



**UNODC**

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime



# International Standards on Drug Use Prevention

Cover photo credits (left to right): ©iStockphoto.com/Quavondo; ©UN Photo/John Isaac; ©UN Photo/Evan Schneider; ©UNODC; ©UN Photo/Myriam Asmani.

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE ON DRUGS AND CRIME  
Vienna

# International Standards on Drug Use Prevention



UNITED NATIONS  
Vienna, 2015

### Note

Minor editorial amendments have been made to this publication, however the content remains the same as the earlier version, first published in 2013.

© United Nations, February 2015. All rights reserved, worldwide.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Information on uniform resource locators and links to Internet sites contained in the present publication are provided for the convenience of the reader and are correct at the time of issue. The United Nations takes no responsibility for the continued accuracy of that information or for the content of any external website.

This publication has not been formally edited.

Publishing production: English, Publishing and Library Section, United Nations Office at Vienna.

## Acknowledgements

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) would like to acknowledge the following for their invaluable contribution to the process of publication of these standards:

The Government of Norway for believing in and supporting the project, as well as the Governments of Sweden and Finland for providing supplementary resources.

The Government of Italy for providing resources for the future dissemination of these standards.

The Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse (CCSA) for taking the first initiative to reach out to international partners to build globally on their own standards.

The European Monitoring Centre on Drug and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) for providing technical advice at all stages of the process and particularly with regard to the methodology, as well as the best practice portal (available at <http://www.emcdda.europa.eu>).

The Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD) for participating in the process and supporting the participation of experts from Latin America.

Mr. Harry Sumnall at the Liverpool John Moore University (LJMU) for allowing this process to utilize the results of their ongoing systematic search of the literature.

Ms. Zili Sloboda, UNODC Consultant and Director of Research, JBS, Inc., United States, for undertaking the first search of the literature, drafting the background paper to the First Consultation and providing continuous and supportive technical advice to the process.

Ms. Angelina Brotherhood, UNODC Consultant, for assessing the literature and the data extraction.

The members of the Group of Experts on the Prevention Standards, for providing the relevant scientific evidence and technical advice, including (in alphabetical order):

Mr. Hisham F. Al Arabi, United Arab Emirates; Mr. Masoud AlBeloushi, United Arab Emirates; Mr. Luis Alfonso, PAHO; Mr. Omar Khalfan Ali, United Arab Emirates; Mr. Ali Al-Marzooqi, United Arab Emirates; Mr. Juma Sultan AlShamsi, United Arab Emirates; Mr. Abdulelah Mohamed Al-Shareef, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; Mr. Feras Alzu'bi, Jordan; Ms. Sofía Aragón Sánchez, Spain; Mr. Gustavo Ascacibar, Peru; Ms. Rubi Blancas, UNODC; Mr. Douglas Billings, United States; Ms. Jazmín Bósquez, Panama; Mr. Gilbert Botvin, United States; Ms. Angelina Brotherhood, United Kingdom; Mr. Gregor Burkhart, EMCDDA; Ms. Rachel Calam, United Kingdom; Ms. Graziela Beatriz Castro dos Santos de Castro, Brazil; Mr. Richard Catalano, United States; Ms. Heather Clark, Canada; Mr. Nicholas Clark, WHO; Ms. Patricia Conrod, Canada; Mr. Royer Cook, United States; Mr. William Crano, United States; Mr. Ken Douglas, Trinidad and Tobago; Mr. Mark Eddy, United States; Mr. Carlos Alberto Escalante, El Salvador; Ms. Lucia Fabricio, Brazil; Mr. Fabrizio Faggiano, Italy; Ms. Sara Fanfarillo, Italy; Ms. Marica Ferri, EMCDDA; Ms. Angela Finck, Brazil; Ms. Valentina Forastieri, ILO; Ms. Silvia Guadarrana, Mexico; Ms. Diana Hammes, Germany; Ms. Frances Harding, United States; Ms. Nadine Harker,

South Africa; Ms. Rebekah Hersch, United States; Mr. Wang Hongru, China; Mr. Heyam Wahbeh Ibrahim, Jordan; Ms. Jadranka Ivandić Zimić, Croatia; Mr. Johan Jongbloet, Belgium; Ms. Valentina Kranzelic, Croatia; Ms. Karol Kumpfer, United States; Mr. Jeff Lee, United Kingdom; Ms. Rosalie Likikbi-Boho, Congo; Ms. Maria Paula Luna, CICAD; Mr. Artur Malczewski, Poland; Mr. Jim McCambridge, United Kingdom; Ms. Lynn McDonald, United Kingdom; Mr. Chris Mikton, WHO; Ms. Brenda Miller, United States; Ms. Maristela G. Monteiro, United States; Ms. Zhanerke Omarova, UNODC; Mr. Akwasi Owusu Osei, Ghana; Mr. Hanno Petras, United Kingdom; Ms. Methinin Pinyuchon, Thailand; Mr. Radu Pop, Romania; Ms. Melva Ramírez, UNODC; Ms. Shanti Ranganathan, India; Ms. Eve Reider, United States; Ms. Elizabeth Robertson, United States; Ms. Ingeborg Rossow, Norway; Ms. Myriam Safatly, France; Mr. Fernando Salazar, Peru; Ms. Teresa Salvador, COPOLAD Consortium EU-LA; Mr. Ohene Sammy Kwane, Ghana; Mr. Alejandro Sánchez Guerrero, Mexico; Ms. Nara Santos, UNODC; Mr. Michael Schaub, Switzerland; Mr. Borikhan Shaumarov, UNODC; Ms. Elisabetta Simeoni, Italy; Ms. Milina Skipina, Bosnia Herzegovina; Mr. Markku Soikkeli, Finland; Mr. Richard Spoth, United States; Mr. Jack Stein, United States; Mr. Vladimir Stempliuk, Brazil; Mr. Harry Sumnall, United Kingdom; Mr. Bian How Tay, Columbo Plan; Ms. Juana Tomas-Rossello, UNODC; Mr. Suriyadeo Tripathi, Thailand; Mr. Bart Uitterhaegen, The Netherlands; Mr. Peer van der Kreeft, Belgium; Mr. Shamil Wanigaratne, United Arab Emirates; Ms. Evelyn Yang, CADCA, United States.

Other UNODC staff in the field offices, for facilitating contact with governments and experts globally and providing substantive and practical feedback.

Mr. Nikolaos Stamatakis and Mr. Jason Basker, UNODC interns, for searching and screening the scientific evidence.

Ms. Hanna Heikkila, Associate Expert, for undertaking much of the background research, assessing the literature, participating in the coordination of the process, and drafting parts of the document.

Mr. Wadih Maalouf for contributing to process of background research, drafting part of the document and providing feedback.

Ms. Elisabeth Mattfeld for providing substantive technical advice at every stage of the process.

Ms. Giovanna Campello, Programme Officer, Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Section, for coordinating and managing the process and drafting parts of the document and finalizing it.

# Contents

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1. Prevention is about the healthy and safe development of children.....	1
2. Prevention of drug use and substance abuse.....	2
3. Prevention science.....	3
4. The International Standards.....	4
<i>The process of development of the International Standards</i> .....	5
<i>The document</i> .....	6
<b>I. Drug prevention interventions and policies.....</b>	<b>11</b>
1. Infancy and early childhood.....	11
<i>Interventions targeting pregnant women with substance abuse disorders</i> .....	11
<i>Prenatal and infancy visitation</i> .....	12
<i>Early childhood education</i> .....	13
2. Middle childhood.....	13
<i>Parenting skills programmes</i> .....	14
<i>Personal and social skills education</i> .....	15
<i>Classroom environment improvement programmes</i> .....	17
<i>Policies to keep children in school</i> .....	17
3. Early adolescence.....	18
<i>Prevention education based on personal and social skills and social influence</i> .....	18
<i>School policies and culture</i> .....	20
<i>Addressing individual psychological vulnerabilities</i> .....	21
<i>Mentoring</i> .....	22
4. Adolescence and adulthood.....	23
<i>Brief intervention</i> .....	23
<i>Workplace prevention programmes</i> .....	24
<i>Tobacco and alcohol policies</i> .....	25
<i>Community-based multi-component initiatives</i> .....	26
<i>Media campaigns</i> .....	27
<i>Entertainment venues</i> .....	28
<b>II. Prevention issues requiring further research.....</b>	<b>29</b>
<i>Sports and other leisure time activities</i> .....	29
<i>Preventing the non-medical use of prescription drugs</i> .....	29
<i>Interventions and policies targeting children and youth particularly at risk</i> .....	30
<i>Prevention of the use of new psychoactive substances not controlled under the Conventions</i> .....	30

<b>III. Characteristics of an effective prevention system .....</b>	<b>31</b>
1. Range of interventions and policies based on evidence .....	31
2. Supportive policy and regulatory framework .....	32
3. A strong basis on research and scientific evidence .....	32
<i>Evidence-based planning</i> .....	33
<i>Research and planning</i> .....	34
4. Different sectors involved at different levels .....	35
5. Strong infrastructure of the delivery system.....	36
6. Sustainability .....	36



# Introduction

There was a time when drug prevention was limited to printing leaflets to warn young people about the danger of drugs, with little or no resulting behaviour change. Now, science allows us to tell a different story. Prevention strategies based on scientific evidence working with families, schools and communities can ensure that children and young people, especially the most marginalized and poor, grow and stay healthy and safe into adulthood and old age. For every dollar spent on prevention, at least ten can be saved in future health, social and crime costs.<sup>1</sup>

These global international standards summarize the currently available scientific evidence, describing interventions and policies that have been found to result in positive prevention outcomes and their characteristics. Concurrently, the global International Standards identify the major components and features of an effective national drug prevention system. It is our hope that international standards will guide policymakers worldwide to develop programmes, policies and systems that are a truly effective investment in the future of children, young people, families and communities. This work builds on and recognizes the work of many other organizations (e.g. EMCDDA, CCSA, CICAD, Mentor, NIDA, WHO<sup>2</sup>), which have previously developed standards and guidelines on various aspects of drug prevention.

## I. Prevention is about the healthy and safe development of children

The primary objective of drug prevention is to help people, particularly but not exclusively young people, to avoid or delay initiation into the use of drugs, or, if they have started already, to avoid developing disorders (e.g. dependence). The general aim of drug prevention, however, is much broader than this: it is the healthy and safe development of children and youth to realize their talents and potential and become contributing members of their community and society. Effective drug prevention contributes significantly to the positive engagement of children, young people and adults with their families, schools, workplace and community.

Prevention science in the last 20 years has made enormous advances. As a result, practitioners in the field and policymakers have a more complete understanding about what makes individuals vulnerable to initiating the use of drugs (“risk factors”) at both the individual and environmental level. More than a lack of knowledge about drugs and their consequences, the evidence points to the following among the most powerful risk factors: biological processes, personality traits, mental health disorders, family neglect and abuse,

---

<sup>1</sup>Spoth, R. L., Clair, S., Shin, C., & Redmond, C. (2006). Long-term effects of universal preventive interventions on methamphetamine use among adolescents. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 160(9), 876.

<sup>2</sup>European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA), [www.emcdda.europa.eu](http://www.emcdda.europa.eu); Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse (CCSA), [www.ccsa.ca/Eng/](http://www.ccsa.ca/Eng/); Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD) at the Organization of the American States, [http://cicad.oas.org/main/default\\_eng.asp](http://cicad.oas.org/main/default_eng.asp); Mentor Foundation (Mentor), [www.mentorfoundation.org/](http://www.mentorfoundation.org/); National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), [www.drugabuse.gov/](http://www.drugabuse.gov/); World Health Organization (WHO), [www.who.int/](http://www.who.int/).

poor attachment to school and the community, favourable social norms and conducive environments, and, growing up in marginalized and deprived communities. Conversely, psychological and emotional well-being, personal and social competence, a strong attachment to caring and effective parents and to schools and communities that are well resourced and organized are all factors that contribute to individuals being less vulnerable (protective factors, recently also referred to as assets) to drug use and other negative behaviours.

It is important to emphasize that these risk factors referenced above are largely out of the control of the individual (nobody chooses to be neglected by his/her parents!) and are linked to many risky behaviours and related health disorders, such as dropping out of school, aggressiveness, delinquency, violence, risky sexual behaviour, depression and suicide. It should not, therefore, come as a surprise that prevention science demonstrates that many drug prevention interventions and policies also prevent other risky behaviours.

Research indicates that some of the factors that make people vulnerable (or, conversely, resistant) to starting to use drugs, differ according to age. Science has identified risk and protective factors during infancy, childhood and early adolescence, particularly relating to parenting and attachment to school. At later stages of the age continuum, schools, workplaces, entertainment venues and media are all settings that may contribute to making individuals more or less vulnerable to drug use and other risky behaviours.

Needless to say, marginalized youth in poor communities with little or no family support and limited access to education in school, are especially at risk. So are children, individuals and communities torn by war or natural disasters.

In summary, drug prevention is an integral part of a larger effort to ensure children and young people are less vulnerable and more resilient.

## 2. Prevention of drug use and substance abuse

Prevention is one of the main components of a health-centred system to address drugs, as mandated by the existing three international Conventions.<sup>3</sup> This document focuses on prevention of the initiation of drug use and the prevention of transition to drug use disorders. The global International Standards do not address other kinds of prevention (e.g. the prevention of health and social consequences of drug use), drug dependence treatment and care, or law enforcement efforts.

This is not to say that these other efforts are not worthwhile. Indeed, it should be stressed that no effective prevention intervention, policy or system can be developed or implemented on its own, or in isolation. An effective local or national prevention system is embedded and integrated in the context of a larger health-centred and balanced system responding to drugs including law enforcement and supply reduction, treatment of drug dependence, and prevention of health and social consequences (e.g. HIV, overdoses, etc.). The overarching and main objective of such a health-centred and balanced system would be to ensure the availability of controlled drugs for medical and scientific use whilst preventing diversion and abuse.

---

<sup>3</sup>Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 as amended by the 1972 Protocol; Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971; and United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988, available at <http://www.unodc.org>.

Although the main focus of the global International Standards is the prevention of the use of drugs controlled in the three International Conventions (including also the non-medical use of prescription drugs), it draws upon and presents evidence with regard to the prevention of other psychoactive substances, such as tobacco, alcohol and inhalants.

Many useful lessons and parallels can be drawn from these complementary prevention fields, but this is far from the only reason for presenting such a comprehensive picture of the evidence. Inhalants are strongly toxic with devastating consequences, driving the urgent need for prevention efforts to address initiation of use. Moreover, in the case of children and adolescents, prevention of tobacco and alcohol initiation is a powerful tool for preventing drug use as well. The brains of children and adolescents are still developing and prevention science tells us that the earlier they start to use psychoactive substances, the more likely they are to develop substance and drug abuse disorders later in life.<sup>4</sup>

### 3. Prevention science

Thanks to prevention science, we also know a lot about what is effective in preventing substance abuse and what is not. It is important to note that science does not happen of its own accord. We owe what we know to the dedication and efforts of researchers and practitioners who rigorously evaluated these prevention programmes, and to the organizations that funded this research. The purpose of this document is to organize the findings from these years of research in a format that enhances the ability of policymakers to base their decisions on evidence and science.

This is not to say that we know it all. Through the review process many gaps in prevention science were noted. The majority of the science originates from a handful of high-income countries in North America, Europe and Oceania. There are few studies from other cultural settings or in low- and middle-income countries. Moreover, most studies are “efficacy” studies that examine the impact of interventions in well-resourced, small, controlled settings. There are very few studies that have investigated the effectiveness of interventions in a “real life” setting. Additionally, there are limited studies that have calculated whether interventions and policy are cost-beneficial or cost-effective (rather than just efficacious or effective). Last, but not the least, it has been observed that few studies report data disaggregated by sex.

Another challenge suggests that often studies are too few to be able to conclusively identify “active ingredients”, i.e. the component or components that are really necessary for the intervention or policy to be efficacious or effective, including with regard to delivery of the strategies (who delivers them best? what qualities and training are necessary? what methods need to be employed?, etc.).

There is a lack of resources and opportunities to undertake rigorous evaluations in some settings, and particularly in low- and middle income countries. This is not to say that work being undertaken is ineffective. Some of the qualitative evaluations that are undertaken reflect promising indications. However, if strategies are not given the opportunity to be

---

<sup>4</sup>Throughout the rest of the document, terminology will be utilized as follows. “Drug use” will be used to refer to the non-medical and/or non-scientific use of drugs controlled in the three International Conventions. “Substance abuse” will be used to refer to the “harmful or hazardous use of psychoactive substances”. In addition to drug use, this includes tobacco use, alcohol abuse, the misuse of inhalants and non-prescription drugs, the use of new psychoactive substances (so-called “legal highs” or “smart drugs”).

tested in a rigorous scientific manner, it is just not possible to state whether they are effective or not.

Finally, as in all medical, social and behavioural sciences, publication bias is a real problem. Studies which report new positive findings are more likely to be published than studies that report negative findings. This means that our analysis risks overestimating the efficacy and the effectiveness of drug prevention interventions and policies.

There is a strong and urgent need for research to be nurtured and supported in the field of drug prevention globally. It is critical to support prevention research efforts in low- and middle-income countries, but national drug prevention systems in all countries should invest significantly in rigorously evaluating their programmes and policies to contribute to the global knowledge base. It is hoped that future updates and editions of these Standards will be able to present a much richer picture of the available evidence.

What can be done in the meantime? Should policymakers wait for the gaps to be filled before implementing prevention initiatives? What can be done to prevent drug use and substance abuse, and ensure that children and young people grow healthy and safe now?

The gaps in the science should make us cautious, but not deter us from action. A prevention approach that has been demonstrated to work in one area of the world is probably a better candidate for success than one that is created locally only on the basis of good will and guesswork. This is particularly the case for interventions and policies that address vulnerabilities that are significant across cultures (e.g. temperament, parental neglect). Moreover, approaches that have failed or even resulted in negative outcomes in some countries are prime candidates for failure and iatrogenic effects elsewhere. Prevention practitioners, policymakers and community members involved in drug prevention and substance abuse prevention have a responsibility to take such lessons into consideration.

What we have is a precious indication of where the right way lies. By using this knowledge and building on it with more evaluation and research, we will be able to provide policymakers with the information they need to develop national prevention systems that are based on scientific evidence and that will support children, young people and adults in different settings to lead positive, healthy and safe lifestyles.

## 4. The International Standards

This document describes the interventions and policies that have been found to result in positive prevention outcomes by the scientific evidence and could serve as the foundation of an effective health-centred national drug prevention system.<sup>5</sup> The International Standards also

---

<sup>5</sup>Throughout the document and for sake of simplicity, drug prevention endeavours are referred to as either “interventions” or “policies”. An intervention refers to a group of activities. This could be a programme that is delivered in a specific setting in addition to the normal activities delivered in that setting (e.g. drug prevention education sessions in schools). However, the same activities could also be delivered as part of the normal functioning of the school (e.g. drug prevention education sessions as part of the normal health promotion curriculum). Normally, the evidence about most interventions has been derived from the evaluation of specific “programmes”, of which there can be many per interventions. For example, there are many programmes aiming at preventing drug use through the improvement of parenting skills (e.g. “Strengthening Families Program”, “Triple-P”, “Incredible Years”, etc.). These are different programmes delivering the same intervention. A policy refers to a regulatory approach either in a setting or in the general population. Examples include policies about substance use in schools or in the workplace or restrictions on the advertising of tobacco or alcohol. Finally, for the sake of summarizing, sometimes the Standards use the term “strategies” to refer to both interventions and policies together (i.e. a strategy can be either an intervention or a policy).

provide an indication as to how interventions and policies should be implemented, drawing on the common characteristics of interventions and policies that have been found to yield positive outcomes. Finally, the document discusses how interventions and policies should exist in the context of national prevention systems supporting and sustaining their development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation on the basis of data and evidence.

## The process of development of the International Standards

The document has been created and published by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) with the assistance of a globally representative group of 85 researchers, policymakers, practitioners, and non-governmental and international organizations. Members of this Group of Experts were in part identified by UNODC because of their research and activities in the field of drug prevention. Additionally, members were nominated by Member States, as they had all been invited to join the process.

Members of the group met twice: in January 2012 to provide general guidance to UNODC on the scope of the process, and in June 2012 to review the evidence collected up to that point and a first draft of the document. The group advised UNODC on the development of methodology for the systematic assessment of the evidence collected. A full description of the methodology used to collect and assess the evidence is described in detail in an appendix to this document (appendix II).<sup>6</sup> The following paragraphs provide a short summary of the methodology to frame the information contained in this document.

The evidence that forms the basis of this document has been contributed by the Group of Experts. Participants in the group provided key works in better researched areas, as well as research that was available on a more limited basis with regard to particular topics or geographical areas. Publications in all languages were accepted, both from academic journals and from reports of organizations. The list of all the 584 studies considered during this process is attached as appendix I.

All received studies were screened to identify the research that reported the efficacy or effectiveness of an intervention or a policy with regard to preventing substance abuse (resulting in 225 studies). In the case of interventions targeting small children, papers reporting effects on important risk and protective factors were also included (31 studies). This is because not all interventions targeting this age group have had the opportunity to follow the participants later in life to see if the intervention had an effect on their subsequent substance abuse. Epidemiological studies discussing prevalence, incidence, vulnerabilities and resilience linked to substance abuse were not included in the process described below, but are included in the references together with studies exploring important issues on substance abuse prevention (268 studies).

Following the screening, studies were categorized according to their methodology: systematic reviews (137), randomized controlled trials (60), and other primary studies such as non-randomized control trials, longitudinal studies, etc. (60). A process of selection was undertaken to reduce the number of studies to be analysed to a more manageable number. All systematic reviews were included, but primary studies (randomized control trials, non-randomized control trials, longitudinal studies and other primary studies) were included

<sup>6</sup>All appendixes and annexes are available on the website of UNODC: <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/prevention/prevention-standards.html>.

only if they provided additional evidence on a specific intervention or policy to that provided by the reviews, particularly with regard to drug use and geographical representation. This resulted in the selection of 16 randomized control trials and 8 other primary studies.

The quality of both the reviews and the selected primary studies was then assessed. The instruments utilized for the assessment are based on those considered to constitute best practice in the medical, social and behavioural field. Studies were assessed to be “good”, “acceptable” and “not acceptable”. Only studies assessed to be “good” or “acceptable” (70 systematic reviews, 10 randomized control trials and 1 other primary study) were analysed. Moreover, only interventions and policies supported by “good” or “acceptable” studies are presented in the International Standards.

However, it is important to note that the quality of the studies is not the same as the actual possible impact of the intervention or policy. There are cases for which “good” systematic reviews concluded that the studies available to them were few or with mixed results. This is indicated in the text by formulations such as “the intervention *might* or *can* prevent substance abuse”.

## The document

Following this introduction, the document is comprised of three main sections. The first describes the interventions and policies that have been found to yield positive outcomes in preventing drug use and substance abuse. Interventions and policies are grouped by the age of the target group, representing a major developmental stage in the life of an individual: pregnancy, infancy and early childhood; middle childhood; early adolescence; adolescence and adulthood.<sup>7</sup>

Some interventions and policies can be targeted at (or are relevant for) more than one age group. In this case, the description is not repeated. They are included under the age for which they are most relevant with a reference to the other developmental stages for which there is also available evidence.

The description of each strategy includes, to the extent possible, the following details:

- A brief description
- The available evidence
- The characteristics that appear to be linked to positive, no or negative outcomes

### Brief description

This subsection briefly describes the intervention or the policy, its main activities and theoretical basis. Moreover, it includes an indication of whether the strategy is appropriate for the population at large (universal prevention), or for groups that are particularly at risk

---

<sup>7</sup>Every child is unique and his or her development will be also influenced by a range of socio-, economic and cultural factors. That is why the ranges referred to by the different ages have not been defined numerically. However, as a general guide, the following could be considered: infancy and early childhood refer to pre-school children, mostly 0-5 years of age; middle childhood refers to primary school children, approximately 6-10 years of age; early adolescence refers to middle school or junior high school years, 11-14; adolescence refers to senior high school, late teen years: 15 to 18/19 years of age; adulthood refers to subsequent years. Although the range has not been used in the Standards for reasons of expediency, young adulthood (college or university years, 20-25 years of age) is also sometimes referred to, as a lot of scientific literature makes reference to it.

(selective prevention), or for individuals that are particularly at risk (indicated prevention, which also includes individuals that might have started experimenting and are therefore at particular risk of progressing to disorders).

#### Available evidence

The text describes what evidence is available and the findings reported in it, by substance. Moreover, wherever available, effect sizes are included, as provided in the original studies. The geographical source of the evidence is indicated to offer policymakers an indication of whether it is already known that a strategy is effective in different geographical settings. Finally, if there is an indication of cost-effectiveness, this is also included in these paragraphs. This part of the text is based exclusively on the studies included in the assessment of the evidence and assessed as “acceptable” or “good”, as described in appendix II. In particular, a table summarizing the characteristics and the findings of the studies has been attached as annex V to appendix II (see footnote 7).

#### Characteristics linked to positive, no and negative outcomes

The document also provides an indication of characteristics that have been found by the Group of Experts to be linked to positive outcomes and, where available, to no or negative outcomes. These indications should not be taken to imply a relation of cause and effect. As noted above, there is not enough evidence to allow for this kind of analysis. Rather, the intention is to suggest the direction that is likely to bring more chances of success according to the collective research and practical experience of the Group of Experts.

Table 1, immediately following this section, summarizes the interventions and policies that have been found to yield positive results in preventing substance abuse by age of the target group and setting, as well as by level of risk and an indication of efficacy. Such an indication combines the strength of the evidence assessed according to the methodology described above with the description of the achievable outcomes as described in section I. It should be emphasized this is purely indicative and should not be taken to imply a prescriptive recommendation by any means.

A second section briefly describes prevention issues where further research is particularly required. This includes interventions and policies for which no acceptable quality evidence was found, but also emerging substance abuse problems, as well as particularly vulnerable groups. Wherever possible, a brief discussion of potential strategies is provided.

The third and final section describes the possible components for an effective national prevention system building on evidence-based interventions and policies and aiming at the healthy and safe development of children and young people. This is another area where further research is urgently needed, as investigations have traditionally focused more on the effectiveness of single interventions and policies. Therefore, the drafting of this section benefited from the expertise and the consensus of the Group of Experts.

Table 1. Summary of interventions and policies that have been found to yield positive results in preventing substance abuse

	Prenatal and infancy	Early childhood	Middle childhood	Early adolescence	Adolescence	Adulthood
<b>Family</b>	<i>Selective</i> Prenatal and infancy visitation ★★					
	<i>Selective</i> Interventions targeting pregnant women with substance abuse disorders ★					
			<i>Universal and selective</i> Parenting skills ★★★★★			
<b>School</b>		<i>Selective</i> Early childhood education ★★★★★				
			<i>Universal</i> Personal and social skills ★★★			



			<p><i>Universal</i> Classroom management ★★★</p>	
			<p><i>Selective</i> Policies to keep children in school ★★</p>	
				<p><i>Universal and selective</i> Prevention education based on personal and social skills and social influences ★★★</p>
				<p><i>Universal</i> School policies and culture ★★</p>
				<p><i>Indicated</i> Addressing individual vulnerabilities ★★</p>
<b>Community</b>				<p><i>Universal</i> Alcohol and tobacco policies ★★★★★</p>
				<p><i>Universal and selective</i> Community-based multi-component initiatives ★★★</p>

Table I. Summary of interventions and policies that have been found to yield positive results in preventing substance abuse (*continued*)

	Prenatal and infancy	Early childhood	Middle childhood	Early adolescence	Adolescence	Adulthood
<b>Community</b> ( <i>continued</i> )				<i>Universal and selective</i> Media campaigns ★		
				<i>Selective</i> Mentoring ★		
					<i>Universal</i> Entertainment venues ★★	
<b>Workplace</b>					<i>Universal, selective and indicated</i> Workplace prevention ★★★	
<b>Health sector</b>				<i>Indicated</i> Brief intervention ★★★★★		

*Notes:* Strategy with an indication of (★ limited/ ★★ adequate/ ★★★ good/ ★★★★★ very good/ ★★★★★★ excellent) efficacy. See previous page for a description of the information implied by this indication. Universal = strategy appropriate for the population at large; selective = strategy appropriate for groups that are particularly at risk; indicated = strategy appropriate for individuals that are particularly at risk.

# I. Drug prevention interventions and policies

## I. Infancy and early childhood

Children's earliest interactions occur in the family before they reach school. They may encounter risks when they experience interaction with parents or caregivers who fail to nurture, have ineffective parenting skills in a chaotic family setting, abuse substances, or suffer from mental health disorders. Sufficient evidence is available showing that the consequences of mothers' intake of alcohol, nicotine and drugs during pregnancy negatively affect developing fetuses. Such deficiencies impede reaching significant developmental competencies and makes a child vulnerable and at risk of negative behaviours later on. By the age of two or three years, children can begin manifesting disruptive behaviours, temper tantrums, are disobedient or demonstrate destructive behaviours. If not properly addressed, these personality traits can become problematic later in life. The key developmental goals for early childhood are the development of safe attachment to the caregivers, age-appropriate language skills, and other executive cognitive functions such as self regulation and pro-social attitudes and skills. The acquisition of these is best supported within the context of a supportive family and community.

### *Interventions targeting pregnant women with substance abuse disorders*

---

#### *Short description*

Pregnancy and motherhood are periods of major and sometimes stressful changes that may make women receptive to addressing their dependence. Evidence-based and comprehensive treatment for substance dependence tailored to the needs of the patient can be accompanied by early parenting training. As substance abuse during pregnancy is dangerous for the mother and for the future child, treatment of pregnant women should be offered as a priority and must follow rigorous clinical guidelines based on scientific evidence.

---

#### *Available evidence*

Two good reviews reported findings with regard to this intervention.<sup>8</sup> According to these studies, providing evidence-based integrated treatment to pregnant women can have a positive impact on child development and emotional and behavioural functioning and on parenting skills. The time frame for the sustainability of these results and the origin of the evidence are not clear.

In addition to this, a good review<sup>9</sup> reported findings with regard to prenatal and infancy visitation for women with alcohol and drug disorders in improving the health of the mother and of the baby, but found insufficient data.

---

<sup>8</sup>Niccols, 2012a and Niccols 2012b.

<sup>9</sup>Turnbull, 2012.

*Characteristics associated with positive prevention outcomes*

Available evidence indicates that the following characteristics are associated with positive prevention outcomes:

- ✓ Providing integrated treatment services to pregnant women who suffer from substance disorders, including concurrent mental health disorders
- ✓ Including attachment-based parenting interventions

*Prenatal and infancy visitation*

---

*Short description*

In these programmes, a trained nurse or social worker visits mothers-to-be and new mothers to provide them with parenting skills and support in addressing a range of issues (health, housing, employment, legal, etc.). Often, these programmes do not target all women, but only some specific groups considered to be at high risk.

---

*Available evidence*

One acceptable randomized control trial reported findings with regard to this intervention. According to this study, these programmes can prevent substance abuse later in life and that they can also be cost-effective in the terms of social welfare and medical costs.<sup>10</sup> The evidence originates from the United States.

---

*Characteristics associated with positive prevention outcomes*

The available evidence indicates that the following characteristics are associated with positive prevention outcomes:

- ✓ Delivered by trained health workers
- ✓ Regular visits up to two years of age of the baby, at first every two weeks, then every month and less towards the end
- ✓ Providing basic parenting skills
- ✓ Supporting mothers to address a range of socio-economic issues (health, housing, employment, legal, etc.)

### *Early childhood education*

---

#### *Short description*

Early education supports the social and cognitive development of pre-school children (2 to 5 years of age) from deprived communities, and is therefore a selective level intervention.

---

#### *Available evidence*

Two good reviews reported findings with regard to this intervention.<sup>11</sup> According to these studies, offering early education services to children growing in disadvantaged communities can reduce marijuana use at age 18 and can also decrease the use of other illicit drugs and smoking. Furthermore, early education can prevent other risky behaviours and support mental health, social inclusion and academic success. All evidence originates from the United States.

---

#### *Characteristics associated with positive prevention outcomes*

The available evidence indicates that the following characteristics are associated with positive prevention outcomes:

- ✓ Improvement of the cognitive, social and language skills of children
- ✓ Daily sessions
- ✓ Delivered by trained teachers
- ✓ Providing support to families on other socio-economic issues

## 2. Middle childhood

During middle childhood increasingly more time is spent away from the family, most often in school and with same age peers. The family still remains the key socialization agent. However, as the role of day-care, schools and peer groups starts to grow, factors such as community norms, school culture and quality of education become increasingly important for safe and healthy emotional, cognitive and social development. The role of social skills and pro-social attitudes grows in middle childhood and they become key protective factors, impacting also the extent to which the school-aged child will cope and bond with school and peers.

Among the main developmental goals in middle childhood are the continued development of age-specific language and numeracy skills, and of impulse control and self control. The development of goal-directed behaviour, together with decision making and problem solving skills, starts. Mental disorders that have their onset during this time period (such as anxiety disorders, impulse control disorder and conduct disorders) may also impede the development of healthy attachment to school, cooperative play with peers, adaptive learning and self-regulation. Children of dysfunctional families often start to affiliate at this time with

---

<sup>11</sup>D'Onise, 2010 and Jones 2006.

deviant peers, thus putting themselves at increased risk of negative life choices, including substance abuse and involvement in illegal activities.

PLEASE NOTE. The same evidence that applies to addressing individual psychological vulnerabilities in early adolescence applies to the same intervention when targeting middle childhood and is not discussed in this section.

---

### *Parenting skills programmes*

---

#### *Short description*

Parenting skills programmes help parents become better parents, in very simple ways. A warm child-rearing style, where parents set rules for acceptable behaviours, closely monitor free time and friendship patterns, help to acquire skills to make informed decisions, and are role models has been shown to be one of the most powerful protective factors against substance abuse and other risky behaviours. These programmes can also be delivered for parents of early adolescents. As the reviews largely cover all ages together, and as principles are largely similar, the intervention is only discussed here. These interventions can be delivered both at the universal and at the selective level.

---

#### *Available evidence*

Nine good reviews and four acceptable reviews reported findings with regard to this intervention.<sup>12</sup> According to these studies, family-based universal programmes prevent alcohol use in young people, the effect size being small but generally consistent and persistent into the medium and long term. There is also strong evidence that these kinds of programmes can prevent self-reported drug use at a follow up of 12 months or more.

Family focused work may be the most potentially effective for vulnerable young people and for young people exhibiting multiple risk factors in producing long-term reductions in substance abuse. Finally, parent and family focused interventions also produce significant and long-term improvements with regard to family functioning (including parenting skills and child behaviour), and may also improve the behaviour, and the emotional and behavioural adjustment of children under the age of three years. Furthermore, there is evidence on cost-effectiveness.

Parenting programmes have been implemented in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America, but only few of these are designed to prevent emotional and behavioural outcomes and/or have a strong methodological design.

---

#### *Characteristics associated with positive prevention outcomes*

Available evidence indicates that the following characteristics are associated with positive prevention outcomes:

- ✓ Enhancing family bonding, i.e. the attachment between parents and children
- ✓ Supporting parents on how to take a more active role in their children's lives, e.g., monitoring their activities and friendships, and being involved in their learning and education

- ✓ Supporting parents on how to provide positive and developmentally appropriate discipline
- ✓ Supporting parents on how to be a role model for their children

Moreover, the following characteristics also appear to be associated with positive prevention outcomes:

- ✓ Organized in a way to make it easy and appealing for parents to participate (e.g. out-of-office hours, meals, childcare, transportation, small prize for completing the sessions, etc.)
- ✓ Typically consisting of a series of sessions (often around 10 sessions, more in the case of work with parents from marginalized or deprived communities or in the context of a treatment programme where one or both parents suffer from substance dependence)
- ✓ Typically including activities for the parents, the children and the whole family
- ✓ Delivered by trained individuals, in many cases without any other formal qualification

---

*Characteristics associated with no or negative prevention outcomes*

- ✗ Undermining parents' authority
- ✗ Using only lecturing as a means of delivery
- ✗ Providing information to parents about drugs so that they can talk about it with their children
- ✗ Focusing exclusively on the child
- ✗ Delivered by poorly trained staff

---

*Existing guidelines and tools for further information*

- UNODC (2010), *Compilation of Evidence-Based Family Skills Training Programmes*, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Vienna, Austria, available at <http://www.unodc.org>
- UNODC (2009), *Guide to implementing family skills training programmes for drug abuse prevention*, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Vienna, Austria, available at <http://www.unodc.org>
- CCSA (2011), *Strengthening Our Skills: Canadian guidelines for youth substance abuse prevention family skills programs*, Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse, Ottawa, ON, Canada, available at <http://www.ccsa.ca>

---

*Personal and social skills education*

*Description*

During these programmes, trained teachers engage children in interactive activities to give them the opportunity to learn and practise a range of personal and social skills. These programmes are typically delivered to all children via a series of structured sessions (i.e. this is a universal level intervention). The programmes provide opportunities to learn skills for coping with difficult situations in daily life in a safe and healthy way. They support the development of general social competencies, including mental and emotional well-being, and also address social norms and attitudes. These programmes do not typically include content regarding specific substances, as in most communities children at this young age have not initiated use. This is not the case everywhere and programmes targeting children who have been

exposed to substances (e.g. inhalants) at this very young age might want to refer to the substance specific guidance included in "Prevention education based on personal and social skills and social influence" under "Early adolescence".

---

#### *Available evidence*

Five good reviews and eight acceptable reviews reported findings with regard to this intervention.<sup>13</sup> According to these studies, supporting the development of personal and social skills in a classroom setting can prevent later drug use and alcohol abuse. Such programmes also influence substance abuse related risk factors, e.g. commitment to school, academic performance, self-esteem and mental well-being, resistance skills and other social skills. Moreover, programmes focusing on improving self-control delivered to children at the age of or younger than 10 reduce general problem behaviours. Besides Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States, the evidence reported above also originates from Africa, Latin America and India.

---

#### *Characteristics associated with positive prevention outcomes*

Available evidence indicates that the following characteristics are associated with positive prevention outcomes:

- ✓ Improving a range of personal and social skills
  - ✓ Delivered through a series of structured sessions, often providing boosters sessions over multiple years
  - ✓ Delivered by trained teachers or facilitators
  - ✓ Sessions are primarily interactive
- 

#### *Characteristics associated with no or negative prevention outcomes*

Available evidence indicates, that the following characteristics are associated with no or negative prevention outcomes:

- ✗ Using non-interactive methods, such as lecturing, as main delivery method
- ✗ Providing information on specific substances, including fear arousal

Moreover, programmes with no or negative prevention outcomes appear to be linked to the following characteristics:

- ✗ Focusing only on the building of self-esteem and on emotional education
- 

#### *Existing guidelines and tools for further information*

- UNODC Guidelines on School Based Education on Drug Abuse Prevention, available at <http://www.unodc.org>
- CICAD Hemispheric Guidelines on School Based Prevention, available at <http://cicad.oas.org>
- Canadian Standards for School-based Youth Substance Abuse Prevention, available at <http://www.ccsa.ca>



### *Classroom environment improvement programmes*

---

#### *Short description*

These programmes strengthen the classroom management abilities of teachers, and support children to become better students, whilst reducing early aggressive and disruptive behaviour. The programmes support teachers in the implementation of a collection of non-instructional classroom procedures in day-to-day practices with all students in order to teach pro-social behaviour and prevent and reduce inappropriate behaviour. These programmes facilitate both academic and socio-emotional learning. They are universal as they target the whole class.

---

#### *Available evidence*

One good review reported findings with regard to this intervention.<sup>14</sup> According to this study, teachers' classroom management practices significantly decrease problem behaviour in the classroom, including disruptive and aggressive behaviour (effect size at classroom level is strong at .8) and strengthen the pro-social behaviour and the academic performance of the children. The time frame for the sustainability of these results is not clear. All evidence reported above originates from the United States and Europe.

---

#### *Characteristics associated with positive prevention outcomes*

Available evidence indicates that the following characteristics are associated with positive prevention outcomes:

- ✓ Often delivered during the first school years
- ✓ Including strategies to respond to inappropriate behaviour
- ✓ Including strategies to acknowledge appropriate behaviour
- ✓ Including feedback on expectations
- ✓ Active engagement of students

### *Policies to keep children in school*

---

#### *Short description*

School attendance, attachment to school and the achievement of age-appropriate language and numeracy skills are important protective factors for children of this age. A variety of policies have been tried in low- and middle-income countries to promote the attendance of children and improve their educational outcomes.

---

<sup>14</sup>Oliver, 2011.

*Available evidence*

Two good reviews<sup>15</sup> reported findings with regard to the following policies: building new schools, providing nutrition in schools and providing economic incentives of various natures to families. According to these studies, these policies increase the attendance of children in school, and improve their language and numeracy skills. Providing simple cash to families does not appear to result in significant outcomes, while conditional transfers do. All this evidence originates from low- and middle-income countries. The time frame for the sustainability of these results is not clear.

### 3. Early adolescence

Adolescence is a developmental period when youth are exposed to new ideas and behaviours through increased associations with people and organizations beyond those experienced in childhood. It is a time to “try out” adult roles and responsibilities. It is also a time when the “plasticity” and malleability of the adolescent brain suggests that, like infancy, this period of development is a time when interventions can reinforce or alter earlier experiences.

The desire to assume adult roles and more independence at a time when significant changes are occurring in the adolescent brain also creates a potentially opportune time for poorly thought out decisions and involvement in potentially harmful behaviours, such as risky sexual behaviours, smoking and drinking, risky driving behaviours and drug use.

The substance abuse and deviant behaviours of peers, as well as rejection by peers, are important influences on healthy behaviour, although the influence of parents still remains significant. Healthy attitudes related to substances and safe social normative beliefs are also important protective factors against drug use. Good social skills and resilient mental and emotional health remain a key protective factor throughout adolescence.

PLEASE NOTE. The same evidence that applies to parenting skills interventions in middle childhood apply to the same interventions and policies when developed for early adolescents and will not be discussed in this section again. Similarly, many of the interventions and policies of relevance to older adolescents can prevent substance abuse in early adolescence, but, for reasons of expediency, they are discussed only in the next session. This applies to alcohol and tobacco policies, media campaigns, brief intervention and community-based multi-component initiatives.

---

*Prevention education based on personal and social skills and social influence*

---

*Short description*

During skills-based prevention programmes, trained teachers engage students in interactive activities to give them the opportunity to learn and practise a range of personal and social skills. These programmes focus on fostering substance and peer refusal abilities that allow young people to counter social pressures to use substances and in general cope with challenging life situations in a healthy way.

In addition, they provide the opportunity to discuss in an age appropriate way, the different social norms, attitudes and positive and negative expectations associated with substance abuse, including the consequences of substance abuse. They also aim to change normative beliefs on substance abuse addressing the typical prevalence and social acceptability of substance abuse among peers. Prevention programmes based on skills enhancement and social influences may also be relevant for adolescents.

---

#### *Available evidence*

Thirteen good reviews, 13 acceptable reviews and 1 acceptable randomized control trial reported findings with regard to this intervention.<sup>16</sup> According to these studies, certain interactive school-based programmes can prevent substance abuse also in the long term (reporting a strong effect size (RR .82) for cannabis use). Such interactive programmes develop personal and social skills and discuss social influences (social norms, expectations, normative beliefs) related to drug use. They generally yield positive results for all substances, as well as for preventing other problem behaviours such as dropping out of school and truancy.

In this context, there are some indications that programmes targeting early adolescents might yield more positive results in preventing substance abuse than programmes targeting younger or older children.

Most of the evidence is on universal programmes, but there is evidence that universal skills-based education can also be preventive among high risk groups.

These programmes are typically delivered by trained facilitators, mostly teachers. However, programmes delivered through computers or the Internet can also reduce substance abuse.

Most of the evidence is from the United States, Europe and Australia. Skills-based prevention programmes also have some evidence on transferability, but as the evidence from low- and middle income countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America is mixed, great caution should be applied at the stage of adaptation and implementation.

---

#### *Characteristics associated with positive prevention outcomes*

Available evidence indicates that the following characteristics are associated with positive prevention outcomes:

- ✓ Using interactive methods
- ✓ Delivered through a series of structured sessions (typically 10-15) once a week, often providing booster sessions over multiple years
- ✓ Delivered by trained facilitator (including also trained peers)
- ✓ Providing an opportunity to practise and learn a wide array of personal and social skills, including particularly coping, decision making and resistance skills, particularly in relation to substance abuse
- ✓ Impact perceptions of risks associated with substance abuse, emphasizing immediate consequences
- ✓ Dispel misconceptions regarding the normative nature and the expectations linked to substance abuse

---

<sup>16</sup>Bühler, 2008; Champion, 2012; Dobbins, 2008; Faggiano, 2005; Faggiano, 2008; Fletcher, 2008; Foxcroft, 2011; Gates, 2006; Jackson, 2012; Jones, 2006; Lemstra, 2010; McGrath, 2006; Moreira, 2009; Müller-Riemenschneider, 2008; Pan, 2009; Porath-Waller, 2010; Ranney, 2006; Reavley, 2010; Roe, 2005; Schröer-Günther, 2011; Skara, 2003; Soole, 2008; Spoth, 2008; Thomas, 2006; Thomas, 2008; West, 2004; Wiehe, 2005.

*Characteristics associated with no or negative prevention outcomes*

Available evidence indicates that the following characteristics are associated with no or negative prevention outcomes:

- X Utilizing non-interactive methods, such as lecturing, as a primary delivery strategy
- X Information-giving alone, particularly fear arousal

Moreover, programmes with no or negative prevention outcomes appear to be linked to the following characteristics:

- X Based on unstructured dialogue sessions
  - X Focusing only on the building of self-esteem and emotional education
  - X Addressing only ethical/moral decision making or values
  - X Using ex-drug users as testimonials
  - X Using police officers to deliver the programme
- 

*Existing guidelines and tools for further information*

- UNODC Guidelines on School Based Education on Drug Abuse Prevention, available at <http://www.unodc.org>
- CICAD Hemispheric Guidelines on School Based Prevention, available at <http://cicad.oas.org>
- Canadian Standards for School-based Youth Substance Abuse Prevention, available at <http://www.ccsa.ca>

*School policies and culture*

---

*Short description*

School policies on substance abuse mandate that substances should not be used on school premises or during school functions and activities by either students or staff. Policies also create transparent and non-punitive mechanisms to address incidents of use transforming them into an educational and health promoting opportunities. Furthermore school policies and school practices may enhance student participation, positive bonding and commitment to school. These interventions and policies are universal, but may also include selective components such as cessation support and referral. They are typically implemented jointly with other prevention interventions, such as skills-based education or supporting parenting skills and parental involvement.

---

*Available evidence*

Three good reviews and one acceptable review reported findings with regard to these policies.<sup>17</sup> According to these studies, substance abuse policies in schools may prevent smoking. Moreover, altering the school environment to increase commitment to school, student participation, and positive social relationships and discourage negative behaviours may reduce drug use and other risky behaviours. In colleges and

universities, addressing school policies and culture among older students during adolescence and adulthood can reduce alcohol abuse, especially when including brief interventions (moderate effect size (SMD .38) in reducing drinking quantities). The time frame for the sustainability of these results is not clear.

School policies have been known to include random drug testing. One acceptable randomized control trial reported findings with regard to this component and reported no significant reductions in drug and alcohol use.<sup>18</sup>

Although most evidence originates from the United States, Europe and Australia, there is also evidence originating from Latin America, Africa and Asia.

---

#### *Characteristics associated with positive prevention outcomes*

- ✓ Supporting normal school functioning, not disruption
- ✓ Supporting positive school ethos, commitment to school and student participation
- ✓ Policies developed with the involvement of all stakeholders (students, teachers, staff, parents)
- ✓ Policies clearly specify the substances that are targeted, as well as the locations (school premises) and/or occasions (school functions) the policy applies to
- ✓ Applied to all in the school (student, teachers, staff, visitors, etc.)
- ✓ Reducing or eliminating access to and availability of tobacco, alcohol, or other drugs
- ✓ Addressing infractions of policies with positive sanctions by providing or referring to counselling, treatment and other health-care and psycho-social services rather than punishing
- ✓ Enforcing consistently and promptly, including positive reinforcement for policy compliance

---

#### *Characteristics associated with no or negative prevention outcomes*

Available evidence indicates that the following characteristics are associated with no or negative prevention outcomes:

- ✗ Inclusion of random drug testing

---

### *Addressing individual psychological vulnerabilities*

#### *Short description*

Some personality traits such as sensation-seeking, impulsivity, anxiety sensitivity or hopelessness, are associated with increased risk of substance abuse. These indicated prevention programmes help adolescents that are particularly at risk to deal constructively with emotions arising from their personalities, instead of using negative coping strategies including harmful alcohol use.

---

<sup>18</sup>Goldberg, 2007.

### *Available evidence*

Four acceptable randomized control trials reported findings with regard to this intervention in early adolescence and adolescence.<sup>19</sup> According to these studies, programmes addressing individual psychological vulnerabilities can lower the rates of drinking (reducing the odds by 29 per cent compared to high risk students in control schools) and binge-drinking (reducing the odds by 43 per cent) at a two-year follow-up.

One good review reported findings with regard to this intervention in middle childhood.<sup>20</sup> According to this study, this type of intervention can impact the individual mediating factors affecting substance abuse later in life, such as self-control.

---

### *Characteristics associated with positive prevention outcomes*

The available evidence indicates that the following characteristics are associated with positive prevention outcomes:

- ✓ Delivered by trained professionals (e.g. psychologist, teacher)
- ✓ Participants have been identified as possessing specific personality traits on the basis of validated instruments
- ✓ Providing participants with skills on how to positively cope with the emotions arising from their personality
- ✓ Short series of sessions (2-5)

## *Mentoring*

---

### *Short description*

“Natural” mentoring in the relationships and interactions between children/adolescents and non-related adults such as teachers, coaches and community leaders has been found to be linked to reduced rates for substance abuse and violence. These programmes match youth, especially from marginalized circumstances (selective prevention), with adults who commit to arrange activities and spend some of their free time with the young people on a regular basis.

---

### *Available evidence*

Two good reviews and one acceptable review reported findings with regard to this intervention.<sup>21</sup> According to these studies, mentoring may prevent alcohol and drug use among high risk youth with results sustained one year after intervention. All evidence is from the United States.

---

### *Characteristics associated with positive prevention outcomes*

- ✓ Providing adequate training and support to mentors
- ✓ Based on a very structured programme of activities

---

<sup>19</sup>Conrod, 2008; Conrod, 2010; Conrod, 2011; Conrod 2013 and O’Leary-Barrett, 2010 reporting on the same trial.

<sup>20</sup>Piquero, 2010.

<sup>21</sup>Bühler, 2008; Thomas, 2011; Tolan, 2008.

## 4. Adolescence and adulthood

As adolescents grow, interventions delivered in settings other than the family and the school, such as the workplace, the health sector, entertainment venues and the community, become more relevant.

PLEASE NOTE: The same evidence that applies to interventions and policies in schools for early adolescents (i.e. class curriculum, addressing individual vulnerabilities, school policies on substance abuse) as well as to mentoring, applies to the same interventions and policies when developed for older adolescents and will not be discussed in this section again.

### *Brief intervention*

---

#### *Short description*

Brief intervention consists of one-to-one counselling sessions that can include follow-up sessions or additional information to take home. They can be delivered by a variety of trained health and social workers to people who might be at risk because of their substance abuse, but who would not necessarily seek treatment. The sessions first identify whether there is a substance abuse problem and provide immediate appropriate basic counselling and/or referral for additional treatment. The sessions are structured and last typically from 5 to 15 minutes.

Brief intervention is typically delivered in the primary health-care system or in emergency rooms, but it has also been found to yield positive results when delivered as part of school-based and workplace programmes, and when delivered online or via computers.

Brief intervention sessions may also use motivational interviewing, which is a psycho-social intervention where the substance abuse of a person is discussed and the patient is supported in making decisions and setting goals about his/her substance abuse. In this case, brief intervention is normally delivered over the course of up to four one-hour sessions.

---

#### *Available evidence*

Ten good reviews, 13 acceptable reviews and 1 acceptable randomized control trial reported findings with regard to this intervention.<sup>22</sup> According to these studies, brief intervention and motivational interviewing can significantly reduce substance abuse also in the long term. This evidence is of high quality, and the effect sizes for alcohol and drug use are strong immediately after intervention (standardized mean difference = 0.79), sustaining substantially over time one year after the intervention (standardized mean difference = 0.15).

Brief intervention and motivational interviewing benefit both adolescents and adults alike, but for women the evidence on long-term impact on alcohol use is inconclusive suggesting larger effects for men. Even single session, brief intervention or motivational interviewing can produce significant and lasting outcomes. A longer duration of counselling does not appear to add additional gains. Brief intervention has

---

<sup>22</sup>Ballesteros, 2004; Beich, 2003; Bertholet, 2005; Carney, 2012; Christakis, 2003; Dunn, 2001; Emmen, 2004; Fager, 2004; Gates, 2006; Humeniuk, 2012; Jensen, 2011; Jones, 2006; Kahan, 1995; Kaner, 2007; Khadjesari, 2010; McQueen, 2011; Nilsen, 2008; Riper, 2009; Smedslund, 2011; Tait, 2003; Vasilaki, 2006; Wachtel, 2010; White, 2010; Wilk, 1997. (place as source beneath Available evidence. Re-number footnotes)

been found to be cost-effective and transferable. Besides evidence from the United States, Europe and Australia/New Zealand and trials in Africa, ASSIST, the brief intervention package developed by WHO, has also been tested Latin America and Asia.

---

#### *Characteristics associated with positive prevention outcomes*

- ✓ One-to-one session identifies if there is a substance abuse problem and provides immediate basic counselling and/or referral
  - ✓ Delivered by a trained professional
- 

#### *Existing guidelines and tools for further information*

- The Alcohol, Smoking and Substance Involvement Screening Test (ASSIST) package for primary health-care professionals and their patients., available at <http://www.who.int>

### *Workplace prevention programmes*

---

#### *Short description*

The vast majority of substance abuse occurs among working adults. Substance abuse disorders expose employees to health risks and difficulties in their relationship with fellow employees, friends and family, as well as, more specifically to the workplace, to safety risks. Young adults are at particularly high risk, as job strain has been found to significantly increase the risk of becoming drug dependent among young adults using drugs. Employers also bear the significant costs of substance abuse. Employees with substance abuse problems have higher absenteeism rates and lower productivity, are more likely to cause accidents, and have higher health-care costs and turnover rates. Moreover, employers have a duty to provide and maintain a safe and healthy workplace in accordance with the applicable law and regulations.<sup>23</sup> Prevention programmes in the workplace are typically multi-component, including prevention elements and policies, as well as counselling and referral to treatment.

---

#### *Available evidence*

One good and one acceptable review reported findings with regard to this intervention. According to these studies, workplace prevention programmes can prevent tobacco and alcohol use. The time frame for the sustainability of these results is not clear. Although interesting experiences have been implemented in Latin America, Asia and Africa, evidence originates from the United States, Australia and Europe.

---

#### *Characteristics associated with positive prevention outcomes*

- ✓ Developed with the involvement of all stakeholders (employers, management, employees)
- ✓ Guaranteeing confidentiality to employees
- ✓ Including and based on a policy on substance abuse in the workplace that has been developed by all stakeholders and is non-punitive



- ✓ Providing brief intervention (including web-based), as well as counselling, referral to treatment and reintegration services to employees who need them
- ✓ Including a clear communication component
- ✓ Embedded in other health or wellness-related programmes (e.g. for the prevention of cardiovascular diseases)
- ✓ Including stress management courses
- ✓ Training managers, employees and health workers in fulfilling their roles in the programme
- ✓ Including alcohol and drug testing only as part of a comprehensive programme with the characteristics described in the above bullet points

---

#### *Existing guidelines and tools for further information*

- ILO (2012), SOLVE training package: Integrating health promotion into workplace OSH policies, Programme on Safety and Health at Work and the Environment (SAFEWORK), International Labour Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, available at <http://www.ilo.org>
- UNODC in cooperation with ILO (forthcoming), Guidelines on workplace prevention programmes.
- CICAD (2009), CICAD Hemispheric Guidelines In Workplace Prevention.

### *Tobacco and alcohol policies*

---

#### *Short description*

Tobacco and alcohol use, dependence and associated disorders, are much more prevalent than drug use disorders and the global burden of disease is much higher. Their use in early adolescence, when the brain is still developing, considerably increases the likelihood of developing substance use disorders and addiction later in life. Moreover, young people who use drugs, often also use alcohol in excessive quantities and/or in combination with other substances. That is why efforts to prevent and reduce tobacco and alcohol use by young people, including harmful patterns of use, are relevant to an overall drug prevention strategy, besides being crucial to any public health policy.

---

#### *Available evidence*

Six good reviews and six acceptable reviews reported findings with regard to alcohol policies,<sup>24</sup> while five good reviews and four acceptable reviews reported findings with regard to tobacco policies.<sup>25</sup> According to these studies, raising the price of alcohol and tobacco reduces their consumption in the general population. With regard to alcohol, the impact appears to affect both moderate and heavy drinkers and an increase of 10 per cent has been found to be associated with a 7.7 per cent decrease in alcohol consumption. With regard to tobacco, an increase of 10 per cent results in 3.7 per cent fewer smokers. Raising prices has also been found to reduce heavy drinking among college students and tobacco consumption among adolescents and college students. Higher tobacco prices appear to impact lower-income populations as well. Finally, higher alcohol prices are associated with decreased violence.

<sup>24</sup>Anderson, 2009; Bühler, 2008; Campbell, 2009; Elder, 2010; Hahn, 2010; Hahn, 2012; Middleton, 2010; Popova, 2009; Rammohan, 2011; Smith, 2009; Spoth, 2008, Wagenaar & Toomey, 2002.

<sup>25</sup>Bühler, 2008; Callinan, 2010; Hopkins, 2001; Lovato, 2011; NCI, 2008; Ranney, 2006; Richardson, 2009; Stead, 2005; Thomas, 2008.

Raising the minimum legal drinking age reduces alcohol consumption, while with regard to tobacco the available evidence is more mixed. Comprehensive interventions achieving high compliance by vendors might impact tobacco use by youth, especially girls and those who have passed the initial stages of tobacco uptake (the others more usually accessing tobacco through friends). The time frame for the sustainability of these results is not clear.

Inconclusive findings are reported with regard to increasing alcohol retailer liability on the consumption of alcohol.

Increased exposure to alcohol advertising increases the probability of starting to drink among adolescents and can increase levels of consumption among existing drinkers. Similarly, tobacco advertising and promotion are linked to increased initiation of tobacco use. A long-term ban on the advertising of tobacco products prevents consumption.

Although most evidence reported above originates from the United States/Canada, Europe, Australia, some evidence for tobacco policies also originates from East Asia and Southern Africa.

---

#### *Characteristics associated with positive prevention outcomes*

- ✓ Increasing the price of tobacco and alcohol through taxation; in the case of alcohol policies, outcomes might be not as strong as in the case of countries where the vast majority of the production and consumption is unrecorded
- ✓ Increasing in the minimum age of sale of tobacco and alcohol products
- ✓ Preventing the sale of tobacco and alcohol to young people under the legal age through comprehensive programmes including active and ongoing law enforcement and education of retailers through a variety of strategies (personal contact, media and information materials)
- ✓ Banning advertising of tobacco and restricting advertising of alcohol to youth

#### *Community-based multi-component initiatives*

---

##### *Short description*

At the community level, mobilization efforts to create partnerships, task forces, coalitions, action groups, etc. bring together different actors in a community to address substance abuse. Some community partnerships are spontaneous. However, the existence of community partnerships on a large scale is normally the product of a special programme providing financial and technical support to communities to deliver and sustain evidence-based prevention interventions and policies over time. Community-based initiatives are normally multi-component, taking place in different settings (e.g. schools, families, media, enforcement, etc.).

---

##### *Available evidence*

Seven good reviews and six acceptable reviews reported findings with regard to this intervention. According to these studies, community-based multi-component initiatives can prevent the use of drugs, alcohol and tobacco. Although most evidence reported above originates from the United States and Canada, Europe and Australia, few studies on community-based multi-component initiatives, particularly with regard to tobacco, originate from Asia.

*Characteristics associated with positive prevention outcomes*

- ✓ Supporting the enforcement of tobacco and alcohol policies
- ✓ Working in a range of community settings (families and schools, workplace, entertainment venues, etc.)
- ✓ Involving universities to support the implementation of evidence-based programmes and their monitoring and evaluation
- ✓ Adequate training and resources are provided to the communities
- ✓ Initiatives are sustained in the medium term (e.g. longer than a year)

*Existing guidelines and tools for further information*

- CCSA (2010), Community-Based Standards, Canadian Standards for Youth Substance Abuse Prevention, Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse, Ottawa, Canada, available at <http://www.ccsa.ca>

*Media campaigns**Short description*

Media campaigns are often the first and/or only intervention delivered by policymakers concerned with preventing the use of drugs in a population, as they are visible and have the potential to reach a large number of people relatively easily.

*Available evidence*

Three good reviews and three acceptable reviews, reported findings with regard to this intervention.<sup>26</sup> According to these studies, media campaigns, in combination with other prevention components, can prevent tobacco use (reporting median reduction of 2.4 per cent). However, no significant findings were reported for alcohol abuse, and only weak findings with regard to drug use.

*Characteristics associated with positive prevention outcomes*

- ✓ Precisely identifying the target group of the campaign
- ✓ Based on a solid theoretical basis
- ✓ Designing messages on the basis of strong formative research
- ✓ Strongly connecting to other existing drug prevention programmes in the home, school and community
- ✓ Achieving adequate exposure of the target group for an adequate period of time
- ✓ Systematically evaluated, including throughout the campaign to adjust messages for maximal effect
- ✓ Targeting parents, as this appears to have an independent effect on children too
- ✓ Aiming at changing cultural norms about substance abuse and/or educating about the consequences of substance abuse and/or suggesting strategies to resist substance abuse

<sup>26</sup>Bühler, 2008; Ferri, 2013, (in press); Hopkins, 2001; NCI, 2008; Ranney, 2006.

*Characteristics associated with no or negative prevention outcomes*

- ✗ Media campaigns that are badly designed or poorly resourced should be avoided as they can worsen the situation by making the target group resistant to or dismissive of other interventions and policies.

---

*Entertainment venues*

---

*Short description*

Entertainment venues include bars, clubs or restaurants as well as outdoor or special settings where large-scale events may occur. These venues can have both positive and negative impacts on the health and well-being of citizens, as they provide social meeting spaces and support the local economy, but at the same time, they are identified as high risk settings for many risk behaviours, such as harmful alcohol use, drug use, drugged driving and aggression. Work in this setting is a rapidly emerging area of research.

Most prevention programmes utilizing entertainment venues have multiple components including different combinations of training of staff and managers on responsible beverage service (RBS) and management of intoxicated patrons; changes in laws and policies, e.g. with regard to serving alcohol to minors or to intoxicated persons, or with regard to drinking and driving; high visibility enforcement of existing laws and policies; communication to raise awareness and acceptance of the programme and to change attitudes and norms; and, offering treatment to managers and staff.

---

*Available evidence*

Two acceptable reviews reported findings with regard to this intervention.<sup>27</sup> According to these studies, training of staff, policy interventions and enforcement may reduce intoxication. It should be noted that evidence on the impact of these interventions on health and social consequences (e.g. car accidents or violence) was not reviewed, while it appears to be significant. The time frame for the sustainability of these results is also not clear. All evidence originates from the United States/Canada, Europe and Australia.

---

*Characteristics associated with positive prevention outcomes*

- ✓ Training staff and management on responsible serving and handling of intoxicated clients
- ✓ Providing counselling and treatment for staff and management who need it
- ✓ Including a strong communication component to raise the awareness and the acceptance of the programme
- ✓ Including the active participation of the law enforcement, health and social sectors
- ✓ Enforcing existing laws and policies on substance abuse in the venues and in the community

---

*Existing guidelines and tools for further information*

- UNODC, ATS prevention guide for policymakers
- CICAD report: insights for a drugged driving policy, available at <http://www.cicad.oas.org>

## II. Prevention issues requiring further research

### *Sports and other leisure time activities*

In many countries and communities, it is popular to organize sports and other drug or substance free leisure time activities as a way to give adolescents pro-social and healthy pursuits, preventing them from engaging in risky behaviours including drug use. However, in fact, there is evidence that sport per se is not always associated with lower rates of substance abuse and that it has been linked to higher rates of smoking and binge drinking.

The review of literature could find two good and one acceptable review reporting that practically no studies are available assessing the impact of organized sports or other leisure time activities on substance abuse or on mediating factors among children. Promising studies are being reviewed with regard to positive experiences in including a substance abuse prevention component in sports coaching. Policymakers should therefore exercise the utmost caution on choosing to implement this kind of intervention, including a strong research component to assess the impact.

Some additional indications on how sports could be used to pursue preventing objectives can be found at UNODCCP (2002), *Sport – Using sport for drug abuse prevention*, United Nations Office on Drug Control and Crime Prevention, Vienna, Austria and UNODC (2003), *EVERYONE WINS! Helping coaches, teachers and youth leaders lead a module on fair play*, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Vienna, Austria.

### *Preventing the non-medical use of prescription drugs*

The non-medical use of prescription drugs controlled under the Conventions is an increasing problem in many countries, so is the abuse of some drugs that are sold over the counter. In some countries, this challenge is second only to cannabis use. Although most notably visible in North America, there are reports of significant treatment demand in Europe, Africa, South Asia and Latin America. Depending on the country and the kind of substance, some more vulnerable groups (such as young people, women, older adults, health-care professionals, but also street children and civilians and armed forces in post-conflict situations) appear to be particularly at risk. Moreover, the health and social consequences of the non-medical use of prescription drugs can be as serious as those deriving from the use of other illicit drugs.

The review of the scientific evidence could not find acceptable or good reviews. Much of the evidence presented in the previous section refers to interventions that address vulnerabilities and resiliences that are not specific to a psychoactive substance. In this context, and as it is to be expected, a number of primary studies with regard to family and school based interventions are being assessed reporting positive outcomes also with regard to the non-medical use of prescription drugs.

Sourcing of prescription drugs occurs through double doctoring, fraud, theft, the Internet and via family and friends. Therefore, in addition to these interventions, it may seem reasonable to assume that all of these sources present opportunities for prevention.

There are some indications that providing authoritative advice to physicians, as well as restricting and monitoring prescriptions and creating registers will change their prescribing behaviour and will limit access to these medications to patients that need them. Given the great influence of parents on youth, and given that many individuals report sourcing these substances from family members, targeting parents to raise their awareness of the need to use prescription drugs only under medical supervision, both for themselves and their children, might be a promising approach. Practical steps in the community to safely dispose of prescription drugs that are out-dated or no longer being used by the intended recipient might be promising. Finally, health-care professionals might need to be trained on an ongoing basis on how to prevent, recognize and manage the non-medical use of prescription drugs and related consequences.

Some additional indications on possible interventions and policies to prevent the non-medical use of prescription drugs can be found at UNODC (2011), *The non-medical use of prescription drugs, policy direction issues*, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Vienna, Austria (available at <http://www.unodc.org>) and CICAD (2012), *Guide to preventing prescription drug abuse*, Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission, Washington D.C., USA (available at <http://www.cicad.oas.org>).

### *Interventions and policies targeting children and youth particularly at risk*

The review of the literature could not find acceptable or good reviews or primary studies on how to prevent substance abuse among these children and youth particularly at risk, in spite of evidence indicating that they are often exposed to drugs at a very young age. This group includes, for example, out-of-school children and young people, street children, current and ex-child soldiers, children and young people of displaced or post-conflict populations, children and young people in foster care, in orphanages and in the juvenile justice system. UNODC is testing a protocol (available on demand) to provide indicated prevention to children exposed to drugs at a very young age in Afghanistan.

### *Prevention of the use of new psychoactive substances not controlled under the Conventions*

Many countries have witnessed the recent rise in the use of new psychoactive substances that are not controlled under the Conventions (so called “legal highs” or “smart drugs”)<sup>28</sup>. None of the studies reviewed reported outcomes on the prevention of such substances. However, it should be noted that, as in the case of the non-medical use of prescription drugs, most prevention based on scientific evidence is not substance specific. This is particularly true of strategies that address vulnerabilities early in life or that strengthen positive coping skills to prevent people resorting to negative coping skills, such as substance abuse. Therefore, it seems reasonable to consider that such strategies might also be effective in preventing the use of these new psychoactive substances. However, this is another area where rigorous research would appear to be necessary.

### III. Characteristics of an effective prevention system

An effective national drug prevention system delivers an integrated range of interventions and policies based on scientific evidence, in multiple settings, targeting relevant ages and levels of risk. This should come as no surprise given the complex interplay of factors that make children, youth and adults alike, vulnerable to substance abuse and other risky behaviours. It is not possible to address such vulnerabilities by simply implementing a single prevention intervention that is often isolated and limited in its timeframe and reach. Let us not forget that the overarching goal here is to support the healthy and safe development of individuals.

To deliver an integrated range of interventions and policies, a system requires strong structural foundations, which are briefly described in this section and include:<sup>29</sup>

- A supportive policy and legal framework
- Scientific evidence and research
- Coordination of multiple sectors and levels (national, sub-national and municipal/local) involved
- Training of policymakers and practitioners
- Commitment to provide adequate resources and to sustain the system in the long term

#### I. Range of interventions and policies based on evidence

The previous section provided a comprehensive review of the interventions and policies that have been found to yield positive results in preventing substance abuse. Strategies differ in three main areas: the age of the target group, the level of risk of the target group and the setting in which the strategy is delivered. An effective system delivers a range of evidence-based interventions and policies in order to:

- Support children and youth throughout their development and particularly at critical transition periods where they are most vulnerable, e.g. infancy and early childhood, at the transition between childhood and adolescence.
- Target the population at large (universal prevention), but also support groups (selective prevention) and individuals (indicated prevention) that are particularly at risk.
- Address both individual and environmental factors of vulnerability and resilience.
- Reach the population through multiple settings (e.g. families, schools, communities, the workplace, etc.).

---

<sup>29</sup>The reader might also want to refer to the EMCDDA (2011), European drug prevention quality standards, European Monitoring Centre on Drugs and Drug Addiction, Lisbon, Portugal, that also contain a discussion of these issues (available at <http://www.emcdda.europa.eu>).

## 2. Supportive policy and regulatory framework

No programme, no policy can exist in a vacuum. As noted in the introduction, drug prevention is but one of the fundamental components of a health-centred system focused on ensuring that drugs are available for medical and research purposes while preventing diversion and drug use and that other psychoactive substances do not impact on the burden of health. In this respect, an effective national system would be:

- Embedded in a comprehensive and health-centred system of drug control focused on ensuring the availability of drugs for medical and research purposes, whilst preventing diversion and drug use, thus including supply reduction, treatment, care and rehabilitation of drug dependence, and, prevention of the health and social consequences of drug use (e.g. HIV/AIDS, Hepatitis C, overdoses, etc.).
- Based on the understanding of drug dependence as a chronic and relapsing disorder impacting the brain that is caused by the complex interaction of genetic, biological and psychological vulnerabilities with the environment and needs to be treated and not punished.
- Linked to a public health national strategy for the healthy and safe development of children, young people and adults, including the prevention, treatment and care of substance abuse, as well as the prevention of other unhealthy or risky behaviours.

Moreover, the delivery of programmes by both governmental and non-governmental agencies can be greatly enhanced if it is mandated and supported at the national level by appropriate regulation, including:

- National standards for drug use and substance abuse prevention interventions and policies;
- National professional standards for drug and substance prevention practitioners;
- A policy requiring schools to implement substance abuse prevention education and policies in the context of health or personal/ social education and promotion, including standards on how to do so;
- A policy requiring employers to implement substance abuse workplace prevention policies or programmes, including standards on how to do so;
- A policy requiring health, social and education services to support families to nurture the physical, cognitive and emotional development of their children;
- A strong local and national surveillance and monitoring data system to inform policy makers at all levels, practitioners and researchers about emerging substance abuse patterns (different substances being used, existing substances being used in new ways (e.g., injection of crack), or new population groups being involved) and a review process to inform both prevention and treatment programming.

## 3. A strong basis on research and scientific evidence

An effective national drug prevention system should both be based on scientific evidence and support research efforts to contribute to the evidence base. There are two dimensions to this. On the one hand, interventions and policies should be chosen on the basis of an accurate understanding of what the situation really is. This systemic approach will include



identifying the population that is most vulnerable or starting to use substances, possible reasons for why they are initiating use, and which interventions and policies most closely respond to this situation. On the other hand, the effectiveness and, whenever possible, the cost effectiveness of delivered interventions and policies, needs to be rigorously evaluated. Results of this rigorous evaluation will allow decision-makers to know the impact on outcomes such as decreasing initiation of drug use and to inform and expand the base of knowledge related to prevention interventions. It is also important that this research and its findings be peer-reviewed, published and discussed to the extent possible.

### *Evidence-based planning*

With regard to the first dimension, an information system should be in place to provide the necessary understanding of the situation, as well as opportunities to use this knowledge to plan. To address this dimension, an effective national prevention system would include:

- An information system regularly collecting and monitoring information:
  - Prevalence: what percentages of people (by age, gender and other important characteristics) are using which substance(s)? How often and how much? What are the health and social consequences?
  - Initiation of use and transition to disorders: at what age are people (especially young people) initiating the use of drugs and/other substances? When are they transitioning to a substance abuse disorder?
  - Vulnerabilities: why are people, especially young people, initiating the use of drugs and/or abuse other substances? What is the situation among children with regard to factors that are known to be linked to substance abuse (e.g. poor parenting, mental health problems, poor attachment to school, violence and abuse, etc.)? Why are people that have started to use drugs transitioning to disorders (what are the factors that make them vulnerable to doing so)?
- A formal mechanism to regularly feed the data generated by the information system into a systemic planning process that will in turn consider:
  - Strategies needed: which evidence-based interventions and policies have been effective addressing the identified situation?
  - Availability and coverage of existing strategies: which of these interventions and policies are currently being implemented? What percentage of the population who need them are reached by these interventions and policies?
  - Quality of existing strategies: are ongoing interventions and policies based on scientific evidence (this refers to both the scientific understanding of the vulnerabilities addressed and/or the systematic adaptation of existing evidence-based programmes)?
  - Effectiveness of existing strategies: have the strategies been evaluated (see below) and, if so, what are the results? What do the data generated by the information system tell us with regard to the effectiveness of the prevention system as whole?
  - Available infrastructures and resources that could be utilized as part of the national prevention system.
  - What are the gaps between the strategies needed and the availability, coverage, quality and effectiveness of the existing systemic strategies, infrastructures and resources?

### *Research and planning*

The second dimension pertains to the evaluation of specific prevention programmes and policies. As noted, the evidence-based strategies identified in the previous section are not necessarily appropriate to the target, to the level of resources, or to the cultural environment reflected at the national level, although in many cases they will be. There may be other programmes or policies that more successfully address these issues. It is imperative that selected programmes and policies:

- Be based on a scientific understanding of the vulnerabilities addressed. In other words and as an example, it is strongly desirable that programmes and policies are created to address a risk factor or situation that has been found to be linked to increased initiation (or earlier onset or higher prevalence of substance abuse) by scientific research and a needs assessment, not by the feelings of an individual, however well intentioned and concerned.
- Include a scientific monitoring and evaluation component in order to assess whether these interventions result in the desired outcome. This would suggest the importance of collaboration with academic and research institutions (including, but not limited to, universities), as well as the use of an experimental or quasi experimental design. In the field of medicine, no intervention would be used unless scientific research had found it to be effective and safe. The same should go for drug prevention interventions and policies.

It should be noted that in the Standards, the intention was to provide an indication of the effectiveness, or at least the efficacy, of kinds of interventions and policies, without referring to specific evidence-based programmes. However, the evidence originates in the evaluation of specific programmes and this means that it can never be assumed that a strategy that is “basically similar” to an evidence-based one will be as effective. For example, while there may be evidence for “prenatal and infancy visitation programmes” overall, some particular ones of that type are quite effective and other particular ones of that type have been showing to be ineffective, even though they may have some of the “proven” characteristics of the type. This is another reason why evaluation becomes so crucial.

In this context, the reader is referred to the European drug prevention quality standards recently published by the EMCDDA, which provides exhaustive guidance on the improvement of the quality of drug prevention programmes with regard to these, and other, phases of the programme cycle, as well as to the Canadian portfolio of standards.<sup>30</sup>

This is not to say that, in the case of implementation of an evidence-based programme belonging to the interventions described in the previous section, evaluation would be any less important. Indeed, in the case of adaptation of existing evidence-based programmes, it is suggested that the process includes:

- A careful and systematic process of adaptation that does not touch the core components of the programme, while making it more acceptable to the new socio-economic/cultural context. Ideally, this would take place with the support of the developers of the programme. In this context, the UNODC Guide on family skills training contains a chapter solely devoted to adaptation.

---

<sup>30</sup>EMCDDA (2011), European drug prevention quality standards, European Monitoring Centre on Drugs and Drug Addiction, Lisbon, Portugal, available at <http://www.emcdda.europa.eu>; and Canadian Standards for Youth Substance Abuse Prevention, available at <http://www.ccsa.ca>.

- A scientific monitoring and evaluation component in order to assess whether the programme is actually effective in the new socio-economic/cultural context.

#### 4. Different sectors involved at different levels

National drug prevention systems are about ensuring children, young people and adults have the opportunity to lead healthy and safe lifestyles in multiple settings. Therefore, the national sectors to be involved in the delivery of systemic prevention interventions and policies are many and necessitate clear role definition and coordination.

A national drug prevention system would therefore involve relevant national sectors (e.g. education, health, social welfare, youth, labour, law enforcement, etc.) in the planning, delivery, monitoring and evaluation of its components:

- Integrated levels of consistent implementation: national (federal), sub-national (state/regional/district), and municipal, local).
- Full spectrum of key stakeholders: this could include, but is not limited to, national and sub-national administration, municipal or local, governmental service delivery agencies, non-governmental agencies, residents and community leaders, religious communities and leaders, universities and other research institutions, and the private sector.
- Structured and well-defined roles and responsibilities for all stakeholders: there is great value in a partnership of various stakeholders working together and taking responsibility for different elements of policy development and implementation.
- A strong lead and coordinating agency.

It should be noted that there is not one single way of organizing the delivery of evidence-based prevention strategies. For example, they need not necessarily be carried out in the form of programmes, but can also be integrated into the everyday work of institutions and services such as the school, youth work and health and social services. In this case, strategies are planned, managed and coordinated centrally, while the implementation relies on local multi-professional coordination. Other possible examples of how different levels could interact would include:

- Policymakers at the national level coordinating the development of the national policies, setting the quality standards and supporting the infrastructure for implementation through adequate funding for the delivery of strategies and for the training for relevant stakeholders.
- Policymakers and/or agencies at the local level delivering interventions and policies, feeding data to the information system, and actively improve their knowledge and skills.
- NGOs, residents and community leaders (which could include religious communities and leaders) mobilizing for changes in or acceptance of policies, influencing community norms, delivering evidence-based interventions and policies; it should be noted that community mobilization has been found to be an effective and participatory mechanism to realize evidence-based strategies.
- Universities and research institutions analysing data to feed a better understanding of the substance abuse situation and to monitor and evaluate the national policies, evaluating specific interventions and policies.

- Private sector actively supporting prevention in the workplace and contributing to evidence-based and innovative interventions, and operators in alcohol and tobacco industries and marketing taking effective measures to prevent and reduce harm in their practices, including self-regulatory actions.

## 5. Strong infrastructure of the delivery system

To be delivered effectively, interventions and policies must be supported by adequate resources:


- Agencies delivering interventions and policies need to be adequately financed.
- Practitioners delivering intervention and policies need to be adequately trained on an ongoing basis.
- Policymakers at different levels planning and developing interventions and enforcing policies need to be adequately trained on an ongoing basis.
- Technical assistance should be provided on an ongoing basis to support implementation and continuous quality improvements.
- Academic and research institutions need to be adequately financed.

## 6. Sustainability

Drug prevention is effective and cost-effective, but, as with all policies, there needs to be a visible medium- to long-term investment to realize its potential. In this respect, the following are ways in which the action of the components mentioned above should be sustained:

- A mechanism of review and adjustment of the national prevention system at regular intervals
- Delivery of evidence-based interventions and policies planned and resourced to be active at least in the medium term
- Regular collection of data through the information system, including feedback into the planning/review process
- Continuous support to research for the rigorous evaluation of interventions and policies
- Continuous support to the training of practitioners and policymakers involved in the planning, delivery, monitoring and evaluation of drug prevention strategies

Figure I. Schematic representation of a national drug prevention system









# UNODC

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime

Vienna International Centre, P.O. Box 500, 1400 Vienna, Austria  
Tel.: (+43-1) 26060-0, Fax: (+43-1) 26060-5866, [www.unodc.org](http://www.unodc.org)