JOINT SUBMISSION BY AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL AND HARM REDUCTION INTERNATIONAL TO THE EXPERT PANEL ESTABLISHED PURSUANT TO COMMISSION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS RESOLUTION 68/6

15 November 2026

This submission has been jointly prepared by Amnesty International and Harm Reduction International, two international organizations campaigning for the full abolition of the death penalty. For years, our organizations have been joining efforts to highlight the unlawful and arbitrary use of this cruel punishment specifically for drug-related offences, including before the UN Commission on Narcotic Drugs (CND).

Research carried out independently and separately by our organizations indicates that drug-related executions have been increasing in recent years, representing more than 40% of the total number of executions recorded worldwide.[1] Drug control has been a significant driver of the use of this punishment globally; and in several countries.[2]

Although the use of the death penalty for drug-related offences has long been unlawful under international human rights law and standards, several governments have justified its retention in the name of drug control.[3]

Our organizations submit to the Expert Panel established pursuant to CND resolution 68/6 (Expert Panel) that the UN Drug Conventions do not give state parties a mandate to punish drug-related crime by death, while at the same time international human rights law and standards explicitly prohibit it. As most states that still retain this punishment for drug-related offences introduced it after the adoption of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961, the Expert Panel should recommend UN bodies overseeing the implementation of the UN Drug Conventions to take prompt action to support its immediate abolition.

JOINT SUBMISSION (1,612 words, excluding footnotes and Annex)

1. THE DEATH PENALTY IS NOT CONTEMPLATED UNDER THE UN DRUG CONTROL CONVENTIONS

The UN Drug Conventions do not make any reference to the death penalty, while providing guidance on penalties applicable under the treaties. The drafting of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs of 1961 began in 1948 as an effort to consolidate and harmonize various multilateral treaties existing at the time.[4] With regard to penalties, Article 36 of the 1961 Single Convention requests state parties to ensure that "serious offences shall be liable to adequate punishment particularly by imprisonment or other penalties of deprivation of liberty." [5]

The official Commentary on the Convention acknowledges the challenges during the drafting process with formulating a general international rule for offences and punishments to be implemented at national level; and the "divergent positions of different countries on matters of penal law to an even greater extent than the provisions of the earlier treaty. Its terms are therefore broader and more flexible, and their binding character even weaker." However, the Commentary clarifies that the Plenipotentiary Conference did not accept a proposal to refer to "severe" punishment by the required two-thirds majority.

---

[1] Amnesty International, "Death sentences and executions in 2025" (ACT 50/0778/2026), May 2026, https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/0778/2026/en/; Harm Reduction International, "The Death Penalty for Drug Offences: Global Overview 2025", March 2026, https://hri.global/flagship-research/death-penalty/the-death-penalty-for-drug-offences-global-overview-2025/

[2] For more information, see Amnesty International and Harm Reduction International, "2026 World Drug Day: Call on UNODC to condemn the use of the death penalty in statement – Joint submission" (ACT 50/1178/2026), 15 June 2026, https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/1178/2026/en/

[3] Among other examples, Central Narcotics Bureau, Section 1: Singapore's drug control strategy, last updated 20 November 2025, https://www.cnb.gov.sg/drug-victims-remembrance-day/singapore-drug-control-strategy/; the International Day Against Drug Abuse and Illicit Trafficking has been a regular hook for Chinese courts, including the Supreme People's Court, to issue judicial guidelines on how to apply the death penalty for drug related offences. Amnesty International, "Death sentences and executions in 2025" (ACT 50/0778/2026), May 2026, p.21.

[4] David Bewley-Taylor and Martin Jelsma, "Fifty Years of the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs: A Reinterpretation, Series on Legislative Reform of Drug Policies Nr. 12, March 2011, https://undrugcontrol.info/images/stories/documents/dlr12.pdf. For an analysis of penalties under the UN Drug Control Conventions", see Neil Boister, "Penal Aspects of the UN Drug Conventions", Kluwer Law International, 2001.

[5] This provision builds on Article 2 of the Convention of 1936 for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs Adopted in Geneva on 26 June 1936. Its Article 2 states: "Each of the High Contracting Parties agrees to make the necessary legislative provisions for severely punishing, particularly by imprisonment or other penalties of deprivation of liberty, the following acts […]".

The resulting Paragraph 1 retained "'adequate' punishment of the offences which it covers if they are serious. It further clarifies that the opponents of the word "severe" note[d] "severe" carried overtones of "retribution", which was one of the purposes of penal law which *should not* be emphasized".[6]

In addition to restricting the notion of "adequate punishment" only to deprivation of liberty, amendments to this Article brought through the 1972 Protocol Amending the Single Convention added paragraph (b) to allow for the provision of "an alternative to conviction or punishment or in addition to conviction or punishment, that such abusers shall undergo measures of treatment, education, after-care, rehabilitation and social reintegration in conformity with paragraph 1 of article 38."[7] The intended aim of the foreseen penalties under the 1961 Single Convention was therefore clarified to emphasize the role of alternatives to incarceration and promote proportionate responses, rather than increasing the punitive nature of the UN drug control framework.

Similarly, the UN Convention on Psychotropic Substances of 1971 refers in its Article 22 to "adequate punishment, particularly by imprisonment or other penalty of deprivation of liberty".[8] It also encourages the resort to "alternative to conviction or punishment or in addition to punishment, that such abusers undergo measures of treatment, education, after-care, rehabilitation and social reintegration".[9] Its Commentary reiterates the limitations to punitive regimes posed by this Article, as "'Adequate' penalties are required only for serious offences".[10] While the Commentary introduces more explicitly a link between punishment and deterrent effect,[11] it reaffirms the interpretation of adequate punishment as relating to imprisonment or another form of deprivation of liberty only. In relation to subparagraph (b), the Commentary not only clarifies that alternative measures could be applied to any offence, "no matter how serious", but it further explains that in cases of substitute measures state parties "are bound to prosecute, although under subparagraph (b) not required to convict or punish".[12]

A new range of criminal offences and a more pronounced emphasis on punishment were introduced in the UN Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988. Article 3.4 (a) emphasizes the need to take into account "the grave nature" of the offences and expands the recommended punishment to include "pecuniary sanctions and confiscation." It further limits the possibility of alternative measures to "appropriate cases of a minor nature" (Article 3.4 (c)). Importantly, greater deference is given to national frameworks, with an explicit statement that "Nothing contained in this article shall affect the principle that […] such offences shall be prosecuted and punished in conformity with that law [of the state party]" (Article 3.11).

Its Commentary underscores this turn, with priority given in the structure of paragraph 4 to heavier penalties and the need for sanctions to reflect the "grave nature" of the offences.[13] However, it is important to note that this treaty still does not include the death penalty among the listed sanctions, nor removes reference to imprisonment as the referred punishment in the treaty.

Critically, the UN Drug Convention framework was adopted at a time when international human rights law had already developed to significantly restrict the scope of the death penalty, while envisaging its abolition as programmatic goal, as outlined in the next section. Even when considered in isolation from other developing international norms, the enhanced turn in favour of punishment does not make reference, nor can be interpreted as supporting, the death penalty. Additionally, the punitive approach historically at the core of the drug control framework has received increasing scrutiny, due to its negative health and rights implications, and discussions are intensifying regarding the need for alternative approaches.[14]

---

[6] Italics added. Commentary on the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961 / prepared by the Secretary-General in accordance with paragraph 1 of Economic and Social Council resolution 914 D (XXXIV) of 3 August 1962, p.425-429, https://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/organized_crime/Drug%20Convention/Commentary_on_the_single_convention_1961.pdf Article 39 of the Single Convention allows state parties to establish stricter or more severe punishments than those referred to in the Convention "as in its opinion is necessary or desirable for the protection of the public health or welfare". The Commentary clarifies (pp.449-450) that permissible substitute controls should clearly be more strict or severe, for example the death penalty instead of imprisonment. However, it is clarified that the reference to the death penalty "is made in the light the provisions of the Single Convention. It does not imply any position as to the admissibility of this penalty on moral or other legal grounds." (p.450, footnote no.3).

[7] Commentary on the Protocol Amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, Geneva, 25 March 1972, p.76, https://www.unodc.org/documents/commissions/CND/Int_Drug_Control_Conventions/Commentaries-OfficialRecords/1961Convention/1961_COMMENTARY_AMENDING_PROTOCOL_en.pdf

8 Article 22, subparagraph (a).

[9] Article 22, subparagraph (b).

[10] Commentary on the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, Done at Vienna on 21 February 1971, p.352, https://www.unodc.org/documents/commissions/CND/Int_Drug_Control_Conventions/Commentaries-OfficialRecords/1971Convention/1971_COMMENTARY_en.pdf

[11] "They have to be adequate for achieving their social purposes, i.e. for producing the desired deterrent effect. Different degrees of severity may be required in different countries."

[12] Commentary on the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, Done at Vienna on 21 February 1971, p.353, https://www.unodc.org/documents/commissions/CND/Int_Drug_Control_Conventions/Commentaries-OfficialRecords/1971Convention/1971_COMMENTARY_en.pdf

[13] Commentary on the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, 1988, done at Vienna on 20 December 1988, p.85, https://www.unodc.org/documents/treaties/organized_crime/Drug%20Convention/Commentary_on_the_united_nations_convention_1988_E.pdf

[14] Among other examples, see Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, Arbitrary detention relating to drug policies – Study of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, UN Doc. A/HRC/47/40, 18 May 2021, paras.8 and 51; UN Office on Drugs and Crime, United Nations system common position supporting the

2. THE "MOST SERIOUS CRIMES" RESTRICTION UNDER INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS LAW AND STANDARDS

Although international human rights law allows the death penalty under certain circumstances, from the outset it clearly established the death penalty as an exceptional measure with a requirement to restrict its use to the "most serious crimes" and setting abolition as goal for retentionist countries.[15]

The drafting of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), adopted in 1966, began in 1947.[16] As positions differed with regard to abolition, the restriction to the "most serious crimes" was included in the very first draft of Article 6 of the Covenant, even though it attracted criticism for lacking precision.[17] In 1982, the UN Human Rights Committee, the body monitoring ICCPR implementation, stated in its first General Comment on the right to life that "most serious crimes' must be read restrictively to mean that the death penalty should be a quite exceptional measure."[18]

Two years later, the UN Economic and Social Council – of which the CND is a subsidiary body – adopted, and the UN General Assembly endorsed, without a vote the UN Safeguards Guaranteeing Protection of the Rights of Those Facing the Death Penalty.[19] Safeguard no.1 clarifies that "In countries which have not abolished the death penalty, capital punishment may be imposed only for the most serious crimes, it being understood that their scope should not go beyond intentional crimes with lethal or other extremely grave consequences."

Since then, the Human Rights Committee has consistently clarified that "'The most serious crimes' must be read restrictively and appertain only to crimes of extreme gravity, involving intentional killing. Crimes not resulting directly and intentionally in death, such as […] drug and sexual offences, although serious in nature, can never serve as the basis, within the framework of article 6, for the imposition of the death penalty. […]."[20] Other UN bodies and mandates, including International Narcotics Control Board, have supported this interpretation.[21]

The prohibition of the imposition of the death penalty for drug-related offences constitutes a fundamental safeguard to protect the right to life under international human rights law and standards.

3. STATE PRACTICE

As the UN drug and human rights treaties were being developed, including to restrict the use of the death penalty, authorities in several countries moved in the opposite direction. Analysis of legislative developments in UN member states that currently retain the death penalty for drug-related offences in law shows that only three countries – China, Egypt and Iran –[22] are known to have had this punishment in place when the 1961 Single Convention was adopted.[23]

Available information indicates that the majority of UN member states introduced the death penalty for these offences in the following three decades, with 8 countries doing so in the 1970s, 14 in the 1980s and 4 in the 1990s (see tables in Annex), setting their legislation against the spirit and text recommendations of the international treaties that the international community had been adopting.

---

implementation of the international drug control policy through effective inter-agency collaboration, 2023, p.7, https://www.unodc.org/res/un-common-position-drugs/index_html/2315371E-eBook.pdf

[15] Article 6, paras.2 and 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. UN Human Rights Committee, General comment No. 36 - Article 6: right to life, CCPR/C/GC/36, 3 September 2019, para.50.

[16] Report of the first session of the Drafting Commission of the Commission on Human Rights, held from 9 to 25 June 1947, Un Doc. E/CN.4.21, 1947.

[17] UN Economic and Social Council, Commission on Human Rights, Fifth Session – Summary Record of the Ninety-Seventh Meeting held at Lake Success, New York on 24 May 1949 at 11.45am, UN Doc. E/CN.4/SR.97, 3 June 1949, p.4; UN Economic and Social Council, Commission on Human Rights, Sixth Session – Summary Record of the Hundred and Fortieth Meeting held at Lake Success, New York on 30 March 1950 at 2.30pm, UN Doc. E/CN.4/SR.140, 7 April 1950, p.11.

[18] UN Human Rights Committee, General comment No. 6: Article 6 (Right to life), 30 Apr 1982, para.7.

[19] Economic and Social Council resolution 1984/50 of 25 May 1984.

[20] UN Human Rights Committee, Concluding observations of the Human Rights Committee –Thailand, UN Doc. CCPR/CO/84/THA, 8 July 2005, para.14; General comment No. 36 (2018) on article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, on the right to life, UN Doc. CCPR/C/ GC/36, 30 October 2018, para.35.

[21] Among others, in 2012 the UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions has similarly stated that "The death penalty may not be imposed for drug-related offences unless they meet [the intentional killing] requirement." Report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions (2012), UN Doc. A/67/275, para.122. The same position has been supported by other UN bodies and mandates, including the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, Arbitrary detention relating to drug policies – Study of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, UN Doc. A/HRC/47/40, 18 May 2021, paras.41-43, the Special Rapporteur on Torture (UN Doc. A/HRC/10/44, para. 66) and the UN Secretary-General (UN Doc. A/HRC/24/18, para. 78); UN Human Rights Council, Human rights challenges in addressing and countering all aspects of the world drug problem-Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, UN Doc. A/HRC/54/53, 15 August 2023, para.30; Human Rights Council resolution 60/17 of 7 October 2025. Report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 2021, UN Doc. E/INCB/2021/1, para. 904.; INCB annual report 2017, para 257, https://www.incb.org/incb/uploads/documents/Publications/AnnualReports/AR2017/Annual_Report_chapters/Chapter_2_2017.pdf

[22] Syria became independent from Egypt in September 1961, after the adoption of the Single Convention. The Republic of Korea introduced the death penalty in 1961.

[23] The analysis is included in Annex. Some countries, such as Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam had the death penalty for drug-related offences in laws that pre-dated the establishment of the UN, and were later reformed. For the purposes of this submission, only the introduction of the death penalty in modern legislation is included.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The above analysis shows that use of the death penalty in the name of drug control has no support in either the UN drug or human rights treaties.

Recent efforts by international drug control mechanisms to address this human rights violation have not gone far enough, nor led to an end of executions for drug-related crimes.[24] The use of the death penalty for drug-related offences remains a contentious issue at the CND, which has precluded this body from taking a formal position on this important matter. While UNODC representatives have on occasions recalled the UN's unconditional opposition to the death penalty, advocacy and advances towards abolition have not been included in programmatic documents.[25] These bodies must unequivocally and publicly condemn use of the death penalty for drug-related offences and challenge the ill-founded perceptions that the death penalty can serve as an effective drug control tool.

Amnesty International and Harm Reduction International recommend the Expert Panel to condemn the use of the death penalty for drug-related offences as contravening the spirit of and punishments envisaged under the UN Drug Conventions; and to call on international drug control mechanisms, including the CND and UNODC, to ensure the implementation of the UN Drug Conventions is consistent with international human rights obligations, including in relation to the death penalty.[26]

In particular, the Expert Panel should call on:

- CND to establish a standing agenda item to address the human rights impacts of drug policies, including in relation to the death penalty;
- UNODC to ensure that human rights are a central part of its monitoring work, to incorporate an explicit commitment to promote death penalty abolition (both generally and for drug-related offences specifically) in its forthcoming strategy; and to ensure that its cooperation with countries that still retain the death penalty does not risk contributing to the use of the death penalty or other human rights violations, in line with UN policy;[27]
- all states that retain the death penalty to fully abolish it as a matter of urgency.

Contacts:

Amnesty International, Chiara Sangiorgio, Policy Adviser – Death Penalty: chiara.sangiorgio@gmail.com

Harm Reduction International, Giada Girelli, Senior Analyst, Human Rights and Justice , giada.girelli@hri.global

[24] Among other examples, the UN system coordination Task Team on the Implementation of the UN System Common Position on drug-related matters has reiterated in unequivocal terms that the application of the death penalty for drug-related offences does not respect the spirit of the international drug control conventions and has the potential to become an obstacle to effective cross-border and international cooperation against drug trafficking (UN Chief Executives Board, "What we have learned over the last ten years: A summary of knowledge acquired and produced by the UN system on drug-related matters", UN Doc. E/CN.7/2019/CRP.10). The International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) has also noted that "States' actions that violate human rights in the name of drug control policy are inconsistent with the international drug control conventions", and has called on States that still retain the death penalty for drug-related offences to consider abolishing it for such offences and commuting death sentences that have already been imposed. (Report of the International Narcotics Control Board for 2021, UN Doc. E/INCB/2021/1, para. 904). More broadly, the INCB has stressed that respect for human rights is a prerequisite for the implementation of the international drug control conventions, and that measures adopted with the purported aim of furthering drug policy that are inconsistent with universally recognized human rights norms are a violation of the international drug control conventions.

[25] See, for example, UNODC, Statement of the UNODC Executive Director Yury Fedotov on the use of the death penalty in Indonesia, 29 April 2015, https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/press/releases/2015/April/statement-of-the-unodc-executive-director-yury-fedotov-on-the-use-of-the-death-penalty-in-indonesia.html

[26] Among other examples, Amnesty International, Harm Reduction International and Justice Project Pakistan, "Joint statement delivered at the 69th session of the UN Commission on Narcotic Drugs on the death penalty for drug-related offences", (ACT 50/0824/2026), 12 March 2026, https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act50/0824/2026/en/

[27] UNSDG Guidance Note on Human Rights for Resident Coordinators and UN Country Teams, January 2017, https://unsdg.un.org/resources/unsdg-guidance-note-human-rights-resident-coordinators-and-un-country-teams; UNODC and the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights – Position Paper (2012), https://track.unodc.org/track/uploads/res/track/resourcehub/2012/unodc_and_the_promotion_and_protection_of_human_rights__position_paper_html/UNODC_and_the_promotion_and_protection_of_human_rights_position_paper_2012.pdf; UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Human Rights Topics – Death Penalty, https://www.ohchr.org/en/topic/death-penalty

ANNEX –KNOWN YEAR OF INTRODUCTION OF DEATH PENALTY FOR DRUG-RELATED OFFENCES IN COUNTRIES THAT STILL RETAIN IT[28]

Known Decade	Countries	No. of countries
Before or in 1950s	China, Iran	2
1960s	Egypt, Iraq, Republic of Korea	3
1970s	Algeria, Indonesia, Libya, Malaysia, Myanmar, Singapore, Syria, Thailand	8
1980s	Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Guyana, India, Jordan, Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, United Arab Emirates, United States of America and Viet Nam	14
1990s	Cuba, Mauritania, Oman, Yemen	4
2000s	Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Lao People's Democratic Republic, South Sudan	3
2020s	Maldives	1

UN member state	Accession or ratification 1961 Single Convention[29]	Accession to or ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	Known year of first introduction of death penalty for drug-related offences	Reference
Algeria	1964	1989	1975	Ordinance 75-09 of 17 February 1975
Bahrain	1990	2006	1984	Decretal Law No. 10 of 1984, amending Decretal Law No. 4 of 1973 on Controlling the Use and Circulation of Narcotic Substances and Preparations
Bangladesh	1975	2000	1988	Dangerous Drugs (Amendment) Act, 1988 (Act No. 36 of 1988)
Brunei Darussalam	1987		1982	Amendment to Misuse of Drugs Enactment, 1978, later amended by the Emergency (Misuse of Drugs) Amendments Order 1984
China	1985	Signed in 1998	1930s (before the People's Republic of China) 1982	The death penalty was introduced in the 1930s under pre-People's Republic of China regulations. Following the establishment of the People's Republic of China, the death penalty was introduced through the 1982 Decision of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress on Severely Punishing Criminals Who Seriously Undermine the Economy.
Cuba	1962	Signed in 2008	1999	Law 87/1999, amending the Penal Code
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	2007	1981	2006	Ministry of Public Security decree of 1 March 2006 Decision No. 2483 of the Standing Committee of the Supreme People's

[28] Among other references, see UN Economic and Social Council, Capital punishment- Report of the Secretary-General, E/1980/9, 8 February 1980; Amnesty International, "The death penalty: No solution to illicit drugs" (ACT 51/002/1995), 2 October 1995, https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/act51/002/1995/en/; UN Office on Drugs and Crime, SHERLOC–Sharing Electronic Resources and Laws on Crime, Database of Legislation, https://sherloc.unodc.org/cld/en/v3/sherloc/legdb/index.html; Harm Reduction International, Death-eligible drug crimes: Legislation by country, 9 May 2024, https://hri.global/publications/deathpenaltydrugslegislation/. More information on each is country is available upon request.

[29] Based on accession/ratification of the UN Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961 before and after the adoption of the 1972 Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961. See https://treaties.un.org/pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=VI-15&chapter=6&clang=_en and https://treaties.un.org/pages/viewdetails.aspx?src=treaty&mtdsg_no=vi-18&chapter=6&clang=_en#EndDec

(North Korea)				Assembly (SPA), "addendum to the Criminal Code for ordinary crimes".
Egypt	1966	1982	1960	Presidential Law No. 182 of 1960
Guyana	2002	1977	1989	Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (Control) Amendment Act 1989
India	1964	1979	1989	Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (Amendment) Act 1988 (Act No. 2 of 1989)
Indonesia	1976	2006	1976	Narcotics Law No. 9 of 1976
Iran	1972	1975	1959	Law Amending the Law on the Prohibition of Poppy Cultivation and Opium Use, 1959
Iraq	1962	1971	1968	Law no.196 of 1968
Jordan	1962	1975	1988	Law on Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (Law No. 11 of 1988)
Kuwait	1962	1996	1983	Law No. 74 of 1983 Concerning the Combating of Narcotics and the Regulation of Their Use and Trade [30]
Lao People's Democratic Republic	1973	2009	2001	National Assembly No. 03/NA, 10 April 2001 - Production, Trade, Consumption or Possession of Narcotics
Libya	1978	1970	1971	Law No. 23 of 1971 on Narcotics[31]
Malaysia	1967		1975	Dangerous Drugs (Amendment) Act 1975 (Act A293)
Maldives	2000	2006	2025	Act No. 28/2025 - Third Amendment to the Drugs Act (Act No. 17/2011)
Mauritania	1989	2004	1993	Law 93-37 of 20 July 1993
Myanmar	1963		1974	Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Law, 1974 (Law No.5 of 1975)
Oman	1987	2025	1999	Royal Decree 17/99 issuing the Law on Combating Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances
Qatar	1986	2018	1987	Law No. 9 of April 1987 on the Control and Regulation of Narcotic Drugs and Dangerous Psychotropic Substances
Republic of Korea (South Korea)	1962	1990	1961	Extraordinary Regulation on Special Criminal Punishment (Law No. 633 of 22 June 1961)[32]
Saudi Arabia	1973		1987	Resolution No. 138 implemented through High Order No. 4/B/966 of 10 Rajab 1407 AH
Singapore	1973		1975	Misuse of Drugs (Amendment) Act, 1975

[30] Under the 1983 law, the death penalty was provided for acts resulting in the death of a public official. It was amended to increase the scope of the death penalty for drug-related offences in 1995.
[31] Under the 1971 law, the death penalty was provided for acts resulting in the death of a public official. The scope of the death penalty was expanded for drug-related offences under Law No. 7 of 1990 on Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances.
[32] This regulation did not make a specific reference to narcotics.

South Sudan	No. It ratified the 1988 Convention in 2023.	2024	2008	Penal Code Act, 2008 (Act No. 9 of 2008)
Sri Lanka	1963	1980	1984	Poisons, Opium, and Dangerous Drugs (Amendment) Act, No. 13 of 1984
Sudan	1974	1986	1989	Narcotics Act / Hashish and Opium Ordinance 1924 Amendment No. 1, 1989
Syria	1962	1969	1970	Syrian Legislative Decree No. 3 of 6 January 1970, amending Law No. 182 of 5 June 1960 on Fighting Narcotics and Regulating its Commerce
Thailand	1961	1996	1979	Narcotics Act B.E. 2522 (1979)
United Arab Emirates	1988		1986	Federal Law No. 6/1986 Concerning the Fight against Narcotics
United States of America	1967	1992	1988	Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, 21 U.S.C. § 848(e)
Viet Nam	1970	1982	1989	Law amending and supplementing a number of articles of the Criminal Code, Law No. 30-LCT/HĐNN8, 28 December 1989
Yemen	1996	1987	1993	Law No 3 of 1993