

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

3148_1_3_4 Cyberleg Global State Dec 2024_public_v6 Final 2758-0625-0764 v.1.docx

Version 2 February 2025
Provisional/Public

**The global state of cybercrime legislation
2013 – 2024:
A cursory overview**

prepared by the
Cybercrime Programme Office
of the Council of Europe (C-PROC)

www.coe.int/cybercrime

Contents

1 Purpose.....3
2 Reforms of legislation on cybercrime and electronic evidence3
3 Substantive criminal law provisions4
4 Specific procedural powers to secure e-evidence5
5 Links to the Convention on Cybercrime5
6 Appendix: Parties, signatories and States invited to accede to the Convention on Cybercrime (status 31 December 2024)7

Technical report prepared by the [Cybercrime Programme Office of the Council of Europe](#) (C-PROC) under the projects GLACY-e, CyberEast+, CyberSEE, CyberSouth+ and Octopus Project.

Contact

Cybercrime Division
Council of Europe
Email cybercrime@coe.int

Disclaimer

This technical report does not necessarily reflect official positions of the Council of Europe, of Parties to the Convention on Cybercrime or of donors to C-PROC projects.

1 Purpose

The Council of Europe is cooperating with a large range of countries in all regions of the world and, through its Cybercrime Programme Office (C-PROC), is supporting many of them in the reform of legislation on cybercrime and electronic evidence.

In January 2013, prior to the 2nd meeting of the [UN Intergovernmental Expert Group on Cybercrime](#), under the then Global Project on Cybercrime a review of the state of cybercrime legislation worldwide had been prepared.

Following yearly updates of the study by C-PROC since 2018, the present overview summarises the situation as at 31 December 2024.

The purpose of this update is to provide a cursory overview of global trends regarding legislation on cybercrime and electronic evidence, and thus to serve as a starting point for more thorough assessments and in particular for targeted support to countries or regions in view of further strengthening of laws or of criminal justice capacities to enable the application of new legislation by practitioners.

2 Reforms of legislation on cybercrime and electronic evidence

Some countries began to work on specific legislation on cybercrime and electronic evidence already in the 1990s. By December 2024, some 95% of UN Member States had either carried out such reforms or reforms were underway.

Almost all regions have commenced reforms during the past eleven years.

	States	Underway or undertaken in recent years							
		By January 2013		By January 2018		By February 2020		By December 2024	
All Africa	54	25	46%	45	83%	46	85%	50	91%
All Americas	35	25	71%	31	89%	32	91%	34	97%
All Asia	42	34	81%	37	88%	38	90%	38	90%
All Europe	48	47	98%	48	100%	48	100%	48	100%
All Oceania	14	12	86%	12	86%	13	93%	14	100%
All	193	143	74%	173	90%	177	92%	184	95%

Obviously, reforms of legislation can never be considered completed and should thus be understood as a continuous process.

One problem seems to be that in many countries, reforms are initiated but not carried through, with draft laws sometimes pending for years or being abandoned.

Furthermore, some Governments are careful not to adopt laws without the necessary capacities to apply them. In some instances, laws have been adopted but not their implementing regulations.

Capacity building support is required to move ahead.

3 Substantive criminal law provisions

As a result of reforms undertaken, 132 States (or 68% of UN Member States) seem to have had substantive criminal law provisions to criminalise offences against and by means of computers “largely in place” by December 2024, that is, they had adopted specific domestic provisions corresponding to most of the substantive criminal law articles of the Convention on Cybercrime.¹

An additional one fourth of States had adopted at least some specific substantive criminal law provisions.

Very good progress was thus made in eleven years between January 2013 and December 2024 in this respect. And the pace of reforms significantly increased since 2018.

By January 2013	States	Largely in place		Partially in place		Not in place or no information	
All Africa	54	6	11%	18	33%	30	56%
All Americas	35	10	29%	12	34%	13	37%
All Asia	42	13	31%	17	40%	12	29%
All Europe	48	38	79%	8	17%	2	4%
All Oceania	14	3	21%	6	43%	5	36%
All	193	70	36%	61	32%	62	32%

By January 2018	States	Largely in place		Partially in place		Not in place or no information	
All Africa	54	14	26%	21	39%	19	35%
All Americas	35	13	37%	15	43%	7	20%
All Asia	42	17	40%	18	43%	7	17%
All Europe	48	44	92%	4	8%	0	0%
All Oceania	14	5	36%	6	43%	3	21%
All	193	93	48%	64	33%	35	19%

By February 2020	States	Largely in place		Partially in place		Not in place or no information	
All Africa	54	22	41%	19	35%	13	24%
All Americas	35	17	49%	15	43%	3	9%
All Asia	42	18	43%	19	45%	5	12%
All Europe	48	44	92%	4	8%	0	0%
All Oceania	14	5	36%	6	43%	3	21%
All	193	106	55%	63	33%	24	12%

By December 2024	States	Largely in place		Partially in place		Not in place or no information	
All Africa	54	34	63%	13	24%	7	13%
All Americas	35	23	66%	10	29%	2	6%
All Asia	42	21	50%	18	43%	3	7%
All Europe	48	46	96%	2	4%	0	0%
All Oceania	14	8	57%	4	29%	2	14%
All	193	132	68%	47	24%	14	7%

¹ This does not necessarily mean that they were fully in line with these provisions of the Convention on Cybercrime.

4 Specific procedural powers to secure e-evidence

Reform of procedural law and the enactment of specific procedural powers to secure electronic evidence for use in criminal proceedings (corresponding to Articles 16 to 21 Convention on Cybercrime and subject to the safeguards of Article 15) is a more complex undertaking.

	States	Procedural legislation largely in place ²							
		By January 2013		By January 2018		By February 2020		By December 2024	
All Africa	54	5	9%	10	19%	16	30%	26	48%
All Americas	35	5	14%	9	26%	12	34%	18	51%
All Asia	42	8	19%	13	31%	11	26%	12	29%
All Europe	48	31	65%	39	81%	39	81%	37	77%
All Oceania	14	1	7%	3	21%	4	29%	7	50%
All	193	50	26%	74	38%	82	42%	100	52%

Progress was made during the past eleven years and by December 2024 some 52% of States had specific powers largely in place. However, many States still rely on general procedural law provisions (for search, seizure and so on) to investigate cybercrime and secure electronic evidence.

Again, Governments may be reluctant to adopt specific procedural powers without the capacity of their authorities to apply them in practice, and further capacity building would be needed to advance.

Following the opening for signature of the Second Additional Protocol to the Convention on Cybercrime on enhanced cooperation and disclosure of electronic evidence in May 2022, some 30 to 40 countries are currently reforming their domestic legislation in line with this Protocol. By December 2024, 48 States had signed it of which two had also ratified it.

5 Links to the Convention on Cybercrime

By December 2024, nearly 50% of UN Member States were either Parties or Signatories to the Convention on Cybercrime or had been invited to accede. These 95 States were thus members or observers in the Cybercrime Convention Committee (T-CY). There is consistent progress in terms of membership, with a particularly large increase occurring in 2022-2024.

	States	Parties, signatories or invited to accede							
		By January 2013		By January 2018		By February 2020		By December 2024	
All Africa	54	3	6%	8	15%	10	19%	18	33%
All Americas	35	8	23%	11	31%	12	34%	17	49%
All Asia	42	2	5%	4	10%	4	10%	7	17%
All Europe	48	43	90%	46	96%	46	96%	46	96%
All Oceania	14	1	7%	2	14%	2	14%	7	50%
All	193	57	30%	71	37%	74	38%	95	49%

² Note: The availability of procedural powers is sometimes difficult to determine without a more detailed assessment. In some countries some procedural powers may be the subject of secondary regulations.

Beyond membership, the Convention on Cybercrime appears to serve 84% of States worldwide as a guideline or at least as a source inspiring domestic legislation, as reflected in the structure of or concepts used for at least some provisions.

		Use of Convention on Cybercrime as guideline or source							
	States	By January 2013		By January 2018		By February 2020		By December 2024	
All Africa	54	21	39%	33	61%	38	70%	44	81%
All Americas	35	22	63%	24	69%	26	74%	28	80%
All Asia	42	25	60%	27	64%	28	67%	30	71%
All Europe	48	46	96%	47	98%	47	98%	47	98%
All Oceania	14	10	71%	11	79%	14	100%	14	100%
All	193	124	64%	142	74%	153	79%	163	84%

The T-CY is an important forum in which close to 100 States are able to engage with each other. One reason for the influence of the Convention on Cybercrime beyond these States is that many more States are benefiting from capacity building activities.

By December 2024, some 186 States had participated in Council of Europe activities on cybercrime.

		Participation in Council of Europe cybercrime activities previously							
	States	By January 2013		By January 2018		By February 2020		By December 2024	
All Africa	54	20	37%	35	65%	50	93%	53	98%
All Americas	35	24	69%	33	94%	34	97%	35	100%
All Asia	42	25	60%	31	74%	32	76%	36	86%
All Europe	48	47	98%	48	100%	48	100%	48	100%
All Oceania	14	12	86%	14	100%	14	100%	14	100%
All	193	128	66%	161	83%	178	92%	186	96%

6 Appendix: Parties, signatories and States invited to accede to the Convention on Cybercrime (status 31 December 2024)³

Parties		Signatories or invited to accede
Albania	Luxembourg	Guatemala
Andorra	Malta	Ireland
Argentina	Mauritius	Kazakhstan
Armenia	Republic of Moldova	Kenya
Australia	Monaco	Malawi
Austria	Montenegro	Mexico
Azerbaijan	Morocco	Mozambique
Belgium	Netherlands	New Zealand
Benin	Nigeria	Niger
Bosnia and Herzegovina	North Macedonia	Papua New Guinea
Brazil	Norway	Republic of Korea
Bulgaria	Panama	Rwanda
Cabo Verde	Paraguay	São Tomé and Príncipe
Cameroon	Peru	South Africa
Canada	Philippines	Timor-Leste
Chile	Poland	Trinidad and Tobago
Colombia	Portugal	Uruguay
Costa Rica	Romania	Vanuatu
Côte d'Ivoire	San Marino	
Croatia	Senegal	
Cyprus	Serbia	
Czech Republic	Sierra Leone	
Denmark	Slovak Republic	
Dominican Republic	Slovenia	
Ecuador	Spain	
Estonia	Sri Lanka	
Fiji	Sweden	
Finland	Switzerland	
France	Tonga	
Georgia	Tunisia	
Germany	Türkiye	
Ghana	Ukraine	
Grenada	United Kingdom	
Greece	United States of America	
Hungary		
Iceland		
Israel		
Italy		
Japan		
Kiribati		
Latvia		
Liechtenstein		
Lithuania		

³ Source: [Council of Europe Treaty Office: Convention on Cybercrime \(ETS 185\)](#)