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The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) is responsible for the United Nations activities in the fight against
• illicit drugs
• international crime (organized crime, trafficking in human beings), corruption and
• terrorism
and assists Member States in these efforts.

Goal: Towards security and justice for all – making the world safer from drugs, crime and terrorism

UNODC has approximately 1,500 staff members or 2,300 employees worldwide of which some 650 are located at its headquarters in Vienna. UNODC relies on voluntary contributions, mainly from governments, for 90 per cent of its budget (some US$ 300 million per year).

The three pillars of the UNODC work are:

• Research and analytical work to increase knowledge and understanding of drugs and crime issues and expand the evidence-base for policy and operational decisions;

• Normative work to assist States in the ratification and implementation of the international treaties, the development of domestic legislation on drugs, crime and terrorism, and the provision of secretariat and substantive services to the treaty-based and governing bodies; and

• Field–based technical cooperation projects to enhance the capacity of Member States to counteract illicit drugs, crime and terrorism (drugs: supply reduction: alternative development, law enforcement, forensic labs; demand reduction: prevention, treatment; money laundering)
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A century of international drug control

A CENTURY OF INTERNATIONAL DRUG CONTROL

Vienna, 2009
Opium flows from British-India into China, 1650-1880

First Opium War, 1839-42
Domestic opium production in China, 1836-1906

INTERNATIONAL DRUG CONTROL

1909 Shanghai Conference
13 nations; forum known as Opium Commission, led to

1912 International Opium Convention (The Hague); officially entered into force 1915.
Governed shipment of narcotic drugs, i.e. control of transport of drugs which were used for medical purposes

1920 LEAGUE OF NATIONS DRUG CONTROL
Products subject to control were related to opium poppy, coca bush and cannabis

1920 Establishment of “Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs” to assist the League’s Council

Under the League’s auspices, 3 new Conventions were passed:

1925 Convention, which went into force in 1928:
- Introduction of a statistical control system,
- Introduction of a system of import certificates and export authorizations for the licit international trade in narcotic drugs
- “Permanent Central Narcotics Board” of independent experts (compared to INCB) formed to supervise statistical control system

1931 Convention, which entered into force in 1933
“Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs”
- Aimed at limiting manufacture of drugs to amounts needed for medical and scientific purposes
- Establishment of a Drug Supervisory Body, to monitor operation of the system (compare CND)

1936 Convention, which went into force in 1939
“Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs”
- Severe punishment for illicit drug traffickers

In addition, there were also international agreements, signed in 1925 and 1931 to suppress opium smoking.

1946 UNITED NATIONS DRUG CONTROL

1946 Protocol, entered into force in 1947
Legally transferred the drug control functions exercised by the League of Nations to the United Nations

1948 Protocol, entered into force in 1949
Brought a large number of synthetic drugs (“man-made substances”) under international control

1953 Opium Convention, entered into force in 1965
- Protocol for Limiting the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of International and Wholesale Trade in and Use of Opium, signed in New York;
- Aimed at limiting opium use and trade to medical and scientific needs;
- Eliminated legal over-production through stock control
- Only 7 countries (Bulgaria, Greece, India, Iran, Turkey, USSR and Yugoslavia) were authorized to produce opium for export
- The Permanent Central Board (now the INCB) was empowered with supervisory and enforcement responsibilities; Board has right to impose embargo on importation and exportation of opium

1961 Single Convention on NARCOTIC DRUGS, entered into force in 1964
- Consolidation of earlier drug control treaties (for opium, coca bush and cannabis)
- Streamlining the control mechanism
- The Permanent Central Board and the Drug Supervisory Body became the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB)
- It also prohibits opium smoking, coca leaf chewing - transition period

1972 Protocol amending the Single Convention, entered into force in 1972
- stronger emphasis on treatment and rehabilitation, social integration as alternatives to imprisonment for abusers
- INCB is given key role in ensuring a balance between supply and demand of narcotic drugs for medical and scientific purposes

1971 Convention on Psychotropic Substances, entered into force in 1976
- Amphetamine-type substances, sedative hypnotic agents, hallucinogens
- Particularly LSD (lysergic acid diethylamide), mescaline, amphetamines, and sedative hypnotics, such as barbiturates
- 4 separate “schedules”
- Schedule 1, those which are completely prohibited
- Convention also regulates inspection of stocks, records, laboratory premises
- Responsibility: CND, INCB

1988 Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, entered into force in 1990
- Money Laundering (confiscation of proceeds)
- Extradition of major drug traffickers
- Cooperation in demand reduction

Parties: 184

Parties: 183

Parties: 188

1998 Special Session of the General Assembly devoted to Countering the Drug Problem

2000 Political Declaration, Guiding Principles of Drug Demand Reduction: Action Plans

2009 Political Declaration and Plan of Action (target date: 2019)

2016 Special Session of General Assembly
1st International Opium Conference, Shanghai, 1909

The International Opium Commission
February, 1909
Established by the Shanghai Municipal Government
November, 1906
The 1925 International Opium Convention banned exportation of Indian hemp to countries that prohibited its use.

Importing countries were required to issue certificates approving the importation, stating that the shipment was to be used "exclusively for medical or scientific purposes".

Egypt: "I earnestly beg all the delegates to give this question [hashish] their best attention, for I know the mentality of Oriental peoples, and I am afraid that it will be said that the question was not dealt with because it did not affect the safety of Europeans..."
This "Drug Summit" was to assess the international drug problem, and develop a forward-looking strategy for the 21st century by focusing on six crucial issues: demand reduction (incl. "harm reduction" - "reducing the adverse consequences of drug abuse"), alternative development; amphetamine-type stimulants; precursor chemicals ("know your customer"); money-laundering; and judicial cooperation.
Global opium production in metric tons, 1906/1907 – 2016

Note: The transformation of poppy straw into opium equivalents is tentative. A transformation ratio of around 7 kg of opium for 100 kg of poppy straw was applied, derived from average morphine output from poppy straw of 0.7% at the global level and an average opium morphine content of close to 10% at the global level (10 years average). Annual specific results were applied for data over the 2006-2015 period. Poppy straw figures for 2016 are still preliminary. Average 2006-2015 ratios (7.2 kg of opium for 100 kg poppy straw and 9.8 kg of morphine for 100 kg of opium) were used as proxies for 2016.
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In illicit opium production

Licit poppy straw production in opium equivalents in tons

Licit opium production
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Average 2006-2015 ratios (7.2 kg of opium for 100 kg poppy straw and 9.8 kg of morphine for 100 kg of opium) were used as proxies for 2016.
Trends in the global interception rate of opiates, 1980-2015

Sources: UNODC calculations based on illicit crop monitoring surveys and responses to the annual report questionnaire.

Note: For details of the calculation methods, see the online methodology section of the present report.
Estimates of opiate use among the total population 1907/08 and 2006

Estimates of annual prevalence of opiate, cocaine and ATS use at the global level, 1907/08 and 2006/07

RESEARCH

Trends and patterns
GLOBAL OVERVIEW OF DRUG DEMAND AND SUPPLY
Latest trends, cross-cutting issues
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DEMAND
Global trends in estimated number of drug users and people with drug use disorders, 2006-2015


Source: UNODC, responses to annual report questionnaire.
Note: Estimates are for adults (aged 15-64) who used drugs in the past year.

Source: UNODC, responses to the annual report questionnaire.
Note: Estimated percentage of adults (aged 15-64) who used drugs in the past year.
Life-time prevalence of illicit drug use among 15-16 year old students in Europe and in the USA, 2015

- **Czech Republic**: 37%
- **United States**: 35%
- **France**: 32%
- **Monaco**: 31%
- **Liechtenstein**: 31%
- **Bulgaria**: 30%
- **Italy**: 28%
- **Spain**: 28%
- **Slovakia**: 28%
- **Estonia**: 26%
- **Slovenia**: 26%
- **Poland**: 25%
- **Netherlands**: 23%
- **Croatia**: 22%
- **Austria**: 21%
- **Ireland**: 20%
- **Latvia**: 19%
- **Lithuania**: 19%
- **Belgium (Flanders)**: 18%
- **Portugal**: 16%
- **Georgia**: 15%
- **Malta**: 14%
- **Hungary**: 14%
- **Denmark**: 13%
- **Romania**: 11%
- **Greece**: 11%
- **Cyprus**: 10%
- **Ukraine**: 10%
- **Albania**: 10%
- **Montenegro**: 10%
- **Finland**: 9%
- **Iceland**: 8%
- **Sweden**: 8%
- **Norway**: 7%
- **Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia**: 7%
- **Faroes**: 6%
- **Moldova**: 6%

**Germany**
- Lifetime prevalence (2011): 27.1%
- Annual prevalence: 14%

**USA**
- Lifetime prevalence: 35%
- Annual prevalence: 28%

Annual prevalence of illicit drug use at the global level, among the population aged 15-64, 2009 - 2015

**All drug use:** 5.3%
- Range: 3.3%-7.3%

**Problem drug use:** 0.6%
- Range: 0.3%-0.9%

Source: UNODC, response to annual report questionnaire.
Source: UNODC, Annual Report questionnaire and other Government reports.
Annual prevalence of opioid misuse in the USA in per cent of the general population aged 12 and older 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opioid</th>
<th>Annual prevalence in per cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocodone</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxycodone</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codeine</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tramadol</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buprenorphine</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphine</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fentanyl</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methadone</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxymorphone</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydromorphone</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration
(Licit) consumption or pharmaceutical opioids* per inhabitant in defined daily doses (DDDs) for statistical purposes, average 2014-2016

Source: INCB, Narcotic Drugs 2017, p. 251.
(Licit) Consumption of opioids in S-DDDs per million inhabitants, average 2014-2016

* in alphabetical order:
buprenorphine, codeine, fentanyl, hydromorphone, methadone, morphine, oxycodone, pethidine and others.
Countries with the highest levels of (licit) opioids consumption in S-DDDs per million inhabitants, average 2014-2016

Age distribution of the use and the misuse of pharmaceutical opioids in the USA, 2016

Overall proportion of the misuse of pain relievers:
12.6% of all persons having access to pain medication

Source: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration (SAMHSA)
Number of deaths and “healthy” years of life lost (DALYs) attributable to drug use, 2015


Notes: Error bars represent uncertainty intervals. Numbers given in charts are percentage changes from 2005.
Drug overdose deaths: United States and European Union, 1985-2016

Drug overdose deaths
USA: 20 per 100,000 inhabitants
Range in states: 6.3 – 52 (2016)
EU-28: 1.5 per 100,000 inhabitants (2015)

Sources: EMCDDA, UNODC, Annual Report Questionnaire data and ONDCP.
Overdose deaths in the USA, 1999-2016

- Total overdose deaths
- Heroin
- Cocaine
- Benzodiazepines
- Prescription opioids
- All opioids

Data sources:
- UNODC
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)

Graph shows the increase in overdose deaths from 1999 to 2016, with a significant rise in the last few years, particularly related to opioids.
Overdose deaths in the USA involving opioids, 2000-2016

Number of opioid samples submitted to and analysed by laboratories, by type of drug identified, United States, 2009-2016

Source: US Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), National Forensic Laboratory Information System reports.
Number of countries reporting drug cultivation\(^a\) 2010-2015

\(^a\) Countries reporting cultivation, production and eradication of cannabis plants, opium poppy and coca bush, countries reporting seizures of cannabis plants, opium poppy plants and coca bush, and countries identified by other Member States as countries of origin for cannabis plants, opium poppy plants and coca leaf.

Source: UNODC, responses to the annual report questionnaire.
Distribution of total drug seizure cases, 2015 (2.4 million cases)

Source: UNODC, responses to the annual report questionnaire.

*Note: Based on information from 64 countries.*
**Global drug seizures of selected drugs, by quantity, 2010-2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cannabis (tons)</th>
<th>Cocaine (tons)</th>
<th>Opioids (tons)</th>
<th>ATS (tons)</th>
<th>NPS (tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** UNODC, responses to the annual report questionnaire.

**Note:** A rate of 10:1 was used to convert seizures of opium into seizures expressed in heroin equivalents.
Proportion of internet using drug users purchasing their drugs via the darknet, 2014 and 2018 (or latest year/a)

Proportion in per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe 2018</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe 2014</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas 2018</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americas 2014</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania 2018</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania 2014</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia 2018</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia 2014</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global 2018</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global 2014</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Closest year available used instead of 2014 / 2018. Source: Global Drug Survey (GDS)
MARKET ANALYSIS OF PLANT-BASED DRUGS
Opiates, cocaine, cannabis
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A. THE OPIATE MARKET

Global cultivation
change from previous year

- Most recent estimate: 304,800 ha
- Change from previous year: 8%

Global seizures
change from previous year

- Opium: +11%
- Heroin: -5%
- Morphine: -54%

Global production
change from previous year

- 6,380 tons of opium
- 4,300 tons processed into heroin
- 2,000 tons consumed as opium
- Change from previous year: 34%

Global number of users

- Opioid users: ~25 million
- Opiate users: ~17.7 million

Notes: Data on cultivation and production/manufacture refer to 2016. Data on seizures and numbers of users refer to 2015. Seizures of different substances are of varying purity. Estimates of cultivation and eradication of opium poppy, production of opium, manufacture of heroin and prevalence of opioids and opiates use are available in the annex of booklet 2.
Global opium poppy cultivation, 1998-2017

Sources: UNODC calculations based on UNODC crop monitoring surveys and responses to the annual report questionnaire.
Opium poppy cultivation, 2017

Afghanistan

(328,000 ha; +63%; 301,000-355,000 ha)

Myanmar

(41,000 ha; -25%; 30,200-51,900)

Mexico (2015)

26,100 ha (21,500 - 28,100)

Sources: UNODC, Opium Surveys in Afghanistan, Myanmar in 2017 and Mexico 2015.

*change as compared to 2016;
**change as compared to 2015.
Afghanistan – opium poppy cultivation in hectares, 2017

Source: UNODC and Ministry of Counter Narcotics, Afghanistan Opium Survey 2017

Change 2016 to 2017
Afghanistan – opium poppy cultivation in hectares, 2017

Source: UNODC and Ministry of Counter Narcotics, Afghanistan Opium Survey 2017
Afghan opium production in tons, 1994-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Production 2016 (tons)</th>
<th>Production 2017 (tons)</th>
<th>Change 2016-2017 (%)</th>
<th>2017 production as % of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>+256%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>+47%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-eastern</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>+50%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern*</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>+406%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>5,158</td>
<td>+99%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western*</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>+6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (rounded)</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>+87%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimates of 2016 and 2017 are not directly comparable since Ghornach district, a major opium cultivating district formerly part of Badghis province (Western region) came in 2017 under the administration of the Governor of Faryab province.

Sources: MCN/UNODC opium surveys, 1994-2017. The vertical lines represent the upper and lower bounds of the confidence interval of the estimates. Figures refer to oven-dry opium. Production figures for 2006 to 2009 have been revised in 2012; see MCN/UNODC Afghanistan opium survey 2012.
Sources: UNODC calculations based on crop monitoring surveys

data a for 2016 and 2017 are still preliminary.
Aggregate seizures of heroin and morphine, 2015

Weight in ton equivalents.

The present map includes data from countries and territories for which official seizure data are available and amount to more than 10 kg. The seizure data are presented as reported (no adjustment made for purity).

Source: UNODC annual report questionnaire data, supplemented by other official sources.

Note: The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations. Dashed lines represent undetermined boundaries. Dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu and Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties. The final boundary between the Sudan and South Sudan has not yet been determined.

A dispute exists between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

The vast majority of seizures of heroin and morphine are reported to UNODC by weight. Whenever the availability of information allows, seizures expressed in other units are converted to weight; in particular 1 litre is assumed to have a weight of 1 kg.

For more details please refer to the methodology section of the World Drug Report.

Trend 2014-2015

Increase (>10%)

Stable (+/- 10%)

Decrease (>10%)

Heroin and morphine seizures registered by UNODC (2010-2015)

No heroin and morphine seizures registered by UNODC (2010-2015)
Over the 1996-2016 period the standard deviation of annual changes of Afghan opium production amounted to 3.9 while the standard deviation of annual changes of heroin seizures related to Afghan opiate production was just 0.2, indicating far lower year on year changes of heroin seizures.
Dry Afghan farm-gate opium prices, October 2004 - February 2018

Heroin related treatment in West, Central- and South-East Europe – first-time entrants into treatment, 2006-2015

Quantities of heroin and morphine seized in countries supplied by opiates produced in Latin America, 1998-2015

Source: UNODC, responses to the annual report questionnaire.
Annual prevalence of heroin use and heroin-related deaths in the United States, 2005-2016

Source: SAMHSA, Results from the 2016 National Survey on Drug Use and Health, Sept. 2017 and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Multiple Cause of Death, December 2016 and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Drug Overdose deaths in the United States, 1999-2016, NCHS Data Brief, December 2017.
B. THE COCAINE MARKET

Global cultivation
change from previous year

Most recent estimate (2015)
156,500 ha

Global seizures
change from previous year

219,000 x
2015

864 tons
cocaine as seized
2015

Global production
change from previous year

1,125 tons
pure cocaine
2015

Global number of users

17.1 million
2015

Note: Data refer to 2015. Seizures are of cocaine of varying purity. Estimates of illicit cultivation and eradication of coca bush, manufacture of cocaine and prevalence of cocaine use are available in the annex of booklet 2.
Coca bush cultivation, 1990-2016

2015-2016
Colombia: +52%
Peru: +9%
Bolivia: +14%
Global: +36%

2013-2016
Colombia: +76%
Peru: -12%
Bolivia: +0.4%
Global: 76%

2000 - 2016
Colombia: -11%
Peru: +1%
Bolivia: +58%
Global: -4%

Sources: UNODC, Coca Surveys, Colombia, Peru and Bolivia (Plurinational State of) and US Department of State, INCSR (prior to 2000).
### Global coca cultivation and cocaine manufacture, 1998-2016

#### Hectares under coca cultivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Colombia (ha)</th>
<th>Peru (ha)</th>
<th>Bolivia (Plurinational State of) (ha)</th>
<th>Total (ha under coca cultivation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>101,800</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>341,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>212,000</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>386,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>163,300</td>
<td>221,300</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>398,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>144,800</td>
<td>19,900</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>166,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>221,300</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>243,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>163,800</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>254,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>169,000</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>257,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>156,900</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>245,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,077</td>
<td>131,700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>243,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>238,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>235,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>233,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,188</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>230,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>229,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,134</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>229,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>228,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>227,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>226,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>224,131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Potential manufacture of cocaine in tons (at 100 per cent purity)

- **Global cocaine manufacture ('old' conversion ratio)**
- **Global cocaine manufacture ('new' conversion ratio)**

Source: UNODC coca cultivation surveys in Colombia, Peru and the Plurinational State of Bolivia
### Coca cultivation density – Colombia, 2016

Coca cultivation in hectares, Colombia, 2008-2016

**Source:** UNODC, Colombia – Monitoreo de territorios afectados por cultivos ilícitos 2016, Julio 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Narino</td>
<td>19,612</td>
<td>17,639</td>
<td>15,951</td>
<td>17,231</td>
<td>10,733</td>
<td>17,177</td>
<td>17,285</td>
<td>29,755</td>
<td>42,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putumayo</td>
<td>9,668</td>
<td>5,633</td>
<td>4,785</td>
<td>9,951</td>
<td>6,148</td>
<td>7,667</td>
<td>13,609</td>
<td>20,068</td>
<td>25,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norte de Santander</td>
<td>2,886</td>
<td>2,713</td>
<td>1,889</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>4,516</td>
<td>6,345</td>
<td>6,944</td>
<td>11,527</td>
<td>24,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cauca</td>
<td>5,422</td>
<td>6,597</td>
<td>5,906</td>
<td>6,066</td>
<td>4,326</td>
<td>3,326</td>
<td>6,389</td>
<td>8,660</td>
<td>12,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caquetá</td>
<td>4,303</td>
<td>3,985</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>3,327</td>
<td>3,695</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>6,542</td>
<td>7,712</td>
<td>9,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioquia</td>
<td>6,096</td>
<td>5,096</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>3,104</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>2,293</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td>8,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaviare</td>
<td>6,629</td>
<td>8,660</td>
<td>5,701</td>
<td>6,839</td>
<td>3,851</td>
<td>4,725</td>
<td>5,658</td>
<td>5,423</td>
<td>8,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta</td>
<td>5,525</td>
<td>4,469</td>
<td>3,006</td>
<td>3,040</td>
<td>2,699</td>
<td>2,988</td>
<td>5,042</td>
<td>5,002</td>
<td>8,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivar</td>
<td>5,847</td>
<td>5,346</td>
<td>3,324</td>
<td>2,027</td>
<td>1,968</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>1,566</td>
<td>1,044</td>
<td>4,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Córdoba</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>3,113</td>
<td>3,889</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1,263</td>
<td>2,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chocó</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>1,799</td>
<td>3,158</td>
<td>2,511</td>
<td>3,429</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>1,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valle del Cauca</td>
<td>2,089</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vichada</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td>3,328</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazonas</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaupés</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santander</td>
<td>1,791</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalena</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>400%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>César</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guainía</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyacá</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arauca</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldas</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Guajira</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cundinamarca</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** 80,953 73,139 61,812 63,762 47,790 48,189 48,189 48,189 96,084 146,139

**Total redondeado** 81,000 73,000 62,000 64,000 48,000 48,000 48,000 48,000 96,000 146,000

**% del total** 52% 52% 52% 52% 52% 52% 52% 52% 52% 52%
Eradication in Colombia, 2001-2016

Source: UNODC, Colombia – Monitoreo de territorios afectados por cultivos ilícitos 2016, Julio 2017.
Coca cultivation in Peru, 2016

Figura 5. Superficie cultivada con coca a nivel nacional 2002 – 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Año</th>
<th>Hectáreas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>46,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>44,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>50,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>48,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>51,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>53,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>56,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>59,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>61,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>62,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>60,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>49,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>42,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>40,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>43,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fuente: UNODC - SIMCI
Coca cultivation in the Plurinational State of Bolivia

Source: UNODC and Estado Plurinacional de Bolivia, Estado Plurinacional de Bolivia – Monitoreo de Cultivos de Coca 2016, Julio 2017
Estimated global cocaine interception rates, 1980-2015

Sources: UNODC calculations, based on coca bush cultivation surveys, responses to the annual report questionnaire; and government reports.

Note: Purity adjustment of seizures based on average unweighted purities at the global level. For details of the calculation methods, see the online methodology section of the present report.
Seizures of cocaine, 2015
Weight in ton equivalents*.

The present map includes data from countries and territories for which official seizure data are available and amount to more than 10 kg.

Source: UNODC annual report questionnaire data, supplemented by other official sources.

Note: The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations.

Rounded lines represent undetermined boundaries. Dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu and Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties.

The final boundary between the Sudan and South Sudan has not yet been determined.

A dispute exists between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

* Seizures as reported (no adjustments made for purity). Includes cocaine salts, crack cocaine, esco paste/cocaine base and non-specified cocaine. The vast majority of seizures of cocaine are reported to UNODC by weight. Whenever the availability of information allows, seizures expressed in other units are converted to weight; in particular 1 line is assumed to have a weight of 1 kg. For more details please refer to the methodology section of the World Drug Report.

**Available data for 2012 were incomplete and therefore not comparable to 2013 data.
Global quantities of cocaine seized, by region, 2006-2016

Cocaine seizures in 2016

Includes cocaine hydrochloride, coca paste and base, and “crack” cocaine; not adjusted for purity.

Source: UNODC, responses to the annual report questionnaire.
Main cocaine trafficking flows, 2011-2015

Source: UNODC elaboration, based on responses to annual report questionnaire and individual drug seizure database.

Notes: The trafficking flows are determined on the basis of country of origin/departure, transit and destination of seized drugs as reported by Member States in the annual report questionnaire and individual drug seizure database. As such, they are to be considered as broadly indicative of existing trafficking routes while several secondary flows may not be reflected. Flow arrows represent the direction of trafficking: origins of the arrows indicate either the area of manufacture or the one of last provenance, and points of arrows indicate either the area of consumption or the one of next destination of trafficking.

The boundaries shown on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations. Dashed lines represent undetermined boundaries. The dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu and Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties. The final boundary between the Sudan and South Sudan has not yet been determined. A dispute exists between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Malv纳斯).
Significant individual cocaine seizures, January 2016-March 2018*

*latest 500 cocaine seizure cases; Source: UNODC (AOTP) and Paris Pact, Drug Monitoring Platform (DMP)
Significant individual cocaine seizures, January 2016-March 2018*

*latest 500 cocaine seizure cases; Source: UNODC (AOTP) and Paris Pact, Drug Monitoring Platform (DMP).

Sources: Responses to the annual reports questionnaire data; the United States National Household Survey on Drug Use and Health; Quest Diagnostics, “Quest Diagnostics Drug Testing Index”, full year 2015 tables” (September 2016), and previous years; the Canadian Tobacco, Alcohol and Drugs Survey (CTADS) 2015 and, for previous years, Health Canada, Canadian Alcohol and Drug Monitoring Surveys (CADUM).
Cocaine market: signs of expansion in Europe


Benzoylecregonine (cocaine metabolite) found in wastewater per 1,000 inhabitants in Europe (based on data from 99 European cities), 2011-2017

Sources: UNODC, annual reports questionnaire data an CORE (Sewage Analysis Core Group Europe)
Benzoylcegonine (cocaine metabolite) found in wastewater per 1,000 inhabitants, 2016 (or latest year available)

Source: Sewage Analysis CORE Group Europe (SCORE).
MARKET ANALYSIS OF SYNTHETIC DRUGS
Amphetamine-type stimulants, new psychoactive substances
Global seizures
change from previous year

- 21% methamphetamine
- 6% amphetamine
- 35% "ecstasy"
- 39% synthetic MFS

132 tons methamphetamine
52 tons amphetamine
6 tons "ecstasy"
23 tons synthetic MFS

Global number of users

"ecstasy" users 22 million
Users of amphetamines and prescription stimulants 37 million

* Excludes GBL, ketamine and other medicines.
Seizures of ATS (excluding "ecstasy"-type substances), 2015
Weight in ton equivalents*

The present map includes data from countries and territories for which official seizure data are available and amount to more than 10 kg.

Trend 2014-2015

Increase (>10%)
Stable (± 10%)
Decrease (>10%)
No comparable data available for previous year

Source: UNODC, annual report questionnaire data, supplemented by other official sources.
Note: The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations.
Dashed line represents undetermined boundaries. Dotted line represents approximately the line of control in Jammu and Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu and Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties.
The final boundary between the Sudan and South Sudan has not yet been determined.

A dispute exists between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

*This quantity reflects the bulk weight of seizures of amphetamine-type stimulants (excluding 'ecstasy'-type substances), amphetamine, methamphetamine, non-specified ATS, pre-cursors stimulants and other stimulants, with no adjustment for purity. Seizures of amphetamine, methamphetamine and non-specified ATS reported in tablets or similar units are converted using assumed bulk tablet weights between 50mg and 300mg, depending on the region and specific drug type and based on information currently available to UNODC. The conversion factors are listed in the methodology section of the World Drug Report. Seizures reported by volume are converted assuming 1 litre has a mass of 1 kg.
Expanding market: Amphetamine-type stimulants (ATS)

- Total ATS seizures: highest ever
- Amphetamine and methamphetamine constitute considerable share of burden of disease, rank second only after opioids
- Users of amphetamines increased, reaching 37 million globally
- Methamphetamine seizures up, East and South-East Asia overtaking North America
- “Ecstasy” seizures stable but greater variety of products on the market

ATS seized worldwide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amphetamine</th>
<th>&quot;Ecstasy&quot;</th>
<th>Methamphetamine</th>
<th>Non-specified ATS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amphetamine and "captagon" trafficking flows with countries in the Near and Middle East reported as provenance or destination, 2014-2015


Note: The origins of the flow arrows do not necessarily indicate the source/manufacture of amphetamine/"captagon". Flow arrows represent the direction of trafficking and are not an indicator of the quantity trafficked. The boundaries shown on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations. Dashed lines represent undetermined boundaries. The dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu and Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties. The final boundary between the Sudan and South Sudan has not yet been determined.
Seizures of "ecstasy"-type substances, 2015
Weight in kilogram equivalents.*
The present map includes data from countries and territories for which official seizure data are available and amount to more than 1 kg.

Source: UNODC annual report questionnaire data, supplemented by other official sources.
Note: The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations. Dashed lines represent undetermined boundaries. dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu and Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties. The final boundary between the Sudan and South Sudan has not yet been determined.
* A dispute exists between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).
* This quantity reflects the bulk weight of "ecstasy"-type substances seized, with no adjustment for purity. Seizures of "ecstasy"-type substances reported in tablets or similar units are converted using assumed bulk tablet weights between 200mg and 300mg, depending on the region and based on information currently available to UNODC. The conversion factors are listed in methodology section of the World Drug Report 2011. Seizures reported by volume are converted assuming 1 litre has a mass of 1 kg.
Interregional trafficking flows of “ecstasy”, 2012-2015


Note: The origins of the flow arrows do not necessarily indicate the source/manufacture of “ecstasy”. Flow arrows represent the direction of “ecstasy” trafficking and are not an indication of the quantity trafficked. The boundaries shown on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations. Dashed lines represent undetermined boundaries. The dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu and Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties. The final boundary between the Sudan and South Sudan has not yet been determined.
Range of new psychoactive substances continues to grow

260 NPS reported in 2012

483 NPS reported in 2015
Number of psychoactive substances under international control, 1912-2018

Number of internationally controlled drugs in 2017 and identified New Psychoactive Substances (NPS) at the global level, 2009 to 2017 (cumulative)

Sources: Commission on Narcotic Drugs and UNODC Early Warning Advisory on NPS (based on information submitted by Member States through surveys and submissions from laboratories participating in the International Collaborative Exercises (ICE) programme.)
Lifetime prevalence of New Psychoactive Substances (NPS) among youths (age 15-24) in Europe

Changes 2011-2014:
- **Increase:** 18 EU countries (64% of EU countries)
- **Stable:** 8 EU countries (29% of EU countries)
- **Decline:** 1 EU country (4% of EU countries)
- **Data not available:** 1 EU country

**Prevalence in 2014**
- **Life-time prevalence:**
  - EU: 8%
- **Annual prevalence**
  - EU: 4%
- **Past month prevalence**
  - EU: 1%

Sources: European Commission, Eurobarometer, Young People and Drugs, Flash Eurobarometer series No. 401, August 2014.
Expanding market: New psychoactive substances

Between 2009-2016, 739 different NPS reported
In 2015 alone, almost 500 NPS were on the market worldwide
Core group of about 80 persistent NPS
Innovation continues but at slower pace
NPS with stimulant properties expand in number
Recent emergence of NPS mimicking medicines (fentanyl analogues, benzodiazepine derivatives) with high potential to cause harm

UNODC, early warning advisory on new psychoactive substances.
Emergence of NPS by year, 2009-2016

Overall size of market for NPS still relatively small

Many NPS users unaware of content of NPS products and dosage of substances contained

Injecting use of NPS with stimulant effect among high-risk groups further aggravating health risks (e.g. HIV)

Easy availability and low price make them highly attractive for some groups

Identification of NPS in the laboratory still a challenge due to their high number

Source: UNODC, early warning advisory on new psychoactive substances. Based on the analysis of 717 NPS.

Note: The analysis of the pharmacological effects comprises NPS registered up to December 2016. Plant-based substances were excluded from the analysis as they usually contain a large number of different substances some of which may not have been known and whose effects and interactions are not fully understood.
C. THE CANNABIS MARKET

Global seizures
change from previous year

-2% herb  
6% resin

5,781 tons  
cannabis herb

1,536 tons  
cannabis resin

2015

Global number of users

183 million

2015

Note: Data refer to 2015. Estimates of illicit cultivation, production and eradication of cannabis and prevalence of cannabis use are available in the annex of booklet 2.
Global quantities of cannabis resin and herb seized, 1998-2015

Source: UNODC, based on responses to the annual report questionnaire.
Seizures of marijuana (cannabis herb), 2015
Weight in ton equivalents*.
The present map includes data from countries and territories for which official seizure data are available and amount to more than 100 kg.

Source: UNODC annual report questionnaire data, supplemented by other official sources.
Note: The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations.
Dashed lines represent undetermined boundaries. Dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu and Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties. The final boundary between the Sudan and South Sudan has not yet been determined.
A dispute exists between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).
* The vast majority of seizures of marijuana (cannabis herb) are reported to UNODC by weight. Whenever the availability of information allows, seizures expressed in other units are converted to weight; in particular, 1 litre is assumed to have a weight of 1kg.
For more details please refer to the methodology section of the World Drug Report.
Seizures of hashish (cannabis resin), 2015
Weight in ton equivalents*.
The present map includes data from countries and territories for which official seizure data are available and amount to more than 10 kg.

Source: UNODC annual report questionnaire data, supplemented by other official sources.
Note: The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations. Dashed lines represent undetermined boundaries. Dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu and Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties. A dispute exists between the Government of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland concerning sovereignty over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).
* The vast majority of seizures of hashish (cannabis resin) are reported to UNODC by weight. Whenever the availability of information allows, seizures expressed in other units are converted to weight; in particular 1 litre is assumed to have a weight of 1kg.
Estimated number of cannabis users and annual prevalence of cannabis use

1998-2016

Source: UNODC, Annual Report Questionnaire data.
Cannabis use in the USA, the EU-28, the UK and Australia, 1971-2016/17

US–general population change in No. of cannabis users 2006-16

- Annual: +48%
- Past month: +61%
- Daily/near daily use (>300 times a year): +96%

Sources: SAMHSA, National Household Survey on Drug Use and Health 2016 (and previous years), NIDA, Monitoring the Future, UNODC, Annual Reports Questionnaire Data and EMCDDA, Statistical Bulletin (2016 and previous years), Home Office, Drug Misuse declared in the British Crime Survey 2015/16 and AIHW.
Cannabis use: diverging trends

Annual cannabis prevalence:
United States, European Union, Australia, global level

Cannabis prevalence among 15-16 year-old, Europe

Sources: UNODC, responses to the annual report questionnaire; SAMHSA, EMCDDA and the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.

Past month prevalence of cannabis use in the general population in US states and in Uruguay*, 2009-2014

- **Colorado:** +43% 2012-2014
- **Washington:** +25% 2012-2014
- **Uruguay:** +32% 2011-2014

Sources: SAMHSA NSDUH, JND ENCDH

Annual prevalence rates of cannabis use

Global level and in the USA, 2002-2016

Annual prevalence in per cent of population age 12 and above


+43% +25%

Global prevalence rate in % of population age 15-64
Prevalence rate in USA in % of population age 12+

Sources: SAMHSA, National Household Survey on Drug Use and Health and UNODC, ARQs.
Cannabis use in the past month among the population aged 12 years and older in the United States as a whole, in states with measures allowing recreational cannabis market, and other selected states, 2002-2015

Source: Key Substance Use and Mental Health Indicators in the United States: Results from the 2015 National Survey on Drug Use and Health, earlier surveys and SAMHSA State level estimates for the different years. Except for 2002, the state level estimates are presented as two-year averages. Alaska, Colorado, California, Maine, Nevada and Oregon had medical cannabis in 2000 or earlier.
SUPPLY REDUCTION EFFORTS
Schematic presentation of the impact of drug control on drug production and consumption

UNODC activities assisting Member States to reduce drug supply

- **Alternative Development**
- Heads of National Law Enforcement Agency meetings (HONLEA)
- “Paris Pact Initiative” (2003+ incl. ADAM (“automated donor assistance mechanism”))
- **Container Control Programme** (with WCO) (since 2004)
- Airport Communication Programme (AIRCOP) (targeting drug couriers and cargo on flights from source countries (Latin America/Caribbean) to Africa and then to Europe; in cooperation with Interpol (I-24/7) and WCO (CENComm))
- UNODC technical assessments in law enforcement problem areas (frequent findings: weak border controls, lack of strategy, poor inter-agency cooperation, lack of technical equipment/ forensic support; lack of trained staff/specialist expertise in modern law enforcement methods, needs for legislative assistance, recovering proceeds from crime, corruption etc.)
- Law enforcement training (covert intelligence gathering, use of informants, intelligence-led enforcement, financial investigation, cyber crime / “darknet”, computer based training, crime scene investigation, forensic training)
- Witness protection – good practice (manual)
- Forensic support (capacity building; integration of scientific support to LE, judicial system and regulatory authorities)
- **Anti-Money Laundering**
- Promoting regional and inter-region law enforcement cooperation; controlled deliveries; creating networks and “networking the networks”
- Assisting member states in implementing the international drug, crime, corruption and terrorism conventions
- **Firearms** (e.g. assisting Member states to implement the Protocol and register firearms)
- Applied research (“understanding the dynamics of the illicit drug markets”); AOTP, SMART, Early Warning Advisory
ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT

Historical development of the concept

- Crop substitution
- Integrated rural development
- Alternative development (+ preventive AD)
- Alternative livelihoods
ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT

Member States implementing domestic alternative development projects (as reported to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime), 2010-2013

Sources: UNODC annual report questionnaire and UNODC alternative development projects. Only countries providing sufficient information on the implementation of alternative development projects are included.

Note: The boundaries shown on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations. Dashed lines represent undetermined boundaries. The dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu and Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties. The final boundary between the Sudan and South Sudan has not yet been determined.
Role of Alternative Development

Vicious circle:
- Weakening of the rule of law
- Rising illicit drug production
- Strengthening of organized crime and increasing violence
- Reduction in overall growth of the licit economy
- Reduction of investment into licit sectors

Alternative development:
- Falling poverty and strengthening of the rule of law
- Increasing in overall growth of the licit economy

Virtuous circle:
- Falling illicit drug production
- Weakening of organized crime and falling violence
- Increase in investment into licit sectors

Source: UNODC.
Drivers of illicit cultivation

- No single factor/household specific
- Vulnerability and opportunity factors
- Characteristics of the illicit crop (agronomic, durability, profit)
- Possession of skills
- Infrastructure and socio-economic opportunities (missing employment opportunities, access to markets, to credit; size of landholdings, etc.)
- Environment (climate, water, arable land etc.)
- Rule of Law and governance

Challenges of alternative development

- Marginalization
- Poverty
- Isolated areas
- Limited government control
- Insecurity
- Difficult to justify development assistance on purely economic grounds
STRATEGIC ELEMENTS OF ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

• Economic and infrastructural component
  – Support and credit schemes
  – Marketing support
  – Private sector involvement and value chain development

• Political component
  – Significant and long-term investment and support
  – Conditionality

• Organizational component
  – Farmers’ associations
  – Resource management groups

• Social component
  – Local ownership and community participation
  – Land governance

• Environmental component
Agricultural alternative development assistance committed by OECD donor countries, by recipient country, annual average in the combined period 1998-2013.
The total farm-gate income from illicit opium and coca production amounted to some $2.6 billion in the six main opium and coca-producing countries in 2013, ranging from less than 0.2% of GDP in Colombia to about 0.9% in the Plurinational State of Bolivia, 1% in Myanmar and 4% in Afghanistan.
Trends in gross disbursements of alternative development provided by OECD donor countries, 2002-2013

Source: OECD, International Development Statistics online database (data extracted on 19 December 2014).
Gross disbursements for agricultural alternative development assistance by OECD donor countries, 2009-2013, and of alternative development assistance by national authorities in 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agricultural alternative development disbursement from external sources (millions of constant 2012 dollars)</th>
<th>Alternative development reported by national authorities (2013) (millions of constant 2012 dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>266.4</td>
<td>161.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>118.2</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia (Plurinational State of)</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>450.6</td>
<td>300.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other developing countries</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All developing countries</td>
<td>506.0</td>
<td>322.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: OECD, International Development Statistics online database (data extracted on 19 December 2014); UNODC, annual reports questionnaire; Colombia, Ministry of Justice and Law, Division for Programmes to Combat Illicit Cultivation, Administrative Unit for Territorial Consolidation, October 2014.
Gross disbursements for agricultural alternative development assistance provided by OECD donor countries as a proportion of total development assistance, 2009-2013, as a percentage of total development assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Average 2009-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia (Plurinational State of)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: OECD, International Development Statistics online database (data extracted on 19 December 2014).
Alternative development versus eradication

**UNGASS - 1998 Political Declaration; “Measures to enhance international cooperation to counter the world drug problem”: ACTION PLAN ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ON THE ERADICATION OF ILLICIT DRUG CROPS AND ON ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT**

- Para 28: States with problems of illicit drug crop cultivation should ensure that alternative development programmes are complemented, when necessary, by law enforcement measures:
  - (a) Law enforcement measures are required as a complement to alternative development programmes in order to tackle other illicit activities such as the operation of illicit drug laboratories, the diversion of precursors, trafficking, money-laundering and related forms of organized crime, both in areas where alternative development programmes are implemented and elsewhere along the trafficking chain;
- Para 30: In areas where viable alternative sources of income already exist, law enforcement measures are required against persistent illicit cultivation of narcotic crops.
- Para 31: In areas where alternative development programmes have not yet created viable alternative income opportunities, the application of forced eradication might endanger the success of alternative development programmes.
Para 7: We reiterate our commitment to address drug-related socio-economic issues, in particular the illicit cultivation of narcotic plants and illicit manufacture and production of drugs, including through the implementation of long-term, comprehensive and sustainable development-oriented and balanced drug control policies and programmes, such as alternative development and, as appropriate, preventive alternative development programmes, and we recommend the following measures:

(a) Target the illicit cultivation of crops used for the illicit production and manufacture of drugs and address related factors by implementing comprehensive strategies aimed at alleviating poverty and strengthening the rule of law, accountable, effective and inclusive institutions and public services and institutional frameworks, as appropriate, and by promoting sustainable development aimed at enhancing the welfare of the affected and vulnerable population through licit alternatives;

(b) Encourage the promotion of inclusive economic growth and support initiatives that contribute to poverty eradication and the sustainability of social and economic development, develop measures for rural development, improving infrastructure and social inclusion and protection, addressing the consequences of illicit crop cultivation and the manufacture and production of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances on the environment, with the incorporation and participation of local communities, and consider taking voluntary measures to promote products stemming from alternative development, including preventive alternative development, as appropriate, to gain access to markets, consistent with applicable multilateral trade rules and with national and international law, within the framework of comprehensive and balanced drug control strategies;

(c) Express concern that illicit cultivation of crops and illicit manufacture, distribution and trafficking remain serious challenges in addressing and countering the world drug problem, and recognize the need for strengthening sustainable crop control strategies that may include, inter alia, alternative development, eradication and law enforcement measures, for the purpose of preventing and reducing significantly and measurably the illicit cultivation of crops, and the need for intensifying joint efforts at the national, regional and international levels in a more comprehensive manner, in accordance with the principle of common and shared responsibility, including by means of appropriate preventive tools and measures, enhanced and better coordinated financial and technical assistance and action-oriented programmes, in order to tackle those challenges;

(d) Consider elaborating and implementing comprehensive and sustainable alternative development programmes… that support sustainable crop control strategies to prevent and significantly, durably and measurably reduce illicit crop cultivation and other illicit drug-related activities, ensuring the empowerment, ownership and responsibility of affected local communities, including farmers …

(e) Develop best practies towards implementing the United Nations Guiding Principles on Alternative Development
MEASURING THE SUCCESS OF ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT

• Traditional approach:
  – reduction in the area under illicit crop cultivation

• Broadening the set of indicators used to measure success in alternative development
  • Socio-economic indicators
  • Human development indicators

In the *United Nations Guiding Principles on Alternative Development*, the coupling of human development and crop reduction indicators to measure the success of alternative development efforts is suggested.

In paragraph 18 (v) of the Guiding Principles, Member States, international and regional organizations, development agencies, donors, international financial institutions and civil society are asked to “apply, in addition to estimates of illicit cultivation and other illicit activities related to the world drug problem, indicators related to human development, socioeconomic conditions, rural development and the alleviation of poverty, as well as institutional and environmental indicators, when assessing alternative development programmes in order to ensure that the outcomes are in line with national and international development objectives, including the Millennium Development Goals”.

• Composite indices
Thailand: Opium poppy cultivation (in hectares), 1961-2013 and GDP Index, 1965=100, based on constant US$


---

**Poppy cultivation in Thailand**

- **1961/62**: 12,112
- **1965/66**: 17,920
- **1967**: 8,777
- **1972/73**: 4,177
- **1980/81**: 1,103
- **2000/2001**: 265

**GDP Index Thailand**

- **1965=100**: 6.0% per year
- **1966**: -98.5%

**GDP Index World**

- **2010**: 3.3% per year
Thailand: People-Centred Human Development Indicators for Doi Tung Development Project

- **Economic: Per Capita Income Increase**
  - Doi Tung Income: +65%
  - Poverty line in Bangkok: -75%

- **Social: Higher Level of Education**
  - Data for primary, secondary, vocational, and college/university education.

- **Environmental: Forest Regeneration**
  - Comparison between 1989 and Present.
  - Categories: Infrastructures, Residential, Agriculture, Economic Forest, Reforestation, Original Forest.
Pakistan: area under opium poppy cultivation, 1975-2013

Attacks by terrorist, insurgent and non-State armed groups and area under coca cultivation, Peru, 1978-2016

Colombia: area under coca cultivation, eradication and alternative development, 2000-2013

Source: UNODC, Colombia Coca Surveys 2013 (and previous years).
The consolidation index is used to measure, among other issues, some of the basic elements of alternative development derived from sub-indices describing:

(a) the institutionalization of the territory;
(b) citizen participation and good governance; and
(c) regional integration.

These areas were identified by the authorities as the policy’s main pillars for the reconstruction of territories that were previously under the influence of groups involved in large-scale illicit crop cultivation, drug manufacture, drug trafficking and insurgency.
Registered victims* of non-State armed violence and area under coca cultivation, Colombia, 2000-2016

* Victims of terrorist attacks, related homicides, mines, kidnapping, forced displacements, forced disappearance, torture, etc.

Sources: UNODC and Gobierno de Colombia, Colombia Monitoreo de territorios afectados por cultivos ilícitos 2015 (July 2016 and previous years); Unidad para la Atención y P reparación Integral a las Víctimas, Red Nacional de Información, "Registro único de víctimas". Available at http://rni.unidadavictimas.gov.co/RUV.
Key elements of success for alternative development

• Long-term political and financial support
• Income-generating alternatives
• Marketing of products of alternative development
• Land tenure and the sustainable management and use of land
• Local ownership and community participation
  • Focus on women
• Minimum levels of security
Persons killed in terrorist attacks and area under opium poppy cultivation in Afghanistan, 2000-2016

Source: MCN and UNODC, Afghanistan Opium Survey 2016 - Cultivation and Production (Vienna, 2016), and previous years; Global Terrorism Database.
Security and area under poppy cultivation in Afghanistan

2016: 201,000 ha, +10%

2017: 328,000 ha, +63%

TABLE 7 Distribution of opium poppy cultivation areas occupied by insurgent groups, Afghanistan, 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Opium poppy cultivation 2016</th>
<th>Opium poppy in Taliban control zone</th>
<th>Opium poppy in High-confidence Taliban support zone</th>
<th>Opium poppy in Low-confidence Taliban support zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>201,294</td>
<td>52,642</td>
<td>116,135</td>
<td>2,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Helmand food zone: quick impact projects

2008: Opium cultivation:    -37% in food zone;
    + 8% outside in Helmand
2009:                      -33% in food zone; growth outside
Further decreases of opium cultivation in the food zone reported in subsequent years -38% in 2011 in food zone

2012: 24,241 ha of opium poppy in food zone;
      50,935 ha of opium poppy outside of food zone.

But increases thereafter to
  66,181 ha of opium poppy in food zone in 2017 (2012-2017: +173% )
  77,837 ha of opium poppy outside of food zone in 2017 (+ 52%)

<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>Hilmand</td>
<td>75,176</td>
<td>100,693</td>
<td>103,240</td>
<td>86,443</td>
<td>80,273</td>
<td>144,018</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2012-2017: +192%

Source: UNODC and Ministry of Counter Narcotics, Afghanistan Opium Survey 2017 (and previous years).
Evidence-Based Design of Alternative Development Projects in Afghanistan (2017-2020):

UNODC-Afghanistan: 13 Provinces
UNDP (West): Farah and Badghis
UNDP (East): Nangahar

UNODC-GLOU34: Impact Assessment

Number villages: 478
Total: US$90 millions (impact assessment 5%).
Impact Assessment of Alternative Development Projects by UNODC (Mixed Methods)

1) Describe the current situation (baseline for impact assessment)
2) Need assessment (gaps between poppy and non-poppay villages/households)
3) Theory of change (how changes are expected to happen)

Evidence-based design of AD projects

Remote sensing analysis (areas of legal crops and opium poppy)
Participatory design of data collection instruments

Elaboration of socio-economic instruments
- desk reviews
- discussions on potential interventions
- initial theory of change for opium poppy cultivation

Stakeholders’ feedback

Final socio-economic instruments

1) Village headmen survey (478)
2) Household survey with male & female members (16,462)
3) Consumer questionnaires in four types of markets (413)
4) Women focus groups (77 with 10 women each)
Need assessment:
Comparison of villages by opium poppy and non-poppy status

Overall, opium poppy villages were in a disadvantaged situation in comparison to non-opium poppy villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected variables (statistically significantly) associated with opium poppy cultivation</th>
<th>Recommendation for prioritization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNODC-Afghanistan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-being controlled by anti-government organizations</td>
<td>-security and public services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDP-East</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-not having agricultural market inside the village</td>
<td>-access to markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-having lower quality of roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDP-West</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-having drought problems</td>
<td>-drought mitigation infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Probit model results)
Why do we need a theory of change? AD Interventions are complex and context specific
Proposed theory of change for poppy cultivation
(Structural equation regression) estimates of the paths of the theory of change
Conclusions – Afghanistan AD Impact assessment

Correlation of poverty with poppy is not equal to causation:
- Poppy cultivation occurs in remote villages with low living conditions. Poppy farmers are better off, more income, less food insecurity than non poppy farmers.

Select AD interventions and justify them with evidence:
- Currently no association of greenhouses, orchards or vineyards with legal crop income or food security.
- Complementary versus substitute activities (promoting legal crop cultivation versus livestock).

On targeting female-headed households:
- Female-headed households earn half of the male-headed household income (1350 USD), more food insecurity.
  - Less prone to cultivate opium poppy (female activities: poultry, milk and cheese).
  - Important but complementary target of drug-control policies.

Effects of individual interventions are small:
- Need of packages of alternative development interventions.

Long-term AD plus rule of law is essential:
- Otherwise, improvements oriented to legal crop cultivation may favor poppy cultivation in the short run (e.g., better soil quality).
• Seaports
• Airports
• Land borders

• Specialised units ("Joint Port Control Units")
• Risk Management training in national LE curriculum
• Technical equipment
• Information & intelligence sharing platforms
• Cargo Targeting System (WCO CTS)
• Clearance Systems (ASYCUDA)
• Investigation support and evidence handling

A comprehensive Border Control Strategy for CARGO (since 2004) (90% of all trade conducted via maritime containers, less than 2% are inspected)
Participating countries, 2017 (with dedicated staff)

49 operational countries and 6 funded countries
Cocaine

200 mt seized - 100 mt - destination Europe

CCP Air and Sea (dry) port seizures 2016

DRUGS in KILOGRAMS

- Cocaine: 38,149.361 kg
- Heroin: 1,508 kg
- Cannabis Resin: 169,356 kg
- Herbal Cannabis: 1,970,027 kg
- Psychotropic: 44.5 kg
- Tramadol: 10,320 kg
- Precursors: 55,600 kg
- NPS: 100 kg

Precursors 49.9%
Tramadol 9.3%
Psychotropic 0.2%
Herbal Cannabis 1.8%
Resin 0.2%
NPS 0.1%
Cocaine 34.2%
Donor Countries

Australia
Canada
Denmark
European Union/EC
France
Germany
Italy
Japan
Luxembourg
Netherlands
Norway
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
United Kingdom
United States
Lessons learned

- Government/senior management commitment
- Lack of human resources
- Training elements – basic to specialized training
- Sustainability – rotation policy
- Information sharing policy/tradition – lack of inter-agency cooperation
- Private sector cooperation
- Anti-corruption measures
- UNODC staff on the ground
- WCO and UNODC training resources – recruited full time trainers
European Trans-regional Responses to Drug Trafficking and Organised Crime

Real time operational communication between international airports to fight transnational organized crime, including drug trafficking, and terrorism

Strengthening criminal investigation and criminal justice cooperation along the cocaine route in Latin America, the Caribbean and West Africa

EU COCAINE ROUTE PROGRAMME (CRP)
AIRport Communication Project (AIRCOP)

FUNDING

EU COCAINE ROUTE PROGRAMME (CRP)
THREE PILLARS OF AIRCOP

1. Establishment of Joint Airport Interdiction Task Forces (JAITFs)

2. Real time transmission and sharing of information

3. National and regional training and mentoring activities

EU COCAINE ROUTE PROGRAMME (CRP)
EU COCAINE ROUTE PROGRAMME (CRP)

THE AIRCOP PROJECT

Training and Seizures

- 5.7 tons of cocaine
- 1.6 tons of cannabis
- 1.3 tons of meth
- 350 kgs of heroin
- 100 kgs of amphetamine
- 2.1 tons of counterfeit medicine
- 360 kgs of ephedrine
- 9 tons of tobacco products
- 7.5 million undeclared USD

- 3,200 persons trained
- 20% of them were women
- 200 training and mentoring activities
- 20 joint operations

EU COCAINE ROUTE PROGRAMME (CRP)
CRIMJUST

Strengthening criminal investigation and criminal justice cooperation along the cocaine route in Latin America, the Caribbean and West Africa

IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

INTERPOL

TRANSPARENCY INTERNATIONAL

EU COCAINE ROUTE PROGRAMME (CRP)
EU COCAINE ROUTE PROGRAMME (CRP)

MAIN PILLARS & GEOGRAPHIC COVERAGE

West Africa
Cabo-Verde, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau
Associated Country: Nigeria

Latin America & the Caribbean
Dominican Republic, Panama
Associated Countries: Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru
Percentage of capacity building activities carried out by region:

- **LAC**: 45%
- **WA**: 30%
- **LAC-WA**: 25%

Total of Capacity Building Activities: 62

Location of Activities:
- **CRIMJUST Countries**
- **Non-CRIMJUST Countries**

**EU COCAINE ROUTE PROGRAMME (CRP)**
IMPLEMENTATION STATUS

Total Nr. of participants attending Capacity Building Activities

1606
Total number of participants

20%
Of participants are female

N.4
Average activities per month

N.3
Operational Activities

EU COCAINE ROUTE PROGRAMME (CRP)
Operation Lionfish III
Disrupting transnational drug networks

5,000 law enforcement officers
357 suspects arrested
13 countries
55 drugs seized
20 clandestine drug laboratories

5,000
13
55
20

Argentina Bolivia Brazil Cape-Verde Chile Colombia Dominican Republic Ecuador Ghana Guinea-Bissau Nigeria Panama Peru

CANNABIS COCAINE HEROIN OTHERS PRECURSOR CHEMICALS

EU COCAINE ROUTE PROGRAMME (CRP)
IMPACT OF CRIMJUST TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Regional Specialized Training on Financial Disruption of Criminal Networks
January 2018, Colombia

- 92% learned new ways to understand, investigate and disrupt criminal networks
- 100% considered the training course on financial disruption of criminal networks as extremely useful

9. How do you consider this activity?
- Extremely useful
- Useful
CRIMJUST capacity building efforts are multiplied and disseminated to 2,000 officials in Argentina, participants underlined the high value of the topics learned, which had both operational and strategic utility relevant for professional activities.
CRIMJUST Next Steps

✓ Focus on post seizure investigations including the transition between investigation and prosecution (LE vs Prosecutors)

✓ Strengthening cooperation mechanisms at a national, regional and international level, with special focus in interregional cooperation.

✓ Tailor actions to countries’ requests

✓ Streamline anti-corruption and integrity actions
“The Paris Pact Initiative –
A Global Forum
to Fight Against the Illicit Trafficking of Opiates Originating in Afghanistan to the Region and Beyond”
Significant individual heroin seizures in Europe, January 2016-December 2017*

Balkan route: 80% of all mentions of heroin trafficking in West, Central and South-East Europe over 2012-2016 period

Source: UNODC (AOTP) and Paris Pact, Drugs Monitoring Platform (DMP).
Paris Pact initiative: A Partnership to Combat Illicit Traffic in Opiates Originating in Afghanistan

Paris Pact partners - 58 partner countries and 23 regional and international organizations

Paris Pact Policy Consultative Group Meetings endorsing Expert Working Group recommendations

UNODC
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
Vienna Declaration

Pillar I
Regional Cooperation
Offering a forum for dialogue

Pillar II
Financial Flows linked to Illicit Traffic in Opiates
Adapting to evolving threats along trafficking routes

Pillar III
Preventing the diversion of precursor chemicals
Promoting good practice

Pillar IV
Reducing Drug Abuse and Dependence
Enhancing evidence-based policy and strategy

UNODC
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Paris Pact Initiative
A Partnership to Combat Illicit Traffic in Opiates Originating in Afghanistan
Paris Pact Programme

Consultative Mechanism
Expert Working Groups / Policy Consultative Group Meetings

Information Management
- ADAM
- Drugs Monitoring Platform (DMP)

Research and Liaison Officer Network
FUNDING PARTNERS OF PHASE IV

- Austria
- France
- India
- Norway
- Russian Federation
- Turkey
- United Kingdom
- United States of America

www.paris-pact.net
UNODC initiatives in creating regional networks of agencies and in "networking" the networks

Promoting regional structures to support cross border and regional cooperation

- Prosecutorial and Central Authorities
- Law Enforcement
- Financial Intelligence
Law Enforcement

* Ensuring exchange of criminal intelligence;
* Coordinating multilateral operations;
* Serving as a platform for operational initiatives
  – e.g. meetings of the case officers investigating real cases promoting ‘controlled deliveries’

- **Joint Planning Cell** – Afghanistan, Iran, Pakistan
- **Gulf Criminal Intelligence Centre to Combat Drugs (GCIC)** - Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia & UAE
- **Central Asian Regional Information and Coordination Centre (CARICC)** – 5 Central Asian countries (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan) plus Russian Federation and Azerbaijan.
- Others
“Networking the Networks”
"NETWORKING THE NETWORKS"
Modern forensic technologies to support national drug control efforts - Laboratory & Scientific Section
Field testing methods (screening)

UNODC drug and precursor test kits

Handheld FTIR devices

Handheld Raman devices
Scenario 1: Latin American remote border post
Suspicious object found. A packet of powdery substance concealed in a shoe.
DEMO: UNODC Drug and Precursor Kits

✓ Fast preliminary/screening test

✓ Immediate action can be taken in the field

✓ Can save time and work

✓ Portable

✓ Cheap and easy to use
✓ Specific chemical reactions between substances in question and appropriate reagent(s)

✓ The reaction give a product with a characteristic colour

✓ This colour is specific for a group of substances that are chemically related, e.g. opiates
TEST E
Cocaine, methaqualone
1. Place a small amount of the suspected material in a test tube.
2. Add one drop of reagent E1 and shake for 10 seconds.
3. Add one drop of reagent E2 and shake for 10 seconds.
   Colour indicates the possible presence of cocaine or methaqualone.
Scenario 2: Airport Mail Room
Scenario 2: Airport Mail Room

- Suspicious colourful packages found in mail with labels “NOT FOR HUMAN CONSUMPTION”. Intention to bypass regulations.
- May contain herbal or powdery substances.
- Suspected to contain NPS
- Associated with serious health risks
- Mimic the effect of traditional drugs
DEMO: Handheld Raman devices

- Gives more information than colour test kits
- Able to detect new drugs of abuse (if the library knows these drugs)
- No sample handling required
- Uses a laser beam (be careful!)
- Able scan through thin glass and plastic bags
- Scans are compared to a library
DEMO: Handheld Raman devices

Mail No: 1

Mail No: 2

Mail No: 3
DEMO: Handheld Raman devices

Mail No: 1
DEMO: Handheld Raman devices

Mail No: 1

A synthetic cathinone, MDPV detected

Scheduled in the 1971 Convention (Schedule II) in 2015
DEMO: Handheld Raman devices

Mail No: 2
A synthetic cannabinoid, JWH-073 detected

NPS under WHO surveillance list. Considered to have the potential to cause public health harm
DEMO: Handheld Raman devices

Mail No: 3
DEMO: Handheld Raman devices

Mail No: 3

Acetyl fentanyl detected

Scheduled in the 1961 Convention (Schedule I, IV) in 2016
Scenario 3: In a container of a Seaport
Scenario 3: In a container of a Seaport

A whole container containing suspicious soft toys found.

Packets of capsules containing powdery substance were concealed in the soft toys.
DEMO: Handheld FTIR devices

- Gives more information than colour test kits
- Able to detect new drugs of abuse (if the library knows these drugs)
- Easy to operate
- Little sample handling is required
- Sample to be placed onto the sample well or in direct contact
- Scans are compared to a library
Acetaminophen (paracetamol) detected.

Does not mean absence of a controlled substance!
Paracetamol is commonly used as a cutting agent.
Field testing methods (screening)

✓ field tests were never intended as a definitive method to identify suspected material

✓ field tests are tools or techniques, which can assist customs and law enforcement officers in making decisions regarding suspected materials

✓ field tests are useful because they give the officer probable cause to take further actions

✓ Suspected material must be sent to a laboratory for confirmatory analysis
Confirmatory analysis in laboratory

- various methodology and instrumentation used e.g. GC-MS, GC-FID, HPLC, LC-MS
- Good laboratory practices
- Quality management
- Health and safety precautions
Training and Workshops
THANK YOU
FOR YOUR ATTENTION

For more information:
http://www.unodc.org/