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In brief

On 1 January 2012, the Dutch coffeeshop (= sales outlet for cannabis products) policy was tightened. Two further criteria that coffeeshops must adhere to in order for them to be tolerated were added to the Opium Act Directive (Aanwijzing Opium-wet) for the Public Prosecution Service: the private club criterion and the residence criterion. Coffeeshops were only permitted to give access and to sell cannabis products to members and hence needed to maintain a verifiable members’ list, and only residents of the Netherlands aged 18 and over were permitted to become a member.

The enforcement of this new policy began in May 2012 in the southern provinces of Limburg, Noord-Brabant and Zeeland. As a result, drugs tourism to these provinces swiftly declined. However, aside from the non-residents, the coffeeshops also lost a large portion of their local customers, since users, and particularly the younger users, did not want to register as a member. Accordingly, the illegal market expanded. Neighbourhood residents, who had previously experienced the nuisance caused by coffeeshops and their (non-resident) visitors, now experienced a greater amount of nuisance caused by dealer activities. After 1 May, the police quickly shifted its priority from monitoring compliance by coffeeshops to combating the illegal market and nuisance of street dealing.

The policy was amended at the end of 2012, with the abolishment of the private club criterion. The residence criterion has remained in place, but since 2013 the decision on whether to enforce it is left to the local authority. The scope for locally tailored enforcement approaches has introduced ‘couleur locale’ to the enforcement. Since this latest policy change, the effects of the 2012 change are still perceptible, although there are signs that the situation in 2013 is reverting to pre-May-2012. Drug tourists remain largely absent in the three southern provinces, but are returning in small numbers to places where the residence criterion is not enforced. Neighbourhood residents are experiencing less nuisance caused by street dealing activities, but more nuisance from the coffeeshops, where the overall nuisance has not diminished significantly. Residents of the Netherlands have largely returned to the coffeeshops, but the recovery certainly falls short of 100%. Illegal cannabis sale has been tempered but remains greater than before May 2012.

At the end of 2013, the situation is relatively calm and under control in most areas, certainly in comparison to 2012 when the enforcement of the new policy in the three southern provinces triggered drastic changes in the users’ market.

This emerges from the current evaluation study on the tightened coffeeshop policy, conducted between early 2012 and early 2014 by the Research and Documentation Centre of the Ministry of Security and Justice [WODC], Bureau INTRAVAL and the Bonger Institute of the University of Amsterdam.
The design and the results of the study are described below. For more detailed information (such as sampling characteristics, levels of significance) the reader is referred to the chapters in the report.

**The study**

By tightening the coffeeshop policy, the government sought to make coffeeshops smaller and more controllable, to reduce the nuisance and criminality associated with coffeeshops, to combat the trade in illicit drugs and to reduce the number of foreign visitors attracted by Dutch policy. Coffeeshops were expected to serve the local market only. The study researched the actual effects of this tightened policy.

**Fourteen coffeeshop municipalities and coffeeshop areas**

The study was conducted in fourteen municipalities, of which seven in the three southern provinces and another seven in the rest of the country. The municipalities were selected with a view to obtaining a country-wide sample which is as representative as possible. Fourteen coffeeshop areas were selected in the municipalities. In 2012, the new criteria were only enforced in the three southern provinces. No action was taken as yet in the rest of the country. In the 2012 study, the municipalities in the three southern provinces were treated as an ‘experimental group’ and the other municipalities as ‘comparison group’. The situation is different in 2013, when the residence criterion applies throughout the country. The local variation in enforcement of the criterion creates differences between the municipalities that interfere with the previous differentiation between the ‘experimental’ and ‘comparison’ group. For example, the policy is not actively enforced in 2013 throughout the three southern provinces. These differences in enforcement have been incorporated in a number of analyses. Although the design of the research was not entirely quasi-experimental in 2012, due to unexpected events such as the closure of coffee-shops that were part of the sample and differences in enforcement, nonetheless we can compare what occurred in areas with the new policy and areas without. Partly because the implementation was also investigated, this permits an interpretation of the results in terms of effectiveness.

**Three measurements**

The study covers the period from early 2012 to end 2013. Three measurements were performed: the first, as a baseline measurement, was taken in March-April 2012, before the enforcement of the new criteria. The first follow-up measurement was taken in October-November 2012, and the second follow-up measurement in October-November 2013.

**Broad measurements**

The study measured: how the implementation progressed, the number of coffee-shop visitors, the frequency and nature of the nuisance caused by coffeeshops as perceived by neighbourhood residents, and developments in the illegal cannabis market. Municipal civil servants and police personnel, public prosecutors and coffee-shop owners and managers were interviewed about the implementation (n=40, 36

---

69 A 15th municipality was included in the measurement of the implementation.
and 61 in successive measurements). Coffeeshop visitors were interviewed face-to-face about their purchasing behaviour and use (n=1,051, 739 and 726). Neighbourhood residents reported by means of a survey on the nuisance that they experience (n=712, 714 and 714). Cannabis users were asked face-to-face in a street survey about their purchase and use of cannabis (n=942, 812 and 907). Also, two cohorts were followed up over time, one consisting of coffeeshop visitors (n=108) and one consisting of current cannabis users residing in the Netherlands, contacted through the street survey (n=79). Finally, ethnographical field work was conducted in four municipalities to obtain a more in-depth understanding of trends and players in the illegal circuit.

Coffeeshop visitors and cannabis users were recruited with a view to achieving representativeness, by taking into account relevant background characteristics, by spreading the measuring moments evenly, by approaching respondents at random and in different ways, and by ensuring that the different categories of actors were included in the research.

To obtain as reliable a picture as possible, the findings from the different angles were combined with each other (‘triangulated’).

Report

An interim report was drawn up on the developments as a consequence of implementing the private club and residence criteria in 2012 (Van Ooyen, Bieleman & Korf, 201370). The results from the cohort studies and the ethnographic fieldwork were not part of this report. The current final report describes the developments in 2012 and 2013 for all study components.

Enforcement of the new criteria in the municipalities

In May 2012, the private club and residence criteria were first enforced in the southern provinces of Limburg, Noord-Brabant and Zeeland. This went hand in hand with an intensive communication campaign aimed at drug tourists. In the initial phase, compliance by the coffeeshops was monitored, although some things were still unclear for the local authorities and they found it difficult to put the national framework into local practice. The approach gradually took form. In 2012, the police had to devote much time and effort to combatting the illegal market, which quickly took priority over monitoring the coffeeshops. Both administrative and criminal law interventions were applied, such as declaring prohibition zones and arrests followed by swift settlement rulings by the Public Prosecutor. Already in 2012, differences in implementation among the municipalities began to emerge, as some engaged actively with the new policy, while others took a bit more of a wait-and-see attitude. As the checks grew less frequent, the coffeeshops largely adhered to the new rules and kept their doors shut to non-residents.

The private club criterion was abolished in November 2012 – meaning that registering with a coffeeshop as a member was abolished – and the residence criterion came into force for the entire country in January 2013. The latter criterion has been

amended, however: according to the national policy documents, enforcement can be implemented ‘in phases if necessary, based on a locally tailored approach’ (‘zo nodig gefaseerd plaatsvinden op basis van lokaal maatwerk’). The mayor, the chief of police and the public prosecutor must coordinate this policy in the local ‘authority triangle’, taking into account the local situation. A municipality can choose to incorporate the residence criterion in its coffeeshop policy and the associated enforcement policy. Whether the policy is actively enforced in practice is also for local decision-makers to determine.

Local policy documents and interviews with local actors paint the following picture of enforcement in 2013:

- Eleven of the fifteen municipalities in the sample have incorporated the residence criterion in their coffeeshop policy/enforcement arrangement, the other four municipalities have not.

- Five of these eleven municipalities enforce the policy actively. They do so because they wish to retain the positive effects of the residence criterion in 2012 – keeping away the drug tourists – or because they are a party to regional or national policy. The intensity of the enforcement varies. One municipality pursues a very strict enforcement (coffeeshop visitors must show proof of identity and a proof of registration in the Municipal Population Database, or Gemeentelijke Basisadministratie), three municipalities take a more lenient approach and permit exceptions to a limited extent, and one municipality only enforces the residence criterion if a coffeeshop is causing nuisance and the authorities suspect a violation of the age and hard drugs criteria. The coffeeshops in these five municipalities generally comply with the residence criterion and cooperate with the checks, and the police has sufficient capacity to combat any nuisance. Abolishing the private club criterion has made enforcement easier.

- Six municipalities have incorporated the residence criterion in their coffeeshop policy/enforcement arrangement, but do not actively enforce the policy. There are several reasons for this.
  - In three of these municipalities, all located in the northern provinces, there is no nuisance related to cannabis tourism. Accordingly, there is no perceived need for active enforcement. These three municipalities have explicitly formulated this in their policy, using the available scope for a locally tailored approach.
  - The situation is more complicated in the other three municipalities. These municipalities, if they were to pursue their formal policy, ought to actively enforce the policy. However, the enforcement was discontinued when the coffeeshops in these municipalities decided, in May 2013, to once again cater to non-residents as well. There are three principal reasons why the municipalities chose not to enforce the policy. First, these municipalities prefer to wait for the ruling of the Council of State about the admissibility of the residence criterion. As long as this is not clear, they will not enforce the policy. Second, closing down the coffeeshops that contravene the policy would lead to street dealing and nuisance and hence demand more policy effort and capacity. Finally, they do not enforce the policy because the nuisance caused by returning non-residents has remained limited (thanks in part to the implementation of

71 The Council of State has in the meantime pronounced a judgment on 18 June 2014 (Judgment 201304752/1/A3 Raad van State) in which the residence criterion was judged to be a proportional measure to ban non-residents from the coffeeshops. The ban of non-residents is considered a legitimate goal of the government’s policy and the mayors.
alternative measures). Thus, the authorities more or less turn a blind eye to coffeeshops serving non-residents, as long as it concerns small numbers and does not cause any major nuisance.

At the end of 2013, the presence of non-residents in these 6 municipalities does not result in any uncontrollable problems. If the drug tourism should cause any problems, then the enforcement arrangement provides a basis for the enforcement of policy.

- Four of the fifteen municipalities have not incorporated the residence criterion in their coffeeshop policy/enforcement arrangement, and (therefore) do not enforce the criterion. These municipalities do not experience any nuisance related to drug tourism, so that the residence criterion was not seen a matter of urgency in 2013.

Municipalities, whether they enforce (actively) or not, often (also) implement other measures to combat nuisance from coffeeshops irrespective of whether drug tourists cause the trouble or not. Some municipalities limit the hours of operation of the coffeeshops, install ‘quick visit parking spaces’, or deploy extra street sweeping capacity to clean up litter. The coffeeshops themselves also play an active role in combating nuisance in their direct vicinity.

By late 2013, the general situation is relatively calm and manageable. Municipalities apply a customised approach with local differences in enforcement, which can be described as a pragmatic approach. The implementation is supported by consistent adherence to the residence criterion by the coffeeshops, a flexible cooperation with inspections, and the presence of sufficient police personnel to control the nuisance and illegal trade that can result from enforcement. The implementation is hindered in municipalities where there is, simultaneously, a lack of adherence to the residence criterion by a majority of the coffeeshops, insufficient police personnel to control the nuisance that might be associated with enforcement, and the unclear legal status of the residence criterion, so that some municipalities choose to await the ruling by the Council of State.

*Combating the illegal market*

During the implementation of the new criteria in 2012, a rise was anticipated in the sale of cannabis to users outside the coffeeshop, as a possible side-effect. In 2012, combating the illegal market and the associated nuisance was approached proactively. The minister of Security and Justice made additional police resources available for this. By 2013, combating the illegal market becomes more reactive. In the municipalities that participated in the study, enforcement was no longer a priority except in one, unlike in 2012. Fewer police resources are available in 2013 to combat crime specifically related to drugs. In most municipalities, however, the problems do not warrant extra resources. In most locations, the focus has shifted (also) to ‘high impact crimes’, while the drug trade from premisses and other informal locations and cannabis cultivation also receive a great deal of attention.

In this context of enforcement, a number of developments have taken place with regard to the nuisance, coffeeshop visits, drug tourism and the illegal drugs trade. These developments took place in the three southern provinces, while hardly any changes were perceived in the rest of the country.
Nuisance within the direct vicinity of the coffeeshops

People who live close to coffeeshops experience various types of nuisance that they associate with soft drugs: the nuisance caused by (foreign) coffeeshop customers, by cannabis dealing on the street, by drugs tourists, and by loitering coffeeshop customers. In each survey, people who live close to coffeeshops in the three southern provinces report more of such nuisances than in other provinces. The nature of the nuisance changes significantly between early 2012 and late 2013 (see Figure S1). During the baseline measurement in March-April 2012, neighbourhood residents mainly experienced nuisance which they associated with (foreign) coffeeshop customers and loitering coffeeshop customers. By the end of 2012, this type of nuisance had decreased. Neighbourhood residents now mainly experienced the nuisance of street dealing. By the end of 2013, nuisance from coffeeshop customers had increased again - albeit not to the level of before 2012. Dealing on the street is still a source of nuisance by the end of 2013, but - in general - less than it was during late 2012. Nuisance from what neighbour residents call drugs tourists has essentially disappeared by late 2013.

When all types of nuisance are combined that neighbours in the three southern provinces associate with coffeeshops or drugs tourists, it becomes evident that there was a decrease between early 2012 and the end of 2012, but an increase again in 2013. On balance, the nuisance experienced by neighbour residents did not change significantly anywhere during those 18 months; not in the southern provinces, nor in the rest of the country.

Figure S1  Nuisance experienced by neighbour residents of coffeeshops that they associate with coffeeshops (left) and on dealing outside coffeeshops (right), southern provinces, % of the total number of reported types of nuisance

Coffeeshop visits

After the implementation of the stricter coffeeshop policy in 2012, the number of visits to coffeeshops declined in the three southern provinces, while in the rest of the country hardly any change occurred. Six months after the implementation of the new coffeeshop policy, the number of visits to coffeeshops had decreased by 76% percent in the southern provinces. A year later, the number of visits to coffeeshops had increased again, but still remained 48% lower than the original number. This is based on counts performed of coffeeshop visits.
This development is confirmed by a street survey targeting current cannabis users. Before the enforcement of the private club and the residence criterion, and according to the users themselves, 91% of users in the three southern provinces bought cannabis in a coffeeshop in the municipality; later surveys indicate that by 2012, this had declined to 52%. A year later, purchases in coffeeshops had risen again, but had not reached its previous level (82%). In the street-cohort study (in which resident participants of the street survey were followed individually for eighteen months) a sharp decline emerges in cannabis purchases in coffeeshops after the implementation of the new policy in 2012 in the three southern provinces. Before the implementation, 93% of the street cohort bought cannabis in a coffeeshop in the municipality, whereas after the implementation, only 47% of current users did. This was corrected somewhat in the following year, but in the most recent survey, barely over half of current users bought cannabis in a coffeeshop (56%). Local experts who were interviewed in the municipalities where the experiments took place estimate that the market share of coffeeshops in locally sold cannabis decreased from an average of 73% to an average of 38%. A year later (late 2013), this had increased back to 50%, but according to the experts it still had not reached its original level. Figure 2 shows an overview and also indicates how the purchase of cannabis outside the coffeeshops changed.

In addition to a large share of the drugs tourists, at first a part of the residents also stayed away from the coffeeshops. The ethnographic fieldwork demonstrates that the mandatory proof of registration in the Municipal Population Database (Gemeentelijke Basis Administratie) was an obstacle for registering with a coffeeshop. Particularly the youngest group of customers (18 through 23 years old) did not register as member of a coffeeshop. Since the Private club criterion was abolished, a large part of this group seems to have returned. During the second follow up at the end of 2013, the number of visits to coffeeshops by residents begins to return to its original level, while the average age -- 30 years old -- is comparable again with the former level. The ethnographic fieldwork, however, shows that younger customers still are buying cannabis on the illegal market and that young, regular customers from towns in the vicinity largely continue to avoid the coffeeshops.
Drugs tourism decreased substantially, especially during the initial months after May 1, 2012. By the end of 2013, non-residents are gradually starting to return, although the decline is still evident (see Figure S3).

- From the survey held among coffeeshop customers before the implementation of the new coffeeshop policy, 39% of customers in the three southern provinces lived outside the Netherlands. By the end of 2012, not one non-resident was found in the coffeeshops. However, by the end of 2013 several non-resident coffeeshop customers were again found: 13% of the total number of visitors. This only appears in coffeeshop areas where the residence criterion is not enforced. In the coffeeshop areas where the residence criterion is enforced, not a single non-resident was found in the second follow-up survey.
- The non-residents who were interviewed in late 2013 in the coffeeshops, as well as those who were part of the cohort of coffeeshop customers, estimate that the availability of cannabis abroad had increased significantly since early 2012.
- Above we saw that the nuisance caused by what neighbourhood residents call drugs tourists more or less disappeared by the end of 2013: 5% of neighbours mentioned this in early 2012, 15% at the end of 2012 and 1% at the end of 2013.
- In the street survey among current cannabis users in the southern municipalities in 2012 and in 2013, hardly any non-residents were found who acquired cannabis here since the implementation of the new policy. The percentage of non-residents declined from 23% during the baseline measurement to 8% during the first follow-up survey and to 6% during the second follow-up survey. Additionally, during the second follow-up survey in municipalities in the three southern provinces where the residence criterion essentially was no longer in effect, non-residents were largely absent.
- The ethnographic fieldwork shows that in the municipality where coffeeshops remain off-limits to non-residents, eventually the drugs tourists also largely disappear from the illegal cannabis market.

**Figure S3** Non-residents in the coffeeshops and the street survey among current users, southern provinces, %
The illegal users’ market

In the three southern provinces, the decline in cannabis purchases in coffeeshops goes hand-in-hand with a clear rise in purchases on the illegal market, as demonstrated by the street survey and the cohort studies (see Figure S2). Especially sales through mobile phone dealers (06-dealers), street dealers and in part through home dealers increased. The street trade grew explosively.

The ethnographic fieldwork shows that some of the drugs tourists kept coming to the municipalities that participated in the experiment after the implementation of the private club and residence criterion and once there, resorted to the illegal market. Initially this occurred in the city centre. Afterwards, the flourishing street trade transferred to the working class neighbourhoods, where many street dealers originated from.

The illegal cannabis market flourished not only because of the drugs tourists who were prohibited from visiting coffeeshops and then started buying cannabis outside the coffeeshops much more frequently. Local users also started looking for cannabis products outside the coffeeshops. Young local users (18 through 23 years old) quite easily found their way to an already existing illegal cannabis market for underage users. The sale of cannabis to drugs tourists resulted in an illegal source of income for a growing number of adolescents and young adults.

The effect seems to diminish somewhat in 2013. According to local experts, there was a reduction of illegal sales between the end of 2012 and the end of 2013, but a year and a half after the implementation of the new policy, more mobile phone dealers, street dealers and home dealers remain than before the implementation. Experts also reported an increase in the number of drug runners in 2012, who later partially disappeared from view in 2013. In places where sales to non-residents were permitted again in 2013, the sale of cannabis returned to the coffeeshops and the illegal cannabis market diminished somewhat. However, this development stagnated and during the second follow-up, a larger illegal cannabis market existed than formerly. Young resident users especially prefer to buy cannabis products from dealers.

Conclusion and discussion

The research was performed in fourteen municipalities (fifteen in the implementation study) which form a cross-section of all 103 coffeeshop municipalities in the Netherlands. Large groups of neighbour residents, coffeeshop customers and cannabis users were selected randomly. The findings from the various sub-studies, which were performed using various methods and with different groups of respondents, were combined. The result is a fairly coherent view of the changes that took place between 2012 and 2013. Moreover, an ‘experimental’ group and a ‘comparison’ group participated in 2012, which improved insight into the net effects of the policy. Support for the validity of the research is found in the fact that the findings are in line with other - local and national - studies into the consequences of a more restrictive policy, in municipalities outside the sample of this study.

The users’ market for cannabis reacted quickly and robustly to the enforcement of the private club and residence criteria in the three southern provinces in 2012. According to the interim report, this could be attributed mainly to the combination of information targeting non-residents and active enforcement, cooperation between municipalities, the availability of police resources and compliance by the coffee-
shops. Some effects were intended in advance, such as the sharp decline in drug tourism. Some effects were unintended consequences: the avoidance of coffeeshops by residents of the Netherlands and the growth of the illegal market. The nuisance experienced by neighbour residents shifted from nuisance caused by coffeeshops to nuisance caused by street dealing.

The market also reacted again to the policy change in 2013. After the private club criterion was abolished, some residents returned to the coffeeshops but there was no full recovery. Some residents have continued to buy on the illegal market. Moreover, there was a slight increase in the nuisance that neighbour residents associate with coffeeshops. This may be due to the rise in the number of visits to coffeeshops in 2013 by residents and - in some places - also by non-residents.

Drugs tourists largely continue to avoid the southern provinces in 2013. The coffeeshops keep the doors shut to non-residents in municipalities where the residence criterion is enforced. The police have sufficient resources to act against any illegal sales and nuisance. Non-residents are admitted to coffeeshops in municipalities where the policy is not actively enforced. The numbers, however, are relatively slight and they do not cause notable nuisance.

The illegal market has diminished again - non-residents stay away, residents return to the coffeeshops - but is still larger than it was before May 2012. Altogether the effects in 2013 have reduced somewhat, but are still present. The situation has not returned to the levels from before May 2012.

This study confirms that the cannabis users market is dynamic and reacts quickly to changes in policy. The resilience of drugs markets has been reported internationally before, and especially that of established drugs markets such as the cannabis market, for instance by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA, 2013, 2014; see also Caulkins, 2007; Kilmer & Hoorens, 2010).

The effect on the cannabis market clearly consisted in a shift in the nature of supply of cannabis on the consumers’ market: from coffeeshops to the illegal market and then to a certain degree back again. No evidence was found of any effect on the scale of cannabis use. Within a year and a half, the number of current users in the cohort studies declined significantly by 13% (cohort coffeeshop customers) and 17% (street cohort users). This is in line with the findings of Van der Torre, Schaap, Beke, Bervoets, Gieling and Keijzer (2012), who found that approximately 16% of cannabis users in the municipality of Tilburg (almost wholly) stopped using cannabis after the implementation of the stricter policy in 2012. The present study does show, however, that this decline in use also occurred in municipalities where the new measures were not enforced. There the percentage of current users also declined significantly with 11% and 23% respectively. There thus appears to be a general decrease in use among respondents during the whole survey that was not associated with the new policy. In part, this can be attributed to - with the increase in age – ‘normal’ quitting cannabis use, which recent research indicates occurs among 6% of the frequent cannabis users over a period.

---

of 18 months (Van der Pol, 2014). It is unclear what the remaining decline can be attributed to. The use of drugs other than cannabis showed little change. It was not measured whether there was an effect on the scale of cannabis offered on the market. The availability of cannabis in the Netherlands as reported by users was continually at a high level, but there were fluctuations in the form of a decrease in availability in the southern provinces in 2012 and a (slight) recovery in 2013. The shift in supply has had consequences for adolescents and young adults in certain lower class neighbourhoods who were attracted by the lucrative and flourishing sale of cannabis outside the coffeeshops. Previous research by Van Wijk and Bremmers (2011) into the drugs runners in Maastricht showed that, in the underprivileged neighbourhoods where many drugs runners grow up, these runners very much look up to the older and already criminal youngsters as role models, because they have money and status.

Other findings from the present study reflect other available research. It was reported in various local and regional studies that drugs tourists primarily stayed away after the implementation of the residence criterion (Snippe & Bieleman, 2012; Van der Torre, Beke, Bervoets et al., 2013; Van der Torre, Holvast, Keijzer et al., 2013; Van der Torre, Schaap, Beke et al., 2012). For example, Van der Torre et al. (2012) report that after the implementation of the residence criterion in Tilburg, none or few drug tourists were spotted. This also occurred in Terneuzen and in Bergen op Zoom-Roosendaal after the closure of the coffeeshops (Beke, Van der Torre & Keijzer, 2012; Bieleman, Nijkamp & Buit-Minnema, 2009; Van der Torre, Beke, Bervoets et al., 2013). The decline in coffeeshop visits by residents after the implementation of the private club criterion was also reported in other studies.

The gradual return of residents of the Netherlands to the coffeeshops after the private club criterion was abolished is also in line with findings of other local and regional studies. The mandatory registered membership prevented residents from purchasing cannabis in the coffeeshop. This obstacle has been removed. The pattern observed regarding the gradual return to the coffeeshops resembles what Korf,
Benschop, Nabben en Wouters (2013)\textsuperscript{78} report about Lelystad: many users quickly switched to the newly opened local coffeeshop, but a large part did not do so immediately and kept buying in Almere or Amsterdam (where they were used to doing so).

Our findings that the street trade emerged after the enforcement of the new coffeeshop criteria and gradually became less visible – as internet and mobile phone use became more involved, fewer customers were attracted and/or the street trade moved to suburbs or abroad – was reported previously by Van der Torre, Schaap, Beke et al. (2012), Van der Torre, Beke, Bervoets et al. (2013), Van der Torre, Holvast, Keijzer et al. (2013). Also Asmussen (2007)\textsuperscript{79} observed this trend in Copenhagen after the closure of public sales points for cannabis there. Bieleman et al. (2009), Beke et al. (2012) observed similar transfer phenomena (to a limited extent and other municipalities) after the closure of coffeeshops in Terneuzen and Bergen op Zoom-Roosendaal.

The situation surrounding the residence criterion remains unclear in 2013. A number of municipalities have not yet completed their policy-making and a legal consensus regarding the residence criterion had not yet been reached at the time of this study (in 2012 and 2013). It is therefore advised to continue monitoring future developments.
