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# Introduction

Considerable efforts have been made over the years to improve the estimates presented in the *World Drug Report,* which rely, to a large extent, on information submitted by Member States through the Annual Reports Questionnaire (ARQ)*.* Nonetheless, challenges remain in producing such estimates because of the gaps and the varying quality in the available data. One major problem is the heterogeneity in the completeness and the time frame of data coverage in ARQs reported by Member States. Irregular reporting may result in absence of data for some years and may also influence the reported trend in a given year. In addition, submitted questionnaires are not always comprehensive, and much of the data collected are subject to limitations and biases. These issues affect the reliability, quality and comparability of the information received.

## Sources of information

Under the International Drug Conventions, Member States are formally required to provide national drug control related information annually to the ‘Secretary General’ of the United Nations (i.e. the Secretariat in the UNODC). For this purpose, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs in 2020 endorsed the revised Annual Reports Questionnaire (ARQ) that is sent to Member States each calendar year for submission of responses and information on the drug situation.

The World Drug Report 2023 online segment is based on data primarily obtained from the ARQs submitted by Governments to UNODC. In 2020, the ARQ was updated and streamlined[[1]](#footnote-2) and the data collection was fully moved to an online interface, created specifically for this purpose. The first time the data was collected in the online environment was in 2021 (present cycle of data collection). This may have led to some additional challenges in data comparability with the previous years. The data collected in the current ARQ normally refer to the drug situation in 2021.. Out of 200 potential respondents to the ARQ for 2021 (including 193 Member States), UNODC received 84 full replies – submission of all updated and streamlined ARQ modules and 41 partial replies (submission of part of the ARQ modules) to its Annual Reports Questionnaire. Europe, had the best coverage (64 per cent of the respondents provided a full reply, while 24 provided partial response), followed by Asia (48 per cent and 22 per cent) and the Americas (46 per cent and 23 per cent). In the case of Africa, 42 per cent of the Member States, and in the Oceania region, only two out of the 16 countries, responded to the Annual Report Questionnaire.

In general, the quantity of information provided on illicit drug supply is slightly better than that of information provided on drug demand.

In order to analyse the extent to which Member States provided information, a number of key questions in the ARQ were identified:

* For drug demand, data was collected mainly in annual modules A01-A06. In total, 115 countries submitted the modules on registries and prevalence of drug use, 108 the module on mortality, 112 the module on people with drug use disorders, and 109 the modules on people who inject drugs and treatment. However, this analysis does not take into account the completeness or quality of the information provided in response to each of the areas mentioned.
* For drug supply, data was predominantly collected in annual modules A07-A12, but additional themes were covered in rotating modules R06, R07, R09 and R11. In total, 124 countries submitted the module on seizures, 115 on clandestine laboratories and cultivation and eradication, and 113 countries submitted the module on price and purities. However, this analysis does not take into account the completeness of responses of the quality of information provided in each of sections mentioned.
* Additional topics related to drug policy frameworks were covered in modules A13 (Legislative, institutional, and strategic framework). Module A14 gathered information on Innovative methods for data. In total, 113 countries or territories submitted module A13, and107 submitted A14.Information provided by Member States in the ARQ form the basis for the estimates and trend analysis provided in the World Drug Report. Often, this information and data is not sufficient to provide an accurate or comprehensive picture of the world’s drug markets. When necessary and where available, the data from the ARQ are thus supplemented with data from other sources.

As in previous years, seizure data made available to UNODC via the ARQ was complemented primarily with data from other government sources, such as other official communication with UNODC, official national publications, data provided to UNODC by the Heads of National Law Enforcement Agencies (HONLEA) at their regional meetings and data published by international and regional organisations such as Interpol/ICPO, World Customs Organization, European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) and the Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD). Price data for Europe were complemented with data from Europol. Demand related information was obtained through a number of additional sources, including the national assessments of the drug situation supported by UNODC, the drug control agencies participating in the UNODC’s ‘Drug Abuse Information Network for Asia and the Pacific’ (DAINAP), as well as various national and regional epidemiological networks such as the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) or the Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD). Reports published by National governments and academic research published in the scientific literature were also used as additional sources of information. This type of supplementary information is useful and necessary to present – to the extent which is possible – an unbiased comprehensive picture of the drug situation as long as Member States lack the monitoring systems necessary to produce reliable, comprehensive and internationally comparable data.

To this end, UNODC encourages and supports the improvement of national monitoring systems. Major progress has been made in the area of illicit crop monitoring over the last three decades in some of the countries that have major illicit crop cultivations. In close cooperation with UNODC and with the support of major donors – these countries have developed monitoring systems designed to identify the extent of, and trends in, the cultivation of narcotic plants. These data form a fundamental basis for trend analysis of illicit crop cultivation and drug production presented in the World Drug Report.

There remain significant data limitations on the demand side, notably among countries in Africa and Asia.. Despite commendable progress made in several Member States, in the area of prevalence estimates for example, far more remains to be done to provide a truly reliable basis for trend and policy analysis and needs assessments. The work currently being done on the World Drug Report provides yet another opportunity to emphasize the global need for improving the evidence base available to the policy makers and programme planners.

# Drug use and health consequences

## Data on drug use and health consequences

UNODC estimates of the extent of illicit drug use in the world have been published periodically since 1997. Assessing the extent of drug use (the prevalence and estimates of the number of drug users) is a particularly difficult undertaking because it involves in most settings measuring the size of a ‘hidden’ population. Regional and global estimates are reported with ranges to reflect the information gaps. The level of confidence expressed in the estimates varies across regions and drug types.

A global estimate of the level of use of a specific drug involves the following steps:

1. Identification and analysis of appropriate sources (starting from the ARQ);
2. Identification of key benchmark figures for the level of drug use in all countries where data are available (annual prevalence of drug use among the general population aged 15-64) which then serve as ‘anchor points’ for subsequent calculations;
3. ‘Standardization’ of existing data if reported with a different reference population than the one used for the *World Drug Report* (for example, from age group 12 and above to a standard age group of 15-64);
4. Adjustments of national indicators to estimate an annual prevalence rate if such a rate is not available (for example, by using the lifetime prevalence or current use rates; by aggregating prevalence of two drug types, like use of amphetamine and methamphetamine to obtain the joint estimates of prevalence of use for amphetamines overall; or extrapolating from lifetime or annual prevalence rates among the youth population to the adult population. The latter includes the identification of adjustment factors based on information from countries in the region with similar cultural, social and economic situations where applicable;
5. Imputation for countries where data are not available, based on data from countries in the same subregion. Ranges are calculated by considering the 10th and 90th weighted percentile of the subregional distribution, using the target[[2]](#footnote-3) population in the countries as weights;
6. Extrapolations of available results for a subregion were calculated only for subregions where prevalence estimates for at least two countries covering at least 20% of the population were available. If, due to a lack of data, subregional estimates were not extrapolated, a regional calculation was extrapolated based on the 10th and 90th percentile of the distribution of the data available from countries in the region. Since the World Drug Report 2019, when this methodology was revised, a weighted percentile procedure has been used that takes into account the population aged 15-64 in the countries;
7. Aggregation of subregional estimates rolled-up into regional results to arrive at global estimates.

For countries that did not submit information through the ARQ, or in cases where the data were older than 10 years, other sources were identified, where available. In nearly all cases, these were government sources. Many estimates needed to be adjusted to improve comparability (see below).

In cases of estimates referring to previous years, the prevalence rates are unchanged and applied to new population estimates for the year 2021. Currently, only a few countries measure prevalence of drug use among the general population on an annual basis. The remaining countries that regularly measure it - typically the more economically developed - do so usually every three to five years. Therefore, caution should be used when interpreting any change in national, regional or even global prevalence figures, as changes may in part reflect newer reports from countries, at times with changed methodology, or the exclusion of older reports, rather than actual changes in prevalence of a drug type. Additional caution is required in the interpretation of prevalence rates based on 2020/2021 surveys, as many countries had to adjust methodologies owing to the situation related to the COVID-19 pandemic and rules and regulations in place to protect public health from it (e.g. lockdowns or social distancing rules leading to several surveys moving their data collections online). As a result, the comparability of 2020/2021 studies with previous studies is unknown and may be decreased.

Detailed information on drug use is available from countries in North America, a large number of countries in Europe, a number of countries in South America, the two economically most advanced countries in Oceania and a limited number of countries in Asia and Africa.

One key problem in national data is the level of accuracy, which varies strongly from country to country. Not all estimates are based on sound epidemiological surveys. In some cases, the estimates simply reflect the aggregate number of drug users found in drug registries, which cover only a fraction of the total drug using population in a country. Even in cases where detailed information is available, there is often considerable divergence in definitions used, such as chronic or regular users; registry data (people in contact with the treatment system or the judicial system) versus survey data (usually extrapolation of results obtained through interviews of a selected sample); general population versus specific surveys of groups in terms of age (such as school surveys), special settings (such as hospitals or prisons), or high risk groups, et cetera.

To reduce the error margins that arise from simply aggregating such diverse estimates, an attempt has been made to standardize - as a far as possible - the heterogeneous data set. Available estimates were transformed into one single indicator – annual prevalence among the general population – in most instances using regional average estimates and using transformation ratios derived from analysis of the situation in neighbouring countries. The basic assumption is that though the level of drug use differs between countries, there are general patterns found for the psychoactive substances for which regional and global estimates are generated (for example, young people consume more drugs than older people; males consume more drugs than females; people in contact with the criminal justice system show higher prevalence rates than the general population, et cetera) which apply to most countries. It is also assumed that the relationship between lifetime prevalence and annual prevalence among the general population or between lifetime prevalence among young people and annual prevalence among the general population, except for new or emerging drug trends, do not vary greatly among countries with similar social, cultural and economic situations.

UNODC does not publish estimates of the prevalence of drug use in countries with smaller populations (less than approximately 100,000 population aged 15-64) where the prevalence estimates were based on the results of youth or school surveys that were extrapolated to the general adult population, as applying such methods in the context of small countries can result in inaccurate figures as the underlying samples for such extrapolations are often small and potentially biased.

## Indicators

The most widely used indicator at the global level is the annual prevalence rate: the number of people who have consumed an illicit drug at least once in the twelve months prior to the study. Annual prevalence has been adopted by UNODC as one of key indicators to measure the extent of drug use. It is also part of the Lisbon Consensus on core epidemiological indicators of drug use which has been endorsed by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. The key epidemiological indicators of drug use are:

1. Drug use among the general population (prevalence and incidence);
2. Drug use among the youth population (prevalence and incidence);
3. High-risk drug use (number of injecting drug users and the proportion engaged in high-risk behaviour, number of daily drug users);
4. Utilization of services for drug problems (treatment demand);
5. Drug-related morbidity (prevalence of HIV, hepatitis B virus and hepatitis C virus among drug users);
6. Drug-related mortality (deaths attributable to drug use).

Efforts have been made to present the overall drug situation from countries and regions based on these key epidemiological indicators.

The use of annual prevalence is a compromise between lifetime prevalence data (drug use at least once in a lifetime) and data on current use (drug use at least once over the past month). Accurate data on current use would, in many cases, require larger samples than countries are willing to afford while data on life-time prevalence have only a limited use when drug use among the general population is considered. The annual prevalence rate is usually shown as a percentage of the youth and adult population. The definitions of the age groups vary, however, from country to country. Given a highly skewed distribution of drug use among the different age cohorts in most countries, differences in the age groups can lead to substantially diverging results.

Applying different methodologies may also yield diverging results for the same country. In such cases, the sources were analysed in-depth, and priority was given to the most recent data and to the methodological approaches that are considered to produce the best results. For example, it is generally accepted that nationally representative household surveys are reasonably good approaches to estimating cannabis, ATS or cocaine use among the general population, at least in countries where there are no adverse consequences for admitting illicit drug use. Thus, household survey results were usually given priority over other sources of prevalence estimates.

When it comes to the use of opiates (opium, heroin, and other illicit opiates), injecting drug use, or the use of cocaine and ATS among regular or dependent users, annual prevalence data derived from national household surveys tend to grossly under-estimate such use, because heroin or other problem drug users often tend to be marginalized or less socially integrated, and may not be identified as living in a ‘typical’ household (they may be on the streets, homeless or institutionalized). Therefore, a number of ‘indirect’ methods have been developed to provide estimates for this group of drug users, including benchmark and multiplier methods (benchmark data may include treatment demand, police registration or arrest data, data on HIV infections, other services utilization by problem drug users or mortality data), capture-recapture methods and multivariate indicator methods. In countries where there was evidence that the primary ‘problem drug’ was opiates, and an indirect estimate existed for ‘problem drug use’ or injecting drug use, this was preferred over household survey estimates of heroin use. Therefore, for most of the countries, prevalence of opioid or opiates use reported refers to the extent of use of these substances measured through indirect methods.

For other drug types, priority was given to annual prevalence data found by means of household surveys. In order to generate comparable results for all countries, wherever needed, the reported data was extrapolated to annual prevalence rates and/or adjusted for the preferred age group of 15-64 for the general population.

## Extrapolation methods

### Adjustment for differences in age groups

Member States are increasingly using the 15-64 age group, though other groups are used as well. Where the age groups reported by Member States did not differ significantly from 15-64, they were presented as reported, and the age group specified. Where studies were based on significantly different age groups, results were typically adjusted. A number of countries reported prevalence rates or number of drug users for the age groups 15+ or 18+. In such cases, adjustments were generally based on the assumption that there was no significant drug use above the age of 64; the reported number of drug users based on the population age 15+ (or age 18+) was shown as a proportion of the population aged 15-64.

### Methodology to produce joint estimates for more than one type of drugs

In the collection of information on prevalence of drug use, a number of instances arise where data are available for specific types of drugs, but prevalence data are needed at a higher level of aggregation. In other words, prevalence data may be available for two particular kinds of drugs but may also be needed in the form of a single figure which takes into account both types at the same time. This is especially relevant in the case of closely related types of drugs. For example, the prevalence of use of cocaine salts and “crack” cocaine may be known, but in addition the prevalence of cocaine in general may be needed. If no empirical data is available from Member States, a joint estimate is produced by aggregating the different types of drugs according to the following method:

The methodology to calculate the estimate for prevalence of use of two drugs considers the extent to which the group of users of one drug overlaps with the group of the users of the other drug, for the same reference period (i.e. lifetime, past year or past month).

The prevalence rates of two types of drugs are combined to obtain the estimate of the prevalence of any of the two drugs, which is derived as the midpoint of a lower (minimum) estimate and an upper (maximum) estimate. These two estimates represent two opposite extreme scenarios: in one scenario all the users of one type of drug also consume the other drug, whereas in the other scenario none of the persons consuming the first drug consume the other drug (and vice versa).

Given any two drugs A and B, we denote by PA and PB the prevalence of use of drugs A and B, respectively. We aim to obtain an estimate of the prevalence of use of at least one of the drugs A and B (e.g. use of cocaine = use of cocaine salts or crack cocaine). We shall call this value Z = PA&B.

The lower estimate (Z min) corresponds to the scenario where all the users of one drug are to be found among the users of the other drug. Therefore, the lower (minimum) joint estimate corresponds to the highest value (maximum) among the two values of prevalence.

Z min = max (PA, PB)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | OR |  |

The upper (maximum) joint estimate reflects the opposite scenario, where the group of users of drug A is completely separate from the group users of drug B; that is, none of the users of drug A consume drug B (and vice versa).

Therefore, the upper (maximum) joint estimate for the two drugs is the sum of the prevalence of the drug A and drug B; in other words, **Z max = PA + PB**.

The best estimate is obtained as the midpoint between Z min and Z max; that is **Z best = (Z max + Z min)/2**. This represents a scenario in between the two extremes, where some of drug A users consume also drug B.

### Extrapolation of results from lifetime prevalence to annual prevalence

Some countries have conducted surveys in recent years without asking the question whether drug consumption took place over the last year. In such cases, results were extrapolated to reach annual prevalence estimates. For example, country X in West and Central Europe reported a lifetime prevalence of cocaine use of 2%. As an example, taking data for lifetime and annual prevalence of cocaine use in countries of West and Central Europe, it can be shown that there is a strong positive correlation between the two measures (correlation coefficient R = 0.94); that is, the higher the lifetime prevalence, the higher the annual prevalence and vice versa. Based on the resulting regression line (with annual prevalence as the dependent variable and lifetime prevalence as the independent variable) it can be estimated that a country in West and Central Europe with a lifetime prevalence of 2% is likely to have an annual prevalence of around 0.7% (see figure). Almost the same result is obtained by calculating the ratio of the unweighted average of annual prevalence rates of the West and Central European countries and the unweighted average lifetime prevalence rate (0.93/2.61 = 0.356) and multiplying this ratio with the lifetime prevalence of the country concerned (2% \* 0.356 = 0.7%).

**Figure: Example of annual and lifetime prevalence rates of cocaine use in West and Central Europe**



Sources: UNODC, Annual Reports Questionnaire Data / EMCDDA, Annual Report.

A similar approach was used to calculate the overall ratio by averaging the annual/lifetime ratios, calculated for each country. Multiplying the resulting average ratio (0.387) with the lifetime prevalence of the country concerned provides the estimate for the annual prevalence (0.387 \* 2% = 0.8%). There is a close correlation observed between lifetime and annual prevalence (and an even stronger correlation between annual prevalence and monthly prevalence). Solid results (showing small potential errors) can only be expected from extrapolations done for a country in the same region. If instead of using the West and Central European average (0.387), the ratio found in the USA was used (0.17), the estimate for a country with a lifetime prevalence of cocaine use of 2% would instead amount to 0.3% (2% \* 0.17). Such an estimate is likely to be correct for a country with a drug history similar to the USA, which has had a cocaine problem for more than two decades, as opposed to West and Central Europe, where a significant cocaine problem is largely a phenomenon of the last decade. Therefore, data from countries in the same subregion with similar patterns in drug use were used, wherever possible, for extrapolation purposes.

Both approaches—the regression model and the ratio model—were used to determine upper and lower uncertainty range estimates calculated at a 90% confidence interval among those aged 15-64 years in the given country. The greater the range, the larger the level of uncertainty around the estimates. The range for each country is reported in the statistical annex, where available.

### Extrapolations based on school surveys

Analysis of countries which have conducted both school surveys and national household surveys shows that there is, in general, a positive correlation between the two variables, particularly for cannabis, ATS and cocaine. The correlation, however, is weaker than that of lifetime and annual prevalence or current use and annual prevalence among the general population. But it is stronger than the correlation between opiate use and injecting drug use and between treatment demand and extent of drug use in the general population

These extrapolations were conducted by using the ratios between school surveys and household surveys of countries in the same region or with similar social structure where applicable. As was the case with extrapolation of results from lifetime prevalence to annual prevalence, two approaches were taken: a) the unweighted average of the ratios between school and household surveys in the comparison countries with an upper and lower uncertainty range estimate calculated at a 90% confidence interval; and b) a regression-based extrapolation, using the relationships between estimates from the other countries to predict the estimate in the country concerned, with an upper and lower uncertainty range estimate calculated at a 90% confidence interval. The final uncertainty range and best estimate are calculated using both models, where applicable.

### Extrapolations based on treatment data

For a number of developing countries, the only drug use-related data available was drug users registered or treatment demand. In such cases, other countries in the region with a similar socio-economic structure were identified, which reported annual prevalence and treatment data. A ratio of people treated per 1,000 drug users was calculated for each country. The results from different countries were then averaged and the resulting ratio was used to extrapolate the likely number of drug users from the number of people in treatment.

## National, regional and global estimates of the number of people who use drugs and the health consequences of drug use

For this purpose, the estimated prevalence rates of countries were applied to the population aged 15-64, as provided by the United Nations Population Division for the year 2021 (using WPP 2022 revision).

In the tables presented in the World Drug Report for regional and global estimates, totals may not add up due to rounding.

Ranges have been produced to reflect the considerable uncertainty that arises when data are either extrapolated or imputed. Ranges are provided for estimated numbers and prevalence rates in the Report. Larger ranges are reported for subregions and regions with less certainty about the likely levels of drug use – in other words, those regions for which fewer direct estimates are available, for a comparatively smaller proportion of the region’s population, or for regions for which the existing estimates show a comparatively larger variability.

Countries with one published estimate (typically those countries with a representative household survey, or an indirect prevalence estimate that did not report ranges) did not have uncertainty estimated. This estimate is reported as the ‘best estimate’.

To account for populations in countries with no published estimate, the 10th and 90th percentile in the range of direct estimates within the subregion was used to produce a lower and upper estimate. Similarly, to the World Drug Report 2022 in this report a weighted percentile procedure was implemented, that takes into account the population in the 15-64 age group in each country. For example, suppose there are four countries in the Near and Middle East / South-West Asia subregion with sufficiently recent past year prevalence estimates for cocaine use: Afghanistan (0.00 per cent, a point estimate), Iran (Islamic Republic of) (0.00 per cent – 0.22 per cent , best estimate 0.11 per cent), Israel (0.50 per cent – 0.70 per cent, best estimate 0.60 per cent) and Pakistan (0.00 per cent – 0.04 per cent, best estimate 0.01 per cent). In order to obtain a best estimate for the subregion, the weighted average of the best estimates for prevalence over these four countries is applied to the population of the remaining countries in the subregion without prevalence data. To obtain a range for the subregion, the weighted 10th percentile of the lower bounds of the uncertainty ranges (0.00 per cent, 0.00 per cent, 0.50 per cent and 0.00 per cent), namely 0.00%, and the 90th percentile of the upper bounds (0.00 per cent, 0.22 per cent, 0.70 per cent and 0.04 per cent), namely 0.21 per cent, were considered. It is important to note that, as Israel accounts for only about 3 per cent of the population within the 15-64 age group in these four countries, the resulting weighted percentiles are not heavily influenced by the higher prevalence present in this country. The percentages of 0.00 and 0.21 were applied to the population of the remaining countries without prevalence data, in combination with the national level data for Afghanistan, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel and Pakistan, to derive subregional lower and upper estimates of 0.01 and 0.13 per cent respectively.

In some cases, not all the subregions in a region had sufficient country-level data to allow the above calculations. In such cases, for the purposes of arriving at estimates at regional level, lower and upper estimates at the sub-regional level were derived based on the data points from the entire region, specifically by considering the weighted 10th and 90th percentiles respectively of the lower and upper country-level estimates. These results were then combined with the other subregions to arrive at upper and lower estimates, and hence best estimates, at regional level.

This produces conservative (wide) intervals for subregions where there is geographic variation and/or variance in existing country-level estimates; but it also reduces the likelihood that skewed estimates will have a dramatic effect on regional and global figures, as the weighted percentiles procedure will give a smaller weight to relatively small countries, which tend to be more likely to present an extreme prevalence.

As in the World Drug Report 2022 in this report the region of Oceania was divided into four subregions (Australia and New Zealand, Melanesia, Micronesia, and Polynesia), while in previous years prior to 2018 no subregional estimates of annual prevalence among the population aged 15-64 were available. Given that the data for Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia is scarce, in order to avoid imputing these regions with data from only Australia and New Zealand (which are highly developed and thus very different from most other countries in Oceania), the closest five countries to these regions with available data were considered in the calculations, when necessary. This was the case for the calculations of the prevalence of cocaine, “ecstasy”, opiates and opioids.

### Estimates of the total number of people aged 15-64 who used illicit drugs at least once in the past year

This year’s Report used the same approach as in the previous years. Two ranges were produced, and the lowest and highest estimate of each approach was taken to estimate the lower and upper ranges, respectively, of the total drug using population. This estimate is obviously tentative given the limited number of countries upon which the data informing the two approaches were based. The two approaches were as follows:

Approach 1:

The global estimates of the number of people using each of the five drug groups in the past year were added up. Taking into account that people use more than one drug type and that these five populations overlap, the total was adjusted downward. The size of this adjustment was made based upon household surveys conducted in 29 countries globally including countries from North America (Canada, Mexico and the United States of America), Europe (including Italy, Germany, Spain and England and Wales), Latin America (Argentina, Brazil, Plurinational State of Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, El Salvador and Uruguay), Asia and the Pacific (Israel, Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand and Australia) and Africa (Algeria, Nigeria), which assessed all five drug types, and reported an estimate of total illicit drug use. Across these studies, the extent to which adding each population of users overestimated the total population was a median factor of 1.16. The summed total was therefore divided by 1.16 to arrive at an estimate of the global number of drug users.

Approach 2:

This approach was based on the average proportion of the total drug using population that used cannabis as a strong positive correlation between cannabis use and overall drug could be identified. The average proportion was obtained from household surveys conducted in the same countries as for Approach 1. Across all of these studies, the median proportion of cannabis users to total drug users was 80.9 per cent. The range of cannabis users at the global level was therefore divided by 0.809 to arrive at an estimate of the global number of drug users.

The global lower estimate was the lower of the two values obtained from the two approaches, while the upper estimates was the upper value derived from the two approaches described. The average of the two values was reported as best estimate.

### Estimates of the number of people suffering from drug use disorders

It is useful to make estimates of the number of drug users whose use is particularly problematic, as a proxy to those who could be diagnosed with drug use disorders, as this subgroup of drug users is most likely to come to the attention of health and law enforcement. Moreover, this subgroup’s drug use has been estimated to cause the main burden of disease and on public order.

The number of “people suffering from drug use disorders” was previously referred to as “problem drug users”. In this Report, as in previous years, each of the five range estimates of the number of people using each of the five drug groups was converted into a ‘heroin user equivalent’. This was calculated with ‘relative risk coefficients’ (see below)

Table: Relative risk coefficient

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Treatment index | IDU index | Toxicity index | Deaths index | Relative risk coefficient (average) |
| Opiates | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Cocaine | 85.3 | 47.8 | 88 | 18.5 | 59.9 |
| Amphetamines | 20.1 | 59.5 | 32 | 6.8 | 29.6 |
| Ecstasy | 3.8 | 6.1 | 20.7 | 1 | 7.9 |
| Cannabis | 9 | 0 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 2.8 |

A lower range was calculated by summing each of the five lower range estimates; the upper end of the range was calculated by summing the upper range of the five estimates.

To obtain an estimate of the number of ‘problem drug users’ (i.e. an estimate of the number of people suffering from drug use disorders), these totals were multiplied by the corresponding proportion of dependent heroin users (DSM-IV) among past year heroin users in the United States National Survey on Drug Use and Health (range 53-68% over a five year period). Hence, the LOW estimate is the lower proportion (53%) multiplied by the lower estimated size of the heroin use equivalent population. The HIGH estimate is the higher proportion (68%) multiplied by the higher estimated size of the heroin use equivalent population.

### Calculation of regional and global estimates of cannabis use among 15-16 years old students

In 2018, UNODC produced in the World Drug Report – for the first time – an estimate of the annual prevalence of cannabis use among 15-16 years old students, based on available data from 130 countries. Starting from 2019, the World Drug Report presents also estimates of any illicit drug use prevalence among 15-16 years old students.

The age group “15-16 years” was chosen as this is the “preferred” age group for “youth” that is asked in UNODC’s annual report questionnaire. This age group was also chosen by ESPAD which regularly provides data from some 35 European countries on drug and alcohol use. This age group is also available from the surveys among 10th graders undertaken annually under the Monitoring the Future project in the United States, funded by the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), and from a number of other countries.

Cannabis use prevalence rates typically increase with age until around 18-20 years before declining again thereafter with age. This also means that for most countries cannabis use prevalence rates among 15-16 years old students turn out to be rather similar to the broader group of students aged 12-18 (with those aged 12-14 showing lower rates and those aged 17-18 showing higher rates). Thus, for the United States the annual cannabis use prevalence rates amongst 10th graders turn out to be very similar to those found amongst 8th, 10th and 12th graders combined. Similarly, in Colombia annual prevalence of cannabis use amongst 12 to 18 years old students was found to have been very similar to the rates found among 15-16 years old students. The same applies to students in Pakistan as well. Cannabis use prevalence rates among students aged 15-16 are thus reasonably good proxies for cannabis use among the overall student population aged 12-18. They are thus the preferred indicator for measuring student drug use at the international level as is also reflected in the question on student drug use in UNODC’s annual report questionnaire.

The methodology chosen to calculate the global average of cannabis use among students aged 15-16 years was very similar to the methodology used to calculate cannabis use among the general population aged 15-64:

1. Listing – on a sub-regional basis – the latest annual prevalence rates of cannabis use among the population aged 15-16 (which in most cases reflected school surveys) and multiplying such percentages with the average population of those aged 15-16 in those countries in 2020.
2. For the remaining countries that reported prevalence data on cannabis use (but not the requested age group or not annual prevalence), the following adjustments/extrapolations were done:
	1. Adjusting surveys using different age groups to a likely estimate for the population aged 15-16 years; the age adjustments were done based on detailed data from the United Stated for countries in North America, Europe and the developed countries of the Oceania region (i.e. Australia and New Zealand); for Africa and Asia based on detailed data available from Pakistan and for South America, Central America and the Caribbean based on detailed data available from Colombia.

A special model was developed for the adjustments. Taking into account considerations of diversity and representativity, the following data served as benchmarks for the calculation of the conversion ratios: the 2013 survey in Colombia among people aged 12-65[[3]](#footnote-4), the 2012 survey carried out in Pakistan jointly by UNODC and the Government of Pakistan targeting the population aged 15-64[[4]](#footnote-5) and the 2015 National Survey on Drug Use and Health of the United States among people aged 12 years and older[[5]](#footnote-6). After collating or generating prevalence data broken down by age groups, prevalence data were derived for each single-year age group. In cases where robust data were not available at this level of granularity (e.g. prevalence data available only for the age brackets 15-19, 20-24, 25-29, etc.), the prevalence in single-year age groups was estimated by optimizing for smoothness the prevalence data as a function of age - subject to the constraints that the total number of users within each given age bracket remained unchanged (i.e. equal to the prevalence multiplied by the population within the specific age bracket). Where necessary boundary conditions were imposed, e.g. a prevalence of 0 for ages 10 and below. On the basis of single-year prevalence estimates obtained, the prevalence rates were estimated for each possible age group that could potentially arise (e.g. 10-15, 12-19, 14-22). Finally, the conversion factors were calculated as the ratios of the prevalence data within the respective age groups as compared to the age groups of interest (age 15-16 years).

* 1. Extrapolating available life-time or past month data of cannabis use from individual countries to (missing) annual prevalence data based on a regression analysis of other countries in the subregion providing both life-time and annual data among youth or both past month and annual data among youth. A 95 per cent confidence interval was then used to calculate, in addition, a minimum and a maximum estimate based on such regression data.
1. For the remaining countries which did not report any prevalence data it was assumed that – on average – they had similar prevalence rates as the population weighted average of the reporting countries in the subregion. In cases where the reporting countries accounted for less than 20 per cent of the total population of the subregion, the (weighted) average of reporting countries in the region as a whole was used instead.
2. For countries not reporting any prevalence data it was assumed that the lower estimate was equivalent to the (population weighted) 10th percentile of the reporting countries in the subregion (or the region if reporting countries in the subregion accounted for less than 20 per cent of total population in the subregion) while the upper estimate was equivalent to the (population weighted) 90th percentile of the reporting countries in the subregion (or the data for the region was used as a proxy if reporting countries in the subregion accounted for less than 20 per cent of the total population in the subregion).

The reported ranges reflected primarily the coverage of a region by student surveys; in short, the larger the reported error margins, the less countries reported school survey data in a region or sub-region to UNODC. Error margins turned out to be small for Europe and the Americas where a majority of countries undertook such school surveys in recent years while they were rather large for Africa, Asia or for the Oceania region (with the exception of the economically advanced countries in this region).

1. The totals of the calculated subregional estimates gave the regional estimates and the total of the regional estimates then gave the global estimates.
2. The number of cannabis users was shown for a hypothetical average age of 15-16 years; in order to calculate the total number of cannabis users of those aged 15 years and 16 years the totals had to be still multiplied by two (in order to be in line with the approach used to show general population estimates for those aged 15-64)

### Estimated global cannabis use broken down by sex and age

In 2022 World Drug Report, an analysis was provided for the first time, aimed at estimating the global breakdown of cannabis users by age and sex. This exercise was repeated for 2023. As a basis for these estimates, the global estimated number of past-year users of cannabis in the age group 15-64, as well as global prevalence of past-year cannabis use among 15-64 year-olds and 15-16 year-olds, described above, was used. The starting point was thus the latest global estimate of past-year cannabis users in the age 15-64. The following sequence of steps was taken:

1. These users were divided into males females based on an estimate of the percentage of women among past year cannabis users estimated previously based on the household survey data from 64 countries (see below).
2. Further, the margin total for 15-16 year-olds was added on the basis of an estimate of prevalence of cannabis use among this age group globally and the global population data from the World Population Prospects, United Nations Population Division.
3. These were then subsequently subdivided into boys and girls based on a weighted average of proportions of girls among past-year cannabis users in subregions where data was available. In case of Europe, ESPAD study-based proportion of girls among cannabis users (42%) was used. There were a handful of countries with available school surveys data in Africa and the Middle East and their proportion of girls was at a similar level within these subregions, thus their weighted average was used for African region and the subregion of Middle East. North American studies had also reasonably similar proportions of girls among cannabis users. These proportions were then averaged while weighed by the estimated population of cannabis users living in each region or subregion (estimation procedure is detailed above).
4. The remaining male and female cannabis users aged 17-64 were then further subdivided into more detailed age groups according to age-related coefficients. These coefficients expressed how many times higher is the past-year prevalence of cannabis use among the group aged approximately 17-24 than among those aged 15-64 and how many times higher is the prevalence among 25-34 than among those aged 15-64. The coefficients were gender-specific (calculated separately for males and females), determined as medians of numbers obtained from the data of 18 countries for the age group 17-24 and of 19 countries for the age group 25-34. This step was performed after careful examination that there is not too much variation among the countries (see graphs below). The countries with available data were almost exclusively, with few exceptions from Western and Central Europe and from South and Central America. Tables and graphs below demonstrate the coefficients as well as their distribution in the available data.

Table. Coefficients of multiplication of cannabis use prevalence among young adults by gender

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Coefficients for age group 17-24 |  |  | Coefficients for age group 25-34 |  |
| Total | 2.3235 |  | Total | 1.6420 |
| Males | 2.1452 |  | Males | 1.6575 |
| Females | 2.4873 |  | Females | 1.5113 |

  

  

1. Applying these coefficients on the global prevalence of cannabis use by gender and the global population size in each age group by sex has led to estimates of male cannabis users in the age group 17-24 and females in the same age group, as well as males and femalesusing cannabis in the past year in the age group 25 to 34 years.
2. Adding up the estimates by gender and subtracting them from the estimate of men and women cannabis users in the age group 17-64 mentioned under step 4 then lead to the estimates for the remaining age group.

Despite the fact that the distribution of age groups in which cannabis use is higher than among the general population is almost universally similar[[6]](#footnote-7), and the same applies to sex to a large extent, there are limitations of the approach taken. Foremost, while sex distribution was obtained as a population-weighted average of data from 64 diverse countries of the world, some subregions were less represented than others (in particular the entire African region). This is even more true about the age distribution which was based on data from 18 - 19 countries, most of which were from subregions of Western and Central Europe and South and Central America. Therefore, there may be differences in the exact age distribution of cannabis use among subregions, which may have led to lack of precision of the present estimated distribution of cannabis use by sex and age. Therefore this first estimate of cannabis use prevalence by sex and age needs to be interpreted with caution. Further improvements of the used methodology are likely possible.

### Estimates of the proportion of male and female users of cannabis by region and of male and female users by drug

It is important to mention that the estimates of the proportions of males and females among cannabis users by region and the estimates of the proportions of males and females among users of selected drug groups cannot be considered global estimates. Unfortunately, for most drugs and subregions, data is too scarce to provide representative estimates of gender breakdown of drug users.

Instead, the presented estimates are pooled estimates based on the results of household surveys (or indirect estimates in the case of some countries reporting opioid use) conducted in the countries and reported mostly by means of the annual report questionnaire. All estimates are calculated only on the basis of countries which were able to provide gender-specific estimates of prevalence of use in the past year. The estimate for region or drug is weighted by the population size of the respective countries with available household survey results assuming male and female population of equal size (assuming that 50% of population aged 15-64 are men and 50% are women).

The numbers of countries per subregion or drug group varied widely, as it can be seen from the tables below. Therefore, the results obtained need to be interpreted with caution, as they may not be representative of the entire subregion or drug group. In particular, no (sub)region-weighting was applied to obtain estimates by drug group which may have led to overrepresentation of women due to higher availability of household surveys results in the subregions with higher proportion of women who used a substance in the past year.

Table. Number of countries included in the estimate of proportions of males and females among past-year cannabis users per region

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subregion | Number of countries included in the pooled estimate |
| Africa | 3 |
| Asia | 6 |
| Australia and New Zealand | 2 |
| Caribbean | 3 |
| Central America | 3 |
| South America | 7 |
| South-East Europe | 8 |
| North America | 3 |
| West and Central Europe | 27 |

 Table. Number of countries included in the estimate of proportions of males and females among past-year users of each drug group

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Drug group | Number of countries included in the pooled estimate |
| Opioids | 26 |
| Cocaine | 53 |
| Cannabis | 64 |
| New psychoactive substances | 31 |
| “Ecstasy”-type substances | 50 |
| Non-medical use of pharmaceutical stimulants | 13 |
| Amphetamines | 48 |
| Non-medical use of pharmaceutical opioids | 24 |
| Non-medical use of sedatives and tranquilizers | 48 |

### Estimates of the number and prevalence of people who inject drugs , HIV and hepatitis (C and B virus) among people who inject drugs (PWID)

**Data sources, selection of country estimates and validation process**

Population size estimates for PWID, and the prevalence of HIV and hepatitis among PWID, were identified using a comprehensive search of the published peer-reviewed literature, a search of the “grey” literature, from the official United Nations survey instruments of UNODC (ARQ) and UNAIDS (GMP), from regional organizations (particularly the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA)), and through the global network of UNODC HIV/AIDS Advisors.

The criteria for the selection of country estimates primarily involved the consideration of the methodological soundness of the estimates, determined according to the classification presented in the table below (studies in class A are of higher methodological quality and those in class D of lower quality), with due regard to national geographic coverage, the year of the estimate, and the definition of the target population (global and regional estimates were made for the annual prevalence of injecting among both genders aged 15-64). UNODC, WHO, UNAIDS and the World Bank, civil society organizations, a large network of national and international experts reviewed and validated the estimates.

Table: Classification of methodology for people who inject drugs, and those among them living with HIV and hepatitis

Data are categorized by methodology according to a slightly modified classification originally proposed in Mathers et. al. (2008) Lancet paper.[[7]](#footnote-8)



As part of a wider review process, every year since 2014, UNODC, WHO, UNAIDS and the World Bank have reached out to a broad group of experts from academia and regional, international, including civil society, organizations to ensure that a scientific approach to the methodology was used and that the greatest number of datasets available worldwide on the subject were included. Data were sent to Member States as part of the prepublication for their validation and potential comments on the selected estimates, or for completion of data if there were national estimates based on surveys or studies that had been conducted and which UNODC was not aware of.

**Calculation of regional and global estimates**

Regional and global estimates were calculated for the reference year 2021 (as most of the data presented in the World Drug Report 2023 is for the reference year 2021.).

The regional best estimates for the prevalence of injecting drug use, and HIV and hepatitis among PWID, were calculated as the population-weighted means. The global estimates for 2021 were calculated as the population-weighted regional means. In the population-weighting procedure, the population refers to those aged 15-64 years for the year 2021 in the case of the prevalence of people who inject drugs, or to the estimated number of PWID for the year 2021 in the case of the prevalence of HIV and hepatitis among PWID. For countries where a number (as size estimate) of PWID was reported in the study/survey, a prevalence estimate was subsequently calculated using the population aged 15-64 corresponding to the year of the estimate. For those countries where an estimate of the prevalence of HIV or hepatitis among PWID was available, but a population size estimate for PWID was not, then the regional weighted average prevalence of people who inject drugs was used to produce a population size estimate for PWID that was used in the weighting procedure for the prevalence of HIV and hepatitis among PWID.

Uncertainty intervals for the regional and global best estimates were calculated that reflect both the range in the country prevalence estimates (if these were available) and the regional variability in the available country prevalence estimates. To achieve this, the 10th and 90th percentiles of the known prevalence estimates for countries from within the same region were determined. These were then applied to countries from within the same region for which no estimates were available to give a range of plausible population size estimates. This produced a liberal uncertainty range while excluding the extreme prevalence estimates.

In 2023, the data points for people who inject drugs and living with HIV were also populated. However there were not enough data points available of the recent data that would allow regional or global estimation of the people who inject drugs and are living with HIV and hepatitis B and C by gender. The data points disaggregated by gender were available for PWID from 18 countries, for HIV among PWID from 58 countries, for hepatitis C from 28 and hepatitis B from 17 countries. For gender-specific estimates, an inclusive approach was adopted to enable the mapping of the availability of reported estimates, their quality, and general trends, for the purpose of informing research, and future reporting.

**Data quality of estimates on people who inject drugs and HIV among PWID**

* *Interpretation of regional and global estimates*

The global and regional estimates for the prevalence of people who inject drugs and HIV among PWID presented for 2021 in the *World Drug Report* should be viewed as an update to those presented in previous editions of the *World Drug Report* that reflect the latest or the best data available. This year new or updated information on size estimates of PWID was available from 23 countries and on HIV among PWID from 31 countries. The current estimates, changed from the previous year due to new population size estimate of people who inject drugs in thee United States and few other small population countries in Africa, but represent the best estimates that can currently be made using the most recent and highest quality data available to UNODC, WHO, UNAIDS, and the World Bank based on data reported by Member States, published or grey literature or through other stakeholders.

* *Quality of national-level data on PWID*

In the current round the data on PWID includes information from 125 countries, of which 19 were updated from previous years Overall, of the data from 130 countries on the size estimates or prevalence of PWID, covering 91 of the global population aged 15-64, 29 per cent were of high methodological quality (class A, as defined in the table above) and 82 per cent related to recent data from 2015 or later. Almost one-half (48 per cent) of the countries have information that is from recent, methodologically high-quality surveys. With a low level of coverage of the population aged 15-64 compared to other regions there is limited information on PWID for countries in Africa (61 percent of the data coverage in terms of countries). It is noticeable that there are relatively few recent and methodologically high-quality data from the Americas (19 per cent). However, for the two sub-regions with the highest prevalence of PWID (Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, and Central Asia and Transcaucasia) there is a very high percentage data coverage of the populations aged 15-64 and approximately one half or more of the estimates are both recent and of high methodological quality.

* *Quality of national-level data on HIV among PWID*

Of the 123 countries with information on the prevalence of HIV among PWID, 25 were updated in the current round. Of those, 75 per cent were of high methodological quality (class A, as defined in the table above) and 64 per cent related to timely data from 2015 or more recently. Information from nearly half of the countries (48 per cent) provided was from both recent and methodologically high-quality surveys. The two sub-regions that have by far the highest prevalence of HIV among PWID (South-West Asia, and Eastern and South-Eastern Europe) have prevalence estimates from all countries and from methodologically high-quality surveys from nearly one third of those countries.

Table: Population coverage, timeliness and methodological quality of information from the 130 countries with data on people who inject drugs



Sources for original estimates on PWID: UNODC annual report questionnaire, progress reports of UNAIDS on the global AIDS response (various years), the former Reference Group to the United Nations on HIV and Injecting Drug Use, peer-reviewed journal articles, study/survey reports and national government reports.

Table: Population coverage, timeliness and methodological quality of information from the 123 countries with data on the prevalence of HIV among people who inject drugs



Sources for original estimates on HIV among PWID: UNODC annual report questionnaire, progress reports of UNAIDS on the global AIDS response (various years), the former Reference Group to the United Nations on HIV and Injecting Drug Use, peer-reviewed journal articles, study/survey reports and national government reports.

## Estimate of total number of people in treatment for drug use disorders

The data on drug-related treatment reported by Member States in the annual report questionnaire is often scarce, while the existing data points may have incomplete coverage. A first attempt was made in WDR 2022, to partially overcome these drawbacks. The sequence of steps taken was as follows, while limitations of the approach are detailed below.

* 1. First, countries with treatment data reported as having national coverage were selected and their most recent data reported between 2015 and 2019 was used. The year 2020 was mostly avoided as the COVID-19 pandemic has had a detrimental effect on treatment attendance, which could bias the results.
* 2. Data reported by European countries were updated with ‘total treated population’ published by the EMCDDA under table HSR-10-1 (available from <https://www.emcdda.europa.eu/data/stats2022/hsr_en>) as these figures comply with the UNODC definition best.
* 3. The rate of treated patients or clients per 100 000 inhabitants aged 15-64 of the respective countries was calculated.
* 4. An average rate for the countries with available data was calculated, which was weighted by the numbers of treated persons in each country, i.e. an overall rate of treated per overall population of these countries, was obtained.
* 5. This rate was then applied to the region’s or subregion’s population aged 15-64 (Americas were divided into North America and South and Central America and the Caribbean, while the remaining regions were not divided).
* 6. The global figure was obtained by adding up the estimates of all regions or subregions.

The list of countries included in the estimate with primary data reported by them is as follows:

* Africa: Ethiopia, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo, Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Morocco, Tunisia, Angola, Algeria, Mauritius, Seychelles
* Asia: India, Bangladesh, Kuwait, Philippines, Oman, Uzbekistan, Iraq, China, Kazakhstan, Myanmar, Armenia, Sri Lanka, Turkmenistan, Singapore, Azerbaijan, Macao SAR, Brunei Darussalam, Afghanistan, Tajikistan, Hong Kong SAR, Cambodia, Israel, Thailand, Iran (Islamic Republic of)
* Americas: Panama, El Salvador, Grenada, Mexico, Peru, Bahamas, Chile, Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Costa Rica, United States of America, Canada
* Europe: Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom.

There were several limitations of this approach. Firstly, the rates of treated individuals per 100 000 inhabitants varied considerably among countries to the extent that no useful sensitivity analysis intervals could be obtained for the analysis. Therefore, there is likely considerable uncertainty in the rates applied to the countries not covered by reporting of the numbers of treated persons. Secondly, it was not possible to quantify the background prevalence (prevalence of drug use disorders in the populations of the respective countries) which could have been a very influential factor determining the numbers of treated persons. Furthermore, despite reporting numbers as having ‘national’ coverage, in many reporting countries the coverage of reporting is far from optimal. This is especially true in the case of India with reported only 1.9 treated person per 100 000 inhabitants in the latest data (lowest rate in the region and known to be likely grossly underestimated) and likely also China and other countries. This knowledge led us to interpret the obtained estimate as the lower bound estimate of the actual number of treated persons globally, which needs to be further improved in the years to come.

It also has to be noted, that previously published estimated rate of treated persons per estimated number of people with drug use disorders is not comparable between WDR 2022 and previous World Drug Reports, owing to the fact that a different methodology was used in determining this rate.

### Calculation of trends based on qualitative information

In addition to estimates on the extent of drug use, Member States also provide UNODC with qualitative information on their perceptions of drug use trends, trends in drug treatment and drug-related morbidity and mortality as well as qualitative information on perceptions of trafficking trends and on perceptions of cultivation trends.

The advantage of the use of such indices based on reported trend indicators is that often larger numbers of countries are able to report such trends, not only developed but also developing countries, thus reducing a potential reporting bias in the results. This is notably of importance when it comes to changes in prevalence rates of drug use as there is a strong bias in favour of household surveys conducted in developed counties as these are more likely to be regularly conducted in developed countries. There is also an advantage of using such qualitative information for the analysis of trafficking as the “traditional method”, the analysis of trends in quantities seized may reflect not only underlying changes in drug flow but also changes in law enforcement priorities. Finally, for crops where no comprehensive, scientific monitoring of the areas under drug cultivation exist, such as for cannabis, countries report a multitude of indictors that are, in general, not directly comparable with each other (hectares eradicated, plants eradicated, quantities eradicated, plants seized, greenhouses dismantled etc.) and which – when aggregated at the global level - often point into opposite directions. Under such circumstances, the analysis of reported cultivation trends by Member States provides at least some basic indications for the likely overall trends in cultivation.

Thus, in the online segment as well as in the booklet on Contemporary Issues on Drugs, perceptions of cannabis use and cannabis cultivation trends (both for overall cannabis cultivation as well as indoor and outdoor cannabis cultivation) were shown, and similarly perceptions of opioid use trends, trends in cocaine and ATS use and treatment for cocaine and ATS use disorders, and of trends in the trafficking of amphetamine, methamphetamine and ecstasy.

Countries’ reporting of such trends are typically based on a multitude of indicators, including – in the case of drug use trends - general population prevalence data, school surveys, treatment data, emergency room visits, mortality data, reports by social workers, health care officials and law enforcement officers, arrest data, seizure data, media reports, etc..

Based on this information, a simple index has been created. For reports of “large increase” 2 points were allocated, for “some increase” 1 point; for “stable” 0 points; for “some decrease” 1 point was deducted and for “large decrease” 2 points were deducted. The points calculated for each year were subsequently added to the accumulated points of the previous year to arrive at the respective trends perception index. The year 2010 wase chosen as the starting year of the respective index.

Results of the calculation of the index based on qualitative information of cannabis use at the global level are shown below:

*Example of calculation of qualitative information on trends in cannabis use at the global level, 2010-2021*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Points | Cannabis use perception trend index (2010=0) |
| 2010 |   | 0 |
| 2011 | 4 | 4 |
| 2012 | 9 | 13 |
| 2013 | 19 | 32 |
| 2014 | 22 | 54 |
| 2015 | 15 | 69 |
| 2016 | 34 | 103 |
| 2017 | 25 | 128 |
| 2018 | 35 | 163 |
| 2019 | 16 | 179 |
| 2020 | 12 | 191 |
| 2021 |  |  |

Points allocated per country: “large increase”: 2 points; “ some increase”: 1 point; “stable”: 0; “some decrease”: -1 point; “large decline”: -2 points

### Trend in the treatment for cocaine use disorders (2010-2021)

The online segment reported, inter alia, trends in cocaine use and trend in the treatment for cocaine use disorders. The trend in the treatment for cocaine use disorders was calculated on the basis of reported numbers of treated persons due to the use of cocaine as their primary drug. Data were available from 26 countries, out of which 20 were from Europe (mostly Western and Central Europe), four were from the Americas and two countries were located in Asia. The full list of countries is as follows: Austria, Belgium, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Greece, Indonesia, Italy, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Netherlands (the), Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Türkiye, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (the), Uruguay. Between approximately 65,000 and 135,000 treated persons in total were included in the analysis each year.

Countries were included solely on the basis of available data with a rule that a maximum of two neighboring data points were allowed to be missing from the time series. In other words, countries with missing three or more neighboring data points in their time series were excluded from the analysis. Still, in some cases, data for the time interval 2020-2020 were incomplete. In these cases, interpolation was used. If one or two data points were missing between other data points, the method used to fill in the data gaps was geometric mean. If this was the case for the first or last data points in the time series, these were interpolated on the basis of holding the trend calculated from countries with available data, constant.

## Analysis of drug consumption based on the analysis of wastewater

The development of analytical tools and methods for the wastewater analysis took place in recent years in Europe by wastewater research institutes under the umbrella of the SCORE initiative (Sewage Analysis CORe group Europe under the European Cooperation in Science and Technology initiative), supported by the European Union under the EU Framework Programme Horizon 2020. Both EU and non-EU countries participate in this cooperation.

In order to obtain – as far as possible – comparable data, wastewater in various cities has been analysed by the research institutes participating in the SCOREexercise over a one-week period each year in spring. The analysis was done for the main cocaine metabolite (benzoylecgonine) as well as for amphetamine, methamphetamine and MDMA.

Such wastewater analyses to determine the extent of drug consumption took place in overall more than 240 waste-water treatment sites over the period 2011-2022 participating in the SCORE exercise across the globe, located in more than 175 cities in 41 countries[[8]](#footnote-9).

There is, however, a problem of how to deal with sites which used to report in the past but did not report any longer in recent years. In order to reduce a potential bias in the calculation of recent trends due to missing data, only a subset of these data was used for such a trend analysis of the various drugs in Europe. Only sites which, in principle, agreed to participate in the SCORE exercise of 2022 were included in the trend calculations; such cities happened to be equivalent to cities which reported at least one result over the 2020-2022 period (a similar approach as taken in last year’s World Drug Report).[[9]](#footnote-10)

The trend analysis in the 2023 World Drug Report was thus conducted on a subsample of 135 waste-water treatment sites, located in 119 cities in 26 countries of Western, Central and South-Eastern Europe (i.e. in cities of Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands (Kingdom of the), Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye and the United Kingdom).

The waste-water sites in these cities had an aggregate population of 59 million people in 2022 and accounted overall for slightly more than 10 per cent of the total population of the 26 European countries participating in SCORE over the 2020‒2022 period

Participation varied, however, strongly across the European countries, ranging from 1 per cent of the country’s total population in France and the United Kingdom to 59 per cent in Austria, followed by Finland (58 per cent), Estonia (52 per cent) and Latvia (46 per cent). h The median amounted to 15 per cent with an inter-quartile range from 8 to 33 per cent.[[10]](#footnote-11)

Proportion of population covered by waste-water analysis, 2020-2022

Source: UNODC calculations based on wastewater data provided by Sewage Analysis CORe group Europe (SCORE).

There was a general increase in the number of waste-water treatment sites providing data over the last decade. The number of waste-water treatment sites providing data on benzoylecgonine in Europe in recent years, for instance, rose from 13 in 2011 to 64 in 2020, 78 in 2021 and 109 in 2022.

The approach used is further exemplified for the case of benzoylecgonine, the main cocaine metabolite found in wastewater. The amount of benzoylecgonine found each day in the waste-water was determined and a daily average was calculated. This is important as cocaine use (similar to the use of MDMA or amphetamine) is typically more widespread during the weekend than during normal weak days. In a subsequent step the size of the population responsible for the wastewater in the respective wastewater catchment areas was determined and the results were shown in terms of average milligrams of benzoylecgonine (a main cocaine metabolite) per day found in waste-water per 1000 inhabitants[[11]](#footnote-12).

Even though the results from the analysis of wastewater have been obtained applying high levels of scientific rigour, the subsequent analysis of the trends at the European level has remained a challenge due to the fact that different cities across Europe took part in this exercise in different years over the period 2011 ̶ 2022 and differences of cocaine consumption across European cities continue to be quite significant. This means that the inclusion or the exclusion of a specific city can have a significant impact on the overall average.

Even though the problem in arriving at (reasonable) trend data was alleviated by basing the analysis on a subsample of cities reporting waste-water results in recent years (2020‒2022), the problem of missing data did not fully disappear.

In theory, this problem can be overcome by analysing the results of the cities which participated each year in this exercise. However, such results would be based on the results of just 7 cities (Antwerp (Belgium), Castellon (Spain), Eindhoven (Netherlands), Milan (Italy), Santiago (Spain) Utrecht (Netherlands)) in 5 European countries and the data from such a limited number of cities are not necessarily a reliable indicator for overall cocaine consumption trends in Europe.

An alternative approach used and shown in the report was to expand the analysis to 119 European cities, having participated in studies analysing bencoylecgonine in wastewater over the period 2020‒2022.; UNODC included in its calculations only such cities that were geographically located within Europe, i.e., not included were cities though being part of European countries located outside of Europe.

Interpolation techniques were used to account for missing data. First, data from the 119 cities were entered as reported from individual cities. In case of data gaps between years it was assumed that there was a gradual increase or decline in per capita results between the two data points (using the Excel function Series, Trend, Growth). In case of missing data at the beginning or at the end of the data series, the latest reported data (from other years) was used to fill the data gaps. This method helped to reduce the bias due to the reporting of additional cities (or the non-reporting of other cities) in specific years while making better use of reported data, thus reducing potential trend distortions.

In order to calculate a European average, first an **unweighted average** was calculated.

Second, the city results were **weighted** by the respective **population living in the respective waste-water catchment areas**. The calculation of an average, weighted by the population living in the various cities (i.e., the population served by the respective sewage system, to be precise) provides a better estimate for the overall cocaine consumption of the population served by the sewage systems of the participating cities. Whether this is, however, a better proxy for overall cocaine consumption among the European population at large is less clear. This would have been the case if all of Europe had participated in this exercise or if a random selection of sites had taken place. However, the cities participating in the waste-water exercise were not randomly selected, but are based on a convenience sample of European cities expressing their willingness to participate in this exercise. Results at the European level must thus be interpreted with caution.

In the original model used by UNODC, information from all cities was collected. One limitation of this method used was that the more cities not reporting in the latest year(s), the flatter became the resulting curve, potentially under-estimating overall growth (and/or in years of decline, under-estimating the net decline). In order to reduce this bias, trends in this year’s and last year’s World Drug Report were calculated based on cities which had signalled their readiness to participate in the 2021/2022 SCORE exercises thus limiting the non-reporting cities in 2022 to just a few.

The method of interpolations used for calculting the **weighted averages** is shown below based on a hypothetical example of data from four cities:

**Hypothetical sample: data of benzoylecgonine per 1000 inhabitants in four cities**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | 2014 | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |  | 2021 | 2022 |  |
| City A | 80 | 78 | 75 | 80 | 92 |   | 95 |  | 97 | 100 |
| City B |   | 55 | 60 |   |   | 85 | 90 |  |   | 102 |
| City C | 150 | 154 |   |   | 174 | 180 |   |  |   |   |
| City D | 140 |   |   | 115 | 120 | 125 | 127 |  | 130 | 135 |

**Interpolation method\* used for dealing with missing data for calculating the averages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | 2014 | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |  |
| City A | 80 | 78 | 75 | 80 | 92 | 93 | 95 | 97 | 100 |
| City B | 55 | 55 | 60 | 67 | 76 | 85 | 90 | 90 | 102 |
| City C | 150 | 154 | 160 | 167 | 174 | 180 | 180 | 180 | 180 |
| City D | 140 | 131 | 123 | 115 | 120 | 125 | 127 | 130 | 135 |

\*using Excel growth function for filling in data within a time series and assuming no change after latest year available

**Reported population living in waste-water catchment areas in cities A, B, C, D**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | 2014 | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| City A | 120,000 | 125,000 | 126,000 | 128,000 | 130,000 |  |  |  | 135,000 |
| City B |  | 210,000 | 215,000 |  |  | 220,000 | 225,000 | 225,000 |  |
| City C | 60,000 | 65,000 |  |  | 75,000 | 77,000 |  | 80,000 |  |
| City D | 150,000 |  |  | 170,000 | 175,000 | 177,000 | 180,000 | 182,000 | 185,000 |

**`**

**Interpolation method\* used for estimating population living in waste-water catchment areas in cities A, B, C, D**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | 2014 | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| City A | 120,000 | 125,000 | 126,000 | 128,000 | 130,000 | 131,232 | 132,476 | 133,732 | 135,000 |
| City B | 210,000 | 210,000 | 215,000 | 216,654 | 218,321 | 220,000 | 225,000 | 225,000 | 225,000 |
| City C | 60,000 | 65,000 | 68,176 | 71,506 | 75,000 | 77,000 | 77,000 | 77,000 | 77,000 |
| City D | 150,000 | 156,391 | 163,053 | 170,000 | 175,000 | 177,000 | 180,000 | 182,000 | 185,000 |

\*using Excel growth function for filling in data within a time series and assuming no change after latest year available

Based on these data the population weighted averages can be calculated for the four cities. (i.e. for 2022: (100\*135,000+102\*225000+180\*77,000+135\*185,000) / sum (135,000, 225,000, 77,000, 185,000) = 121).

The actual calculation was done in Excel, using for each year the “sumproduct” function for benzoylecgonine found in the four cities and the population in the four catchment areas; the resulting total was then divided by the total population in the four waste-water catchment areas in the respective year to arrive at the average for the respective year.

**Calculation of average of benzoylecgonine per 1000 inhabitants in four hypothetical cities**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| **Average** for cities A, B, C, D |  **95**  |  **93**  |  **93**  |  **96**  |  **105**  |  **111**  |  **113**  |  **115**  |  **121**  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Finally, a **chained index** was established which took all city results into account once a city reported data in two subsequent years. i.e., reporting in year x followed by reporting in year x+1. The advantage of this method is that it is based entirely on reported data and does not require any explicit assumptions to be made about missing data. The disadvantage is that it is based on fewer datapoints as it does not cover trends once there has not been any immediately following reporting. Emerging trends from reporting in year x and again in year x+2, or in year x+3, etc. are ignored in this model.

A hypothetical sample is shown below, calculating paired averages to arrive at growth rates and combine the results into a chained index:

**Hypothetical sample: data of benzoylecgonine per 1000 inhabitants in four cities**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | 2014 | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| City A | 80 | 78 | 75 | 80 | 92 |   | 95 | 97 | 100 |
| City B |   | 55 | 60 |   |   | 85 | 90 |   | 102 |
| City C | 150 | 154 |   |   | 174 | 180 |   |   |   |
| City D | 140 |   |   | 115 | 120 | 125 | 127 | 130 | 135 |

**Hypothetical sample: calculation of growth rates of paired averages**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | City A | City B | City C | City D | Averages (of data in reporting and subsequent year)  | Growth rates |
| 2014 | 80 |   | 150 | 140 |  115.0  |   |
| 2015 | 78 | 55 | 154 |   |  116.0  |  1.009  |
| 2015 | 78 | 55 | 154 |   |  66.5  |   |
| 2016 | 75 | 60 |   |   |  67.5  |  1.015  |
| 2016 | 75 | 60 |   |   |  75.0  |   |
| 2017 | 80 |   |   | 115 |  80.0  |  1.067  |
| 2017 | 80 |   |   | 115 |  97.5  |   |
| 2018 | 92 |   | 174 | 120 |  106.0  |  1.087  |
| 2018 | 92 |   | 174 | 120 |  147.0  |   |
| 2019 |   | 85 | 180 | 125 |  152.5  |  1.037  |
| 2019 |   | 85 | 180 | 125 |  105.0  |   |
| 2019 | 95 | 90 |   | 127 |  108.5  |  1.033  |
| 2020 | 95 | 90 |   | 127 |  111.0  |   |
| 2021 | 97 |   |   | 130 |  113.5  |  1.023  |
| 2021 | 97 |   |   | 130 |  113.5  |   |
| 2022 | 100 | 102 |   | 135 |  117.5  |  1.035  |

Hypothetical sample: Calculation of chained index

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | 2014 | 2015 | 2017 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
|  | 100 | 100\*1.009 | 100.9\*1.015 | 102.4\*1.067 | 109.2\*1.087 | 118.7\*1.037 | 123.2\*1.033 | 127.3\*1.023 | 130.1\*1.035 |
| Chained index |  100.0  |  100.9  |  102.4  |  109.2  |  118.7  |  123.2  |  127.3  |  130.1  |  134.7  |

While each of the methods used to identify consumption trends has its merits and its shortcomings, it may be still interesting to note that all calculations of benzoylecgonine in wastewater in Europe resulted in strong increases (73 per cent for both weighted and unweighted averages of the 119 cities over the period 2011 ̶ 2022) and stronger increases when only the 7 cities’ results are considered which analysed their waste-water each year (135 per cent based on unweighted and 118 per cent based on weighted averages over the 2011 ̶ 2022 period). Clculations of a chained index showed even stronger increases (152 per cent over the period 2011 ̶ 2022). While cocaine consumption appears to have temporarily stabilized or even declined in 2020, the year of the COVID-19 outbreak in Europe, cocaine consumption increased again strongly in 2021 and 2022. It may be also interesting to note that reported quantities of cocaine seized even quintupled in Europe over the period 2011-2021, suggesting that Europe’s cocaine consumption might have increased even stronger without the intensification of law enforcement inverventions in recent years.

**Benzoylecgonine found in waste-water in Europe, 2011-2022**

Source: UNODC calculations based on wastewater data provided by Sewage Analysis CORe group Europe (SCORE).

Wastewater data were also used used for the calculation of amphetamine, methamphetamine and MDMA standardized loads (in milligrams per day per 1000 inhabitants) in Europe.

# Drug cultivation, production and manufacture

Data on cultivation of opium poppy and coca bush and production of opium and coca leaf for the main producing countries (Afghanistan, Myanmar, Mexico and the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, for opium; and Colombia, Peru and the Plurinational State of Bolivia for coca) are mainly derived from national monitoring systems supported by UNODC in the framework of the Global Illicit Crop Monitoring Programme (ICMP). The detailed country reports can be found on the UNODC website <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/crop-monitoring/index.html>

UNODC supported monitoring systems in most other countries started following UNGASS 1998, became operational over the 2000-2002 period and have reported data ever since. Opium cultivation and production estimates are available up to the year 2022.

The preliminary opium poppy cultivation data for 2021, published in last year’s World Drug Report 2022 were revised as new information from missing countries became available and some country results were revised. Nonetheless, these are still preliminary figures as data from a number of countries, notably Mexico, have been reported for 2020 but not for 2021 or 2022. In this case, data for 2020 are used as a proxy to arrive at the global totals for 2021 and 2022.

Preliminary opium poppy cultivation estimates for 2022 – 315,800 hectares hectares at the global level – must thus still be interpreted with caution. These estimates are based on new information received from Afghanistan and Myanmar, the two countries responsible for some 86 per cent of the global area under poppy cultivation in 2020 and on the assumption that the overall area under poppy cultivation in the other countries may not have changed. Data for 2021 were slightly revised by 1 per cent from 246,800 ha to 249,880 ha as new data became available – but this number may still change further once data from Mexico for 2021 will have been received. (Latest data used as a proxy for Mexico refers to 2020).

.

Opium poppy cultivation in countries which do not conduct area surveys, was estimated with an indirect method (see below). The global opium poppy cultivation estimates for 2022 will be adjusted again in next year’s World Drug Report once more data will have become available.

Preliminary estimates suggest that global opium production in 2022 amounted to some 7,800 tons. The preliminary opium production estimates for 2022 are based on data received from Afghanistan and Myanmar and the assumption of no significant changes in the overall total of the other countries.

The preliminary estimate for global opium production in 2021, published in the 2022 World Drug Report, got revised slightly by 1 per cent from 7,930 tons to 8,030 tons as new data became available – but will probably change again in next year’s World Drug Report once actual data from Mexico will have been reported.

In contrast to the area under opium poppy cultivation, the preliminary estimates for global opium production in 2022 are with 7,800 tons slightly lower (3 per cent) than the global opium production estimates for 2021 (8,030 tons) and lower than the recent peak reported in 2017 (10,240 tons) though still higher than average annual opium production over the period 2010-2020 (6,800 tons per year).

It may be also interesting to compare these estimates to earlier estimates though a comparison of opium poppy cultivation and opium production with estimates from previous decades, notably those reported for periods prior to World War II are rendered difficult as the methodologies then used differ from the methodologies used nowadays. Opium production estimates are nowadays mainly derived from an analysis of satellite photos for the analysis of the area under cultivation which is then multiplied with the respective yields of opium per hectare found in specific regions, as derived from detailed yield surveys. In contrast, opium production estimates at the turn of the 19th to the 20th century were mainly derived from a detailed analysis of tax payments and other levies of opium poppy farmers to the authorities.

Such global opium production estimates reported in the proceedings of the Shanghai Opium Commission, 1909, revealed e.g. a global opium production of 41,600 tons of opium for the period 1906/07.[[12]](#footnote-13) For the year 1934 official reports by the League of Nations saw a global opium production of some 16,600 tons [[13]](#footnote-14) falling – based on preliminary estimates by the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) to 216 tons by 2022.

A direct comparison, however, may be misleading. Comparisons are complicated by the fact that the legal status of opium production was not always clear in the 19th century and the early decades of the 20th century, i.e. data reported usually comprised both legal and illegal production of opium. Thus, long-term comparisons should be made with estimates for legal and illegal opium production combined.

Moreover, this calculation does not take into account that much of the licit source of morphine production nowadays is in the form of poppy straw rather than in the form of opium as such.

Calculations can be also done based on the area of opium poppy under cultivation. Preliminary estimates suggest that a total of 145,326 ha may have been under (licit) poppy straw cultivation in 2022, far more than under licit opium cultivation (6,180 ha). Such licit cultivation of together around 155,000 ha compares with an illicit opium cultivation of 315,800 ha in 2021. This suggests that the illicit opium poppy cultivation accounted for some 67 per cent of of the total area under illicit and licit cultivation of opium and poppy straw in 2022.

Alternatively, production of harvested opium straw may be converted into an estimate of opium equivalents. One possibility is to calculate the morphine produced out of the poppy straw (which is published in the INCB Narcotics Report) and then to find out how much opium would have been (probably) needed to produce such amounts of morphine. This can be done based on the reported ratios of the actual morphine manufactured out of opium at the global level, again reported in the INCB Narcotics Report.

Calculations suggest that such global production of harvested opium straw (used for the manufacture of heroin, and based on preliminary estimates) may have amounted to some 3,660 tons, expressed in opium equivalents in 2022. This means that the total licit production of (morphine related) opiates (production of opium plus production of poppy straw intended for morphine manufacture), was equivalent to some 3,900 tons in 2022 (3,656+216 tons) expressed in opium equivalents. Illicit opium production (some 7,800 tons) was thus (again) equivalent to around 67 per cent of all opium production in 2022 (some 11,700 tons).

Though among the highest such values over the last two decades (slightly higher values at the global level were only reported for 2017 and 2019), such figures are, nonetheless, significantly lower than the opium production estimates reported for the year 1906/07 (41,600 tons of opium) and are still less than the licit and illicit opium production estimates reported for the year 1934 (16,600 tons).

**Figure: Global opium production, 1906-2022**

Sources: UNODC calculations based on Report of the International Opium Commission, Shanghai, China, Feb. 1909, Vol. II, INCB, *Narcotic Drugs 2021 - Estimated World Requirements for 2022 – Statistics for 2020* (and previous years), UNODC, A Century of International Drug Control (2009), UNODC, *World Drug Report 2023 (and* previous years).

**Coca cultivation** estimates in the three main Andean coca producing countries were available – at the time of drafting the World Drug Report - up to the year 2021 for Colombia, Peru and the Plurinational State of Bolivia. Results for the year 2022 will be published on UNODC’s website as soon as the new reports will have been released.

Estimates of **cannabis cultivation** in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012 in Afghanistan, as well as cannabis cultivation in 2003, 2004 and 2005 in Morocco, were also produced by the UNODC-supported national monitoring systems and can be found on the UNODC website. In addition, UNODC published in 2022 estimates of 6 major cannabis producing states in Nigeria for the year 2019. These estimates showed a total of 8,900 ha under cannabis cultivation. These estimates were thus lower than previous estimates for Morocco (72,000 ha for 2005), though within the range of the estimates published for Afghanistan (7,000-14,000 ha for 2012). Estimates for other countries were drawn from ARQ replies and various other sources, including reports from Governments, UNODC field offices and the United States Department of State’s Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs.

A full technical description of the methods used by UNODC-supported national monitoring systems can be found in the respective national survey reports available at <https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/crop-monitoring/index.html>

## Net cultivation

Not all the fields on which illicit crops are planted are actually harvested and contribute to drug production. For Afghanistan, a system of monitoring opium poppy eradication was in place until 2021 which provided all necessary information to calculate the net cultivation area. Given the political changes this country, the calculation of a net area under cultivation, however, was no longer possible for 2022, though actually reported eradications in that year as well as year earlier (some 42 ha out of 177,000 ha cultivation in 2021 and a similarly small proportion in 2022) were so small that they did not really affect comparability with previous years cultivation estimates.

In Myanmar and the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, only the area of opium poppy eradicated before the annual opium survey is taken into account for the estimation of the cultivation area. Not enough information is available to consider eradication carried out after the time of the annual opium survey. The overall area eradicated, however, tends to be rather small and so is the potential impact on the overall calculations of eradication for the latter two countries. The identified area under opium poppy cultivation in Myanmar was 40,100 ha for 2022 while the area eradicated amounted to 1,404 ha in that year. The net cultivation area – depending on the time eradication was actually taken place – could have been thus 0 to 1,404 ha or 0 to 3 per cent less than the area reported for opium poppy cultivation. Such a figure, however, would still fall well within the overall error margins of the reported area under opium poppy for Myanmar (29,000 – 62,900 ha in 2022).

The situation is different for Mexico. Data presented here are based on the area sown with opium poppy (24,100 ha in the season 2019/20). Based on official data provided by the authorities, 11,747 ha of the area under opium poppy cultivation were destroyed in Mexico in 2020 (and a figure of similar magnitude over the 2019/20 period), i.e. a far higher proportion than in Afghanistan or Myanmar. A major difference between coca and other narcotic plants such as opium poppy and cannabis is that the coca bush is a perennial plant which can be harvested several times per year. This longevity of the coca plant should, in principle, make it easier to measure the area under coca cultivation. In reality, the area under coca cultivation is dynamic, making it difficult to determine the exact amount of land under coca cultivation at any specific point in time or within a given year. There are several reasons why coca cultivation is so dynamic, including new plantation, abandonment, reactivation of previously abandoned fields, manual eradication and aerial spraying.[[14]](#footnote-15)

The issue of different area concepts and data sources used to monitor illicit coca bush cultivation was repeatedly investigated by UNODC.[[15]](#footnote-16) To improve the comparability of estimates between countries and years, since 2011 net coca cultivation area at 31 of December is presented not only for Colombia but also for Peru. For technical reasons, the initial area measurement of coca fields takes place on satellite images acquired at different dates of the year and sometimes having different technical specifications. For the Plurinational State of Bolivia, in contrast, most satellite images are taken close to the 31 of December in order to reduce potential errors linked to subsequent eradication. In any case, for the Bolivian and Peruvian estimate, these differences are considered to have a limited effect only, whereas the dynamic situation in Colombia requires more adjustments to maintain year-on-year comparability. For more details, please see the country specific reports.

## Indirect estimation of illicit opium poppy cultivation

Eradication and plant seizure reports indicate that illicit opium poppy cultivation exists in many countries, which do not regularly conduct illicit crop surveys. Starting 2008 a new methodology was introduced to estimate the extent of this illicit cultivation with an indirect method based on two indicators available in UNODC’s databases: eradicated poppy area and opium poppy (plant, capsule) seizures reported as units or weight.

*Prioritization of data sources:* Whenever possible, the eradicated poppy area was used as this indicator is conceptually closest. If this indicator was not available, poppy plant seizure data was used, which requires an additional conversion of the seized amount into area eradicated. It can be assumed that plant seizures are often a different way of recording eradication. e.g. in cases where area measurements are technically difficult or because the law requires all seized material to be weighed even if the seizure consists actually of eradicated plants on a field. Large-scale or long-distance illicit trade with opium poppy plants is unlikely as the plants are bulky, perishable and of low value.

*Eradication factor:* Evidence from countries which provide both illicit cultivation and eradication data indicates that illicit cultivation is typically a multiple of the area eradicated. This relationship, averaged over the last five years for which information is available, was used to calculate a factor which allowed to estimate illicit cultivation in countries from eradication figures. Since 2008, this factor is based on opium poppy cultivation and eradication data from Colombia, Lao People’s Republic, Mexico, Myanmar, Pakistan, Thailand and Guatemala. Over the years, the average over these five countries ranged between 2.1 and 3.7(eradicated area \* factor = net cultivation area). (Afghanistan was not considered for the calculation of the factor as the objective was to estimate low to mid-levels of illicit cultivation. Afghanistan, representing two thirds or more of global illicit poppy cultivation, clearly fell outside this range).

*Plant seizures:* seizures of poppy plant material usually happen close to the source, i.e. in vicinity of the cultivated area. The data available to UNODC does not allow to accurately and systematically differentiate between the various parts (capsules, bulbs, entire plants) of the plant seized as for plant seizures. Most (roots, stem, leaves, capsules) or only some parts (poppy straw, capsules only) of the plant may be seized. While this does not influence seizure data given in plant units, it plays a role when interpreting seizure data given as weight

*Plant seizure data in units* represent plant numbers, which can be converted into area (ha) using an average number of opium poppy plants per hectare. Yield measurements from Afghanistan and Myanmar, where UNODC has conducted yield surveys over several years, indicate an average figure of about 190,000 plants per hectare. Dividing poppy plant seizure numbers by this factor results in estimate of the area on which the seized material was cultivated. This is equivalent to eradicated area, as the seized material was taken out of the production cycle. Eradicated area multiplied with the eradication factor described above yields then cultivation area.

*Plant seizure data reported as weight:* In order to convert the weight of seized poppy plants into area, a typical biomass per hectare of poppy was estimated based on the evaluation of various sources. The biomass yield in oven-dry equivalent including stem, leaves, capsule and seeds reported by a commercial licit opium poppy grower in Spain[[16]](#footnote-17) was 2,800 kg/ha for rain-fed and 7,800 kg/ha for irrigated fields respectively. Information on the weight of roots was not available. Loewe[[17]](#footnote-18) found biomass yields between 3,921 kg/ha to 5,438 kg/ha in trial cultivation under greenhouse conditions. Acock et al.[[18]](#footnote-19) found oven-dry plant weights of about 37 grams including roots in trials under controlled conditions corresponding to a biomass yield of around 7,000 kg/ha with the assumed plant density of 190,000/ha. Among the available biomass measurements only the figures from Spain referred to poppy grown under field conditions. All other results fell into the range between the non-irrigated and irrigated biomass yields (2,800 – 7,800 kg/ha) reported. For purposes of this calculation the simple average of these two values was taken.

Two caveats have to be made: a) As the reporting format does not differentiate between capsules and plants or between the different growth stages of a poppy plant, it was assumed that the reported weight refers to whole, mature plants. This leads to a conservative estimate as many plant seizures are actually carried out on fields before the poppy plants reach maturity. b) The reference biomass measurements from scientific studies are expressed in oven-dried equivalents, whereas the reported weights could refer to fresh weight or air-dry weight; both of which are higher than the oven-dry equivalent weight equivalent. This would lead to an over-estimation of the illicit cultivation area. In the case of young plants, which are typically fresh but not yet fully grown, both errors could balance off, whereas in the case of mature or harvested plants, which tend to be drier, both errors would be smaller.

In order to avoid the fluctuations typically present in seizure and eradication data, the above calculations were based on plant seizures averaged over the most recent five-year period, rather than datapoints relative to the specific year. If no eradication or plant seizure was reported in that period, no value was calculated.

## Yield and production

To estimate potential production of opium, coca leaf and cannabis (herb and resin), the number of harvests per year and the total yield of primary plant material has to be established. The UNODC-supported national surveys take measurements in the field and conduct interviews with farmers, using results from both to produce the final data on yield. *[[19]](#footnote-20)*

Opium yield surveys are complex. Harvesting opium with the traditional lancing method can take up to two weeks as the opium latex that oozes out of the poppy capsule has to dry before harvesters can scrape it off and several lancings take place until the plant has dried. To avoid this lengthy process, yield surveyors measure the number of poppy capsules and their size in sample plots. Using a scientifically developed formula, the measured poppy capsule volume indicates how much opium gum each plant potentially yields. Thus, the per hectare opium yield can be estimated. Different formulas were developed for South-East and South-West Asia. In Afghanistan, yield surveys are carried out annually; in Myanmar regularly.

For coca bush, the number of harvests varies, as does the yield per harvest. In the Plurinational State of Bolivia and Peru, UNODC supports monitoring systems that conduct coca leaf yield surveys in several regions, by harvesting sample plots of coca fields over the course of a year, at points in time indicated by the coca farmer. In these two countries, yield surveys are carried out only occasionally, due to the difficult security situation in many coca regions and because of funding constraints. In Colombia, coca leaf yield estimates are updated yearly through a rotational monitoring system introduced in 2005 that ensures that every yield region is revisited about every three years. However, as the security situation does not allow for surveyors to return to the sample fields, only one harvest is measured, and the others are estimated based on information from the farmer. In 2013 for the first time the concept of productive area was applied to calculate the coca leaf yields in Colombia, taking into account the dynamics of the fields due to spraying and eradication for which some fields are only partly productive during the year. This way of calculating was retroactively applied to the results of 2005-2012, giving slightly different results than published in previous years [[20]](#footnote-21). In Peru and the Plurinational State of Bolivia the additional production of partly productive areas is not considered for the coca leaf yield estimates.[[21]](#footnote-22)

### Conversion factors

The primary plant material harvested - opium in the form of gum or latex from opium poppy, coca leaves from coca bush, and the cannabis plant - undergo a sequence of extraction and transformation processes, some of which are done by farmers onsite, others by traffickers in clandestine laboratories. Some of these processes involve precursor chemicals and may be done by different people in different places under a variety of conditions, which are not always known. In the case of opium gum, for example, traffickers extract the morphine contained in the gum in one process, transform the morphine into heroin base in a second process, and finally produce heroin hydrochloride. In the case of cocaine, coca paste is produced from either sun-dried (in the Plurinational State of Bolivia and Peru) or fresh coca leaves (in Colombia), which is later transformed into cocaine base, from where cocaine hydrochloride is produced.

The results of each step, for example from coca leaf to coca paste, can be estimated with a conversion factor. Such conversion factors are based on interviews with the people involved in the process, such as farmers in Colombia, who report how much coca leaf they need to produce 1 kg of coca paste or cocaine base. Tests have also been conducted where so-called ‘cooks’ or ‘chemists’ demonstrate how they do the processing under local conditions. A number of studies conducted by enforcement agencies in the main drug-producing countries have provided the orders of magnitude for the transformation from the raw material to the end product. This information is usually based on just a few case studies which are not necessarily representative of the entire production process. Farmer interviews are not always possible due to the sensitivity of the topic, especially if the processing is done by specialists and not by the farmers themselves. Establishing conversion ratios is complicated by the fact that traffickers may not know the quality of the raw material and chemicals they use, which may vary considerably; they may have to use a range of chemicals for the same purpose depending on their availability and costs; and the conditions under which the processing takes place (temperature, humidity, et cetera) differ.

It is important to take into account the fact that the margins of error of these conversion ratios – used to calculate the potential cocaine production from coca leaf or the heroin production from opium - are not known. To be precise, these calculations would require detailed information on the morphine content of opium or the cocaine content of the coca leaf, as well as detailed information on the efficiency of clandestine laboratories. Such information is limited. This also applies to the question of the psychoactive content of the narcotic plants.

UNODC, in cooperation with Member States, continues to review coca leaf to cocaine conversion ratios as well as coca leaf yields and net productive area estimates.[[22]](#footnote-23) More research, however, is needed to establish comparable data for all components of the cocaine production estimate.

Many cannabis farmers in Afghanistan and Morocco conduct the first processing steps themselves, either by removing the upper leaves and flowers of the plant to produce cannabis herb or by threshing and sieving the plant material to extract the cannabis resin. The herb and resin yield per hectare can be obtained by multiplying the plant material yield with an extraction factor. The complex area of cannabis resin yield in Afghanistan was investigated in 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012. The yield study included observation of the actual production of resin, which is a process of threshing and sieving the dried cannabis plants. In Morocco, this factor was established by using information from farmers on the methods used and on results from scientific laboratories. Information on the yield was obtained from interviews with cannabis farmers.[[23]](#footnote-24) Given the high level of uncertainty and the continuing lack of information for the large majority of cannabis-cultivating countries, the estimates of global cannabis herb and resin production have not been calculated.

### “Potential” production versus “actual production”

‘Potential’ heroin or cocaine production refers to total production of heroin or cocaine if all the cultivated opium or coca leaf, less the opium and coca leaf consumed as such, were transformed into the end products in the respective producer country in the same year. Direct consumption of opium or the coca leaves being taken into account. Thus, for example, consumption of coca leaf considered licit in the Plurinational State of Bolivia and Peru is deducted from the amounts of coca available for the transformation into cocaine. Similarly, opium consumed in Afghanistan and neighbouring countries is deducted from the amounts of opium available for heroin production.

In contrast, opium stocked or opium used from stocks accumulated over previous years is not considered in the calculation of ‘potential’ heroin manufacture though it may have a significant impact on ‘actual’ heroin manufacture. Similarly, none of the coca leaf harvested in a previous year is taken into consideration when it comes to the manufacture of cocaine. This is less of a problem for the coca leaf, but it should be noted that opium can be stored for extended periods of time and converted into intermediate or final products long after the harvest year. Thus ‘actual’ heroin manufacture, making use of accumulated stocks of opium from previous years, can deviate significantly from ‘potential’ heroin manufacture out of the opium produced in a specific year.

While global opium production shows strong year-on-year fluctuations (standard deviation of percentage changes on a year earlier: 0.5 over period 1998-2021), global heroin seizures tend to remain rather smooth (standard deviation of percentage changes on a year earlier: 0.12 over period 1998-2021). This suggests that there may be ‒ irrespective of a long-term upward trend and a stronger rise in global heroin seizures than in global opium production (and thus an increase in the global interception rates) ‒ a rather constant year-on-year output in the manufacture of heroin. ‘Actual’ global heroin manufacture, in contrast to global opium production and derived ‘potential’ global heroin manufacture, tends to be rather smooth.

Thus, average numbers of such calculated ‘potential’ heroin manufacture over a few years (e.g. over a period of 5 years) may turn out to provide more realistic estimates of the ‘actual’ amounts of heroin manufactured in any specific year than the calculated ‘potential’ heroin manufacturing estimate for that year.

Figure: Global opium production and heroin seizures, 1998–2022

Sources: UNODC, opium surveys; UNODC, responses to the annual report questionnaire; and other Government sources

This is of significance in years when opium production is either rather high or rather low as compared to other years. he differences are far less pronounced in years when opium production has been close to average, such as 2020, 2021 or 2022.

At the same time, it should be noted that opium and coca leaf seizures are not taken into account in the calculation of potential global heroin or cocaine manufacture. This tends to be more of an issue for opium than for the coca leaf. It tends to over-estimate the actual amount of opium available for the manufacture of heroin as, in reality, opium seized is no longer available for the manufacture of heroin. In 2021 global opium production amounted to 8,030 tons while opium seizures amounted to 892 tons, equivalent to 11 per cent of opium production. Such opium is no longer available for the manufacture of heroin. As discussed above, an estimate of potential manufacture of heroin also does not take into account previous years’ opium being used for the manufacture of heroin or the stockpiling orclearance of stocksof opium in a specific year. Given rather stable opium production levels over the period 2018‒2022, such changes in stocks, however, are unlikely to have affected ‒ to any significant extent ‒ heroin manufacture in 2020, 2021 or 2022. In this respect, estimated ‘potential’ manufacture of heroin seems to have been a rather good proxy for actual manufacture of heroin. Global potential heroin manufacture (at export purities) was estimated at 507-739 tons in 2022.

###  Purity of potential production estimates

For **cocaine**, potential production of 100 per cent pure cocaine is estimated. In reality, clandestine laboratories do not produce 100 per cent pure cocaine but cocaine of lower purity which is often referred to as ‘export quality’.

For **heroin**, two conversion ratios are used. Apart from Afghanistan, not enough information is available to estimate the production of heroin at 100 per cent purity. Instead, potential production of export quality heroin is estimated, whose exact purity is not known and may vary. For Afghanistan, the calculations are more detailed. Here the share of all opium converted to heroin is estimated and a specific conversion ratio is applied, which uses an estimated purity for heroin of export quality, derived from wholesale purities found in other countries in the neighbourhood.

Although it is based on current knowledge on the alkaloid content of narcotic plants and the efficiency of clandestine laboratories, it should be noted that ‘potential production’ remains a hypothetical concept and is not an estimate of actual heroin or cocaine production at the country or global level.

The concept of potential production is also different from the theoretical maximum amount of drug that could be produced if all alkaloids were extracted from opium and coca leaf. The difference between the theoretical maximum and the potential production is expressed by the so-called laboratory efficiency, which describes which proportion of alkaloids present in plant material clandestine laboratories are actually able to extract.

### Country-specific estimates

**Colombia**

From 2013 onwards, the yearly ‘productive’ areas were estimated, instead of using the average area under coca cultivation of the reporting year and the previous year (the approach used in previous reports). In addition, a different conversion factor for estimating cocaine base was applied. Both the adjustment of the productive area estimate and the estimation of the conversion factor for cocaine base were retroactively applied to the results of 2006-2012.[[24]](#footnote-25)

In 2019, the overall conversion ratios from coca leaf production to the manufacture of cocaine hydrochloride in Colombia were reviewed and the results of this review were retroactively applied to the results from Colombia for the years 2014 to 2018. This review became necessary as due to changes in the overall political context of the country, farmers – often without in-depth knowledge of chemistry – got increasingly involved in the manufacture of coca paste and cocaine base, resulting in overall efficiency losses. At the same time, several of the larger cocaine manufacturing facilities operated by professional chemists showed efficiency gains.

The net result was still a loss in the overall efficiency as compared to a decade ago (and thus a downward revision of cocaine manufacturing estimates for Colombia over the period 2014-2018), going hand in hand with rising levels of efficiency in the manufacturing of cocaine identified over the period 2014-2019. The older estimates prior to the review in 2019 for years after 2013 are no longer shown in this World Drug Report, except for the graph below.

Figure: Estimates of cocaine hydrochloride manufacture in Colombia (tons), 2005-2018





* Estimated cocaine manufacture prior to the review of conversion ratios
* Estimated cocaine manufacture following the review of conversion ratios
* Source: UNODC and Gobierno de Colombia, Monitoreo de territorios afectados por cultivos ilícitos 2018 (August 2019).

a Years to which the revised conversion ratios were applied.

**Peru**

Potential cocaine production in Peru is estimated from potential coca leaf production and after deducting the amount of coca leaf estimated to be used for traditional purposes according to Government sources (9,000 mt of sun-dry coca leaf).

The Plurinational State of Bolivia

Potential cocaine production in the Plurinational State of Bolivia is estimated from potential coca leaf production after deducting the amount of coca leaf produced on 12,000 ha in the Yungas of La Paz where coca cultivation has been for years authorized under national law.

### “Old” versus “new” conversion ratios for cocaine

Cocaine estimates based on the “old” and the “new” conversion ratios are shown. Results based on the “old” conversion ratios are shown for the years in which no estimates based on the “new” conversion ratios have been available. Only for a short period, 2005–2009, estimates based on both the “old” and the “new” conversion ratios are shown, indicating an overall higher level though similar trends for the cocaine estimates based on the “new” conversion ratios.

In order to estimate cocaine production from the area under coca cultivation, the coca leaf yield per region is estimated based on yield studies as well as – based on experiments in the field - –he coca-leaf to coca-paste conversion, the coca-paste to cocaine base conversion and the cocaine-base to cocaine hydrochloride conversion. The results are then adjusted to show an overall conversion ratio from coca leaf to (a potential) 100 per cent pure cocaine hydrochloride.

The ‘old’ conversion ratios from coca leaf to cocaine hydrochloride are based on studies conducted by the United States Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) in the Andean region in the 1990s. The ratios for Colombia – in close cooperation with the Colombian authorities - –ere updated in 2004 and are part of the ‘old’ conversion ratio series.

In subsequent years the DEA undertook 'new’studies in Peru (2005) and in the Plurinational State of Bolivia (2007-2008), following indications that the laboratory efficiency in these countries may have improved.

The ‘new’ conversion rates used in this report – for the years 2007-2021 – however, have not been reconfirmed so far in national studies as funds for such studies have not been forthcoming. For this reason, cocaine production data are not shown separately for Peru and the Plurinational State of Bolivia; only the global total based on the ”new” conversion ratio is shown. The calculations of cocaine production based on the “new” conversion ratios refer to the “new” coca leaf to cocaine hydrochloride transformation ratios found by the DEA for Colombia, Peru and the Plurinational State of Bolivia and the updated ratios for Colombia. It should be noted though that the ”new” conversion ratios are still temporary; they will be updated as soon as new data, jointly established between the respective Member States and UNODC will become available (for more details, see World Drug Report 2010 (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.10.XI.13, pp. 251 and 252).

# Drug trafficking

## Seizures

The analysis presented in this report is mainly derived from the ARQ responses from Member States up to the 2021 reporting year. Seizures are reported in volume terms (“quantities seized”) as well as in terms of the number of seizure cases.

Including information from other sources, UNODC was able to obtain data on quantities of drugs seized from 131 countries and territories for 2021, up from 121 for 2020. Seizures are thus the most comprehensive indicator of the drug situation and its evolution at the global level. Although seizures may not always reflect trafficking trends correctly at the national level, they tend to show reasonable representations of trends at the regional and global levels, unless affected by major policy changes (such as legalization of cannabis herb in several jurisdictions in the Americas).

The analysis of seizure cases enables a direct comparison of data across drug categories. Reporting of seizure cases is, however, less comprehensive. A total of 64 countries and territories reported seizure cases to UNODC in 2021.

Countries reporting seizures of drugs in volume terms may report seizures using a variety of units, primarily by weight (kg) but also in litres, tablets, doses, blotters, capsules, ampoules, et cetera. When reporting about individual countries in individual years, UNODC endeavours to be as faithful as possible to the reports received, but often it is necessary to aggregate data of different types for the purposes of comparison. For the aggregation, conversion factors are used to convert the quantities into ‘kilogram equivalents’ (or ‘ton equivalents’). UNODC continues to record and report the disaggregated raw data, which are available in the seizure listings published at: https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/wdr2023\_annex.html under 7.1 Drug seizures 2017‒2021. In these tables, seizure quantities are reproduced as reported. In the rest of the Report, seizure data are often aggregated and transformed into a unique unit of measurement (such as “kilogram equivalents” or “ton equivalents”). Moreover, at some points in the analysis, purity adjustments are made where relevant and where the availability of data allows.

The conversion factors affect seizure totals of amphetamine-type stimulants (ATS), as a significant share of seizures of these drug types is reported in terms of the number of tablets. Apart from seizures of ATS tablets, drug seizures are mainly reported to UNODC by weight, and sometimes by volume. This includes seizures of ATS which are not seized in tablet form (for example, ATS in powder, crystalline or liquid form) as well as seizures of other drug types, such as heroin and cocaine. Moreover, ATS seizures made in tablet form are also sometimes reported by weight, and in some cases, the reported total aggregated weight possibly includes ATS seized in different forms. Reports of seizures by weight usually refer to the bulk weight of seizures, including adulterants and diluents, rather than the amount of controlled substance only. Moreover, given the availability of data, accurate purity adjustments for bulk seizure totals in individual countries are feasible in only a minority of cases, as they would require information on purity on a case by case basis or statistically calibrated data, such as a weighted average or a distribution. The bulk weight of tablets is easier to obtain and less variable.

To ensure the comparability of seizure totals across different years and countries, UNODC uses conversion factors for ATS tablets intended to reflect the bulk weight of the tablets rather than the amount of controlled substance. The factors used in this edition of the *World Drug Report* are based on available forensic studies and range between 90 mg and 300 mg, depending on the region and the drug type, and also apply to other units which are presumed to represent a single consumption unit (dose). The table below lists the factors used for ATS, by type and region. The conversion factors remain subject to revision as the information available to UNODC improves.



For the other drug types, the weight of a ‘typical consumption unit’ was assumed to be: for cannabis herb, 500 mg; for cannabis resin, 135 mg; cocaine and morphine, 100 mg; heroin, 30 mg; LSD, 0.05 mg (50 micrograms); and opium, 300 mg. For opiate seizures (unless specified differently in the text), it was assumed that 10 kg of opium were equivalent to 1 kg of morphine or heroin. As in previous editions of the World Drug Report, seizures quantified by volume (litres) are aggregated using a conversion ratio of 1 kilogram per litre, which applies to all drug types. Cannabis plants are assumed to have an average weight of 100 grams.

Though these transformation ratios can be disputed, they provide a means of combining the different seizure reports into one comprehensive measure. The transformation ratios have been derived from those normally used by law enforcement agencies, in the scientific literature and by the International Narcotics Control Board, and were established in consultation with UNODC’s Laboratory and Scientific Section.

A special challenge has been the emergence of **pharmaceutical opioids** in recent years. For the year 2021 total seizures of 135 tons of codeine, 35 tons of tramadol, 14 tons of fentanyl and 7 tons of other pharmaceutical opioids were reported. Such seizure figures, without any further adjustments, however, may be misleading as doses across pharmaceutical opioids vary significantly.

Directly comparable doses are, however, difficult to identify. One of the most comprehensive data set in this regard are the defined daily doses for statistical purposes (S-DDD), established – with the help of experts - by the INCB. For the transformation of seizures of pharmaceutical opioids into doses such S-DDD, shown in milligrams of various substances per day, were used:

 Substance S-DDD in mg





Source: INCB, Narcotic Drugs 2019 (New York 2020).

For buprenorphine, a S-DDD of 8 mg - as reported by the INCB in its annual report on Psychotgropic Substances[[25]](#footnote-26) - was used.

No such conversion ratios, however, have been established by the INCB for tramadol as this substance is not under international control. In this case, a review of doses provided in the literature ranged from 50 to 400 mg per day with a median of around 250 mg per day. (Tramadol tablets typically contain between 50 and 250 mg, i.e. the median daily dose would be equivalent to between 1 and 5 tablets, depending on the strength of the tablet). This ratio can be used as the best estimate for converting reported seizures into daily doses of seized drugs.

Moreover, reports suggest that most of the codeine seized in recent years has been in South Asia in the form of cough syrup while most of the fentanyl was seized in the United States and was heavily diluted.

For the purposes of this report, the quantities seized were first transformed into S-DDDs (defined daily doses for statistical purposes) as provided by the INCB. Thus, for codeine a conversion ratio of 100 mg for one daily dose was used (as found for the use of codeine as a cough suppressant); for oxycodone 75 mg were used; for methadone 25 mg; for buprenorphine 8 mg and for fentanyl 0.6 mg were used.

For substances which are not under international control (and for which no official S-DDDs were established), such as tramadol, a review of the literature (including grey literature), as discussed above, gave as a best estimate, some 250 mg per day [starting from 25 mg to a maximum of typically 400 mg though in some cases also larger quantities of up to 600 mg have been reportedly prescribed); of course, such estimates of S-DDDs may change once better and more authorative data on the daily use of tramadol were to become available.

For the large group non-specified pharmaceuticals a ratio of 83 mg was assumed; this was the value of the unweighted average of all the opioids for which S-DDDs exist; the 95 per cent confidence interval around these estimates suggests that the results could be some 36 per cent higher or lower than the average.

Subsequently, purity reported from the geographical areas where most seizures take place, was also taken into account.

Thus, information from the United States, where fentanyl seizures are concentrated, shows that purity of fentanyl on the black market varies strongly though it averages at around 9 per cent. This ratio was taken for the purity adjustment of fentanyl seizures.

Codeine is frequently seized in preparations such as cough syrups. Based on information obtained from South Asia, the content of codeine in such preparations varies though, on average, it seems to be equivalent to a codeine content of close to 20 per cent. This ratio was taken for the "purity adjustment" of codeine.

For other pharmaceutical opioids, in contrast, no substantial dilutions have been reported so-far; thus no specific purity adjustment for these products were made.

## Trafficking routes and volumes

Information of trafficking routes was mainly obtained from analyses of reports by Member States in the annual report questionnaire and in individual drug seizures reported to UNODC, as well as analyses of trafficking routes reported by Member States.

Individual drug seizures (IDS) would be the ideal data source for any in-depth analysis of drug flows. Unfortunately, reporting of individual drug seizure cases is very uneven. The total number of countries submitting IDS increased from 38 for the year 2016 to 69 by 2019, though declining thereafter to 32 countries by 2022, thus limiting data availability from official sources as foreseen in the international drug conventions.

This decline, however, was more than compensated by active searches for such data by UNODC on Government sites, partner organisations and the harvesting of such seizure reports in the mass media. Thus, overall coverage, has not declined but clearly improved in recent years. Overall individual drug seizures, were thus collected from 116 countries and territories in 2016 and this number increased to 129 countries and territories by 2021, 155 by 2020, 157 by 2021 and 168 by 2022.

In the case of cocaine, e.g. the weight of aggregate individual seizures reported through UNODC’s Drugs Monitoring Platform, expressed as a proportion of the total weight of annually seized cocaine, as reported by Member States in the annual report questionnaire, rose from just 16 per cent of the total in 2010 to 23 per cent by 2017 and to, on average, 44 per cent over the period 2020-2021. Seizure data collected through UNODC’s Drugs Monitoring Platform has thus clearly gained in importance in recent years.

Aggregate individual cocaine seizures (DMP) and aggregate annual seizures of cocaine (ARQ)

Sources: UNODC, responses to the annual report questionnaire and UNODC, Drugs Monitoring Platform

Information for the maps has been – primarily – based on information contained in the annual report questionnaire, while individual drug seizures reports and official national documents were used to fill gaps.

Some of the maps, however, have been based on UNODC’s Drugs Monitoring Platform. The number of collected individual drug seizures increased from less than 10,000 cases in 2010 to some 20,000 cases in 2018, 29,000 in 2019 and, on average, some 33,000 cases per year over the period 2020-2022.

, Nonetheless, the latter numbers remain still small compared to the overall number of annual seizure cases reported by Member States to UNODC in the annual report questionnaire, amounting, on average, to around 2 million drug seizure cases per year over the period 2020-2022.

###  Main trafficking routes as described by reported seizures

Seizures made in the various regions over the 2018-2021 period were used as a proxy for the importance of drug trafficking activities. Such seizures were distributed according to the countries of departure and transit mentioned by countries in the various regions for the period 2018-2021 (outside of the regions analysed), as weighted by the total reported seizures at the national level. This served as a basis for the calculation of (likely) importance of the various trafficking flows, taking into account that drugs could be seized at different stages along the trafficking route and drugs may need to travel across several sub-regions to reach the seizing country.

A similar approach was implemented using the countries of intended destination reported by the seizing Member States. Afterwards, the flows obtained from using reported departure/transit and destination information separately were put together to estimate the final relative size of the flow. This procedure was implemented at the sub-regional level to produce a matrix of flows across sub-regions. Afterwards, the main countries of departure or transit (and destination) were identified based on the weighted amounts that were seized while being trafficked from (to) them, according to reported seizures by Member States.

## Drug price and purity data

Price and purity data, if properly collected and reported, can be powerful indicators of market trends. Trends in supply can change over a shorter period of time when compared with changes in demand and shifts in prices and purities are relatively good indicators for increases or declines of market supply. Research has shown that short-term changes in the consumer markets are first reflected in purity changes while prices tend to be rather stable over longer periods of time. UNODC collects its price data from the ARQ, and supplements this data with other sources such as DAINAP, EMCDDA and Government reports. Prices are collected at farm-gate level, wholesale level (‘kilogram prices’) and at retail level (‘gram prices’). Countries are asked to provide minimum, maximum and typical prices and purities. When countries do not provide typical prices/purities, for the purposes of certain estimates, the mid-point of these estimates is calculated as a proxy for the ‘typical’ prices/purities (unless scientific studies are available which provide better estimates). What is generally not known is how price data and purity data were collected and how reliable the provided data are. Although improvements have been made in some countries over the years, a number of law enforcement bodies have still not established a regular system for systematically collecting purity and price data.

Prices are collected in local currency or in the currency in which the transactions take place and are then converted by UNODC into US dollars for the purposes of comparability among countries. The conversion into US dollars is based on official UN rates of exchange for the year. If comparisons of prices, expressed in US dollars are made over different years it should be noted that changes in such prices may be also influenced by changes in the exchange rates and may not necessarily reflect changes in the local markets.

### Standardized prices of cocaine and heroin in the United States and Western Europe

The price and purity data used for the various figures found in the report are available under 8. Prices and purities of illicit Drugs (Tables) in the statical annex [World Drug Report 2023 Annex (unodc.org)](https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/wdr2023_annex.html)

For the time series data for heroin and cocaine of Western Europe and the United States, the following methodology was used: For the case of heroin and cocaine prices in the 17 European countries in this Table, the published prices correspond an average of the available prices for the specific year (e.g., “crack” and cocaine salts, or white and brown heroin), if more than one type of drug is reported, or the typical value if only one price is reported by the country. In order to properly calculate the weighted averages across the 17 European Member States, in those countries for which no data is available, a “best estimate” is reported. This “best estimate” is based on: a) the latest reported value, b) an interpolation between two reported values, or c) the midpoint between the reported low and high observed prices (when a typical value is not available).

In order to properly reflect the prices faced by the population within these 17 countries, the average prices are weighted by the population 15-64 years old. A reported average price per gram in Euro is also published based on the average exchange rates for the corresponding year, and the reported units (gram for retail, kilogram for wholesale). Finally, the inflation-adjusted weighted average is expressed in 2021 Euros, by deflating the prices using the Consumer Price Index (CPI) published by Eurostat.

For the case of heroin and cocaine average prices at the retail level in the United States of America, both series were reviewed in 2021 as the revised data up to 2018 was made available. Authorities from the United States of America provided UNODC with newly available quarterly data on the price and purity of cocaine and heroin at the retail level for the 2005-2018 period. The average quarterly price for each of these years is reported. For the year 2019, cocaine price data reported in reply to UNODC’s annual report questionnaire were used while same typical price for heroin in 2019 as in 2018 was used as reported price ranges for heroin did not change between the two years. Since no data on prices was available for 2020 in the United States, the same values used for 2019 were used as reference for this year. In the case of years prior to 2005, the yearly trends from the previously published series are used to retropolate the price available for 2005. These trends are based on ARQ data and data from ONDCP, *2015 National Drug Control Strategy - 2015 Data Supplement*.

In the calculation of purity adjusted average heroin prices, the purity provided by national authorities at the quarterly level are used for 2005-2018, while data available through the ARQ or published in ONDCP, *2015 National Drug Control Strategy - 2015 Data Supplement* are used for previous years. In the calculation of purity adjusted cocaine prices, data from ONDCP is also used up to the year 2004. No data are available from 2019 onwards.

Inflation adjusted prices in the United States were deflated using the CPI, published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. For inflation adjusted average drug prices in Western Europe drug prices were deflated using the Harmonised Indices of Consumer Prices (HICP) published by Eurostat for the Euro area.

## Trafficking of drugs on the dark-web

Over the last few years, UNODC has also regularly analyzed – based on available information – changes and patterns of drug trafficking via the darkweb.

The UNODC analysis of sales on darknet markets has been based on (i) original data from Hikari Labs which uses web-crawling techniques to identify and collect data from darknet markets, “scraping” relevant information from such sites, (ii) data collected by Chainanalysis, analysing licit and illicit flows based on major crypto-currencies as well as on (iii) information gathered through the Global Drug Survey, a non-representative convenience sample of roughly 100,000 self-selected people from more than 50 countries each year.

 Hikari Labs is a spin-out from Carnegie Mellon University’s CyLab Security and Privacy institute, located in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Hikari Labs regularly scraps major darknet markets. The raw data obtained from such monitoring was then used by UNODC for further calculations and analyses.

Data from Hikari Labs provide detailed information on 39 major global darknet markets analyzed over the period 2011-2022, thus providing insights into a number of dimensions of global darknet market activities.

Data provided include information on individual transactions, the minimum sales generated by vendors on the various markets, the length of time markets were operating and/or vendors have been active on such darknet markets, the type of substances or services offered and sold, the likely origin of the vendors (i.e. from where the substances were shipped) or the distribution of darknet sales.

As of June 2022, more than 1.4 million listings of drugs and other substances and services were identified on the monitored darknet markets over the period 2011-June 2022; more than 87,000 vendors were identified, leading to more than $19 million transactions via the darkweb and total sales of more than $1.29 billion of which more than 90 per cent were drug related in recent years (91 per cent in 2021).

Drugs and other goods and services are usually offered by vendors on a darknet market, providing information on the quantities of items offered and the price requested. Once a transaction has taken place and the item delivered, the customer usually leaves feedback under the listed item. While the effective money flows are usually not known, feedback can be used as a proxy for actual transactions. Sales calculations then assume that “one” item at the offered price was purchased. Calculating the total sales made on a darknet market on the basis of the number of individual feedback comments thus generates a conservative (i.e. a low) estimate because:

1. not all customers leave feedback though on some markets customers are actually compelled to comment because vendors consider positive feedback to be one of the most important marketing tools on the dark web;
2. a customer can purchase more than the minimum unit quantity offered on a darknet market. However, this is not really convenient as larger quantities are usually offered at lower unit prices. There are thus indications that most customers purchase the standard unit quantity offered or only slightly larger quantities.
3. not all sites from a darknet market can be fully scraped within a short period of time without arousing suspicion by site administrators. Thus, the actual proportion scraped can differ substantially from market to market and over time (ranging initially (i.e. prior to mid–2015) from 60 per cent to more than 90 per cent of market sites). In recent years, this bias seems to have gained even further in importance, possibly as a result of administrators being better equipped to combat unwanted monitoring. On average 50 per cent of darknet market sites could actually be scraped in the period mid-2017–2020, compared with close to 87 per cent in the period 2011–mid-2017. Assuming items offered and sold on non-scraped darknet sites are similar to those on scraped darknet sites (which is not certain), this could mean that actual darknet sales may be twice as high as the calculated minimum darknet sales shown in the World Drug Report.

It should be also noted that the coverage of individual markets through scraping attempts may significantly differ. There are, e.g. indications that the actual coverage of information collected from Hydra market, for instance, the world’s largest darknet market operating in the Russian language, may have been particularly low (less than 1 per cent), suggesting that actual sales done on this market may well have been substantially higher than indicated through the minimum sales figures shown in the graphs of the World Drug Report.

Data collected and analysed also enabled the identification of the main departure countries of drug shipments. Though not all vendors may have truthfully reported from where the drugs were shipped, there are still indications that by and large the information was basically correct as countries which would have been farther away from the final consumers would have led to negative feedback of customers complaining about the unexpectedly long shipping period.

The second main source of information were data collected by Chinanalysis, based on an analysis of the blockchains of major crypto-currencies. Such data are also the basis for the annual Crypto Crime Reports issued by Chainanalysis. The analysis of such blockchain data showed overall significantly higher levels of darknet market activities than the minimum sales data collected via web-crawler techniques on major darknet markets. Irrespective of differences, both data sets indicated a strong decline of such darknet market activities in 2022, primarily linked to the dismantling of Hydra market by the German authorities in April 2022. This was a mainly Russian speaking darknet market, which in recent years seems to have accounted for close to 80 per cent of all darknet market activities,

Observed minimum sales on 39 major darknet markets (mostly drug-related) and estimates of overall darknet market sales (mostly drug-related) based on analysis of blockchain, 2011-2022

Sources: UNODC calculations based on Hikari Labs data and Chainanalysis, Crypto Crime Report 2023 (and previous years).

The third main source of information on trends in darknet markets came from information collected via the **Global Drug Survey**. Even though this information is not based on a random sample, usually used in social sciences, the mere size of the number of participants can help shed some light on underlying trends. Even though the overall number of participants of the Global Survey fluctuated around 100,000 people in recent years, the number of people providing specific answers to darknet market questions was, however, substantially smaller. Thus, the information of people who purchased drugs via the darkweb was based on information of around 23,300 persons in 2022 and, on average, 54,000 persons per year over the period 2014-2022. While the number of persons providing answers to this question rose strongly from 53,000 by January 2014 to 88,000 by January 2020, the numbers declined again during the two COVID years to around 24,000 by January 2021 and 23,000 by January 2022. To what extent changes in the participation rates in this survey also influenced the overall outcome of the results is, however, difficult to judge.

Table: Obtaining drugs from darknet markets in the last 12 months

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| Numbers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No | 50,968 | 55,684 | 68,008 | 58,188 | 48,560 | 43,635 | 75,465 | 20,420 | 20,813 |
| Yes | 2,507 | 3,488 | 5,593 | 5,024 | 4,997 | 5,252 | 13,274 | 3,470 | 2,512 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 53,475 | 59,172 | 73,601 | 63,212 | 53,557 | 48,887 | 88,739 | 23,890 | 23,325 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |
| No | 95.3 | 94.1 | 92.4 | 92.1 | 90.7 | 89.3 | 85.0 | 85.5 | 89.2 |
| Yes | 4.7 | 5.9 | 7.6 | 7.9 | 9.3 | 10.7 | 15.0 | 14.5 | 10.8 |

Source: Global Drug Survey

In addition to reporting the raw data as they were, UNODC also calculated a population weighted average as the numbers of persons participating in this survey differed strongly from country to country, with a strong bias e.g. for participants from Germany and relatively low numbers for participants from the United States. Even though this resulted in some changes regarding the peak year, both indicators basically showed a clear upward trend over the period 2014-2020, followed by a decline over the period January 2021 to January 2022 to levels found prior to the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic.

For the calculation of the population weighted average the problem of missing data was also explicitly addressed, using a similar approach as in other parts of this report. It was assumed that (i) the proportions gradually increased or decreased between two data points (using Excel growth function) and that (ii) data remained unchanged from the last time they were reported for a country. Not included in the calculation of the overall average were the data for the Russian Federation as in this case only two data points existed and the survey had never been translated into the Russian language, thus creating a bias for a small subset of the population which was using drugs, the darknet and which was fluent in English.

**Figure:  Proportion of people purchasing drugs over the dark web among surveyed Internet users who used drugs in the past year, January 2014 to January 2022 (or latest year available)**

Source: UNODC calculations based on Global Drug Survey.

 A population weighted average, with missing data addressed, was also used for the regional averages.

**Figure: Proportion of people purchasing drugs over the dark web among surveyed Internet users who used drugs in the past year, selected regions and subregions, 2014-2022**

Source: UNODC calculations based on Global Drug Survey
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