

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

3148\_1\_3\_4 Cyberleg Global State Jan2022\_2768-1795-0725 v3public

Version 2 February 2022  
Provisional/public

**The global state of cybercrime legislation  
2013 – 2022:  
A cursory overview**

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

**[www.coe.int/cybercrime](http://www.coe.int/cybercrime)**

**Contents**

1 Purpose .....3  
2 Reforms of legislation on cybercrime and electronic evidence .....3  
3 Substantive criminal law provisions .....4  
4 Specific procedural powers to secure e-evidence .....5  
5 Links to the Budapest Convention .....5  
6 Appendix: Parties, signatories and States invited to accede to the Budapest Convention on Cybercrime (status 31 January 2022).....7

Technical report prepared by the [Cybercrime Programme Office of the Council of Europe](#) (C-PROC) under the projects GLACY+, CyberEast, iPROCEEDS 2, CyberSouth and Octopus Project.

---

**Contact**

Cybercrime Division  
Council of Europe  
Email [cybercrime@coe.int](mailto:cybercrime@coe.int)

**Disclaimer**

This technical report does not necessarily reflect official positions of the Council of Europe, of Parties to the Budapest Convention 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 updates of the study by C-PROC in 2018, 2019 and 2020, the present overview summarises the situation as at 31 January 2022.

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 January 2022, some 94% of UN Member States had either carried out such reforms or reforms were underway.

Many African States, in particular, have commenced reforms during the past nine years.

	States	Underway or undertaken in recent years							
		By January 2013		By January 2018		By February 2020		By January 2022	
All Africa	54	25	46%	45	83%	46	85%	46	85%
All Americas	35	25	71%	31	89%	32	91%	34	97%
All Asia	42	34	81%	37	88%	38	90%	39	93%
All Europe	48	47	98%	48	100%	48	100%	48	100%
All Oceania	14	12	86%	12	86%	13	93%	14	100%
<b>All</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>94%</b>

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, 128 States (or 66% 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 January 2022, that is, they had adopted specific domestic provisions corresponding to most of the substantive criminal law articles of the Budapest Convention.<sup>1</sup>

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

Very good progress was thus made in the eight years between January 2013 and January 2022 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%
<b>All</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>32%</b>

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%
<b>All</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>19%</b>

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%
<b>All</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>12%</b>

By January 2022	States	Largely in place		Partially in place		Not in place or no information	
All Africa	54	32	59%	12	22%	10	19%
All Americas	35	23	66%	10	29%	2	6%
All Asia	42	19	45%	20	48%	3	7%
All Europe	48	46	96%	2	4%	0	0%
All Oceania	14	8	57%	4	29%	2	14%
<b>All</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>9%</b>

<sup>1</sup> This does not necessarily mean that they were fully in line with these provisions of the Budapest Convention.

## 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 Budapest Convention and subject to the safeguards of Article 15) is a more complex undertaking.

	States	Procedural legislation largely in place <sup>2</sup>							
		By January 2013		By January 2018		By February 2020		By January 2022	
All Africa	54	5	9%	10	19%	16	30%	22	41%
All Americas	35	5	14%	9	26%	12	34%	16	46%
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%	6	43%
<b>All</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>48%</b>

Progress was made during the past eight years and by January 2022 some 48% 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.

## 5 Links to the Budapest Convention

By January 2022, 41% of UN Member States were either Parties or Signatories to the Budapest Convention or had been invited to accede. These 80 States were thus members or observers in the Cybercrime Convention Committee (T-CY). There is consistent progress in terms of membership.

	States	Party, signatory or invited to accede							
		By January 2013		By January 2018		By February 2020		By January 2022	
All Africa	54	3	6%	8	15%	10	19%	11	20%
All Americas	35	8	23%	11	31%	12	34%	14	40%
All Asia	42	2	5%	4	10%	4	10%	4	10%
All Europe	48	43	90%	46	96%	46	96%	46	96%
All Oceania	14	1	7%	2	14%	2	14%	5	36%
<b>All</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>41%</b>

Beyond membership, the Budapest Convention now appears to serve 82% 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

	Use of Budapest Convention as guideline or source								
	States	By January 2013		By January 2018		By February 2020		By January 2022	
All Africa	54	21	39%	33	61%	38	70%	41	76%
All Americas	35	22	63%	24	69%	26	74%	27	77%
All Asia	42	25	60%	27	64%	28	67%	29	69%
All Europe	48	46	96%	47	98%	47	98%	47	98%
All Oceania	14	10	71%	11	79%	14	100%	14	100%
<b>All</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>82%</b>

The T-CY is an important forum in which more than 80 States are now able to participate. One reason for the influence of the Budapest Convention beyond these States is that many more States are benefiting from capacity building activities.

By January 2022, some 185 States had participated in Council of Europe activities on cybercrime in recent years.

	Participation in Council of Europe cybercrime activities previously								
	States	By January 2013		By January 2018		By February 2020		By January 2022	
All Africa	54	20	37%	35	65%	50	93%	52	96%
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%
<b>All</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>96%</b>

## 6 Appendix: Parties, signatories and States invited to accede to the Budapest Convention on Cybercrime (status 31 January 2022)<sup>3</sup>

Parties		Signatories or invited to accede
Albania	Morocco	Benin
Andorra	Netherlands	Brazil
Argentina	North Macedonia	Burkina Faso
Armenia	Norway	Fiji
Australia	Panama	Guatemala
Austria	Paraguay	Ireland
Azerbaijan	Peru	Mexico
Belgium	Philippines	New Zealand
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Poland	Niger
Bulgaria	Portugal	Nigeria
Cabo Verde	Romania	South Africa
Canada	San Marino	Trinidad and Tobago
Chile	Senegal	Tunisia
Colombia	Serbia	Vanuatu
Costa Rica	Slovak Republic	
Croatia	Slovenia	
Cyprus	Spain	
Czech Republic	Sri Lanka	
Denmark	Sweden	
Dominican Republic	Switzerland	
Estonia	Tonga	
Finland	Turkey	
France	Ukraine	
Georgia	United Kingdom	
Germany	United States of America	
Ghana		
Greece		
Hungary		
Iceland		
Israel		
Italy		
Japan		
Latvia		
Liechtenstein		
Lithuania		
Luxembourg		
Malta		
Mauritius		
Republic of Moldova		
Monaco		
Montenegro		

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