

MEMEM

Inter-American Drug Abuse
Control Commission
(CICAD)

Secretariat for
Multidimensional
Security
(SMS)

**United
States of
America**

**EVALUATION OF
PROGRESS IN
DRUG CONTROL**

2007-2009



Organization of
American States

2010



OAS/Ser.L/XIV.2.48
CICAD/docx.1843/10

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES
Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD)

Multilateral Evaluation Mechanism (MEM)
Governmental Expert Group (GEG)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

EVALUATION OF PROGRESS IN DRUG CONTROL
2007-2009

ISBN 978-0-8270-5574-2



CICAD wishes to thank the following national institutions of the United States of America which provided information for this MEM national Fifth Round report:

- White House Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP)
- U.S. Department of State
 - Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs (INL)
- U.S. Coast Guard
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
 - Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)
 - Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP)
 - Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT)
 - Office of Applied Studies
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security
 - Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement
- U.S. Department of Justice
 - Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF)
 - Criminal Division, Narcotic & Dangerous Drug Section
 - Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA)
 - National Drug Intelligence Center
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA)
- U.S. Department of Defense
 - Joint Interagency Task Force South



PREFACE

The Multilateral Evaluation Mechanism (MEM) is a diagnostic tool designed by all member states of the Organization of American States (OAS) to periodically carry out comprehensive, multilateral evaluations of the progress of actions taken by member states and by the hemisphere as a whole, in dealing with the drug problem. The Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD), of the Secretariat of Multidimensional Security, an OAS specialized agency, implemented this Mechanism in 1998, pursuant to a mandate from the Second Summit of the Americas held in Santiago, Chile in 1998.

The MEM is not only an evaluation instrument, but has also become a vehicle for disseminating information on the progress achieved by individual and collective efforts of OAS member state governments, catalyzing hemispheric cooperation, promoting dialogue among member state government authorities and precisely channeling assistance to areas requiring greater attention by optimizing resources. The MEM process itself is assessed by the Intergovernmental Working Group (IWG), comprised of delegations from all member states, which meets before the onset of each MEM evaluation round to review and strengthen all operational aspects of the mechanism, including the indicators of the evaluation questionnaire.

National evaluation reports are drafted by experts from each member state, with experts not working on their own country's report, guaranteeing the transparent multilateral nature of the MEM. Each chapter is based on countries' responses to a questionnaire of indicators covering the main thematic areas of institution building, demand reduction, supply reduction and control measures as well as subsequent comments and updated information provided by the government-appointed coordinating entities.

This report covers the full country evaluation for the MEM Fifth Round evaluation period 2007-2009. The follow-up report on the implementation progress of recommendations assigned to the country will be published in June 2012. All MEM reports can be accessed through the following webpage: www.cicad.oas.org.



INTRODUCTION

The United States of America (U.S.) has a total area of 9,826,675 sq km, including 12,034 km of borders (with Canada 8,893 km—includes 2,477 with Alaska—and with Mexico 3,141 km) and 19,924 km of coastline. The country has a population of approximately 307,212,123 with the following main ethnic groups: white, black, hispanic, asian and indigenous. The U.S. is the world's largest economy and third largest country by land area. It has a labor force of 154.2 million people, a 99 percent literacy rate, a per capita GDP of US \$46,400 and is a market-oriented economy. The country's exports include motor vehicles and parts, industrial machinery, aircraft, agricultural products, and telecommunications equipment. The U.S. is a constitutional-based federal republic divided into 50 states, one district, and numerous territories.

I. INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING

A. National Anti-drug Strategy

The United States of America (U.S.) had a National Drug Control Strategy during the evaluation period, 2007-2009 that covered the areas of demand reduction, supply reduction, alternative, integral and sustainable development programs, control measures, national drug information and research systems, money laundering, international cooperation and evaluation programs.

The country reports that during the years 2007–2009, the National Drug Control Strategy pursued the following strategic priorities: stopping initiation; reducing drug abuse and addiction; and disrupting the market for illegal drugs.

The Strategy also had the following goals: 10 percent reduction in youth drug use in two years, and 25 percent reduction in youth drug use over five years.

The U.S. also informed that the most recent edition of its National Drug Control Strategy was published in May 2010. This new version, developed by the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP), with input from a variety of Federal, State, and local partners, aims at reducing drug use and its consequences through a balanced policy of prevention, treatment, enforcement, and international cooperation.

Regional, state and municipal authorities in the U.S. have jurisdiction in areas related to anti-drug policy, but the number of state or municipal governments that execute anti-drug plans was not provided. The country reports that part of its decentralization strategy is the Drug Free Communities (DFC) program, through which the federal government provides grants to community organizations that facilitate citizen participation in local drug prevention efforts. In 2009, the U.S. government announced \$21 million in new Drug Free Communities (DFC) grants to 161 communities across the country.



The approximate annual total amount of the budget (in millions) for financing the national anti-drug strategy for the years 2006–2009 is provided in the following table:

2006 (US \$)	2007 (US \$)	2008 (US \$)	2009 (US \$)
13,144.1	13,844.1	13,276.3	15,278.4

The national anti-drug strategy includes a monitoring and evaluation system, operated by the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP).

The ONDCP, established by the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, is the U.S. national anti-drug authority. It is an independent office within the Executive Office of the President and, by law, its Director evaluates, coordinates, and oversees U.S. anti-drug efforts of executive branch agencies and ensures that such efforts sustain and complement state, local, and tribal anti-drug activities. The ONDCP coordinates demand reduction, supply reduction, alternative, integral and sustainable development, control measures, the drug observatory, international cooperation and program evaluation. The Office has a legal basis, and a central technical office to carry out its mandates.

The U.S. reports that the ONDCP has an independent budget, financed through government allocation. The country provides the following information regarding the budget (in millions) for the period 2007–2009:

Fiscal Year	Total Budget Received (US \$)
2006	474
2007	464.4
2008	421.7
2009	438.9

B. International Conventions

The U.S. has ratified the following international conventions:

- Inter-American Convention against Corruption, 1996;
- Inter-American Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters, 1992;
- United Nations Convention against Corruption, 2003;
- United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, 2000:
 - Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air;
 - Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children;
- United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, 1988;
- UN Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961 as amended by the 1972 Protocol;
- United Nations Convention on Psychotropic Substances, 1971.



The Inter-American Convention against Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Other Related Materials – CIFTA (1997) was signed by the U.S. on November 14, 1997 but is still pending ratification. The country has not acceded to the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, their Parts, and Components and Ammunition of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (2000).

The U.S. made reservations to the following conventions: United Nations Convention against Corruption (2003); United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (2000) and its Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air; Inter-American Convention against Corruption (1996); Inter-American Convention on Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters (1992); United Nations Convention against Illicit Trafficking in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (1988); and United Nations Convention on Psychotropic Substances (1971).

C. National Information System

The U.S. reports that the ONDCP is the centralized office that organizes, carries out studies, compiles and coordinates drug-related statistics and other drug-related information.

The country reports the following demand reduction-related studies carried out during the years 2006–2009:

Studies	2006		2007		2008		2009	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Priority Studies								
Survey of secondary school students	X		X		X		X	
National household surveys	X		X		X		X	
Access to patient registers of treatment centers in the country. Indicate year of implementation.	X		X		X		X	
Recommended Studies								
Cross-section survey of patients in treatment centers		X		X		X		X
Access to forensic medicine registers of deceased persons, which show the association of drug use and cause of death. Indicate year of implementation.	X		X		X		X	
Survey of patients in emergency rooms	X		X		X		X	
Survey of higher education students		X		X		X		X
Number of drug-related deaths	X		X		X		X	



The country indicates the following supply reduction-related information available for the years 2006–2009:

Information	2006		2007		2008		2009	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Priority Information								
Drug availability indicators	X		X		X		X	
Quantities of drugs seized	X		X		X		X	
Number of persons charged with and convicted of drug use, possession and trafficking	X		X		X		X	
Number of drug labs dismantled	X		X		X		X	
Recommended Information								
Number of persons formally charged with and convicted of money laundering	X		X		X		X	
Number of persons formally charged with and convicted of trafficking in firearms, explosives, ammunition and related materials	X		X		X		X	
Number of persons formally charged with and convicted of diversion of chemical substances	X		X		X		X	
Quantities of chemical substances seized	X		X		X		X	
Sale price of drugs (for consumers)	X		X		X		X	

II. DEMAND REDUCTION

A. Prevention

During the years 2006 – 2009, the United States of America (U.S.) has implemented drug abuse prevention programs targeted to students at the secondary and tertiary (university) levels. The country has also carried out prevention programs targeted at other key populations such as communities, indigenous groups, workers in the workplace, incarcerated individuals, and specific ethnic groups. The country does not report, however, specific information related to the nature, the target population and the coverage for some of these prevention programs. The country reports that most of these programs are compatible with the CICAD Hemispheric Guidelines on School-based Prevention and with CICAD’s Hemispheric Guidelines on Workplace Prevention. The country notes, however, that the Federal Government does not have sole jurisdiction for all workplace prevention programs in the U.S.

The country does not indicate whether programs are being carried out for pre-school or elementary school children, family, street populations, or migrants and refugees.



During the years 2006–2009, the U.S. offered training for police officers, teachers, counselors, prison guards and community leaders, technical non-university training, courses on prevention and treatment in the curricula for undergraduate degree programs, continuing education courses for university graduates, diplomas or certificates, graduate and postgraduate specialization and regional and international training programs in drug abuse prevention, treatment and research. However, no information regarding the number of participants on these training programs was provided.

The following refresher or in-service training courses were offered during the years 2006–2009:

Name of Training Course	Prevention	Treatment/ Rehabilitation	Offered to:
SAMHSA/Department of Health and Human Services Courses	Center for Substance Abuse Prevention	---	State and local-level prevention practitioners
Face-to-face training courses and distance learning courses ¹	Center for the Application of Prevention Technologies (CAPT)	---	State and local-level prevention practitioners
Substance Abuse Prevention Specialist Training (SAPST)	Center for the Application of Prevention Technologies (CAPT)	---	State and local-level prevention practitioners
Addiction Technology Transfer Center (ATTC) Network-sponsored events and trainings	---	Center for Substance Abuse Treatment Addiction Technology Transfer Center (ATTC) Program	Substance Abuse Treatment Providers/Professionals

The country informs that the Center for the Application of Prevention Technologies (CAPT) provides prevention-related training to prevent and reduce substance abuse and associated public health issues across the lifespan. Funded by SAMHSA’s Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP), the CAPT assists CSAP grantees—including states, jurisdictions, and Federally-recognized tribes and tribal entities—in the application of data-driven decision-making to the selection and implementation of evidence-based practices and programs.

The country also reports that the Addiction Technology Transfer Centers (ATTC) Network offers a number of activities such as skills training, academic education, online and distance learning courses, conferences, workshops, and publications targeted to front line counselors, treatment and recovery services agency administrators, faith-based organizations, policy makers, the health and mental health communities, consumers and other stakeholders, aiming at the strengthening of the social network.

The U.S. reports that universities offer training in or related to prevention and treatment in the medicine, psychology, nursing, social work, sociology, public health and pharmacy disciplines. In addition, many universities also offer graduate level degrees in addiction, prevention and

¹ www.captus.samhsa.gov



treatment and research for professionals working in drug abuse prevention or treatment-related fields.

During the period 2006–2009, the U.S. carried out the following process and intermediate outcome evaluations of drug abuse prevention programs:

Program Evaluated	Title of Evaluation Performed	Type of Evaluation Performed	Years of Program Evaluation
Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders Center for Excellence	Parent/child, screening/brief intervention, Project Choices, Diagnosis and intervention	Process	Final reports expected in 2011; interim reports in 2009
Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF)—State Incentive Grant Program (SIG): Cohorts I and II	SPF SIG Cross-Site Evaluation: Cohorts I and II	Process	FY 2009
Strategic Prevention Framework—State Incentive Grant Program: Cohorts III & IV	SPF SIG Cross-Site Evaluation: Cohorts III & IV	Process	Results due in FY 2011; Interim reports available in FY 2009 and 2010
Center for Substance Abuse Prevention Discretionary Grant Programs, training and technical assistance contracts, and Substance Abuse and Prevention and Treatment Block Grant	Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) Accountability Report	Process and capacity	Annual reports: FY 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009
Prevention of Substance Abuse (SA) and HIV for At-Risk Racial/Ethnic Minority Subpopulations Cooperative Agreements	Cross-Site Evaluation of the CSAP Minority SA/HIV Prevention Initiative: Cohorts 6 and 7	Process and intermediate outcomes	Final Report 2011; Interim Reports 2009, 2010
Drug Free Communities (ONDCCP)	Drug-Free Communities Support Program National Evaluation	Process and intermediate outcomes	2006, 2008
Youth in the Workplace (YIW)	Cross-Site Evaluation of the Youth in the Workplace Program	Process, outcome, and economic	2006-2007



The country also carried out the following impact evaluations and research studies of drug abuse prevention programs during the years 2006–2009:

Program Evaluated	Title of Study Performed or Underway	Year of Publication of Research Findings (2006, 2007, 2008, 2009)	Institution Carrying Out Evaluation
Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders Center for Excellence	Parent/child, screening/brief intervention, Project Choices, Diagnosis and intervention	Results expected in 2011: interim report 2009	Northrop Grumman Corporation and Human Services Research Institute
Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF)—State Incentive Grant Program (SIG): Cohorts III and IV	SPF SIG Cross-Site Evaluation: Cohorts III and IV	Final Report 2011; Interim Reports 2009, 2010	Human Services Research Institute/ RMC Corporation
Center for Substance Abuse Prevention Discretionary Grant Programs, training and technical assistance contracts, and Substance Abuse and Prevention and Treatment Block Grant	Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) Accountability Report	Annual reports: FY 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009	Human Services Research Institute
Prevention of Substance Abuse (SA) and HIV for At-Risk Racial/Ethnic Minority Subpopulations Cooperative Agreements	Cross-Site Evaluation of the CSAP Minority SA/HIV Prevention Initiative: Cohorts VI and VII	Final Report 2011; Interim Reports 2009, 2010	Human Services Research Institute
Drug Free Communities (ONDCP)	Drug-Free Communities Support Program National Evaluation	2006, 2008	Battelle
Youth in the Workplace (YIW)	Cross-Site Evaluation of the Youth in the Workplace Program	2007	RTI International

B. Treatment

The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) is the agency responsible for the design and execution of public policy, control and regulation of treatment services, financing, program supervision, and human resources training regarding treatment.

Regarding public financing allocated for treatment activities for the years 2006–2009, the country reports that the figures provided below describe federal drug control funding for treatment (including research) in US \$ millions:



Estimated Amount of the National Budget Allocated for Financing Treatment Programs			
2006 (US \$)	2007 (US \$)	2008 (US \$)	2009 (US \$)
2,941.9	3,060.9	3,255.2	3,561.9

The U.S. has official operating standards in place for specialized facilities that provide treatment services that use an FDA approved medication such as methadone or buprenorphine for detoxification or maintenance of opioid addiction. For treatment for drugs other than opioids, guidelines exist in the U.S. on minimum standards of care for drug treatment but without the force of law.

The U.S. also has an official licensing procedure to authorize the operation of specialized treatment facilities. The country reports that for the 1,200 Opioid Treatment Programs (OTPs), Federal rules require initial and periodic licensing and direct monitoring. The country has an official register of specialized treatment facilities, maintained by SAMHSA, as well as a monitoring system for these institutions.

Screening, Brief Intervention, and Referrals to Treatment (SBIRT) programs are provided in some Primary Health Care (PHC) settings. To increase the availability of these services, SAMHSA has developed the SBIRT program. This initiative involves implementation of a system within community and/or medical settings—including physician offices, hospitals, educational institutions, and mental health centers—that screens for and identifies individuals with—or at risk for—substance use-related problems. Screening determines the severity of substance use and identifies the appropriate level of intervention. The system provides for brief intervention or brief treatment within the community setting or motivates and refers those identified as needing more extensive services to a specialist setting for assessment, diagnosis, and appropriate treatment.

The country indicates that data on the number of PHC facilities that deliver specialized care for problems associated with drug use is not available. However, the country reports 114,946 cases treated in officially-licensed specialized treatment facilities that were referred from the general health care system in 2006 and 118,120 cases in 2007.

The U.S. has officially-licensed specialized drug treatment facilities. Licensing of substance abuse treatment facilities falls under the responsibility of each of the 50 states of the country.

Regarding the number of cases treated at officially-licensed specialized treatment facilities, the country provides the following information:

	2006	2007	2008	2009
Number of admissions to officially-licensed specialized treatment facilities for alcohol and other drug problems	1,893,425*	1,817,577*	Data not yet available	Data not yet available

Source: Treatment Episodes Data Set (TEDS), Office of Applied Studies, SAMHSA

* Number of admissions to substance abuse treatment, primarily at facilities that receive public funds. Admissions to Federally-owned facilities and some private-for-profit facilities are not included.



The estimated number of persons potentially in need of care for the years 2006-2009 was provided by the U.S. in the following table:

	2006	2007	2008	2009
Estimated number of persons potentially in need of care	23,591,000	23,202,000	23,051,000	Not available

Source: U.S. National Survey on Drug Use and Health

The U.S. reports in the following table, the number of admissions to substance abuse treatment by gender, age range, type of drugs, and type of service provided, primarily at facilities that receive public funds for the year 2006 and 2007. Data for 2008 and 2009 are not available. Admissions to Federally-owned facilities and some private-for-profit facilities are not included.

	2006	2007
(a) Male	1,293,642	1,229,378
(b) Female	599,308	587,499
(c) Total cases treated	1,892,950	1,816,877
(d) Under 18 years old	142,768	133,734
(e) 18 to 24 years old	344,385	330,581
(f) 25 years old and over	1,403,898	1,350,681
(c) Total cases treated	1,891,051	1,814,996
(g) Alcohol	756,694	732,925
(h) Cannabis	299,692	287,933
(i) Heroin	264,599	246,871
(j) Morphine (*)	---	---
(k) Methadone (*)	4,706	5,094
(l) Opioids	75,425	85,422
(m) Cocaine Hydrochloride	74,764	66,858
(n) Crack	187,956	167,914
(o) Inhalants	1,064	922
(p) Hallucinogens	1,553	1,502
(q) PCP	2,827	3,124
(r) Benzodiazepines (*)	8,846	9,491
(s) Barbiturates (*)	1,046	1,013
(t) Amphetamines	6,383	5,870
(u) Methamphetamines and other derivatives	152,561	137,154
(v) Other Stimulants	875	897
(w) Other Sedatives	2,957	3,197
(x) Other drugs/None Specified	51,477	61,390
(c) Total cases treated	1,893,425	1,817,577
Outpatient	1,176,426	1,131,476
Residential	716,999	685,890
(c) Total cases treated	1,893,425	1,817,366



Regarding aftercare programs, the U.S. reports that the National Survey of Substance Abuse Treatment Services (N-SSATS) collects data from all known substance abuse treatment facilities in the U.S., and in 2007, 80.7 percent of the 13,648 responding facilities reported that they provided some form of aftercare/continuing care.

Activities are carried out through treatment centers or specialized studies to follow-up on patients discharged after completion of their prescribed treatment plans, but the federal government does not require post-discharge data collection/submission.

The country provides the following data regarding the percentage of treatment facilities supervised by professional staff:

Number of officially-licensed specialized treatment facilities for drug problems in which care is supervised by professional staff specifically trained in this area	12,643	Percentage (%) of facilities supervised by qualified treatment staff
Total number of officially-licensed specialized treatment facilities	13,648	92.6%

The U.S. provides the following information regarding the number of cases completing prescribed treatment plans for the years 2006-2007. The data for 2008 and 2009 is not available.

	2006	2007
Number of cases that received treatment in officially-licensed specialized treatment facilities for drug problems and that completed their indicated treatment plan	706,073	Data not yet available
Number of cases treated in officially-licensed specialized treatment facilities for drug problems	1,893,425	1,817,577

The U.S. did not report on the levels of patient satisfaction related to completed treatment plans.



C. Statistics on Consumption

The U.S. reports that it conducts annual surveys to determine the prevalence rates of drug use among the general population, as well as youths in grades 8, 10 and 12². The country provides the following tables regarding prevalence of drug use in the general population for 2008 and 2009.

Year of Survey: 2008	Age Group Surveyed: 12 years or older								
Type of Drug	Lifetime (percentage)			Last 12 Months (percentage)			Last 30 Days (percentage)		
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
Alcohol	85.7	79.0	82.2	70.1	62.3	66.1	57.7	45.9	51.6
Tobacco	77.0	62.6	69.6	41.1	26.8	33.8	34.5	22.5	28.4
Solvents & Inhalants	11.6	6.4	8.9	1.0	0.6	0.8	0.4	0.2	0.3
Cannabis Type									
Marijuana (a)	45.3	37.0	41.0	12.5	8.3	10.3	7.9	4.4	6.1
Hallucinogens	17.4	11.5	14.4	1.9	1.1	1.5	0.6	0.3	0.4
LSD	11.9	7.1	9.4	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.1
PCP	3.3	2.0	2.7	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Poppy derivatives									
Heroin	2.0	1.1	1.5	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
Substances that contain cocaine									
Cocaine HCL	17.7	11.9	14.7	2.7	1.6	2.1	1.0	0.5	0.7
Crack	4.3	2.5	3.4	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.1
Tranquilizers	9.0	8.2	8.6	1.9	2.2	2.0	0.7	0.8	0.7
Sedatives	4.0	3.1	3.6	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
Stimulants	9.5	7.6	8.5	1.0	1.1	1.1	0.4	0.4	0.4
MDMA (Ecstasy)	5.8	4.6	5.2	1.0	0.7	0.9	0.3	0.2	0.2
Methamphetamines*	6.0	4.1	5.0	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1
Any drug	51.3	42.9	47.0	16.4	12.2	14.2	9.9	6.3	8.0

* Non-prescribed/non-therapeutic use only

(a) NSDUH asks about marijuana/hashish use

Note: Rate of prevalence of drug use is defined as the number of people who used a drug during a specified period of time divided by the total number of people in the population at that time; and is generally multiplied by 100.

² The data presented in the tables are the substances included in the country's survey, and are a subset of the substances suggested by the MEM.



Year of Survey: 2009	Age Group Surveyed: 12 years or older								
Type of Drug	Lifetime (percentage)			Last 12 Months (percentage)			Last 30 Days (percentage)		
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
Alcohol	85.8	80.0	82.8	70.6	63.1	66.8	57.6	46.5	51.9
Tobacco	76.4	62.3	69.1	40.1	26.5	33.1	33.5	22.2	27.7
Solvents & Inhalants	12.2	5.9	8.9	1.0	0.7	0.8	0.3	0.2	0.2
Cannabis Type									
Marijuana (a)	46.5	36.8	41.5	14.2	8.6	11.3	8.6	4.8	6.6
Hallucinogens	18.5	11.3	14.8	2.3	1.3	1.8	0.6	0.4	0.5
LSD	12.3	6.6	9.4	0.4	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.1
PCP	3.5	1.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Poppy derivatives									
Heroin	2.0	0.9	1.5	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
Substances that contain cocaine									
Cocaine HCL	17.9	11.3	14.5	2.5	1.3	1.9	0.9	0.4	0.7
Crack	4.3	2.3	3.3	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.2
Tranquilizers	9.2	8.1	8.6	2.3	2.0	2.2	0.8	0.8	0.8
Sedatives	4.1	2.8	3.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1
Stimulants	9.8	7.7	8.7	1.3	1.2	1.2	0.6	0.4	0.5
MDMA (Ecstasy)	6.7	4.7	5.7	1.4	0.9	1.1	0.4	0.2	0.3
Methamphetamines*	6.2	4.0	5.1	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2
Any drug	51.9	42.6	47.1	17.9	12.4	15.1	10.8	6.6	8.7

* Non-prescribed/non-therapeutic use only

(a) NSDUH asks about marijuana/hashish use

Note: Rate of prevalence of drug use is defined as the number of people who used a drug during a specified period of time divided by the total number of people in the population at that time; and is generally multiplied by 100.



The country provides the following tables regarding incidence of drug use in the general population for 2008 and 2009:

Year of Survey: 2008	Age Group Surveyed: 12 years or older					
Type of Drug	Last 12 Months (percentage)			Last 30 Days (percentage)		
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
Alcohol	11.0	7.9	9.1	N/E	N/E	N/E
Tobacco (Cigarette)	3.2	2.3	2.7	N/E	N/E	N/E
Cannabis Type						
Marijuana (a)	1.6	1.4	1.5	N/E	N/E	N/E
Hallucinogens			0.5	N/E	N/E	N/E
LSD	N/E	N/E	0.2	N/E	N/E	N/E
PCP	N/E	N/E	0.0	N/E	N/E	N/E
Poppy derivatives				N/E	N/E	N/E
Heroin	N/E	N/E	0.0	N/E	N/E	N/E
Substances that contain cocaine						
Cocaine HCL	N/E	N/E	0.3	N/E	N/E	N/E
Crack	N/E	N/E	0.1	N/E	N/E	N/E
Tranquilizers / Sedatives/ Depressants			0.5/0.1	N/E	N/E	N/E
Stimulants			0.3	N/E	N/E	N/E
MDMA (Ecstasy)	N/E	N/E	0.4	N/E	N/E	N/E
Any drug	2.2	2.1	2.1	N/E	N/E	N/E

(a) NSDUH asks about marijuana/hashish use

N/E = Non Existant (data not collected)

Note: Rate of incidence of drug use is defined as the number of people who began to use a drug during a specified period of time (a year or a month) divided by the number of people who are at risk of using a specific drug for the first time. The “at-risk population” is the total population under study minus those persons who have used drugs prior to the specified time period.



Year of Survey: 2009	Age Group Surveyed: 12 years or older					
Type of Drug	Last 12 Months (percentage)			Last 30 Days (percentage)		
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
Alcohol	11.3	8.3	9.5	N/E	N/E	N/E
Tobacco (Cigarette)	3.3	2.4	2.8	N/E	N/E	N/E
Cannabis Type						
Marijuana (a)	1.8	1.4	1.6	N/E	N/E	N/E
Hallucinogens			0.6	N/E	N/E	N/E
LSD	N/E	N/E	0.1	N/E	N/E	N/E
PCP	N/E	N/E	0.0	N/E	N/E	N/E
Poppy derivatives				N/E	N/E	N/E
Heroin	N/E	N/E	0.1	N/E	N/E	N/E
Substances that contain cocaine						
Cocaine HCL	N/E	N/E	0.3	N/E	N/E	N/E
Crack	N/E	N/E	0.0	N/E	N/E	N/E
Tranquilizers / Sedatives/ Depressants			0.5/0.1	N/E	N/E	N/E
Stimulants			0.3	N/E	N/E	N/E
MDMA (Ecstasy)	N/E	N/E	0.5	N/E	N/E	N/E
Any drug	2.5	2.1	2.3	N/E	N/E	N/E

(a) NSDUH asks about marijuana/hashish use

N/E = Non Existant (data not collected)

Note: Rate of incidence of drug use is defined as the number of people who began to use a drug during a specified period of time (a year or a month) divided by the number of people who are at risk of using a specific drug for the first time. The “at-risk population” is the total population under study minus those persons who have used drugs prior to the specified time period.



The U.S. provides the following tables regarding prevalence of drug use among high school students for 2008 and 2009:

Year of Survey: 2008	Target Population of the Study: High School Students (10 th Graders)								
	Lifetime (percentage)			Last 12 Months (percentage)			Last 30 Days (percentage)		
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
Alcohol	56.2	60.3	58.3	50.5	54.3	52.5	28.6	29.0	28.8
Tobacco (Cigarettes)	32.3	31.0	31.7	N/E	N/E	N/E	12.7	11.9	12.3
Solvents & Inhalants	11.4	14.1	12.8	5.4	6.3	5.9	1.9	2.3	2.1
Cannabis Type									
Marijuana	31.7	28.0	29.9	25.5	22.2	23.9	15.2	12.3	13.8
Hallucinogens	6.4	4.6	5.5	4.7	3.1	3.9	1.7	0.9	1.3
LSD	3.2	2.0	2.6	2.2	1.3	1.8	0.9	0.4	0.7
Poppy derivatives									
Heroin	1.3	1.0	1.2	1.0	0.6	0.8	0.5	0.2	0.4
Substances that contain cocaine									
Cocaine HCL	4.6	4.4	4.5	3.0	2.8	3.0	1.4	1.0	1.2
Crack	1.9	2.1	2.0	1.3	1.2	1.3	0.6	0.4	0.5
Tranquilizers / Sedatives/ Depressants	6.0	7.5	6.8	4.1	5.0	4.6	1.8	2.0	1.9
Flunitrazepam (Rohypnol®)*	0.4	1.0	0.9	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.1	0.4	0.2
GHB	N/E	N/E	N/E	0.9	0.3	0.5	N/E	N/E	N/E
Ketamine*	N/E	N/E	N/E	1.1	0.9	1.0	N/E	N/E	N/E
Stimulants									
Amphetamines*	7.9	9.9	9.0	5.8	6.9	6.4	2.7	2.9	2.8
MDMA (Ecstasy)	4.5	4.1	4.3	3.4	2.4	2.9	1.6	0.7	1.1
Methamphetamines*	1.9	2.9	2.4	1.4	1.6	1.5	0.9	0.6	0.7
Other drugs (Steroids)	2.1	0.8	1.4	1.4	0.5	0.9	0.9	0.2	0.5
Any drug	35.0	35.0	34.1	27.9	25.6	26.9	17.1	14.4	15.8

* Non-prescribed/non-therapeutic use only

N/E = Non Existant (data not collected)

Note: Rate of prevalence of drug use is defined as the number of people who used a drug during a specified period of time divided by the total number of people in the population at that time; and is generally multiplied by 100.



Year of Survey: 2009	Target Population of the Study: High School Students (10 th Graders)								
	Lifetime (percentage)			Last 12 Months (percentage)			Last 30 Days (percentage)		
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
Alcohol	58.0	60.0	59.1	52.4	53.3	52.8	31.0	29.8	30.4
Tobacco (Cigarettes)	33.7	31.7	32.7	N/E	N/E	N/E	13.7	12.5	13.1
Solvents & Inhalants	11.6	13.0	12.3	5.4	6.7	6.1	1.8	2.6	2.2
Cannabis Type									
Marijuana	35.8	29.0	32.3	29.6	23.9	26.7	18.7	13.2	15.9
Hallucinogens	7.2	5.1	6.1	5.0	3.1	4.1	1.8	0.9	1.4
LSD	3.5	2.4	3.0	2.3	1.3	1.9	0.7	0.3	0.5
Poppy derivatives									
Heroin	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.1	0.6	0.9	0.5	0.2	0.4
Substances that contain cocaine									
Cocaine HCL	4.6	4.5	4.6	2.4	2.8	2.7	1.0	0.8	0.9
Crack	1.9	2.3	2.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	0.5	0.3	0.4
Tranquilizers / Sedatives/ Depressants	6.1	8.0	7.0	4.4	5.7	5.0	1.8	2.1	2.0
Flunitrazepam (Rohypnol®)*	0.4	1.0	0.7	0.3	0.6	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3
GHB	N/E	N/E	N/E	1.5	0.5	1.0	N/E	N/E	N/E
Ketamine*	N/E	N/E	N/E	1.7	0.8	1.3	N/E	N/E	N/E
Stimulants									
Amphetamines*	9.3	11.1	10.3	7.4	6.8	7.1	3.2	3.3	3.3
MDMA (Ecstasy)	5.3	5.7	5.5	3.7	3.5	3.7	1.6	1.0	1.3
Methamphetamines*	2.6	2.9	2.8	1.4	1.7	1.6	0.7	0.5	0.6
Other drugs (Steroids)	1.7	0.8	1.3	1.2	0.4	0.8	0.7	0.2	0.5
Any drug	38.5	33.7	36.0	31.6	27.3	29.4	20.3	15.4	17.8

* Non-prescribed/non-therapeutic use only

N/E = Non Existant (data not collected)

Note: Rate of prevalence of drug use is defined as the number of people who used a drug during a specified period of time divided by the total number of people in the population at that time; and is generally multiplied by 100.



The country provides the following tables regarding incidence of drug use among high school students for 2008 and 2009:

Year of Survey: 2008	Target Population of the Study: High School Students (10 th Graders)					
	Last 12 Months*** (percentage)			Last 30 Days (percentage)		
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
Alcohol	N/E	N/E	7.1	N/E	N/E	N/E
Tobacco (Cigarettes)	N/E	N/E	3.6	N/E	N/E	N/E
Solvents or inhalants	N/E	N/E	1.1	N/E	N/E	N/E
Types of Cannabis						
Marijuana**	N/E	N/E	6.0	N/E	N/E	N/E
Hallucinogens	N/E	N/E	1.4	N/E	N/E	N/E
LSD	N/E	N/E	0.7	N/E	N/E	N/E
Other types of hallucinogens	N/E	N/E	1.3	N/E	N/E	N/E
Poppy derivatives						
Heroin	N/E	N/E	0.3	N/E	N/E	N/E
Substances that contain cocaine						
Cocaine HCL	N/E	N/E	1.3	N/E	N/E	N/E
Crack	N/E	N/E	0.4	N/E	N/E	N/E
Tranquilizers / Sedatives/ Depressants	N/E	N/E	2.0	N/E	N/E	N/E
Stimulants						
Amphetamines *	N/E	N/E	2.2	N/E	N/E	N/E
Other drugs (Steroids)	N/E	N/E	0.4	N/E	N/E	N/E

* Non-prescribed/non-therapeutic use only

** Includes coca paste, cocaine paste, cocaine base, basuco, paco, merla, among other denominations, depending on the terms used by the country.

*** These measures are for the time the individual has been in the grade. This is not necessarily a full year, since the survey is conducted in the spring.

N/E = Non Existant (data not collected)

Note: Rate of incidence of drug use is defined as the number of people who began to use a drug during a specified period of time (a year or a month) divided by the number of people who are at risk of using a specific drug for the first time. The "at-risk population" is the total population under study minus those persons who have used drugs prior to the specified time period.



Year of Survey: 2009	Target Population of the Study: High School Students (10 th Graders)					
Type of Drug	Last 12 Months*** (percentage)			Last 30 Days (percentage)		
	M	F	Total	M	F	Total
Alcohol	N/E	N/E	6.9	N/E	N/E	N/E
Tobacco (Cigarettes)	N/E	N/E	3.9	N/E	N/E	N/E
Solvents or inhalants	N/E	N/E	1.1	N/E	N/E	N/E
Types of Cannabis						
Marijuana**	N/E	N/E	6.4	N/E	N/E	N/E
Hallucinogens	N/E	N/E	1.5	N/E	N/E	N/E
LSD	N/E	N/E	0.7	N/E	N/E	N/E
Other types of hallucinogens	N/E	N/E	1.5	N/E	N/E	N/E
Poppy derivatives						
Heroin	N/E	N/E	0.3	N/E	N/E	N/E
Substances that contain cocaine						
Cocaine HCL	N/E	N/E	1.0	N/E	N/E	N/E
Crack	N/E	N/E	0.4	N/E	N/E	N/E
Tranquilizers / Sedatives/ Depressants	N/E	N/E	1.7	N/E	N/E	N/E
Stimulants						
Amphetamines *	N/E	N/E	2.0	N/E	N/E	N/E
Other drugs (Steroids)	N/E	N/E	0.4	N/E	N/E	N/E

* Non-prescribed/non-therapeutic use only

** Includes coca paste, cocaine paste, cocaine base, basuco, paco, merla, among other denominations, depending on the terms used by the country.

*** These measures are for the time the individual has been in the grade. This is not necessarily a full year, since the survey is conducted in the spring.

N/E = Non Existant (data not collected)

Note: Rate of incidence of drug use is defined as the number of people who began to use a drug during a specified period of time (a year or a month) divided by the number of people who are at risk of using a specific drug for the first time. The "at-risk population" is the total population under study minus those persons who have used drugs prior to the specified time period.



The country provides the following data regarding drug abuse, in relation to number of users and total population surveyed for the years 2006-2009, noting that the figures provided are for “dependence or abuse”:

POPULATION STUDIED: Individuals Aged 12 Years and Older													
Type of Drug		2006			2007			2008			2009		
		n	(1)	(2)	n	(1)	(2)	n	(1)	(2)	n	(1)	(2)
Alcohol	Abuse	18,799	11.5	7.6	18,638	11.2	7.5	18,331	11.1	7.3	18,65	11.1	7.4
Marijuana (a)	Abuse	4,172	16.4	1.7	3,932	15.6	1.6	4,199	16.2	1.7	4,299	15.1	1.7
Cocaine HCl	Abuse	1,671	27.5	0.7	1,598	27.8	0.6	1,411	26.8	0.6	1,120	23.3	0.4

(n) number of persons in thousands.

(1) percentage in relation to previous year’s users ‘qualifying’ as abuse or dependence, or either.

(2) percentage in relation to the total population surveyed ‘qualifying’ as abuse or dependence, or either.

(a) NSDUH asks about “marijuana and hashish”

Regarding the scale used to assess abuse in each case, the U.S. informs that abuse is based on definitions found in the 4th edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV).

The U.S. provides the following data regarding age of first use of drugs in the general population ages 12 and older for the years 2005-2009:

Population: 12 Years and Older	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Type of Drug	Average	Average	Average	Average	Average
Alcohol	14.8	14.9	14.9	14.9	15.0
Tobacco (Cigarettes)	---	15.0	15.0	15.1	15.2
Solvents or inhalants	14.0	14.2	14.2	13.9	14.1
Marijuana (and Hashish)	15.1	15.2	15.3	15.2	15.2
Cocaine HCl	15.9	15.9	15.9	15.9	15.8
Ecstasy	N/E	15.9	15.7	15.7	15.7

N/E = Non Existant (data not collected)

The country reports that this data represents mean age at first use among 12 or older who initiated prior to age 18.



The estimate of the percentage of 10th graders that perceive drug use as being harmful to their health and well-being is reported as follows:

Age group to which this Applies: 10th Graders	
Category	% of those surveyed who believe that persons who engage in the following activities are at great risk (or who think that it is very harmful):
Often inhale solvents	66.8
Occasionally smoke marijuana	32.9
Often smoke marijuana	59.5
Occasionally take cocaine HCl	71.0
Occasionally use crack	75.9
Occasionally take ecstasy	62.1

Source: Monitoring the Future

In addition, the country reports as follows the percentage of youth in the U.S. that perceive drug use as being harmful to their health and well-being, aged 12 to 17:

Category	% of those surveyed who believe that persons who engage in the following activities are at great risk (or who think that it is very harmful):
Often smoke cigarettes	65.8
Occasionally smoke marijuana	30.7
Often smoke marijuana	49.3
Occasionally take cocaine HCl or crack	49.5
Often take cocaine HCl or crack	78.5

Source: National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH)

The U.S. provides the following data regarding the percentage of the University-age population that perceive drug use as harmful to their health and well-being:

Age group to which this Applies: General Population Aged 18-25	
Category	% of those surveyed who believe that persons who engage in the following activities are at great risk (or who think that it is very harmful):
Often smoke cigarettes	64.9
Occasionally smoke marijuana	20.4
Often smoke marijuana	29.1
Occasionally take cocaine HCl or crack	61.1
Often take cocaine HCl or crack	84.3

Source: National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH)



The country has studies that would permit an evaluation of the relationship between drugs and crime. The most recent study was a partial study of arrestees carried out in 2008 - “Drug Abuse Monitoring (ADAM) II 2008 Annual Report”.

Records on alcohol-related traffic accidents are maintained in the U.S., but not on drug-related accidents. The country reports that alcohol was a contributing factor in 31 percent of traffic accidents during the years 2006, 2007 and 2008. The country reports that traffic accident data is provided by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s (NHTSA) Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS). The country has established guidelines on prevention activities related to alcohol- and drug-related traffic accidents. However, records on alcohol- or drug-related accidents in the workplace are not kept in the U.S.

III. SUPPLY REDUCTION

A. Drug Production

The United States of America (U.S) reports that it has significant areas of cannabis crops, both in large outdoor plots and in indoor operations. The U.S. does not have a system to detect and quantify the total area of cannabis crops. The only available data is on the amount of cannabis seized and eradicated by law enforcement agencies that participate in the Domestic Cannabis Eradication/Suppression Program (DCE/SP).

The country reports that it cannot estimate the percentage of illicit cannabis replanted and that its authorities focus their eradication operations every year on priority areas that are known to have high levels of illicit cannabis cultivation. The U.S. does not use a system to measure the potential production of cannabis crops. The country informs that the DCE/SP maintains cannabis eradication statistics and does not collect operational information/intelligence regarding cannabis cultivation in the United States.

The country has detected cannabis plants grown indoors, and provides the following data on the number of plants seized during the years 2006–2009:

2006	2007	2008	2009
Quantity	Quantity	Quantity	Quantity
400,829	434,728	450,986	414,604

The U.S. has a formal crop eradication program for cannabis, based on herbicidal and manual eradication. With regard to the total area of illicit crops eradicated during the years 2006–2009, the country reports that it does not maintain any statistical information on areas of cultivation nor areas that are no longer cultivated. In the United States, outdoor cannabis eradication is not measured in hectares but rather by the number of plants eradicated. The country reports that, in



2006, 4,830,766 cultivated outdoor cannabis plants were eradicated, followed by 6,599,599 plants in 2007; 7,562,322 plants in 2008; and 9,980,038 in 2009.

Illicit laboratories for drugs of natural origin have not been detected in the U.S. However, the U.S. provides the following numbers of illicit synthetic drug labs dismantled during the period 2006–2009:

Drugs of Synthetic Origin	2006	2007	2008	2009
MDMA (ecstasy and its derivatives)	19	9	0	3
Amphetamines	0	0	1	2
Methamphetamines	13,922	3,052	3,859	3,032
GHB	8	2	4	3
PCP	9	3	7	2
Methcathinone	9	2	2	0
Ice Conversion (Crystal Methamphetamine)	24	19	7	6
Cocaine	7	2	0	1

B. Control of Pharmaceutical Products

The United States of America (U.S.) has the following laws and regulations in place for the control of pharmaceutical products:

Title	Date of entry into force
Controlled Substances Act (CSA)	1970
Code of Federal Regulations 21 Part 13000 to end	Revised annually
The Combat Methamphetamine Epidemic Act of 2005	2006
Ryan Haight Online Pharmacy Act Consumer Protection Act of 2008	2008

The country reports that in addition to domestic control of pharmaceutical products containing internationally controlled substances, the U.S. has controlled other substances that are demonstrated to be an abuse, diversion and trafficking problem. These substances include drugs with no accepted medical use (including MDMA-like substances) and some anabolic steroids, as well as pharmaceutical products, including fospropofol, ketamine, tapentadol, lisdexamphetamine, embutramide and others.

The U.S. Department of Justice, Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration (FDA), are the authorities responsible for coordinating activities related to the control of pharmaceutical products. Within the health care sector, register control, monitoring distribution, inspections, administrative sanctions, and the transfer of unusual cases detected by administrative authorities to judicial authorities are utilized to control pharmaceutical products and prevent their diversion.



Import/export control, register control, manufacturing control, monitoring distribution, inspections, administrative sanctions, registry of licensees and registry of quantities of pharmaceutical products sold or manufactured, and free trade zone control are used within the private sector to control pharmaceutical products and prevent their diversion.

The U.S. has an integrated procedure in place to monitor and prevent the diversion of pharmaceutical products. The country reports that this integrated procedure comprises both national and state level systems, namely the Automation of Reports and Consolidated Orders System (ARCOS) and the Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs (PDMPs), respectively.

The country has a regulatory system for the control of pharmaceutical products that includes investigators. The country reports that the DEA currently employs 177 Special Agents; 471 Diversion Investigators; 71 Intelligence Analysts; 17 Attorneys; and 207 Program Analysts for this purpose.

The U.S. has a mechanism through which members of the health sector can communicate and share information with law enforcement or judicial authorities in order to report or prevent the diversion of pharmaceutical products or to apply sanctions. The country reports that the DEA works closely with the medical community to help them recognize drug abuse and signs of diversion and relies on their input and due diligence to combat diversion. The DEA engages in information sharing and education regarding the diversion of pharmaceutical products through its national Website³; national training conferences; national training seminars; state and local schools; and through the publication of booklets and pamphlets.

³ www.deadiversion.usdoj.gov



A system is in place to compile information on administrative and regulatory activities carried out and sanctions imposed related to controlled pharmaceutical products, and the country provides the following information regarding these activities for the years 2006-2009:

	2006	2007	2008	2009
Regulated Activities				
Number of licenses issued to:				
1. Importers	173	186	188	191
2. Exporters	230	232	234	232
3. Manufacturers	509	509	507	511
4. Distributors	807	817	833	813
5. Other	1,218,267	1,277,283	1,311,300	1,318,821
Number of permits issued for:				
1. Importation	453	637	663	872
2. Exportation	3,611	4,678	5,151	5,070
3. Other (Import Declarations)	2,488	2,392	2,448	2,130
(Export Declarations)	2,391	2,469	2,930	2,347
Regulated Entities				
Number of inspections conducted of:				
1. Physicians	228	200	226	653
2. Dentists	17	19	20	14
3. Pharmacists	30	35	29	21
4. Veterinarians	3	10	7	8
5. Importers (& Exporters)	75	91	87	86
6. Manufacturers	130	119	131	134
7. Distributors	235	223	208	224
8. Others (specify)	344	418	415	544

Training courses are offered in the U.S., on an on-going basis, for personnel in the public and private sectors involved in the handling of pharmaceutical products. These courses cover subjects such as the prescription, disposal and distribution of controlled pharmaceutical products; rules, regulations, and policies regarding drug control; and registration procedures for pharmaceutical industry and healthcare practitioners.

U.S. laws provide for the imposition of penal and civil sanctions for the illicit production, diversion and trafficking of pharmaceutical products. Regarding the penal sanctions applicable for these activities, the country refers to Title 21 United States Code, Controlled Substances Act of 1970, and amendments: the Psychotropic Substances Act of 1978; the Controlled Substances Penalties Amendments Act of 1984; the Chemical Diversion and Trafficking Act of 1988 (which implemented the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic



Substances-1988); the Domestic Chemical Diversion and Control Act of 1993; and the Ryan Haight Online Consumer Protection Act of 2008.

The country provides the following data regarding sanctions imposed for illicit production, diversion and trafficking of pharmaceutical products, during the years 2006–2009:

Type of Sanction	Number of Sanctions			
	2006	2007	2008	2009
Penal (Arrests)	1,341	1,451	1,673	1,378
Civil (Fines)	9	47	78	82
Administrative	839	1,241	1,490	1,053

Regarding administrative sanctions indicated, the country informs that the following administrative actions can be utilized by DEA for violations of the Controlled Substances Act: a letter of admonition; an administrative hearing (surrender of registration, voluntary surrender or surrender for cause); and an order to show cause.

The quantities of pharmaceutical products seized during the years 2006–2009 are provided as follows:

Quantities Seized (Dosage Units)				
	2006	2007	2008	2009
Oxycodone	52,998	86,384	686,504	53,816
Hydrocodone	970,827	296,890	152,906	131,989
Hydromorphone	8,356	6,358	25,676	1,350
Pentazocine	436	16	401	0
Codeine	4,769	2,154,162	78,558	5,541
Propoxyphene	229	17	6	0
Meperidine	86	115,674	2,161	7
Methylphenidate	6,082	2,657	27,458	122
Dextroamphetamine	0	0	6	0
Diazepam	121,658	35,714	43,509	7,223
Oxazepam	100	127	0	1
Flurazepam	0	0	0	402
Alprazolam	150,887	83,355	46,705	22,877
Total	1,316,428	2,781,354	1,063,890	223,328

The U.S. did not provide information regarding seized pharmaceutical products that were disposed of during the years 2006–2009.



C. Control of Chemical Substances

The United States of America (U.S.) has the following laws and regulations in place for the control of chemical substances:

Title	Date of Entry into Force
Chemical Diversion and Trafficking Act	1988
Domestic Chemical Diversion Control Act	1993
Comprehensive Methamphetamine Control Act	1996
Methamphetamine Anti-Proliferation Act	2000
Combat Methamphetamine Epidemic Act	2005
Methamphetamine Production Prevention Act	2008

The country reports that all chemical substances listed in the international conventions are controlled by the U.S., and additionally informs that benzaldehyde, benzyl cyanide, ethylamine, gamma-butyrolactone (GBL), hydriodic acid, hypophosphorous acid, Iodine, methylamine, N-methylephedrine, N-methylpseudophedrine, N-phenethyl-4-piperidone (NPP), nitroethane, norpseudoephedrine, phosphorus (red), phosphorus (white or yellow), propionic anhydride, benzyl chloride, hydrogen chloride gas, methly isobutyl ketone, and sodium permanganate are also controlled.

The U.S. reports that the national authorities responsible for law and regulation enforcement for the control of chemical substances are the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) for administrative and judicial activities and the Department of Homeland Security, Customs and Border Protection (CBP) for Customs activities.

The country also reports to have a mechanism through which these institutions can communicate and share information, and that the DEA and the CBP collaborate on targeting suspicious or unauthorized shipments of controlled chemicals imported or transited through the United States.

National registry of licensees, license control, import/export control, inspections, transaction audits, control of distribution, control of the final commercialization, transport control, pre-export notifications and the imposition of sanctions are used to control the diversion of chemical substances. These activities are the responsibility of the DEA and are carried out as part of an integrated procedure applicable to individuals and entities authorized to handle these substances. The DEA is responsible for all regulatory and criminal aspects of the control of regulated chemicals.

The U.S. has a regulatory system for the control of chemical substances that includes investigators. The country reports that the DEA maintains a staff of Diversion Investigators located throughout the U.S. who are responsible for investigating and enforcing chemical laws and ensuring compliance with all aspects of the DEA's chemical control program.



Training courses for administrative, police and customs officers in the control of the diversion of chemical substances are offered in the U.S. The country reports that the DEA provides chemical control training to law enforcement, regulatory, and customs officials through the DEA’s Training Division. The DEA also provides chemical control training to state and local law enforcement through its clandestine laboratory training classes.

An automated information management system is in place to facilitate the secure and efficient handling of information on the control of the diversion of chemical substances. The country informs that the DEA maintains a computerized system to capture and store import and export transactions. This information is reviewed on a regular basis to detect potential diversion attempts.

U.S. law provides for the imposition of penal and civil sanctions for the illicit production, diversion and trafficking of controlled chemical substances. The country reports the applicable penal sanctions as follows:

1. Illicit production: imprisonment of not more than ten years; other sanctions depend on the quantities involved;
2. Diversion: no more than four years imprisonment for a first offense; civil penalties range from US \$10,000 to US \$25,000;
3. Illicit trafficking: no more than ten years for a first offense.

The country provides the following number of sanctions imposed for illicit production, diversion and trafficking of controlled chemical substances during the period 2006–2009:

Sanctions imposed for controlled chemical substances, 2006–2009

	Number of Sanctions			
	2006	2007	2008	2009
Penal	110	102	117	119
Civil	1	3	8	5
Administrative**	5	72	65	59

**Administrative hearing, letter of admonition, immediate suspension order, order to show cause, revocation, surrender for cause, or denial of application.

In the following table, the country reports the total number of exports made and the number of pre-export notifications issued and indicates that the difference between both, is due to the country controlling more chemicals than those included in the United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Pshychotropic Substances, 1988, Table I and Table II.

Year	Number of Controlled Chemical Substance Exports Made	Number of Pre-Export Notifications Issued
2006	9,959	1,936
2007	16,870	2,644
2008	18,309	1,431
2009	11,122	1,561



The U.S. reports that 5 pre-export notifications were not approved by the importing or transit country in 2006, 7 in 2007, 9 in 2008, and 8 in 2009. The U.S. imports controlled chemical substances and handles them in transit. The country received 2,138 imports of such substances in 2006, 1,759 in 2007, 2,022 in 2008, and 1,914 in 2009.

The country received and responded to the following number of pre-export notifications for controlled chemical substances during the years 2006–2009:

	2006	2007	2008	2009
Number of pre-export notifications received by the U.S.	358	576	583	474
Number of responses sent by the U.S.	30	18	13	6
Number of timely replies sent by the U.S. (maximum of 15 days)	Data not collected	Data not collected	Data not collected	Data not collected

Regarding differences between the total number of imports and the number of pre-export notifications received, the country informs that U.S. importers submit notifications directly to the DEA and the DEA does not receive pre-export notifications for every import into the U.S.

The U.S. provides the following information regarding pre-export notifications that were not approved or resulted in an investigation during the years 2006-2009:

	2006	2007	2008	2009
Number of pre-export notifications not approved by the U.S.	30	18	13	6
Number of investigations initiated by the U.S.	30	18	13	6

The Pre-Export Notification System (PENS) is used by the U.S. to send notifications on chemical substances. The country informs that the DEA also has its own information system to send notifications on Table I and Table II chemicals, as well as those chemical substances controlled by the receiving country.



The country provides the following information regarding quantities of controlled chemical substances seized during the years 2006–2009:

Controlled Chemical Substances	Units of Measure	Quantities Seized			
		2006	2007	2008	2009
1-phenyl-2-propanone	liters	2	2	2.8	3.3
3,4-methylenedioxyphenyl-2-propanone	liters	0	0.1	0	85
Acetic Anhydride	liters	77	4	39	0.1
Acetone	liters	9,530	6,931	4,114	3,126
Bromobenzene	liters	1	4	182	0
Dimethylsulfone	kilograms	269	195	266	131
Ephedra	kilograms	---	10,900	60	0
Ephedrine	kilograms	229	1,181	104	3,993
Ergotamine	grams	9	10	0	0
Ethyl Ether	liters	1,190	1,420	2,817	0
Gamma Butyrolactone	liters	---	9	52	16
Hydriodic Acid	liters	142	198	346	260
Hydrochloric Acid	liters	30,266	3,888	3,411	1,452
Hypophosphorous acid	liters	47	19	197	61
Iodine	kilograms	1,432	1,173	6,157	218,246
Lithium	kilograms	30	52	25	46
Lysergic Acid	dosage units	0	10	2	1,701
Methyl Ethyl Ketone	liters	111	154	279	992
Methylamine	liters	1	5,001	3,979	10
N-acetyl anthranilic acid	kilograms	1	0	5	0
Norephedrine	kilograms	1	1,132	0.04	0.9
Phenylacetic Acid	kilograms	0	0.6	1.3	0.02
Piperidine	kilograms	4	0.1	180	17
Piperonal	grams	0	0	1,383	0
Potassium Permanganate	kilograms	143	2.4	6.1	8
Pseudoephedrine	kilograms	289	4,562	602	1,855
Red Phosphorus	kilograms	1,766	16,066	1,155	96,025
Safrole	liters	5	6	3	17
Sodium Hydroxide	kilograms	6,585	2,155	8,675	4,787
Sulfuric Acid	liters	0	0	0	2,835
Toluene	liters	4,020	5,197	6,206	1,943



The U.S. provides the following data on seized chemical substances disposed of during the years 2006–2009:

Controlled Chemical Substances	Unit of Measure	Quantities Disposed of			
		2006	2007	2008	2009
Acetic Anhydride	Kilograms	2.33	4.55	22.14	0
Acetone	Kilograms	3,057	1,788	6,167	3,698
Ephedrine	Kilograms	188.2	166.7	23.55	539.0
Ethyl ether	Kilograms	716.0	88.78	187.7	84.41
Ethylamine	Kilograms	0	0	.45	0
Hydriodic acid	Kilograms	546.4	159.4	244.4	13.97
Hydrochloric Acid	Kilograms	1,912	1,207	5,797	796.1
Iodine	Kilograms	15,296	8,328	4,529	1,233
Iodine (crystals)	Kilograms	1,580	872.4	237.0	492.0
Methyl Ethyl Ketone	Kilograms	28.64	4.21	13.04	3.43
Muriatic Acid	Kilograms	31,760	5,171	5,513	3,195
N-acetylanthranilic Acid	Kilograms	0.91	0	5.30	0
Piperdine	Kilograms	3.27	0	179.7	0
Potassium Permanganate	Kilograms	365.4	2.31	576.8	0
Pseudoephedrine	Kilograms	61.71	7.14	25.63	5.81
Red phosphorus	Kilograms	1,462	1,651	1,118	207.7
Sulfuric Acid	Kilograms	3,827	1,903	2,014	67.11
Toluene	Kilograms	350.0	183.8	265.2	48.58
White Phosphorus	Kilograms	0	0	1.00	3.79

The U.S. reports that all seized controlled chemicals are disposed of in accordance with all applicable guidelines issued by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency.



IV. CONTROL MEASURES

A. Illicit Drug Trafficking

The United States of America (U.S.) provides the following data regarding the quantities of drugs forfeited to law enforcement during the period 2006–2009:

Type of Illicit Drugs	Quantities of Drugs Forfeited				
	Unit of Measure	2006	2007	2008	2009
Opium	Kilograms	273	1,538	332	907
Heroin	Kilograms	2,004	1,446	1,987	2,356
Cocaine HCl	Kilograms	64,114	51,976	49,603	55,837
Marijuana	Kilograms	1,372,655	1,703,953	1,510,312	2,049,274
Hashish (Solid)	Kilograms	1,071	362	367	811
Hallucinogens	Kilograms	43	36	109	47
Methamphetamine (Crystal, Ice)	Kilograms	1,078	831	2,741	4,894
Methamphetamine (Powder)	Kilograms	5,464	3,493	3,470	2,424
MDMA (Ecstasy)	Kilograms	1,507	2,293	1,688	2,254

Sources: National Seizure System (includes both Federal data as well as State and local data)

The U.S. has specialized studies for the characterization and profiling of seized substances.

The country does not have an integrated national system to consolidate the number of persons formally charged with and convicted of illicit drug trafficking. Regarding the data provided in the following table, the U.S. reports that its sources are both the U.S. Department of Justice’s Criminal Division, through its Automated Case Tracking System (ACTS) and the Executive Office for United States Attorneys (EOUSA), through the United States Attorneys’ Case Management System.

Number of persons formally charged with and convicted of illicit drug trafficking, 2006–2009

	Number of Persons Formally Charged With				Number of Persons Convicted of			
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009
ACTS data	48	71	69	19	17	37	50	54
EOUSA data	28,817	28,322	27,679	20,880	26,849	25,730	26,135	19,254

Regarding the number of public officials charged with or convicted of offenses related to illicit drug trafficking, the U.S. reports that it does not separately register those who are formally charged with and convicted for offenses related directly to illegal drug trafficking.



The country does not have laws or regulations at the Federal, State, or local levels that legalize the illicit possession of drugs for personal consumption. There are also no laws or regulations at the Federal level that legalize non-research related possession of drugs (such as marijuana) for personal use for medical or therapeutic purposes. However, several states have laws that permit the possession of marijuana for personal consumption for medical purposes. The criteria used by the U.S. to distinguish simple possession for personal use from possession for illicit trafficking purposes vary in state, local, tribal and territorial legal systems.

The U.S. criminalizes the illicit possession of drugs. The country provides the following data regarding persons formally charged with and convicted of illicit drug possession during the years 2006–2009:

Source	Number of Persons Formally Charged with				Number of Persons Convicted of			
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009
ACTS data	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	0
EOUSA data	234	192	261	282	279	168	162	186

The country does not have an integrated national system to consolidate the number of persons formally charged with and convicted of illicit drug possession. Regarding the data provided, the U.S. reports that its sources are both the U.S. Department of Justice’s Criminal Division, through its Automated Case Tracking System (ACTS) and the Executive Office for United States Attorneys (EOUSA), through the United States Attorneys’ Case Management System.

The U.S. informs that specialized drug treatment courts implement alternative measures for persons charged with and/or found guilty of certain drug offenses, depending on case facts. Generally, these alternative measures are available to first time offenders or those with an addiction to controlled substances (repeat offenders) and include drug awareness and education classes, private drug treatment programs, and county or state run drug treatment programs.

The Office of National Drug Control Policy (HIDTA Program), the U.S. Department of Defense, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, and the U.S. Department of Justice (Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force Program) are the National Drug Control Program Agencies with significant responsibilities for controlling illicit drug trafficking in the United States.

Regarding mechanisms being used to promote or facilitate the timely exchange of information and collaboration between national authorities responsible for the control of illicit drug trafficking, the U.S. informs that interagency intelligence and operational centers are mostly used. The DEA engages with other federal, state, and local law enforcement officials throughout the U.S. to aggressively target the groups involved in illicit drug trafficking, particularly methamphetamine trafficking. The DEA assists state and local law enforcement partners in their law enforcement efforts, particularly with respect to small toxic laboratories, such as providing intelligence, training, and other assistance. The United States Coast Guard (USCG) is a military, multi-mission, maritime



service that is the lead federal agency for maritime drug interdiction and through interagency cooperation shares lead responsibility for air interdiction.

The U.S. has developed specialized training courses and briefings to address illicit drug trafficking for law enforcement, customs officers, prosecutors and the judiciary.

The country reports that all U.S. ports have implemented the International Ship and Port Facility Security (ISPS) Code. In addition, the United States Coast Guard International Port Security Program (IPSP) conducts exchange visits with foreign counterparts to assist in the implementation of the ISPS Code overseas.

The following U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) programs contribute to a multi-layered approach to supply chain and port security:

- Advanced information under the 24-Hour Rule and Trade Act of 2002 (supplemented by Importer Security Filing requirements);
- Screening the information through the Automated Targeting System (ATS) and National Targeting Center - Cargo (NTC-C);
- Partnerships with industry and the private sector such as the Customs Trade Partnership against Terrorism (C-TPAT);
- Partnerships with foreign governments, such as the Container Security Initiative (CSI) and the Secure Freight Initiative (SFI);
- Use of Non-Intrusive Inspection (NII) technology and mandatory exams for all high risk shipments.
- Operation Neptune Shield (ONS) – Internal Coast Guard maritime security operational requirements
- Maritime Transportation Security Act (MTSA) – Implementation of the ISPS Code in the United States

The U.S. Customs and Border Protection, the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the U.S. Coast Guard coordinate and participate in the implementation of counterdrug port security programs.

The country uses a common interagency database, standing interagency task forces, regular interagency meetings, information on electronic monitoring from other countries/agencies, informants, and cooperation with law enforcement or other agencies in other countries to gather, analyze, exchange and share information and intelligence among the national and public entities involved in counter drug activities in ports. The country has a methodology to determine which vessels, cargo or containers should undergo a more complete inspection or examination in person.

Maritime counterdrug detection, monitoring and interdiction activities are carried out by the U.S. The country reports that one of the missions of the Joint Interagency Task Force South (JIATF South) is to coordinate the detection, monitoring, and interdiction of illicit trafficking, and provides the following information regarding the other entities that coordinate and participate in such activities:



Entities	Monitoring				Interdiction			
	Coordinator		Participant		Coordinator		Participant	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Public Prosecutor's Office		X		X		X	X	
Customs		X	X		X		X	
National Police		X		X	X		X	
National Guard		X		X		X	X	
Coast Guard		X	X		X		X	
Navy		X	X			X	X	
JIATF South	X							
USCG			X					
DEA			X		X			
FBI			X		X			
CBP			X					

The U.S. reports the seizure, through maritime interdiction operations, of 51 vessels in 2006, 62 vessels in 2007, 63 vessels in 2008, and 82 vessels in 2009.

During the years 2006–2009, the country reports 229 maritime counterdrug operations were undertaken in partnership with The Bahamas, Jamaica, Canada, Mexico, Costa Rica, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, El Salvador, Honduras, France, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Venezuela, Peru, Panama, and Ecuador.

The country carries out aerial interdiction for illicit drug trafficking activities. The country reports that one of the missions of the Joint Interagency Task Force South (JIATF South) is to coordinate the detection, monitoring, and interdiction of illicit trafficking, and provides the following information regarding the other entities that coordinate and participate in such activities:

Entities	Monitoring				Interdiction			
	Coordinator		Participant		Coordinator		Participant	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Public Prosecutor's Office		X		X		X	X	
Customs		X	X		X		X	
National Police		X	X		X		X	
National Guard		X		X		X	X	
Coast Guard		X	X		X		X	
Navy		X	X			X		X
JIATF South	X							
USCG			X					
DEA			X		X			
FBI			X		X			
CBP			X					



During the years 2006–2009, the country reports the following number of aerial anti-drug interdiction operations carried out:

Year	Number of operations carried out	Countries involved
2006	176	Guatemala, Honduras, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Colombia, Venezuela
2007	240	Guatemala, Honduras, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Colombia, Venezuela
2008	236	Guatemala, Honduras, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Colombia, Venezuela
2009	81	Guatemala, Honduras, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Colombia, Venezuela

The U.S. reports the following number of aircraft seizures undertaken by JIATF South: 2 aircrafts in 2006, 7 in 2007, 8 in 2008, and 8 in 2009.

Provisions of general drug control legislation and regulations, and legislation and regulations specifically created to control cybernetic crime are in place to control the sale of drugs via the Internet in the U.S. The country reports that it has controls in place as part of more general legislation related to drugs under the Controlled Substances Act. The Ryan Haight Online Pharmacy Consumer Protection Act of 2008 created two new offenses. The first prohibits the dispensing of controlled substances by means of the Internet without a valid prescription, and the second, criminalizes the use of the Internet to advertise controlled substances for sale. This new law also increased the statutory maximum penalties for Schedule 3 offenses from 5 to 10 years, for Schedule 4 offenses from 3 to 5 years, and for Schedule 5 offenses from 2 to 5 years if the offense was committed after a prior drug conviction. Finally, the Act added a sentencing enhancement to 15 years for Schedule 3 offenses which result in death or serious bodily injury.

Functions and responsibilities of the authorities involved in the control of the sale of drugs over the Internet includes activities by the DEA, the Food and Drug Administration, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

Procedures, investigation techniques, training and equipment to detect suspicious transactions or diversion of drugs through the Internet are utilized by the responsible institutions. The U.S. reports that each federal agency has a regulatory and policy framework that captures the aspects of Internet drug trafficking that fall within its area of responsibility (i.e. Customs has responsibility for border controls, the FDA has responsibility for approval of drug products, and the DEA has responsibility for regulation and enforcement of controlled substance laws). Each agency provides training and the resources necessary to detect and dismantle internet drug trafficking organizations. The DEA has implemented the cyber crime initiative known as the Internet Online Investigations Project which detects, attacks, and dismantles the infrastructure of organizations or entities that use electronic media (e.g., the Internet) to covertly bring drugs into the U.S. or divert licit drugs domestically. U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) uses undercover operations, trend analysis, information sharing and other investigative techniques.



The U.S. has carried out activities to increase awareness among administrative, judicial, law enforcement, postal, customs and other authorities regarding the illicit sale of drugs over the Internet. The country reports that awareness of illicit sale of pharmaceutical products and other drugs through the internet has increased in many ways. Administrative, regulatory, judicial, law enforcement, postal, customs and other agencies increase awareness through a cohesive working relationship. Most law enforcement agencies also have information on their web sites regarding the Internet sale of pharmaceutical drugs. These agencies also routinely provide training to industry and other regulatory and law enforcement agencies. ICE, with participation from the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), developed the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center, which coordinates domestic and international investigations related to pharmaceuticals. This center deconflicts intelligence among state and local regulatory agencies and multiple federal law enforcement agencies. In addition, the center liaises with the private sector.

The country has a mechanism through which citizens can report the illicit sale of drugs through the Internet. The DEA maintains a hotline for reporting suspicious Internet pharmacies as well as an online reporting form.

B. Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and other Related Materials

The U.S. has official entities that regulate and authorize activities, including the manufacture, importation, exportation, transit, purchase, sale, shipment, movement or transfer, registration, marking, transport, possession, carrying, and storage, for firearms, ammunition, explosives and other related materials. Marketing is not included. These activities are the responsibility of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) in the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Customs and Border Protection in the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, Directorate of Defense Trade Controls in the U.S. Department of State (DOS), and the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The country reports that illicit trafficking in firearms and ammunition is addressed by the Gun Control Act of 1968 and the Arms Export Control Act. The country also informs that the importation of firearms and ammunition is prohibited, unless the importer has a license or permit issued for such purpose. Regulations implementing the Arms Export Control Act also prohibit the import, export, and transit of parts for firearms and ammunition without a license. In addition, it is unlawful to knowingly import any merchandise contrary to law, e.g., without an import permit. The federal explosives laws make it unlawful to import explosives unless the importer has a license or permit.

Regulations implementing the Export Administration Act require an export license for the exportation of certain types of explosives. Regulations specifically make it unlawful for any person to engage in the business of manufacturing firearms without a license. In addition, licensed manufacturers and licensed importers of firearms are required to mark the firearms they manufacture and import with an individual serial number and other identifying information. Criminal penalties can be imposed for willful failure to mark, and importers and manufacturers who fail to mark in accordance with the law and regulations may also have their licenses revoked.



There are no provisions of U.S. law that criminalize or sanction the manufacturing of firearms parts (e.g., other related materials) without a license. Accordingly, there are no sanctions for illicit manufacture of other related materials.

Illicit manufacturing of explosives is prohibited by the federal explosives laws. Regulations specifically make it unlawful to engage in the business of manufacturing explosives without a license.

Laws and regulations involving sale, purchase, transit, movement, registration, transport, possession, carrying and storage vary depending on the jurisdiction, the personal background of the individual or legal entity, and the type of firearms, ammunition, explosive or related material. There are no legal provisions regarding the activity of marketing these products.

Regarding the regulation of activities related to firearms, ammunition, explosives and other related materials, the laws and regulations referenced above:

- Establish administrative controls for the manufacture, importation, exportation and transit of firearms, ammunition, explosives and other related materials;
- Criminalize the trafficking in and illicit production of firearms, ammunition, explosives and other related materials;
- Establish administrative controls for transactions between persons or legal entities, from the initial transfer through to the end user, including all of the various carriers of firearms, ammunition, explosives and other related materials; and
- Regulate and authorize commercial transactions, from person to person, legal entity to person, legal entity to legal entity, and legal entity to foreigners, of firearms, ammunition, explosives and other related materials.

The country reports that the sanctions for non compliance with the established regulations range from license revocation to felony convictions, term of imprisonment up to life, and a penalty of up to \$1 million in fines.

U.S. law requires that firearms be marked at the time of manufacture, for their importation, and for official use after confiscation or forfeiture.

The country has a mechanism for information exchange and cooperation between national institutions, as well as international organizations, regarding all forms of control of firearms, ammunition, explosives and other related materials.

Regarding shipments of firearms, ammunition, explosives and other related materials not authorized due to the absence of the necessary licenses or permits during the years 2006–2009, the country reports that these figures are not tracked centrally and therefore not available.

With regard to the number of times the U.S. has not issued an export license or permit for a shipment of firearms, ammunition, explosives or other related materials because the necessary license or permit was not first issued by the importing country, or the U.S. did not authorize exportation because the transit country did not first issue the necessary license or permit during



the years 2006–2009, the country reports that the system used by the Directorate of Defense Trade Controls in the U.S. Department of State is not configured to capture this specific information.

The U.S. has a national registry of the importation, exportation, and transit of firearms, ammunition, explosives and other related materials. The country reports that, a record-keeping system exists for the exportation and transit of firearms, ammunition, and other related materials. In the case of explosives, the system keeps records for exportation and transit only.

The country provides the following information regarding how long the transaction registries for firearms, ammunition, explosives and other related materials are kept:

Transaction	Firearms	Ammunition	Explosives	Other related materials
Importation	Permanently / 6 Years (ATF)	6 Years (ATF)	N/A – no ATF records system for explosives imports	6 Years (ATF)
Exportation	Permanently / 75 Years (ATF)	Permanently	Permanently	Permanently
Transit	Permanently	Permanently	Permanently	Permanently

Sources: U.S. State Department records unless otherwise noted

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF), U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ)

N/A – Not available

The country informs that the U.S. Department of State keeps computerized records for exportation and transit of these materials and for importation of firearms, and the ATF keeps non-computerized records for importation of firearms, ammunition, and other related materials.

Transaction	Firearms		Ammunition		Explosives		Other related materials	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Importation	X (State)	X (ATF)		X (ATF)		N/A		X (ATF)
Exportation	X (State)		X (State)		X (State)		X (State)	
Transit	X (State)		X (State)		X (State)		X (State)	

N/A – Not available

ATF - Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF)

State – U.S. Department of State

The country reports that federal appropriations law prohibits the centralization or consolidation of records related to firearms transactions. Accordingly, the availability of firearms data from “databases” or “registries” is limited.

There is no database or registry for confiscation of firearms, ammunition, explosives or other related materials. There is a specific registry for arms transfer that follows up from the initial sale through subsequent transfers. The U.S. reports that the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms



(ATF) of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) is the responsible entity, as well as for the control of weapons categorized as National Firearms Act (NFA) only.

The country reports that there is no central registry that connects firearms, ammunition, explosives and other related materials to narcotrafficking cases.

The country provided no information regarding the number of domestic investigations initiated or assisted in the U.S. as a result of a trace request from another country. Data were provided on international firearms trace requests received and completed for firearms recovered outside the U.S. for the years 2006-2009, as follows:

Year	International firearms trace requests received	International firearms traces completed
2006	11,650	11,650
2007	27,677	27,677
2008	18,039	18,039
2009	34,723	34,726

C. Money Laundering

Money laundering is a crime under U.S. legislation. Regarding sanctions, the U.S. reports that both natural and legal persons are subject to effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal, civil and administrative sanctions for money laundering. Criminal sanctions for violating section 1956 are a fine of not more than US\$500,000 or twice the value of the property involved in the transaction (whichever is greater) or imprisonment for not more than 20 years or both. Criminal sanctions for violating section 1957 are a fine and/or imprisonment for not more than 10 years or an alternate fine of not more than twice the amount of criminally derived property and/or imprisonment for not more than 10 years. Civil sanctions for violating both sections 1956 and 1957 are imposed by way of civil penalty, the maximum amounts of which are prescribed by section 1956(b) as being either the value of the property, funds, or monetary instruments involved in the transaction or US\$10,000 (whichever is greater).

Besides illicit drug trafficking, trafficking of firearms, illicit trafficking of migrants, trafficking in human beings, kidnapping, extortion, corruption and crimes against the public administration, fraud or financial crimes, the U.S. legislation establishes a vast list of crimes as predicate offenses for money laundering.

In the U.S. it is not necessary for a person to be convicted of a predicate offense in order to be convicted of laundering the proceeds of that offense. In addition, laws exist that permit the perpetrator of the predicate offense to be convicted for money laundering.

Regarding special investigative techniques in money laundering investigations, the U.S. reports that there is no national law authorizing the use of undercover special operations, the use of informants, or controlled deliveries in connection with special investigation activities to repress



money laundering. However, these practices have been approved by judicial precedents in the Courts. Electronic surveillance is authorized, but must be ordered by a court.

The country is a member of the Financial Action Task Force. Its most recent evaluation was carried out in 2006.

In the U.S., the banking sector, currency exchange sector, stock exchanges (securities brokers-dealers, mutual funds, futures commission merchants, introducing brokers in commodities), insurance sector, transfers of funds, cash or valuables, casinos and gambling are subject to the obligation to submit suspicious transaction reports to prevent money laundering, in accordance with the Bank Secrecy Act. Offshore banks, real estate, lawyers, notaries and accountants are not required to submit reports.

Regarding sectors or activities subject to the obligation to submit objective information reports to prevent money laundering, the country reports that a range of financial industry sectors are subject to Bank Secrecy Act reporting requirements. These include, but are not limited to, depository institutions (e.g., banks, credit unions, and thrifts); broker-dealers in securities; mutual funds; futures commission merchants and introducing brokers in commodities; money services businesses (e.g., money transmitters; issuers, sellers, and redeemers of money orders, travelers' checks, and stored value; currency dealers and exchangers; check cashers; and the U.S. Postal Service); casinos and card clubs; insurance companies; and dealers in precious metals, precious stones, or jewels. Currency Transaction Reports (CTRs) are filed in connection with cash deposits, withdrawals, exchanges of currency, or other payments or transfers by, through, or to a financial institution involving a transaction (or multiple transactions by or on behalf of the same person) in currency exceeding US\$10,000.

The country has a Financial Intelligence Unit responsible for money laundering prevention. The U.S. Department of the Treasury established the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN) in 1990 to provide a government-wide multisource financial intelligence and analysis network. The organization's operation was broadened in 1994 to include regulatory responsibilities for administering the Bank Secrecy Act. FinCEN is part of the U.S. Department of the Treasury and has an annual budget assigned. FinCEN is a member of the Egmont Group and has access to the Group's secure network.

The U.S. reports that there are no limitations on obtaining financial documents and registers in money laundering cases, nor on obtaining documents in money laundering cases subject to secrecy, confidentiality or reserve agreements.

The country reports that assets forfeited under federal forfeiture statutes in connection with illicit drug trafficking and money laundering are managed jointly by the U.S. Marshals Service and the U.S. Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund (DOJAFF) for U.S. Federal law enforcement agencies that participate in the DOJAFF. The U.S. Department of the Treasury's Executive Office for Asset Forfeiture (TEOAF) and the Department of the Treasury Forfeiture Fund (DOTFF) serve this function for the Federal law enforcement agencies that participate in the DOTFF. These entities have their own budgets and manuals that establish the regulations for such management.



The U.S. does not report information on investigations initiated through a financial intelligence report during the years 2006–2009.

The country provides the following partial data on the number of penal proceedings initiated for money laundering offenses, and on the number of persons formally charged with or convicted of money laundering offenses in investigations initiated during the period 2006–2009.

Year	Penal proceedings initiated for money laundering offenses
2006	1,242 (EOUSA data)(FY)
2007	1,362 (EOUSA data)(FY)
2008	1,496 (EOUSA data)(FY)
2009	1,485 (EOUSA data)(FY)

Year	Number of persons formally charged	Number of persons convicted
2006	3,039 (EOUSA data)(FY)	1,697 (EOUSA data)(FY)
2007	3,007 (EOUSA data)(FY)	1,589 (EOUSA data)(FY)
2008	1,496 (EOUSA data)(FY)	1,654 (EOUSA data)(FY)
2009	3,174 (EOUSA data)(FY)	1,665 (EOUSA data)(FY)

D. Judicial Cooperation

In the U.S., extradition, including extradition of nationals, is possible for both illicit drug trafficking and money laundering crimes. The U.S. has complied with the obligation to designate a competent authority to receive, respond to and transmit extradition requests. U.S. law also provides for persons whose extradition has been denied in an illicit drug trafficking or money laundering case to be tried for the offense in the U.S., provided that the United States has an independent basis to exercise subject matter jurisdiction over the offense.

U.S. law permits the provision of reciprocal judicial assistance, which may include taking evidence or statements from persons, effecting service of judicial documents, executing searches and seizures, examining objects and sites, providing information and evidentiary items, providing original or certified copies of relevant documents and records, and identifying and tracing items for evidentiary purposes.

The country uses secure technological resources to facilitate communication among authorities directing criminal investigations. Bank secrecy and other confidentiality laws are not an impediment to providing judicial assistance. U.S. law also permits the granting of controlled delivery requests. Both penal and procedural laws exist that permit the use of controlled delivery. The U.S. has a mechanism to recover assets forfeited abroad.



The country provides the following information on the number of active extradition requests made regarding illicit drug trafficking and money laundering cases during the years 2006–2009:

Active extradition requests regarding illicit drug trafficking cases				Active extradition requests regarding money laundering cases			
2006	2007	2008	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009
415	371	344	296	110	46	64	52

The number of passive extradition requests answered by the country regarding illicit drug trafficking and money laundering cases during the years 2006–2009 are provided by the U.S. in the following table:

Passive extradition requests answered regarding illicit drug trafficking cases				Passive extradition requests answered regarding money laundering cases			
2006	2007	2008	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009
6	4	5	2	0	0	1	0

Regarding the number of requests for reciprocal judicial assistance related to illicit drug trafficking and money laundering cases during the years 2006–2009, the U.S. provides the following data:

Requests for reciprocal judicial assistance made regarding illicit drug trafficking cases				Requests for reciprocal judicial assistance made regarding money laundering cases			
2006	2007	2008	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009
69	56	38	56	59	40	49	55

Requests for reciprocal judicial assistance answered regarding illicit drug trafficking cases				Requests for reciprocal judicial assistance answered regarding money laundering cases			
2006	2007	2008	2009	2006	2007	2008	2009
29	38	35	12	49	72	56	40



EVALUATIVE SUMMARY

In the area of institutional strengthening, CICAD notes that the United States of America (U.S.) has a National Drug Control Strategy (NDCS) in place, which includes a decentralization component, and a national drug authority, the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP), with an assigned budget for its operation.

Regarding international conventions, CICAD views with concern that the U.S. has not ratified the Inter-American Convention against Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and other Related Materials (CIFTA), nor the the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacture of and Trafficking in Firearms and their Parts and Components and Ammunition of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

With reference to a national information system, CICAD notes that the country has a centralized office with the capacity to produce and collect data, to analyze drug-related statistics, and to coordinate the dissemination of drug-related information.

In the area of demand reduction, CICAD recognizes that the country implements drug abuse prevention programs targeting students at the secondary and tertiary (university) levels, community-based prevention programs, as well as programs targeting other key populations such as indigenous groups, workers in the workplace, incarcerated individuals, and specific ethnic groups. CICAD also recognizes that the US has been undertaking evaluations of its drug abuse prevention programs.

CICAD views no progress on the establishment of a national registry of drug abuse prevention programs to include the nature, target population, and coverage of the different programs.

CICAD acknowledges the treatment programs offered by the country, as well as the existence of official operating standards and official licensing procedures to authorize the operation of specialised treatment facilities that use FDA approved medication. However, CICAD views with concern that official operating standards for specialized facilities that provide treatment services for persons with problems associated with drug use, are not applied nationally in the U.S.

In reference to statistics on consumption, CICAD recognizes the drug use statistics produced by the U.S., but views with concern that the country does not keep records on drug-related traffic accidents.

In the area of supply reduction, particularly drug production, CICAD notes that the U.S. does not have a system to estimate total cultivated areas of cannabis crops, but has a formal eradication program for such crops.

Regarding the control of pharmaceutical products and chemical substances, CICAD notes that the country has a legal framework in place for the control of pharmaceutical products, and makes use of an integrated procedure for the prevention and monitoring of their diversion. Information exchange systems are used to facilitate the secure and efficient handling of information among



authorities involved in the control of the diversion of pharmaceutical products and chemical substances. However, CICAD notes that the U.S. did not provide information on the disposal of seized pharmaceutical products for the years 2006-2009.

In the area of control measures, CICAD observes that the U.S. has a legal and institutional framework for the control of illicit drug trafficking. However, CICAD notes that the country does not have integrated national system to consolidate the number of persons formally charged with and convicted of illicit drug trafficking, the number of persons formally charged with and convicted of illicit drug possession, and the number of public officials formally charged with and convicted of offenses related to illicit drug trafficking.

With reference to the control of firearms, ammunition, explosives, and other related materials, CICAD observes that the U.S. has a legal and institutional framework in place. CICAD notes, however, that the country's legal framework does not include provisions for the marketing of such products. CICAD also observes the lack of a national registry of confiscated firearms, ammunition, explosives and other related materials in narco-trafficking cases.

Regarding prevention and control of money laundering, CICAD notes that the U.S. has a legal and institutional framework in place, including a mechanism for the management and disposition of assets seized and forfeited for illicit drug trafficking and money laundering offences. However, CICAD also notes that offshore banks, real estate agents, lawyers, notaries and accountants are not required to submit suspicious transaction reports, and that the country does not report on investigations initiated through financial intelligence reports during the evaluated period, 2007-2009.

In the area of judicial cooperation, CICAD notes that the U.S. has a legal framework that allows extradition, including the extradition of nationals, for illicit drug trafficking and money laundering crimes, and that permits the provision of reciprocal judicial assistance. Moreover, the country uses secure technological resources to facilitate communication among authorities directing criminal investigations, and also has a mechanism to recover assets forfeited abroad.

CICAD recognizes the United States of America's efforts in the context of the Multilateral Evaluation Mechanism (MEM) and encourages the country to continue to participate actively in the process.



RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are assigned to the United States of America in order to assist the country in strengthening its policy to combat the problem of drugs and related activities and increase multilateral cooperation in the Hemisphere:

INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING

1. RATIFY THE INTER-AMERICAN CONVENTION AGAINST ILLICIT MANUFACTURING OF AND TRAFFICKING IN FIREARMS, AMMUNITION, EXPLOSIVES AND OTHER RELATED MATERIALS (CIFTA), A RECOMMENDATION REITERATED FROM THE FIRST EVALUATION ROUND, 1999 – 2000.
2. ACCEDE TO THE PROTOCOL AGAINST ILLICIT MANUFACTURING OF AND TRAFFICKING IN FIREARMS, THEIR PARTS AND COMPONENTS AND AMMUNITION, OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION AGAINST TRANSNATIONAL ORGANIZED CRIME (2000), A RECOMMENDATION REITERATED FROM THE SECOND EVALUATION ROUND, 2001 – 2002.

DEMAND REDUCTION

3. ESTABLISH A NATIONAL REGISTRY OF DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAMS TO INCLUDE THE NATURE, TARGET POPULATION, AND COVERAGE OF THE DIFFERENT PROGRAMS, A RECOMMENDATION REITERATED FROM THE THIRD EVALUATION ROUND, 2003-2004.
4. ADOPT THE NECESSARY MEASURES TO ENSURE THE MANDATORY NATURE OF THE OFFICIAL OPERATING STANDARDS NATIONWIDE FOR SPECIALIZED FACILITIES THAT PROVIDE TREATMENT SERVICES FOR PERSONS WITH PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH DRUG USE, A RECOMMENDATION REITERATED FROM THE SECOND EVALUATION ROUND, 2001-2002.
5. ESTABLISH A NATIONAL SYSTEM TO KEEP RECORDS ON TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS RELATED TO DRUG USE, A RECOMMENDATION REITERATED FROM THE THIRD EVALUATION ROUND, 2003-2004.

SUPPLY REDUCTION

6. ESTABLISH A NATIONAL SYSTEM TO KEEP RECORDS ON TYPES AND AMOUNTS OF SEIZED PHARMACEUTICAL PRODUCTS DISPOSED OF.

CONTROL MEASURES

7. ESTABLISH A NATIONAL AUTOMATED REGISTRY TO CONSOLIDATE THE NUMBER OF PERSONS FORMALLY CHARGED WITH AND CONVICTED OF ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFICKING, THE NUMBER OF PERSONS FORMALLY CHARGED WITH AND CONVICTED OF ILLICIT DRUG POSSESSION, AND THE NUMBER OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS FORMALLY CHARGED WITH AND CONVICTED OF OFFENSES RELATED TO ILLICIT DRUG TRAFFICKING.



8. ESTABLISH A NATIONAL AUTOMATED REGISTRY OF CONFISCATED FIREARMS, AMMUNITION, EXPLOSIVES AND OTHER RELATED MATERIALS INVOLVED WITH NARCOTRAFFICKING CASES.
9. IMPLEMENT A REGISTRY SYSTEM TO KEEP RECORDS OF INVESTIGATIONS INITIATED THROUGH FINANCIAL INTELLIGENCE REPORTS.



Organization of American States

**1889 F Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: (202) 458 3000**

www.cicad.oas.org

ISBN 978-0-8270-5574-2