permanent work contract. As one of the main impediments regarding access to jobs by vulnerable groups, is the initially or even permanently reduced work performances. The main objective of a job coaching project is the mobilisation of individual resources and capacities of the beneficiary in tune with the need of the company he or she is given the opportunity to work for.

A similar project called “Process – Towards a socio-professional reinsertion for marginalised persons” also co-financed by the Ministry of Labour and Employment and the European Social Fund, was running for the period 2009-2010.

**The referent system**

The 2010-2014 national drug action plan foresees the creation of a national ‘referent system’ for drug addicted persons in need of care. The rationale of this project is straightforward and stems from the observation that drug-related care and rehabilitation offers are diverse and a given person enters in contact with several national and transborder care providers and law enforcement authorities in the course of their treatment and (re-)integration history. Often the link between these different stages and institutions could

---

53 LAMBRETTE, G. (2009), Projet "START!" – Constats et réflexions autour d’un projet de réinsertion professionnelle pour personnes toxicomanes au Grand-Duché de Luxembourg, Luxembourg.
be improved if a designated referent could follow-up patients individually and centralise information on the patient and his/her treatment history. Sound examples of the utility of this system are the preparation of release from prison (e.g. continuation of substitution treatment or housing finding), referral to a national care provider for patients in residential treatment abroad or preparation of admission to therapy following a detoxification treatment in hospital. Provided the necessary financial means are made available, the referent system should be operational by 2014.
9. DRUG–RELATED CRIME, PREVENTION OF DRUG–RELATED CRIME AND PRISON

INTRODUCTION

The main source of Information of this part of the report is the Judicial Police Service (SPJ) in Luxembourg.

Due to obvious disparities at the European level in terms of concept definitions in the field of law enforcement data, the respective national terminology should be clarified:

- ‘Interpellation’ (Eng. Interpellation/peremptory questioning, to call on):
  Intervention of law enforcement agents based on reasonable suspicion. The ‘interpellated’ person is heard and a police record occurs. At this level, however, there is no notification to the Public Prosecutor and no mention in the judicial record.

- The term ‘prévenus’ (interpellated/indicted person):
  Refers to persons who have been apprehended by legal enforcement agents for alleged offences against the national drug law (or against law in general).

- ‘Arrestation’ (Eng. Arrest) :
  Interpellation followed by a deprivation of liberty and notification to the attorney at law. The preliminary examination (instruction) refers to the subsequent judicial procedure that leads to public audience, which claims the sentence.

- ‘Condamnation’ (Eng. Conviction) :
  Judgement by which the accused person is found guilty.

- ‘Détention’ (Eng. Imprisonment) :
  Deprivation of liberty. Distinction is made between protective custody (prior to the judgement) and regular detention (following conviction).

DRUG–RELATED CRIME

The NFP collects and re-formats nation-wide data on drug-related offences provided by the SPJ. A staff member of the NFP actively collaborates with the SPJ team in order to adapt law enforcement data to standards required for the editing of the national report on drugs and the EMCDDA annual report.

Drug law offences

As can be seen in tables 9.1, the total number of arrests (169) has increased discontinuously during the last 10 years. Traditionally heroin was the most frequent substance involved in drug-related arrests. In 2004, cocaine has turned to be the main substance involved in those arrests (confirmed by 2005 data), followed by heroin and cannabis.
## Table 9.1 Arrests broken down by type of reporting institution (1995-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>S.P.J.</th>
<th>Gendarmerie</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Customs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of police records for presumed offences against the modified 1973 drug law (code: DELIT-STUP), stable between 1996 and 1998, showed an important increase from 1998 to 2003 (825 to 1,660) and has been stabilising since then. In 2009 and 2010, however, the number of referred police records increased anew (2010: 2,546 records). Since 2011 a decreasing trend has been observed (2012: 1,802).

From 2003 to 2008 (1,487), one observes a significant decrease in drug law offenders, but obviously a new increase in 2009 (1,963) and 2010 (2,530). In 2011 and 2012 a decrease is observed as regards the number of drug law offenders (1,782) as well as for the number of arrests (169).

Table 9.2 records the total number of law enforcement interventions and number of ‘prévenus’ at the national level ensured by respective law enforcement actors that are the Specialised Drug Department of the Judicial Police (SPJ), Police and Board of Customs from 1995 to 2012.

## Table 9.2: Number of national law enforcement interventions (1995-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>S.P.J.</th>
<th>Gendarmerie</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Customs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>1,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>2,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>2,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


55 The original report can be downloaded from: http://www.gouvernement.lu/publications/informations_gouvernementales/rapports_activite/index.html
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.P.J.</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendarmerie</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,753</td>
<td>1,007</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>1,632</td>
<td>1,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>1,782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Specialised Drug Department of the Judicial Police 2013

The population of drug law offenders is composed of 90% males, a proportion that has been varying between 79% and 89% during the past decade. Since 1997, non-natives (52% in 2012) have been representing the majority of drug law offenders (52-68%). Also the percentage of minors (< 18 years) among drug law offenders has been increasing between 2010 (4.9%) and 2012 (8.1%). Heroin and cocaine are the main drugs involved in first drug offences.

Table 9.3: Socio demographic data on drug law offenders (‘prévenus’) (1990-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,939</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>2,034</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>1,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>1,658</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>1,484</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>2,144</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender unknown</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Specialised Drug Department of the Judicial Police 2013
Table 9.4: Distribution of drug law offenders (‘prévenus’) according to first offence and underage status (1992-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First offenders</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders underage</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (‘Prévenus’)</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>1,174</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>2,218</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>2,034</td>
<td>1,575</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>2,530</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Specialised Drug Department of the Judicial Police (Data formatted by NFP) 2013

Table 9.5 Distribution of first drug law offenders (use and use/traffic) according to substance involved ad minima (1992-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High risk substance involved ad minima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphetamines</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type ‘Ecstasy’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illicitly acquired medicaments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution substances</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (substances HRC)</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Specialised Drug Department of the Judicial Police (Data formatted by NFP) 2013

Other drug-related crime

The routine data protocol of the national drug monitoring system (RELIS) includes a series of drug-related offences’ items: The following results summarise the situation observed in 2012:

- 83% of drug users indexed\(^58\) by specialised health care institutions have already been in conflict with law enforcement agencies during lifetime.
- 60% of the total PDU population show multiple law enforcement contacts (decrease).
- The proportion of ‘interpellations’ for other reasons than presumed offences against the drug law (e.g. petty crime such as criminality linked to drug supply or fights) has been decreasing since 1997 (38%) and has been fairly stable in recent years, except for 2010, where data on ‘interpellations’ for other reasons reported an important increase (2006: 34%, 2009: 35%, 2010: 65%, 2011: 36% and 2012: 28%).
- 70% (73%) of indexed PDU have already served at least one prison sentence during lifetime. The proportion of PDU having served more than one prison sentence at the time of reporting (45% slight increase) has been increasing since 2009.

\(^58\) Persons who have been indexed by the RELIS network during a reporting year.
Prevention of Drug-related Crime

In recent years, involvement of major cities in the management of drug-related problems and nuisances has developed. So-called municipal ‘prevention committees’ that include local authorities, police forces and specialised NGOs are in place. The setup of the first national drug injection room in Luxembourg City obviously enhanced the involvement of municipal authorities. The Ministry of Health created a management group that is mandated to follow up developments with regard to the injection room and to react precociously to emerging problems. The national action plan clearly emphasises the importance of a visible involvement of major cities in the management of public safety and order, urban nuisance and hygiene problems related to drugs to guarantee the necessary decentralisation of DR offers and SR interventions.

As far as preventive measures targeting youngsters are concerned, a mechanism has been put in place in 1996 aiming at underage and juvenile drug use offenders and in order to prevent recidivism. The Service Thérapeutique Solidarité Jeunes (Solidarité Jeunes asbl), is financed by the Ministry of Health and intervenes in case a minor of age has been running in conflict with law enforcement forces with respect to a drug-related offence. In this respect the Youth Solidarity team may be considered as a crisis situation manager, offering their services to drug offenders referred by judicial and penal institutions. The available services are free of charge.

The intervention team, in direct collaboration with Youth magistrates and competent law enforcement actors, offers a large variety of services with the primary aim to prevent minor aged drug offenders to enter in the criminal justice system. Interventions are based on a holistic approach of the problem, including the involved person him/herself and his/her family. Youth Solidarity directly reports on intervention progress to the demanding authority. Client statistics show an increasing demand for this kind of intervention from both the criminal justice system and the social oriented institutions.

Table 9.6: Clients core statistics STSJ 2000 – 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of episodes</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral from the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main substance involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XTC/Cocaine</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal drugs</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polydrug</td>
<td>d.m.</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Service Thérapeutique Solidarité Jeunes (Solidarité-Jeunes asbl). 2013
INTERVENTIONS IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Alternatives to prison

The Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg counts two state prisons at the national level; the CPL situated in the vicinity of Luxembourg City and the CPG implemented in the East of the country.

The CPG, may be considered as an alternative to a strict penitentiary regime as it is defined as a semi-open prison established in a fairly rural setting. During daytime, inmates follow a professional activity or participate in one of the centre’s workshops (agriculture, animal breeding, kitchen, horticulture, woodwork, locksmith’s and duties). After work they return to their individual cells for the night. Every block has its own living room, kitchen, bathroom and laundry allowing inmates to live in more or less autonomy.

Part of inmates participates in the ‘DEFF’ programme (see below under ‘Reintegration of drug users after release from prison’) working outside for a minimum loan (RMG - Guaranteed Minimum Income). Others live under a semi-liberty regime (they live at CPG but have an individual and external work contract).

The ‘injonction thérapeutique’ is another alternative to prison (only possible in case of offences for personal possession or use of illicit substances): the offender is proposed to undergo treatment instead of a prison sentence. In other cases, community services (‘TIG: travaux d’intérêts généraux’) may also be an alternative (depending on the gravity of the offence and the sentence). The sentence may be suspended if the ‘prévenu’ agrees to undergo treatment (‘sursis probatoire’). This said, these two alternatives are applicable in case of drug possession or use only (not for cases of production, dealing or trafficking of illicit substances), as in the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg a drug addict is not considered a criminal but a person in need of psycho-social and medical help.

A further, still experimental, alternative to prison available in Luxembourg is the electronic tag. In November 2006, the Minister of Justice presented the introduction of the electronic tag as an alternative to incarceration.

In an experimental phase, this system was exclusively meant for prisoners:
- whose sentence was less than one year,
- who did not represent a danger,
- socially integrated and residing in Luxembourg,
- who were working or undergoing training.

DRUG USE AND PROBLEM DRUG USE IN PRISONS

In 1998, the Ministry of Justice commissioned the medical department of the state prison (CPL) to perform an epidemiological study on HIV and HCV prevalence in prison population (Schlink, 1999). The research protocol relied on a self-administrated anonymous questionnaire on health behaviour and injecting drug use prior and during prison sentence.
MAIN RESULTS:

Drug use in prison
- 32% of prisoners qualified themselves as injecting drug users;
- 28% reported current drug injection in prison;
- 9% have been initiated to injecting drug use in prison;

Risk behaviour
- 58% of current IDU prisoners report life-time needle sharing in prison;
- 8% of current IDU prisoners report last month needle sharing in prison;
- 70% of IDU prisoners only use water to clean up syringes, 22% do not clean syringes at all;
- 90% of prisoners reporting sexual intercourse in prison did not use condoms.

Miscellaneous
- IDU have served more prison sentences than non-drug users (control group);
- IDU showed lower average age than non-drug users;
- a majority of imprisoned IDU were natives

Source: Schlink, 1999

The more recent study ‘Prevalence of viral hepatitis A, B and C and HIV in problematic drug users of illicitly acquired drugs’ (Origer & Removille, 2007), also addressed drug use and drug-related harm in prison settings. Referred to the total study sample (N:246), 56.1% of respondents who have had prison experience during the past ten years reported illicit drug use in prison; 30.5% reported intravenous drug use. 26.7% of lifetime IDU inmates reported needle sharing in prison which is sensibly lower than the rate observed in 1998 by Schlink (1999). Among all settings (inpatient, outpatient treatment, low threshold, etc.) prevalence rates of HIV, HBV and HCV were highest in persons recruited in prison settings.

RESPONSES TO DRUG–RELATED HEALTH ISSUES IN PRISONS

Table 9.7 provides the number of general admissions and the number of admissions according to drug-related convictions (DELIT ‘STUP’) in both national prisons from 1989 to 2012.

Table 9.7: General and DELIT ‘STUP’ admissions in both national prisons (1989 – 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New entries (Total)</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>1,078</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New “STUP” entries</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CPL, CPG. 2013
Drug treatment in prison

Following the law of 27 July 1997 concerning the modification of the penitentiary organisation, a pilot project named ‘Global Drug Care Programme in Prison’ (2000-2005 - TOX project) was set up by a group of experts assigned by the Ministry of Justice in 1999. The concept was designed to implement, among other objectives primary prevention measures in regard to drug consumption and infectious diseases. The overall aim of the project was to integrate drug dependent inmates into a medico-psycho-social drug care network in order to reduce recidivism, risks and criminality after release from prison. The implementation of the project had to be adapted to the two different prison settings. Joint financing by the Ministry of Justice, the National Fund against Drug Trafficking (currently the National Fund against certain Forms of Criminality) and the EU (regarding evaluation) was ensured.

The TOX programme (previously TOX project) takes care of the drug dependent inmates in the two state prisons of Schrassig (CPL) and Givenich (CPG). This service is run by a multidisciplinary staff. The basic principles of the TOX programme in the CPG are the voluntary participation, the cooperation, the transparency, the quality of service, the determination of realisable objectives and the empowerment of participants. Additionally, the programme TOX also prepares inmates to enter a second treatment option available in prison: a “drug-free” programme called “Charly”. The programme provides a “drug-free” zone, where inmates can serve their sentence, or part of it, under certain conditions. Staying drug free and accepting to participate in psychosocial interventions are part of the admissions criteria.

A special programme targeting exclusively women exists and becomes operational when a minimum number of women enrol. Otherwise, individual offers are available for the female population.

Detoxification treatment is either provided in-house under the responsibility of the prison medical unit, or by external detoxification units of general hospitals according to strict rules and procedures. CPL has signed a convention with a major general hospital situated in Luxembourg City ensuring out-of-prison medical care if required.

Psychosocial and therapeutic care is provided by both, in-house staff members and specialised external agents from accredited drug agencies. An example of good practice in this respect is the inclusion of clearly time on content defined service providing of external specialised drug agencies contractually foreseen by state conventions (in the framework of the global drug care programme). This mechanism also applies to external agents in the field of HIV and other infectious diseases. One should also stress the role of the Central Probation Service (SCAS), which motivates inmates to undergo treatment and enables contacts with external therapeutic agencies. Although the psychosocial care strategy is similar in both national prisons, the CPG currently disposes of a more structured intervention programme.

Substitution treatment is also provided in prison but not by the services mentioned above. The nursery and MDs are in charge of methadone prescription within prison. More detailed figures on this type of treatment can be found in respective sections. Three scenarios may occur:

59 The law of 27 July 1997 concerning the modification of the penitentiary organisation regulates the creation of specialised medical units for drug addicts and psychiatric patients within prison.
- most frequently encountered situation applies to new prisoners who underwent substitution treatment prior to their current incarceration. Medical prison staff inquires the accuracy of the information provided by involved inmates by contacting the prescribing GP or the national substitution programme. In case of confirmation, substitution treatment is continued and may be followed by maintenance, dose reduction or detoxification treatment,
- increasingly substitution treatment is initiated within prison. It also includes inmates who have started opiates use in prison,
- opiate using or already substituted prisoners may introduce an admission demand to the national substitution programme 6 weeks before release. Continuity of care and re-socialisation measures are ensured by the intervention of social workers from external field agencies (substitution, HIV, hepatitis, etc.).

The main substitution opiates prescribed in prison are methadone (MEPHENON®), and to a lesser extend buprenorphine (SUBUTEX®) and codeine. Prescription of benzodiazepines is widespread.

Official figures show that 22% of the inmates (of full age) who entered CPL in 2012 received drug substitution treatment, representing a total of 247 persons.

### Table 9.8: Number of prisoners receiving opioid substitution treatment (2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Methadone</th>
<th>Subutex *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>176</td>
<td>25 (SUBUTEX + METHADONE) / 46 (SUBUTEX only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (persons)</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Comité de Surveillance SIDA: Activity report 2013

The average dose of distributed methadone was 22 mg per day (minimal dose 1mg and maximal dose 100mg). The average period of treatment was 135 days.

Of clients in treatment units in prison, 95% (93%) are male against 5% (7%) of females. The mean age of treatment demanders is 32.28 (31 years and 3 months), whereas the average male age is 32.43 (31Y5M) and the mean age of the female clients is consistently lower (2012: 29Y6M, 2011: 29Y). Respectively 31% (31%) of clients in treatment are natives against 69% (69%) of non-natives. The population of non-natives consists for the vast majority of Portuguese nationals, followed by French citizens.

Regarding educational level of the clients in treatment, 76% (78%) have completed primary school, 22% (17%) have completed secondary school. 29% (30%) of clients in treatment units in prison experienced one or more overdoses. As far as the sharing of used syringes is concerned, 47% (44%) reported that they never shared syringes during their lifetime (87% during the last month, 2011: 71%).

### Prevention and reduction of drug-related harm

In 2012, the activities of the previously referred to TOX-programme in prison were centred on three pillars:

- **psychosocial prevention**: psychosocial care of drug-addicted inmates, in order to prepare their future after release from prison and to reduce risks of relapse and recidivism – intensive programme without drugs to prepare post-release ambulatory therapy and/or individual preparation for release.
- **prevention of the STDs**: this health service is proposed in individual and collective settings.
- **coordination of interventions**: the drug-addicted platform was created in order to coordinate interventions of involved professionals.
The TOX programme in the CPG has established psycho-educational activities. The group has focused on two axes:
- **Health development** and
- **Specific psycho-educational practice** for the drug-addicted inmates within a collective pavilion without drugs (specific entourage of at least 4 months with an optional prolongation).
- follow-up of the drug free section together with the “Program Charly” started in May 2007, as preparation for multidisciplinary and intensive therapy.

As far as the CPL is concerned, in 2012, 107 demanders were provided with an individual psychosocial follow-up (901 counselling sessions). 333 clients have benefited from 33 health prevention groups in 2012.

For 2012, the CPG reports a total of 122 psychosocial prevention and 78 HIV and hepatitis prevention groups were held. 305 clients were provided with an individual psychosocial follow-up and 1,427 individual counselling sessions were held. A total of 25 clients participated in the “Programme Charly”.

In 2007, the external evaluation report of the TOX project has been published and recommended the continuation of the action.

The programme is currently part of the RELIS routine data reporting network and first data on treatment demand became available in 2010.

**PREVENTION, TREATMENT AND CARE OF INFECTIOUS DISEASES**

New inmates are seen by medical staff in the framework of the admission procedure of both national prisons. A HIV screening test is suggested during the medical counselling. If the inmate accepts, a simultaneous screening of other infectious diseases like syphilis and hepatitis A, B and C is undertaken.

In 2012, approximately 720 HIV tests have been carried out. 12 tests were positive (10 men and 2 women), 6 co-infections (HIV/HCV) were diagnosed (all the 6 of those were known injecting drug users). To prevent further contamination, vaccination against hepatitis B and A is recommended to those who present a negative serology.

A structured syringes distribution programme has officially been launched in 2005 in the framework of the global drug care programme in prison. In order to enrol, inmates have to send a written request to the prison’s doctor. After counselling, the inmate is handed a kit containing 2 syringes which may be exchanged at the nursery. As the consumption and possession of drugs is illegal, those inmates in possession with a syringe in its kit, are exempted from sanctions for detention of injection paraphernalia. In 2012, 48 kits have been distributed and 1,383 syringes exchanged.

---

Ascorbic acid, filters, sterile physiological water, antiseptic wipes and small plasters are available at the two nurseries. Condoms are also available at different discrete spots of the prison (at the two nurseries, TOX-programme and at the psychiatric ward).

In order to meet specific needs in terms of infectious diseases in prison settings, the creation of a specialised transmittable disease counselling offer (COMATEP) involving prison administration and CHL has become operational in 2011.

**PREVENTION OF OVERDOSE-RISK UPON PRISON RELEASE**

Overdose incidents following prison release is a documented reality that has also been addressed by national research. For instance, the Origer & Delliucci study in 2002 recommended the following measures to prevent overdose risk following an in-depth longitudinal analysis of drug-related death nationwide:

- opening of supervised injection rooms according to the national drugs action plan (1)
- medical controlled heroin distribution programme (foreseen by the national drugs action plan) (2)
- first aid training courses provided to users and their relatives and partners (3)
- gender and ethnic specific interventions (4)
- provision of morphine receptor antagonists to users and selected persons (5)
- creation of ‘transition centres’ for ex or current PDU leaving institutional settings (6)
- development of reintegration programmes for prisoners in the framework of the recent ‘Global care programme for drug addicts in prison’ (7)

Besides, the law of 27 April 2001 introduced an important modification of the basic drug law with regard to overdose prevention. Art.10-1 of the referred law exempts drug users who call for assistance in case another user is in need of medical help, from prison sentences. This change is supposed to reduce drug-related deaths occurring in consumer groups. A new flyer addressing measures to be undertaken by witnesses of a drug-related overdose and the genuine legal situation was elaborated and was broadly distributed among PDU in various settings in 2009.

For persons (with drug careers) leaving prison, a series of measures such as; information and peer education, banning multiple prescriptions of substitution drugs, considering interaction of substitution treatment and concomitant/persistent street drug use and ensuring through-care after prison release need to be further developed.

**REINTEGRATION OF DRUG USERS AFTER RELEASE FROM PRISON**

The CPL runs a proper psychosocial and educational department (SPSE). Jointly with the SCAS and the prison guards’ association, it has set up a project called ‘DEFI’ (Challenge) that aims at the development of therapeutic means, training facilities, socio-professional reinsertion measures and indebtedness management, during prison journey and after the prison release phase.

The future development of synergies with external drug care agencies aiming at a comprehensive concept of through care in terms of psychosocial measures, substitution treatment or economical start-up help are some of the cornerstones of national after-prison reintegration strategies.

The service Quai 57 (Arcus asbl) (see above chapter on social reintegration) also contributes in various ways to (re)insert drug users as far as (re)integration is possible. The future referent system will also contribute to improve the re-integration process of drug-addicted inmates upon release.
10. DRUG MARKETS

INTRODUCTION

Drug markets are of changing nature. They rely on factors such as supply mechanisms, on the economic situation of the country they develop in and on the efficiency of law enforcement strategies. Availability and supply indicators should be interpreted with caution as they rely on the interplay of all these factors. Law enforcement authorities, the National Laboratory of Health and special surveys have provided data for the present chapter.

Overall, the national drug market has become of a more aggressive nature in terms of selling techniques (e.g. dealers approach potential clients and not vice-versa, the dealers insist on selling). New distribution networks have developed in recent years and operate in an obviously professional way and by doing so, have significantly increased drug availability and in particular the supply of cocaine and cannabis. Dealers increasingly tend to actively approach confirmed or potential clients. More recently ethnic groups join to improve their drug distribution strategies whereas previously none of these criminal groups actively searched contact with other groups. Moreover it has been noted that traffickers tend to delocalize their selling points to locations or settings less visible to police as for instance private flats or bars.

Asylum demanders implicated in illicit cocaine trafficking mainly originate from West African countries, particularly from the Ivory Coast. Their number tends to stabilise. In regard to heroin trafficking, no predominant profile of nationality has been reported. A large number of drug traffickers come from North Africa by transiting through Belgium. Numerous traffickers have changed from heroin to cocaine and currently are also involved in cannabis traffic.

Compared to the situation in 2006, purity of heroin and cocaine have been decreasing. Attention has to be paid to the striking differences in maximum and minimum purities as well as to a historically high maximum concentration of THC in cannabis samples seized in Luxembourg. Prices show broader ranges for heroin, cocaine and cannabis.

In terms of seized quantities, important variations are observed for heroin since 2000. As far as cocaine is concerned, increasing quantities have been reported in 2012. The number of seizures also has been showing great variations during the same period, especially for cannabis.

The perceived illicit drug availability in general population is high and follows a weak increasing trend.

AVAILABILITY AND SUPPLY

Perceived availability of drugs

In addition to availability indicators from law enforcement sources, perceived availability of the general public provides further insight in the current situation. Both, the 2004 Flash Eurobarometer 158 survey “Young people and Drugs” and the 2002 Eurobarometer 57.2 survey inform about the level and the evolution of illicit drugs availability in the G. D. of Luxembourg.
**Tab. 10.1 Ease of acquisition of illicit drugs in Luxembourg (2002/2004)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION a: It is easy to get illicit drugs?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near where I live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In May 2008, the Directorate-General Justice, Liberty and Security of the European Commission published a public opinion poll named “Young people and drugs among 15-24 years olds”(N°233) within the scope of Eurobarometer surveys. Questions were included on the ease of access to illicit drugs, alcohol and tobacco:

> The following figure presents the results of the question: “How difficult would it be for you to get hold of any of the following substances if you wanted to?”

**Tab. 10.1 bis Ease of acquisition of drugs in Luxembourg (2008)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of access to heroin (if desired)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of access to cocaine (if desired)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of access to ecstasy (if desired)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of access to cannabis (if desired)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of access to tobacco (if desired)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ease of access to alcohol (if desired)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concerning heroin, youngsters from Luxembourg considered it slightly more difficult (77%) to obtain or to have access to heroin than the European average (72%). Similar to the EU average, only 23% of interviewees thought that getting hold of heroin was easy.

Even if heroin was the substance considered to be most difficult to get hold of, also cocaine was quoted by 67% of young people from Luxembourg as more difficult to obtain than did the EU average (61%).

Ecstasy was considered being more difficult to obtain in Luxembourg (65%) compared to the EU average (56%). Only 34% of youngsters from Luxembourg considered the access to ecstasy as easy (EU average: 38%).

Concerning cannabis, less youngsters from Luxembourg (28%) declared the access to cannabis difficult than the EU average (34%). Access to cannabis was perceived easier (71%) than the EU average (63%). Four out of ten youngsters (41%) found it very easy to obtain cannabis (EU average: 32%, three out of ten).

Luxembourg’s youngsters considered the access to licit substances as tobacco and alcohol as easier than the EU average. Concerning tobacco, 88% of youngsters from Luxembourg found the access very easy compared to the EU average (81%). Also the access to alcohol was referred to as very easy (LU: 86%, EU: 80%).

In summary one may note that a majority of Luxembourg’s youngsters are of the opinion that licit drugs are very easily available in contrast to illicit drugs seen as very difficult to obtain with however the exception of cannabis.

In May 2011, the Eurobarometer study “Youth attitudes on drugs” (N°330) provided results summarised in table 10.1 ter. Although answer categories are slightly different, results clearly show that acquisition of illicit drugs is perceived to be more difficult in 2011 if compared to 2008.

**Tab. 10.1 ter Ease of acquisition of drugs in Luxembourg (2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Ease of access to heroin (if desired)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>impossible</td>
<td>very difficult</td>
<td>fairly difficult</td>
<td>fairly easy</td>
<td>very easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Ease of access to cocaine (if desired)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LU</td>
<td>EU27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Ease of access to ecstasy (if desired)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LU</td>
<td>EU27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Ease of access to cannabis (if desired)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LU</td>
<td>EU27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Ease of access to tobacco (if desired)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LU</td>
<td>EU27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Ease of access to alcohol (if desired)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LU</td>
<td>EU27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Origins of drugs

The national production of illicit drugs appears to be irrelevant in terms of quantities and quality. In 2012 no clandestine drug-manufacturing laboratory has been dismantled at the national level. Law enforcement sources\(^{61}\) indicate that currently the majority of illicit drugs consumed in the G. D. of Luxembourg originate from the Netherlands (cannabis production and transit of other drugs), followed by Belgium (ecstasy and ATS production) and Morocco (cannabis production). Till the beginning of the nineties, most of the persons involved in illicit drug distribution were consumers who supplied themselves in the Netherlands or acquired limited extra quantities of drugs in order to sell them within restricted local networks. Since the opening of EU borders, more organised distribution networks tend to develop within the national drug market.

Drug trafficking patterns

The expansion of more structured distribution networks by organised criminal associations has been reported earlier. More recently different ethnic groups started to create synergies in drug distribution and traffic, whereas previously these groups have been operating separately. The proportion of non-natives involved in drug trafficking has been increasing until 2005 and has been decreasing quite sensibly since then, although non-native drug traffickers represent 70% (75% in 2011). Typically, involved dealers carry small quantities of drugs hidden in their mouth ready to be swallowed promptly in case of police controls. Initially drugs of high quality have been sold at low prices. Progressively however, the quality and diversity of sold drugs have been decreasing. The national drug market has been flooded by a high proportion of low quality injection drugs, which has induced major changes in consume patterns of national drug users.

Little, however, is known on the provision sources of the referred distribution networks. They are highly organised and have managed to significantly increase the supply and availability of drugs at the national level.

SEIZURES

In terms of seized quantities, important variations are observed for heroin and cocaine since 2000. As far as cannabis is concerned, increasing quantities have been reported in 2012. The number of seizures also has been showing great variations during the same period, especially for cannabis.

Quantities and numbers of drug seizures

Striking variations have been observed as to the quantity of illicit substances seized since the beginning of the nineties. A longitudinal data analysis indicates a general decreasing tendency of heroin, cocaine and cannabis seizures until 2002\(^{62}\). Since 2002 however, one observes a significant increase in the quantity of drug seizures mainly concerning heroin and herbal cannabis. However, this trend was not observed in 2009 and 2010 for heroin. Cocaine seizures (quantity) are highly variable since the beginning of the nineties. Quantities of seized cannabis went up in 2012.

Notwithstanding the quantities of cannabis and cocaine seized, the number of seizures has grown discontinuously since 1990. This suggests that more seizures of smaller quantities have been reported. Since 2008 the number of cannabis and cocaine seizures has clearly increased, while the number of heroin seizures discontinuously decreased. Markedly, the number of cannabis seizures has risen from 167 to 821 between 1994 and 2012. The total number of persons involved in traffic has followed a constant upward trend until 2002 and showed a decreasing trendline since then (2012: 1782, 2011: 2210, 2010: 2530, 2009: 1963 persons). A confirmed majority of offenders are non-natives.

---

61 Non published information from the Specialised Drug Unit of the Judicial Police
62 Non–transit drugs destined to the national market
Crack (cocaine-base) seizures have not been reported to date by national authorities. It has, however, appeared on the national market according to field agencies. The first national seizures of ecstasy type substances (MDMA, MDA, etc.) were recorded in 1994. After years of rather modest XTC type pill seizures, 2009 data revealed consistently higher amounts of seizures. In 2011 and 2012, however, the MDMA seizures show again a decrease.

**Fig. 10.1 Total quantities of national yearly seizures: heroin, cocaine, ecstasy type (1988 - 2012)**

Source: Specialised Drug Department of the Judicial Police 2013

**Fig. 10.2 Total number of national yearly seizures: cannabis, heroin, cocaine, MDMA (1988 - 2012)**

Source: Specialised Drug Department of the Judicial Police 2013
Number of illicit laboratories and other production sites dismantled

The last time the dismantling of a synthetic drug manufacturing laboratory was reported by law enforcement dates back to 2003. Since then, no further laboratory seizure on the national territory was reported.

According to police records, single cannabis growing fields are found on a fairly irregular basis. Local cultures of cannabis remain rather insignificant in terms of quantity and national production is limited to small indoor cannabis cultivations (mostly for personal use and not primarily meant to procure economic profit).

PRICE/PURITY

Price of drugs at retail level

Average street prices of heroin (brown), cocaine and ecstasy type substances have fallen from 1998 to 2002/2003 but broader price ranges as well as higher maximum prices for cocaine, heroin and cannabis have been observed since 2004, which is due to a high variability of purity. Typical street retail cannabis is sold for 5-25.– EUR per gram (2011: 5-35.– EUR).
Table 10.2  Price per unit evolution at the street level (1994-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>5-16</td>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>10-35</td>
<td>5-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hashish</td>
<td>2.5-3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>5-30</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>100-150</td>
<td>120-170</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20-120</td>
<td>20-110</td>
<td>30-100</td>
<td>30-100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70-100</td>
<td>50-200</td>
<td>50-250</td>
<td>14-166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin (brown)</td>
<td>65-150</td>
<td>90-150</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50-90</td>
<td>50-90</td>
<td>60-80</td>
<td>33-100</td>
<td>20-250</td>
<td>21-125</td>
<td>20-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20-35</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecstasy</td>
<td>9-13</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>5-25</td>
<td>5-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD</td>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>11-13</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>5-15</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15-25</td>
<td>10-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Price: expressed in EURO at street level.
For cannabis, cocaine & heroin (since 2009) and amphetamines, price per gram is indicated.
For heroin and cocaine, minimum prices refer to traffic units (until 2008) Maximum and average prices refer to street retail quantities.
For ecstasy and LSD, price per pill or unit are indicated.

Purity/potency of illicit drugs

Compared to the situation in 2006, purity of cocaine has been decreasing (2006: 58.80% / 2012: 44.45%), and a remarkable decrease in average heroin purity was observed in 2011 and confirmed in 2012 (9.60%).

Attention has to be paid to the striking differences in maximum and minimum purities as well as to a historically high maximum concentration of THC in cannabis samples seized in Luxembourg. In 2012, the maximum concentration of THC in herbal cannabis was 29.36%. Prices show broad ranges for heroin, cocaine and cannabis.

Attention has to be paid to the striking differences in maximum and minimum purities of all substances. For instance heroin and cocaine show very high maximum purity rates. These values should however be considered carefully, the sampling may contain intermediary seizures, not ready for street consumption and to which cutting agents were supposed to be added. Historically high maximum concentration of THC in cannabis samples seized in Luxembourg has been observed in 2009.
### Table 10.3: Purity of drugs at street level (1994-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cannabis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THC AVRG.</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manihuana Hashish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hashish</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>29.36</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>60-90</td>
<td>60-90</td>
<td>60.25</td>
<td>62.99</td>
<td>58.80</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>46.92</td>
<td>46.74</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>88.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin</td>
<td>15-23</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>17.07</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>24.02</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>54.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STA</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>50.95</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecstasy63 (MDMA)</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>29.77</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>26.44</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>23.57</td>
<td>53.14</td>
<td>77.88</td>
<td>42.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MDEA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MDA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psylocine</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Specialised Drug Department of the Judicial Police / Laboratoire National de Santé. Division Toxicologie. 2013

Purity: For cocaine, heroin and amphetamines, purity is expressed in percentages of pure active substance at the street level.
For cannabis, purity refers to percentage of THC.

In 2011, S. Schneider and F. Meys64 published a paper on analysis results of illicit cocaine and heroin samples seized in Luxembourg from 2005 to 2010. Abstract: This article discusses drug purity, frequency of appearance and concentration ranges of adulterants of 471 illicit cocaine and 962 illicit heroin samples seized in Luxembourg from January 2005 to December 2010. For cocaine samples the mean concentration was lowest in 2009 (43.2%) and highest in 2005 (54.7%) but no clear trend could be observed during the last 6 years. 14 different adulterants have been detected in cocaine samples, from which phenacetin has been the most abundant in terms of frequency of appearance and concentration until 2009. In 2010 the veterinary antihelminthic drug levamisole has become the most abundant adulterant detected in cocaine samples, its concentrations however remained low (1.5-4.1%). The mean heroin concentration was 26.6% in 2005, a decline has been observed in 2006 and the concentrations have been relatively stable since then (15.8-17.4%). Paracetamol and caffeine were by far the most abundant adulterants detected in heroin samples.

**Composition of illicit drug tablets**

Information for this section was provided by the National Laboratory of Health (LNS) and formatted by the NFP. 53.3% of analysed pills contained MDMA as main active substance while 46.7% contained a mix of amphetamines and methamphetamines.

Most common cutting agents found in MDMA, amphetamine or mCPP containing products were sugar and caffeine.

---

63 Ecstasy: dose in mg/pill
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ANNEX II

RELEVANT DATA BASES AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS

a. RELIS drug monitoring system

Relying on a multi-sectorial data network including specialised in- and outpatient treatment centres and low threshold facilities, general hospitals as well as law enforcement agencies and national prisons, the RELIS drug monitoring system, established in 1995 by the NFP in collaboration with the Ministry of Health enables the assessment of new trends in the problem drug users population in general as well as in drug treatment demanders in particular. The NFP has opted for a holistic monitoring of the drug population, which by definition, is heterogeneous and not limited to drug treatment demanders. RELIS data refer to HRC drug users indexed by the national specialised treatment and law enforcement network and, as such, defined as problem drug users.

The main objectives of RELIS are the following:

- present comprehensive information on the drug phenomenon in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg
- estimate the drug prevalence at the national level (problem drug users)
- unfold emerging trends
- track any drug-related activities, be they in policy, demand reduction or research areas
- assess the impact of offer, demand and risk reduction activities on current drug consume behaviours
- serve as a data base for research activities.

The RELIS data collection procedure is based on a standardised extensive data protocol including 23 core items and over 60 sub-items. The standard protocol, including 95 per cent of the Pompidou protocol’s items, has been last modified in 2000 in order to reach compatibility with the TDI (Treatment Demand Indicator) standard. The RELIS standard protocol includes a series of internal consistency items that allow to assess quality and consistency of provided data and to operate unreliable data extraction.

A second protocol, namely the Actualisation Protocol is completed each time a previously known problem drug user is re-indexed after a period of one year following the previous indexing. Finally, a third protocol (Identification Protocol) including only the identification code, the name of the contacted institution and the date and context of admission is applied if a previously known user is re-indexed in the course of the year following his previous indexing. The registration system allows for highly updated, detailed and comparable data and for a follow-up of institutional careers of problem drug users by means of a routine and cost-effective data collection procedure.

To avoid multiple counting and to allow for a follow-up of drug users’ careers, RELIS is based on a 9-digit numerical code obtained by indating 3 core variables (attributers) namely: gender (i.e. 01 / 02), date of birth (i.e., 10051967), and country of birth into a code - calculator developed by the NFP in collaboration with the CRP-Henri Tudor. The solution found is time and cost effective because it relies on a simple HP calculator that runs an attributor-to-code transcription programme based on a multiple-step algorithm.

Each contact person from the participant field institutions disposes of such a calculator and produces the code by him/herself. The reliability in terms of data protection was approved by national data protection authorities, by German partner regions of the Mondorf Group and by the National Commission for Informatics and Liberties (CNIL) of France.
One of the main benefits of the described procedure is that no personal data can be inferred directly from the identification code. The indexing and encoding procedures are carried out at the very level of the field institutions. Thus, NFP is provided with individualised data (reporting protocols) without any reference to identifying information or attributors on the indexed persons, which is undoubtedly one of the major preoccupations of field institutions.

RELIS data processing is based on ORACLE® database software and allows for multiple variable breakdowns as well as separated data analysis for different treatment or law enforcement settings. Separate data can be provided for participation regions and institutions.

In terms of data provision, RELIS further relies on following national registers:

- Register of drug law offenders - Special Drug Department of the Judicial Police,
- National Mortality Register - Ministry of Health,
- Special Overdose Register - Special Drug Department of the Judicial Police,
- AIDS and HIV Register - Laboratory of retrovirology - CRP-SANTE.
- Early warning system on new synthetic drugs

**b. Register on drug law offenders (SPJ)**

The register on drug law offenders is paper-based and maintained by SPJ. Research and queries on drug law offenders are performed manually. Special authorisation has been reached by the NFP to access the referred register and to manually include non-nominative data on offenders into the RELIS database. The NFP thus has developed a standard data collection protocol relying on SPSS® based data analysis. This procedures has enabled the NFP to dispose of detailed anonymous data on all drug law offenders indexed by SPJ and to operate breakdowns referring to use and traffic offences and to substances involved according to types of drug law offences.

**c. General Mortality Register (GMR)**

The GMR is run by the Health Statistics Department of the Directorate of Health. The main impediment towards refined data provision on drug-related deaths and the application of the EMCDDA promoted DRD standard has been the 3-digit ICD coding applied by GMR until 1997. In 1998, ICD-10 standard was first applied by GMR. Currently, drug-related death data are extracted from GMR by means of a separate extraction routine. An integrated software based on the DRD ICD-10 standard allows to extract DRD cases from the GMR according to EMCDDA standards.

**d. Special Overdose Register (SR) of SPJ**

The SR is a paper-based register on acute drug-related deaths run by the SPJ. Over the past years, NFP relies on computer-based indexing procedure (SPSS®) of drug-related deaths by means of a comprehensive data form. NFP is maintaining a standardised database on acute drug-related deaths from 1985 to 2012. Anonymous drug-related death data is encoded at the SPJ and transmitted to the NFP according approved standards.
e. AIDS and HIV register (CRP-SANTE)

Official statistics from the national Retrovirology Laboratory of the CRP-Santé provide the number and proportion of IDU in HIV infected patients. Breakdowns by limited core socio-demographic variables are available. Provided data has public status.

f. Early Warning System on Synthetic Drugs (NFP / SPJ)

In the framework of the Joint Action on Information Exchange, Risk Assessment and Control of New Synthetic Drugs, the NFP has developed a nation wide cross-sectional data exchange network.

Decision has been made to adopt a centralised structure relying on a nation wide EWS partners’ network (local contact persons) as well as centralised coordination of key data providers’ activities. The national coordination unit of EWS is implemented within the NFP. The head of NFP has been appointed national EWS coordinator.

The new mandate of the Inter-ministerial Group on Drugs (November 2000), which represents the top decision level in the field of drug policies, expressively includes the follow-up of the national EWS system. Governmental delegates represented within the Inter-ministerial Group have disseminated information on EWS within their respective administration and have undertaken the required steps towards an effective inter-ministerial collaboration.

The implementation of EWS relies on a network of institutional key-informants. Currently all specialised drug agencies (low/high threshold) at the national level are involved in the data providing process in terms of routine data transmission on new trends. Recently two new agencies have joined the EWS network, namely a counselling centre for drug users underage and a low threshold project. The first does provide relevant data on new consume patterns and trends within youngster population and the second focuses on opiate users. One has to stress that the key-informants network does mainly provide data on trends in drug use but not on toxicological characteristics of substances since the referred agencies do not propose substance related services.

Currently, drug seizures are still one of the most important and the most reliable data source as to substance profiling and detection of new drugs. Samples seized by Customs or Police are either analysed (rapid tests) by the SPJ, or sent, via the Prosecutors office, to the National Laboratory of the Department of Health (LNS) for toxicological profiling. Respective results are not systematically transmitted to the department of Health or the NFP. However, effective bilateral co-operation between the NFP and the national Europol unit (SPJ) allow for rapid data transmission in case a new trend or substances should be detected by the latter. The active involvement of law enforcement agencies in the national monitoring system highly facilitates the implementation of Joint Action-related activities.

Agreements have been made between the National Fund Against certain Forms of Criminality, the NFP and the National Health Laboratory (LNS) on the funding of new technical equipment allocated the toxicology unit of the latter. This achievement has largely contributed to the improvement of the quality of toxicological analysis provided by LNS.

General practitioners have recently been involved in the EWS in terms of data provision on new substances and new consume patterns. All GPs and psychiatrists registered in the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg have received a standardised data form allowing them to provide relevant information to the NFP in case they were confronted with an unknown psychotropic substance or unusual consume patterns. The NFP, as a counter part, committed to provide GPs and psychiatrists with information on the detected trends or substances, as far as there is any information available.
Drug-related deaths have to be reported by emergency services to the Police and the SPJ. Non-fatal drug-related emergencies requiring medical intervention have not to been reported systematically. Moreover, emergency services do not index drug-related interventions separately, which means that no monitoring of those cases can be performed. The referred situation is not likely to change and thus, the inclusion of emergency services in the EWS appears to be unfeasible at the present stage.

National drug legislation does not foresee a legal framework for testing or profiling illicit drugs in nightclubs, public events or rave parties. No such activities have been planned or carried out under the authority of public administrations. Taking into account that the first official seizure of ‘ecstasy’ has only been recorded in 1994, harm reduction and close monitoring activities in this particular field were previously not viewed as a priority.

In October 1995, a new drug help line was created, under the responsibility of the CePT. Given its easy access and the anonymity it guarantees, phone help lines often represent the first step with regard to further orientation or treatment demand proceedings and as such are able to provide high quality data on recent trends in drug use. The national Drug Help Line has been included in the EWS system in the course of 1999. In 2008 the drug phone help line has been replaced by an drug help on-line service run by CePT (Fro NO).

The drug issue is largely covered by various media supports. Press, music, fashion and leisure industries are often the mirror of life styles and current trends in substance use. Information could be collected by screening the media targeted at young people and sub cultural groups. Radio, television, newspaper, magazines, fanzines, books, comics, announcement of events, opening of new clubs, etc., are to be viewed as complementary indicators towards the global monitoring of new drug trends. Since the resources of the NFP do not allow for an overall monitoring of media supports, decision has been made to compile, in collaboration with the information and press department of the State’s Ministry, a monthly national and international press review on drugs.

g. Documentation Centres (NFP / CePT)

The Centre Logistique de Documentation sur les Drogues et les Toxicomanies (CLDDT) is a logistic documentation service run by the NFP since 1995. CLDDT runs the only computer-based national documentation management base specifically focusing on licit and illicit drugs. The CLDDT indexes about 2,900 documents mainly in French, German and English language. Users of information services provided by the CLDDT are mainly researchers, journalists, policy makers, drug treatment and prevention specialists, and general public. The majority of indexed documents are paper-based and abstracts are provided.

In addition to its function of documentation base, CLDDT also ensures the conceptualisation and execution of drug documentation dissemination strategies as required by the NFP. Topic-specific mailing lists have been developed and maintained by active contact making and demand response.

CLDDT is linked to the Centre de Documentation du Centre de Prévention des Toxicomanies run by CePT since 1996. The CePT documentation centre mainly focuses on primary prevention, training and evaluation in the fields of licit and illicit drugs. The current stock approaches 1,000 documents or media supports. Queries are handled manually and no computer-based consultation facilities are provided.
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