



## 【24<sup>th</sup> Edition】

Publish date : March 01, 2017

Chief editor :Shu-Lung Yang

Executive editor :Hua-Fu Hsu

Vice executive editor : Yueh-Chung Ma

Document editor : Nien-I Chen, Yueh-Hsing Chang

Executive department :Crime Research Center,  
National Chung Cheng University

Phone number :+886-5-2720411#26305

Website :<http://deptcrc.ccu.edu.tw/index.php/news/>

◎UNODC and NIDA Reports

◎Taiwan Research News

◎Recent International Academic

Conference



### Call For Paper Journal of Substance Abuse Research

#### 1. About the journal

The *Journal of Substance Abuse Research* is an academic journal published by the Taiwan Society for Substance Abuse Research and the Education Center Substance Abuse, National Chung Cheng University annually each March, June, September and December. We welcome researchers both in Taiwan and worldwide to publish articles regarding empirical studies on substance abuse research in this journal. Please note that published articles will not be accepted.

#### 2. Article solicitation

(1) This journal accepts articles all year round. All articles will be review immediately.

(2) You can download the journal guidelines via:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B9NbpWf1jdgxMDgwb3Q5VE41WGc/view?usp=sharing>

(3) Please mail your articles to

Journal Editorial Board,

Taiwan Society for Substance Abuse Research and Crime Research Center, NCCU

No. 168, University Rd.. Min-Hsiung , Chiayi County, Taiwan 621, R.O.C.

(4) Please submit an electronic version of your manuscript by email to the editors at [deptcrc@ccu.edu.tw](mailto:deptcrc@ccu.edu.tw)

3. After an article is accepted, this Society will give five copies of the current issue of the journal for free, and the PDF file of the published article. Please note that authors will not be paid for their articles. When an article is rejected, this Journal will inform the author in writing without returning his/her works. Please keep a copy before submission.

4. Should you have any doubts or suggestions, please feel free to contact us through the following ways:

Please contact Mr.Chang Lin

Tel: 886-5-2721451

Dedicated phone line:05-2724151

Fax phone:05-2721355

E-mail:[deptcrc@ccu.edu.tw](mailto:deptcrc@ccu.edu.tw)



# UNODC Reports

## Treatment and Care of People with Drug Use Disorders in Contact with the Criminal Justice System: Alternatives to Conviction or Punishment

➤ Editorial Office



The respect, protection and fulfilment of the right to health is a primary goal of drug control policies. Under the international drug control conventions, States parties have committed themselves to take all practicable measures to prevent the illicit use of drugs and to provide for the early identification, treatment, education, aftercare, rehabilitation and social reintegration of persons involved with the illicit use of drugs, including when they are in contact with the criminal justice system. A key challenge in



many countries is to provide adequate treatment and care, not just in prison settings but also as alternatives to conviction or punishment.

In order to address this challenge, UNODC hosted a Meeting of Experts on "Treatment and Care for People with Drug Use Disorders in Contact with the Criminal Justice System: Alternatives to Conviction and Punishment" from 4 to 6 October 2016, bringing together more than 60 health and justice practitioners from 30 countries, as well as civil society and international organizations (AU, EMCDDA, CICAD/OAS) to share experiences and national practices.

The experts exchanged information and views on possible approaches to broaden the use of non-custodial measures, including treatment and care, to persons with drug use disorders, in appropriate cases and in different stages of criminal proceedings. They highlighted the importance of the close cooperation between health and justice sectors, including to ensure that despite possible criminal justice measures the State offers treatment in a continuum of care to patients with drug use disorders. It was stressed that evidence-based treatment and care (and education) services needed to be available and accessible in order to be used to divert appropriate cases from the criminal justice system or as an effective alternative to custodial measures. The meeting provided valuable inputs for a forthcoming handbook by UNODC and WHO on ways in which treatment and care can be applied as alternatives to conviction or punishment in appropriate cases.

*This paper is from: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime*

*[https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/drug-prevention-and-treatment/treatment-and-care-of-people-with-drug-use-disorders-in-contact-with-the-criminal-justice-system\\_-alternatives-to-conviction-or-punishment.html](https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/drug-prevention-and-treatment/treatment-and-care-of-people-with-drug-use-disorders-in-contact-with-the-criminal-justice-system_-alternatives-to-conviction-or-punishment.html)*



# NIDA Reports

## **I. NIH Monitoring the Future survey shows use of most illicit substances down, but past year marijuana use relatively stable**

➤ **Editorial Office**

The 2016 Monitoring the Future (MTF) annual survey results released today from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) reflect changing teen behaviors and choices in a social media-infused world. The results show a continued long-term decline in the use of many illicit substances, including marijuana, as well as alcohol, tobacco, and misuse of some prescription medications, among the nation’s teens. The MTF survey measures drug use and attitudes among eighth, 10th, and 12th graders, and is funded by the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), part of the NIH.

Findings from the survey indicate that past year use of any illicit drug was the lowest in the survey’s history for eighth graders, while past year use of illicit drugs other than marijuana is down from recent peaks in all three grades.

Marijuana use in the past month among eighth graders dropped significantly in 2016 to 5.4 percent, from 6.5 percent in 2015. Daily use among eighth graders dropped in 2016 to 0.7 percent from 1.1 percent in 2015. However, among high school seniors, 22.5 percent report past month marijuana use and 6 percent report daily use; both measures remained relatively stable from last year. Similarly, rates of marijuana use in the past year among 10th graders also remained stable compared to 2015, but are at their lowest levels in over two decades.



The survey also shows that there continues to be a higher rate of marijuana use among 12th graders in states with medical marijuana laws, compared to states without them. For example, in 2016, 38.3 percent of high school seniors in states with medical marijuana laws reported past year marijuana use, compared to 33.3 percent in non-medical marijuana states, reflecting previous research that has suggested that these differences precede enactment of medical marijuana laws.

The survey indicates that marijuana and e-cigarettes are more popular than regular tobacco cigarettes. The past month rates among 12th graders are 12.4 percent for e-cigarettes and 10.5 percent for cigarettes. A large drop in the use of tobacco cigarettes was seen in all three grades, with a long-term decline from their peak use more than two decades ago. For example, in 1991, when MTF first measured cigarette smoking, 10.7 percent of high school seniors smoked a half pack or more a day. Twenty-five years later, that rate has dropped to only 1.8 percent, reflecting the success of widespread public health anti-smoking campaigns and policy changes.

There has been a similar decline in the use of alcohol, with the rate of teens reporting they have “been drunk” in the past year at the survey’s lowest rates ever. For example, 37.3 percent of 12th graders reported they have been drunk at least once, down from a peak of 53.2 percent in 2001.

Although non-medical use of prescription opioids remains a serious issue in the adult population, teen use of prescription opioid pain relievers is trending downwards among 12th graders with a 45 percent drop in past year use compared to five years ago. For example, only 2.9 percent of high school seniors reported past year misuse of the pain reliever Vicodin in 2016, compared to nearly 10 percent a decade ago.



"Clearly our public health prevention efforts, as well as policy changes to reduce availability, are working to reduce teen drug use, especially among eighth graders," said Nora D. Volkow, M.D., director of NIDA. "However, when 6 percent of high school seniors are using marijuana daily, and new synthetics are continually flooding the illegal marketplace, we cannot be complacent. We also need to learn more about how teens interact with each other in this social media era, and how those behaviors affect substance use rates."

"It is encouraging to see more young people making healthy choices not to use illicit substances," said National Drug Control Policy Director Michael Botticelli. "We must continue to do all we can to support young people through evidence-based prevention efforts as well as treatment for those who may develop substance use disorders. And now that Congress has acted on the President's request to provide \$1 billion in new funding for prevention and treatment, we will have significant new resources to do this."

The MTF survey, the only large-scale federal youth survey on substance use that releases findings the same year the data is collected, has been conducted by researchers at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor since 1975.

*This paper is from: National Institute on Drug Abuse*

*<https://www.drugabuse.gov/news-events/news-releases/2016/12/teen-substance-use-shows-promising-decline>*



## II. Overview of legal approaches to control new psychoactive substances at the national level

Report by LSS/RAB/DPA/UNODC, New psychoactive substances: overview of trends, challenges and legal approaches, March 2016, P15-1

### A. Drug control legislation

#### 1. Individual listing of substances

Following the model of the international drug control conventions, individual substances are controlled once their harm has been assessed. They are often divided into schedules/lists that classify them individually based on medical use, their relative abuse potential, and their likelihood of causing dependence when abused.

Each schedule is subject to a graded system of control and restrictions. Examples of this approach to control NPS are the scheduling of BZP, TFMPP and mCPP in New Zealand, in 2008, and the control of mephedrone in Brazil, in 2011<sup>1</sup>

#### Benefits and opportunities

- Controlled substances are specified individually.
- This approach seems to be sufficient in countries where the number of NPS identified is limited and where the spread of NPS on the drug market is not foreseeable in the near future.

#### Limitations

- Scientific and human experience data are required to assess the health risks associated with a

---

<sup>1</sup> BZP and mephedrone have been under international control since 2015.



substance before deciding on its scope of control in many drug control systems. In the case of some NPS, those data are often unavailable, making it very difficult to justify legal controls.

- The legislative process associated with placing new substances under drug control legislation is often lengthy, taking at least several months, and leaving a prolonged time lag between the time the dangerous NPS emerge on the market and the time controls are introduced, thus exposing users to health risks.

### 1.1. Temporary bans

Through temporary bans, administrative authorities can rapidly (in a matter of days or months), via statutory instruments, introduce controls similar to those that apply to the illicit manufacture or trafficking in drugs to NPS (individually or as a group of compounds) that pose an “immediate risk” or are considered to be “dangerous” and a threat to public health, while health issues are assessed by the competent authority and a final decision on control is taken. Temporary controls are limited in time (usually from 6 months to 1-2 years). Drugs controlled under temporary legislation are often subject to reduced or no penalties for personal use quantities, with manufacture, importation, exportation and supply being the main focus of control.

Examples of the use of temporary bans to control NPS can be found in the legislation of Hungary, Italy, Latvia, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

#### Benefits and opportunities

- Temporary bans enable a quicker response to control the supply of potentially harmful NPS when there is little knowledge/evidence of their harms while health issues are fully assessed by independent experts.

#### Limitations





- Temporary controls are limited in time, and in many cases the time is insufficient for the evidence of NPS harm to become available to justify permanent controls.

### 1.2. Rapid procedures

Like temporary bans, rapid procedures are not per se legislation to control NPS, but a system to speed up, in cases of urgency, the standard legislative procedure required to place new substances under permanent control. Thus, in order to accelerate the process, the omission of one or more of the standard legislative steps or the reduction of procedural times to consider the decision by the parliamentary chambers and/or by the President, is permitted.

Rapid procedures can be differentiated from temporary bans based on two main criteria. The first criterion is that, compared to the standard legislative process, in the case of rapid procedures the required level of final approval of the legal text is maintained, but the duration of the consultations is shortened whereas in the case of temporary bans, the level of final approval of the legal text is lowered, e.g. from presidential/royal assent to Ministerial approval. The second criterion is that the bans of substances taken under rapid procedures are permanent and not limited in time, unlike in the case of temporary bans. Countries that have used rapid procedures to control the supply of NPS include Luxembourg, Norway, Poland, Slovakia and Sweden.

#### Benefits and opportunities

- Accelerated legislative or regulatory processes to control NPS provide a rapid response to counter an imminent health threat posed by certain known harmful substances (e.g. mephedrone or NBOME compounds).
- Substances controlled under rapid procedures are subject to permanent controls.

#### Limitations

- Health Advisory Councils/Boards continue to face serious difficulties in advising the legislative



process due to data paucity on the health harms associated with specific substances, which is a common feature with many NPS.

### 1.3. Generic controls

Generic controls complement the list of individually controlled substances by prohibiting at once groups of substances (that include large numbers of individual NPS) encountered and/or to anticipate controls on new substances that may arise. Generic controls target the core molecular structure, which does not itself have to be psychoactive, with legislation specifying particular variations of the structure (particularly substituent groups in specified positions in the molecule) that could fall under control.

Substances under the generic definition show a defined structural similarity to a known illicit drug or parent compound described in the legislation even though the names of those substances are not individually mentioned in the legislation. The generic language goes beyond the terms isomers, esters, ethers and salts and refers, for instance, to specific subgroups of NPS such as naphthoylindoles and benzoylindoles indicating the replacements and substitutions that fall under control.

For instance, a variety of naphthoylindoles that could be produced by replacement of the pentyl substituent on the indole ring of JWH-018 are covered by the generic legislation adopted so far in several countries. Countries and territories that have used this approach to control one or more groups of NPS include Austria, Denmark, France, Hungary, Hong Kong (China), Ireland, Israel, Japan, Lithuania, Norway, the Russian Federation, Switzerland, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom and the United States.

#### Benefits and opportunities

- In countries affected by the proliferation of a large number of NPS, this approach has allowed



control of large groups of substances present on the market without needing to name them individually, and has also enabled the introduction of “future proof” legislation, to be one step ahead of drug manufacturers and controlling substances that may appear but may have not yet emerged on the market.

- The generic approach seems feasible for small and simple groups of NPS because the number of potential compounds is limited.

### Limitations

- Generic controls may be questioned in view of constitutional principles, particularly those related to the fact that individuals should not be convicted of a crime without having had knowledge that a particular substance was banned. - Controlling substances with a much larger skeleton is challenging due to the possibilities of diversification. For instance, in the case of synthetic cannabinoids, new variations, seemingly designed to circumvent legislation, appear regularly, quickly outdated a generic legislation.
- When introducing generic controls, it should be considered that not every modification on parts of the structure of a controlled compound will necessarily ensure that the compound remains pharmacologically active and should be controlled.
- In the absence of rigorous definitions of cluster of compounds and/or in the inclusion of specific exceptions on medicines and substances used for research, substances which are not intended to be controlled because of legitimate industrial, scientific and medical use, may unintentionally fall under generic controls.
- Enforcement of generic legislation could be challenging as in many cases law enforcement authorities face difficulties in identifying the substances controlled under a generic approach.

### 1.4. Analogue controls



With analogue legislation, invoking the concept of “chemical similarity” to a controlled drug allows for the control of substances that are not specifically mentioned in the legislation. Thus, a substance which is both structurally similar to and has a similar or greater effect on the central nervous system as an already controlled substance, is deemed to be a controlled substance analogue and is as such under control. Analogue legislation operates on a substance-by-substance basis and, unlike generic controls, addresses more general aspects of similarity in chemical structure to a “parent” compound.

The definition of what is considered an analogue, the interpretation and applicability of the concept and the penalties associated with the infringement of analogue legislation vary from country to country. In addition to the requirement of chemical similarity, criteria such as pharmacological similarity and/or evidence that the substance is sold for human consumption are used in some countries to delineate more clearly the definition of analogue substances.

An example of the use of analogue legislation to control NPS is provided by Canadian legislation. In Canada, methylene has been considered to be an analogue of amphetamine, which is included in Schedule I of the Controlled Drugs and Substances Act (CDSA). Synthetic cannabinoids, such as JWH-018, are considered to be similar synthetic preparations of cannabis and therefore fall under the controls of Schedule II of CDSA.

### Benefits and opportunities

- Analogue controls may eliminate the need to continually update the schedules of controlled substances as not every substance falling under control via analogue legislation would need to be individually named in the legislation.

### Limitations

- Analogue controls may have unintended negative consequences on legitimate manufacturers



and suppliers of substances for medical and/or research purposes, because they may not have the means to verify whether a substance that they are manufacturing or selling is deemed analogous to a controlled substance and may thus run the risk of prosecution.

- Analogue legislation operates on a substance-by-substance basis, which implies that an assessment of the chemical structure and/or pharmacological similarity of an NPS against that of existing controlled substances needs to be performed for each individual substance.
- The requirement of pharmacological similarity to prove analogy may be very challenging for a number of NPS that have not been studied and thus lack pharmacological information.
- The lack of a recognized scientific method to determine the “substantial similarity” of two substances makes determining whether a substance is deemed to be a controlled substance analogue very complex and resource-intensive for law enforcement and prosecuting authorities.

### 1.5. Neurochemical approach

Through this approach substances are controlled based on the effect they have on the brain rather than through the listing of specific substances or the use of class definitions. This approach has been used so far only to control synthetic cannabinoids but its future application to other NPS groups cannot be excluded. In 2012, the United States introduced this approach to control NPS, in particular “cannabimimetic agents”. Under the “Synthetic Drug Abuse Prevention Act 2012” cannabimimetic agents are defined as “any substance that is a cannabinoid receptor type 1 (CB1 receptor) agonist as demonstrated by binding studies and functional assays” within defined structural classes.

The definition includes a group of substances with possible chemical variations but which have a specific effect through binding to the CB1 receptor. According to the Act, any preparation “...



which contains any quantity of cannabimimetic agents, or which contains their salts, isomers and salts of isomers ...” is placed under Schedule I, which is the schedule with the strictest controls.

### Benefits and opportunities

- This approach could theoretically eliminate the need for continually updating the schedules of controlled substances every time a new synthetic cannabinoid is made or introduced into the market.
- There are relatively simple tests to determine the psychoactive effect.
- This approach provides clearer definitions than analogue controls.

### Limitations

- The neurochemical approach may have unintended negative consequences on legitimate manufacturers and suppliers of substances for medical and/or research purposes, because they may not have the means to verify whether a substance that they are manufacturing or selling falls under the scope of the legislation, by having a specific effect through binding to the CB1 receptor, and thus may run the risk of prosecution.
- According to United States legislation, proof that the substance/chemical meets the structural criteria, as described, and that it satisfies the neurochemical definition are needed, but there is uncertainty in terms of what proof would be required to obtain a conviction under the “Synthetic Drug Abuse Prevention Act 2012”.
- As the public may not easily understand this approach, a clear message to explain the approach is needed.



# Taiwan Research News

## **I. Motivation, self-efficacy, and treatment engagement of clients in the prison-based treatment program in Taiwan**

**Doris Chu, Tze-Hou Wu, Ling Hui Lai, & Jia Fen Su**

**Department And Graduate Institute Of Criminology, National Chung Cheng University**

A number of studies dealing with clients seeking treatment for substance abuse have found motivation to change and self-efficacy are important determinants to generate positive outcomes. However, most of these studies have been conducted in western countries. Do their findings hold in non-western societies, such as Taiwan? The present study analyzes data drawn from surveys conducted with 141 clients from two prison-based substance abuse treatment centers in Taiwan. It examines the relations between clients' motivational readiness to change, their own self-efficacy, and their actions in making change happen. It was found that clients who reported higher treatment motivation and self-efficacy were more likely to take actual steps to make positive changes--such as carrying through their plans to cut down or quit drugs or to actively engage in a treatment program. Interestingly, clients with more prior arrests for drug offense were more inclined to make a positive change in their drug use. Policy implications are discussed.



## **II. The effects of social exclusion on adolescents with drug addiction: an event-related potential study**

**Chiao-Yun Chen & Cheng-Hung ko**

**Department And Graduate Institute Of Criminology, National Chung Cheng University**

Adolescents with drug addiction are major health and social security issue in many countries. In this study, questionnaires measuring rejection sensitivity, negative mood regulation, and need threat were used as part of an investigation of how social exclusion affects adolescents with drug abuse in a correctional institution (experimental group), adolescents without drug abuse in a correctional institution (matched control group 1) and normal adolescents (matched control group 2).

The cyberball task, a task which allows experimental manipulation of exclusion, combined with electroencephalography was used to measure the electrophysiological differences among the three groups in order to understand the impact of social exclusion on them. The results of the questionnaires showed that the scores of the experimental group for anger after rejection were significantly higher than those of the matched control group 2. In the cyberball task, the exclusion stage, when the ball is not thrown to the participant, is typically a situation contrary to their expectations. ERP data from the control groups for this stage was consistent with this, with the worse-than-expected result eliciting the feedback related-negativity (FRN). However, the experimental group showed an ERP pattern with the FRN significantly lower than for the normal matched control group. This may reflect a tendency in this group to expect rejection, so that when rejection occurs, this is not a worse result than expected. This may relate to differences in the feedback monitoring system for this group.





# Latest Conferences Information

➤ Editorial Office

Conference	Host Organization	Date	Location
American Society for Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics (ASCPT)	American Society for Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics (ASCPT)	March 15-18 2017	Washington, DC Contact : <a href="http://www.ascpt.org/ASCPT-2017-Annual-Meeting/Future-Annual-Meetings">http://www.ascpt.org/ASCPT-2017-Annual-Meeting/Future-Annual-Meetings</a>
The American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM) 48th Annual Medical-Scientific Conference	The American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM)	April 6-9 2017	Hilton New Orleans Riverside New Orleans, LA Contact: <a href="http://www.asam.org/education/live-online-cme/the-asam-annual-conference">http://www.asam.org/education/live-online-cme/the-asam-annual-conference</a>
National Advisory Council on Drug Abuse	National Advisory Council on Drug Abuse (NACDA)	May 2 2017	Neuroscience Center, Conference Rooms C & D, 6001 Executive Boulevard, Rockville, Maryland 2085 Contact: <a href="https://www.drugabuse.gov/about-nida/advisory-boards-groups/national-advisory-council-drug-abuse-nacda/meeting-dates">https://www.drugabuse.gov/about-nida/advisory-boards-groups/national-advisory-council-drug-abuse-nacda/meeting-dates</a>
American Psychiatric Association (APA)	American Psychiatric Association (APA)	May 20-24 2017	San Diego, California, USA Contact: <a href="https://www.psychiatry.org/psychiatrists/meetings/annual-meeting">https://www.psychiatry.org/psychiatrists/meetings/annual-meeting</a>
The Forum on Cross-strait Drug and Crime Prevention	National Chung Cheng University Crime Research Center	May 31 2017	No.168, Sec. 1, University Rd., Min-Hsiung Township, Chia-yi County 621, Taiwan (R.O.C.) National Chung Cheng University Contact: <a href="http://deptcrc.ccu.edu.tw/">http://deptcrc.ccu.edu.tw/</a>