

20 February 2020

English only

Commission on Narcotic Drugs**Sixty-third session**

Vienna, 2–6 March 2020

Item 5 (a) of the provisional agenda*

Implementation of the international drug control treaties: changes in the scope of control of substances**Changes in the scope of control of substances: proposed scheduling recommendations by the World Health Organization^{**,**}****Note by the Secretariat**

1. In accordance with article 3 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 as amended by the 1972 Protocol (1961 Convention), the Commission will have before it for consideration recommendations by the World Health Organization (WHO) to place crotonylfentanyl and valeryl fentanyl in Schedule I of the 1961 Convention. Further, pursuant to article 2, paragraphs 1 and 4, of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 (1971 Convention), the Commission will have before it for consideration recommendations by the WHO to add DOC to Schedule I of the 1971 Convention, AB-FUBINACA, 5F-AMB-PINACA (5F-AMB, 5F-MMB-PINACA), 5F-MDMB-PICA (5F-MDMB-2201), 4-F-MDMB-BINACA, 4-CMC (4-chloromethcathinone; clephedrone), N-ethylhexedrone and Alpha-PHP to Schedule II of the 1971 Convention and flualprazolam and etizolam to Schedule IV of the 1971 Convention.
2. In accordance with article 3, paragraphs 1 and 3, of the 1961 Convention, and article 2, paragraphs 1 and 4, of the 1971 Convention, the Director-General of WHO, in the correspondence dated 15 November 2019, notified the Secretary-General of these recommendations.
3. Pursuant to article 3, paragraph 2, of the 1961 Convention, and article 2, paragraph 2, of the 1971 Convention, on 2 December 2019, the Secretary-General transmitted to all States parties to the 1961 Convention and the 1971 Convention a note verbale, to which the notification and the information submitted by WHO in support of its recommendations were annexed.
4. As at the deadline of 31 January 2020, the Governments of the following nine State parties had provided comments considered to be relevant to the WHO recommendations under the 1961 Convention and the 1971 Convention: Argentina,

* E/CN.7/2020/1.

** This conference room paper is to be read in conjunction with document E/CN.7/2020/10.

*** This document has not been edited.



Colombia, El Salvador, Germany, Ireland, Jordan, the Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia and Uruguay.

5. The Government of Argentina stated that it had no objections with regard to the recommendations.

6. The Government of Colombia indicated its support for the recommendations, as there was a strong likelihood of these chemical substances being used for illicit recreational purposes, thus representing a potential risk to public health in Colombia. Further, it was noted that placing etizolam under international control was not considered to pose a risk to the potential manufacture or supply of raw materials or the manufacture of preparations of etizolam for medical purposes.

7. The Government of El Salvador indicated no objections with regard to the recommendations, as there was no information on therapeutic use of these substances in El Salvador.

8. Subject to the pending decision of the Council of the European Union in this regard, the Government of Germany stated that it had no objections to the placement of the aforementioned substances under international control.

9. The Government of Ireland stated that it had no objections to the recommendations, as the twelve substances recommended for scheduling did not have therapeutic uses in Ireland nor did they have legitimate uses.

10. The Government of Jordan supported the addition of 1-AB-FUBINACA, 2-5F-MDMB-PICA (5F-MDMB-2201) and 3-4F-MDMB-BINACA to Schedule II of the 1971 Convention. The Government further indicated that it had no comments regarding the other substances.

11. The Government of the Russian Federation reported that it had no objections to the scheduling recommendations. It indicated that all of the substances recommended for inclusion in the 1961 Convention and the 1971 Convention, except for flualprazolam, were already under national control.

12. The Government of Saudi Arabia indicated its support to the scheduling of the recommended substances to be added under the 1961 Conventions and the 1971 Convention. It stated that the scheduling would be adequate and there would be no economic, social, legal or administrative impact of their inclusion to the mentioned conventions, as it would not contradict with the measures applied on violations of the regulation system and executive rules of narcotic and psychoactive substances.

13. The Government of Uruguay indicated its support for the inclusion of the aforementioned substances in the schedules of the 1961 Convention and 1971 Convention as recommended by WHO, given that these substances had no proven therapeutic uses but might pose a risk to public health and society, and had harmful effects similar to those substances were currently subject to control.
