



WESTERN AUSTRALIA POLICE FORCE

OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

POLICE HEADQUARTERS

6TH FLOOR

2 ADELAIDE TERRACE, EAST PERTH

WESTERN AUSTRALIA 6004

TELEPHONE : (08) 9222 1474

Your Ref: A721294
Our Ref: fA1540227
Inquiries: office.of.commissioner@police.wa.gov.au

Ms Tracey Sharpe
Committee Clerk
Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing
Illicit Drug Use and its Effects on the Community
Legislative Council Committee Office
Parliament House, GPO Box A11
PERTH WA 6837

Dear Ms Tracey Sharpe

**SELECT COMMITTEE INTO ALTERNATE APPROACHES TO REDUCING ILLICIT
DRUG USE AND ITS EFFECT ON THE COMMUNITY**

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission to the Select Committee into alternate approaches to reducing illicit drug use and its effects on the community.

I am pleased to enclose the WA Police Force written submission.

In the event that the Select Committee requires further information relative to the submission, or relative to the terms of reference in general, the WA Police Force is ready to assist.

Yours sincerely

CHRIS DAWSON
COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

21 January 2019



Western Australia Police Force Submission

To the

Legislative Council of Western Australia Select Committee into Alternate Approaches to Reducing Illicit Drug Use and its Effects on the Community

(Established October 2018)

The Select Committee is to inquire into and report on –

- a) Other Australian state jurisdictions and international approaches (including Portugal) to reducing harm from illicit drug use, including the relative weighting given to enforcement, health and social interventions***
- b) A comparison of effectiveness and cost to the community of drug related laws between WA and other jurisdictions***
- c) The applicability of alternate approaches to minimising harms from illicit drug use from other jurisdictions to the Western Australian context, and***
- d) Consider any other relevant matter***

WA Police Force Submission to the Select Committee

Summary:

- The WA Police Force has an existing program to divert user-level drug offenders into drug treatment (health intervention) instead of prosecution.
- The WA Drug Diversion Program compares favourably to international approaches, like Portugal, in that it can divert a larger percentage of drug possession offenders to treatment (details page 2).
- The WA Police Force could increase utilisation of Drug Diversion through the removal of existing legislative barriers and through policy adjustments. This is the preferred way forward as opposed to a relaxation of existing illicit drug laws. A relaxation of existing illicit drug laws would have significant detrimental impacts on the community.
- The WA Police Force welcomes the opportunity to appear before the Committee to further elaborate on our submission and address any questions the Committee may have.

The WA Police Force submission to each aspect of the Terms of Reference:

a) Other Australian state jurisdictions and international approaches (including Portugal) to reducing harm from illicit drug use, including the relative weighting given to enforcement, health and social interventions

- WA has a Police Drug Diversion Program that enables officers to divert eligible drug offenders to drug treatment sessions at a Community Alcohol and Drug Service.
- In brief, the Cannabis Intervention Requirement (**CIR**) requires attendance at one Cannabis Intervention Session and the 'Other Drug' Intervention Requirement (**ODIR**) requires attendance at three Other Drug Intervention sessions. Full details of eligibility requirements are at Appendix 1.
- All states and territories have a police drug diversion program of some kind. Only South Australia has a legislated requirement that an officer must divert eligible drug offenders. See Appendix 2.
- While many advocate the Portuguese model of decriminalisation, a closer comparison reveals that the WA Police Drug Diversion Program already allows for a 'non-criminal' penalty and provides greater scope to divert more low-level drug users to treatment than the Portuguese model.
- For example, offenders in possession of less than 2.5 grams of cannabis in Portugal can be diverted whereas in W.A. offenders can be diverted up to a higher quantity of 10 grams (see comparison table below).
- The decriminalisation style changes (Commission for Dissuasion of Drug Addiction – **CDDA**), introduced in Portugal in 2000, have meant that 6,000 drug offences pa

are now given an administrative penalty (such as a warning, no action or fine), with 1,000 of these referred to drug treatment.

- Around 5,300 drug offenders pa are still given a criminal charge (for consumer or trafficking offences), and this hasn't changed since decriminalisation in 2000.

Comparison in drug policy: Portugal and Western Australia¹

	Portugal (population 10 million)	Western Australia (population 2.6 million)
Legislation		
• Possess	Illegal (Law 30/2000) *	Illegal (<i>Misuse of Drugs Act 1981</i> - MDA)
• Trafficking	Illegal	Illegal (MDA)
Penalty		
Cannabis	< 2.5g - Citation to CDDA: 3 people (lawyer, social worker, medical professional)	10g or less – Cannabis Intervention Requirement (CIR) to attend Cannabis Intervention Session (CIS) with drug counsellor, or Court Prosecution if non-attendance
Cannabis	> 2.5g - eligible; otherwise Court Prosecution (trafficking or consumption)	> 10g – eligible; otherwise Court Prosecution
Other drugs	< 0.1g * - Citation CDDA: 3 people (lawyer, social worker, medical professional)	¼ or less of prescribed amount # (eg Methamphetamine: 0.5g or less – ODIR to attend 3 x Other Drug Intervention sessions (ODIS) with drug counsellor, or Court Prosecution if non-attendance (66% attend)
Other drugs	> 0.1g Court Prosecution (trafficking or consumption)	> ¼ prescribed amount - Court prosecution
Process	CDDA decides sanction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • community service • fine • warning / suspend action (if deemed non-dependent) • barring notice • suspension of professional work licence • refer to treatment (dependant users only) 	Police Officer issues Intervention Requirement. Offender books and attends Intervention Session(s) to expiate offence. If non-attendance referred back to police officer for court prosecution.
Statistics	~ 6,000 citations to CDDA pa Suspend action increasing (59% – 68%) Treatment decreasing (31% to 18%), n = 1080 pa Punitive sanctions increasing (3% to 15%)	~ 8,000 cannabis possession offences pa 2,283 CIRs issued pa (81% compliance = 1850 expiated) ~ 6,000 other drug 434 ODIRs issued pa (66% compliance = 286 expiated)
Advantages	Earlier intervention. Increased provision of treatment Reduction of 6,000 criminal consumer offences pa (now Administrative	Earlier intervention Saving in officer time –13.2 hours x 2,136 complied = 28,195 hrs
Disadvantages	Up to 38% of CDDAs non-operational due staff shortages	

¹ What Can We Learn From The Portuguese Decriminalisation of Illicit Drugs? British Journal of Criminology. (2010) 50, p999-1022.

	Need conjoint expansion of treatment places	
--	---	--

* Possession defined as up to 10 days supply (0.1 g heroin, 0.1 g ecstasy, 0.1 g amphetamine, 0.2 g cocaine, or 2.5 g cannabis)

< ¼ prescribed amount is 0.5 g heroin, 0.5 g methamphetamine, 0.5 g cocaine, 2 MDMA tablets

Reviews of Drug Diversion Programs conducted in Australia

Evaluations of drug diversion programs have shown that multiple positive outcomes are possible from drug diversion²:

- Reduced utilisation of criminal justice system resources
- Reduced incidence of re-offending
- Increased time period before re-offending and decreased likelihood of imprisonment
- Reduced drug use and/or harmful use
- Improved physical health, mental health and relationships
- Improved cost-effectiveness

However counter-productive consequences and negative responses from Drug Diversion programs are also possible:

- Net-widening: increase the likelihood of formal criminal justice intervention, attracting new populations
- Increased inappropriate referrals
- Several evaluations documented resistance from frontline police officers, mainly because Diversion was seen as a soft option.

The Ice Task Force report (2015) also attributed a number of benefits to drug diversion programs including “reducing the rate of reoffending, reducing overall costs, and improving health and social outcomes”.

The overall conclusion from research is that there is a net benefit from Drug Diversion, i.e. the positive outcomes outweigh the perceived negative outcomes.

Other International Approaches –

- In Colorado, cannabis-related traffic deaths increased 48% in the three-year average (2013-2015) since Colorado legalised non-medicinal cannabis compared to the three-year average 2010-2012 prior to legalisation.³
- The number of fatalities with cannabinoid-only or cannabinoid-in-combination positive drivers increased 153%, from 55 in 2013 to 139 in 2017.
- Legalisation of cannabis in Colorado led to an increase in the percentage of probationers testing positive to cannabis use. The proportion of 18 to 25 year-old probationers testing positive for THC increased, from 32% in 2012 to 41% in 2017. The proportion of 36 and older probationers testing positive for THC also increased, from 14% in 2012 to 21% in 2017.

² Cited in Hughes et al 2013. *Evaluation of the ACT Diversion Programs*

³ <https://www.rmhidta.org/html/2016%20FINAL%20Legalization%20of%20Marijuana%20in%20Colorado%20The%20Impact.pdf>

- In the US, the Rocky Mountain High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area Report (2016)⁴ found:
 - Youth cannabis use increased 20% and college-aged cannabis use increased 17% in the two year average since Colorado legalised cannabis.
 - Emergency department rates related to cannabis increased 49% in the two-year average following legalisation.
 - During the period of retail cannabis commercialization in Colorado there was an increase in emergency department presentations for cannabis, from 739 per 100,000 ED visits (2010–2013) to 913 per 100,000 ED visits (January 2014–September 2015).
 - Cannabis was trafficked from Colorado to 36 different states. Highway patrol yearly interdiction seizures of Colorado cannabis increased 37%.
 - Cannabis mail seizures increased 427% in the first three years cannabis became legal.
 - Following the legalisation of cannabis in Colorado, the number of plants seized on public lands increased 73%, from 46,662 in 2012 to 80,926 plants seized in 2017.
- Overseas law enforcement counterparts have advised the legalisation of cannabis has not impacted on organised crime as expected. In fact, legalisation has enabled organised crime networks to legitimise their businesses to generate significant profits.
- As regulated cannabis is more expensive to purchase, organised crime networks continue to sell cannabis on the unregulated black market where it remains cheaper and the organised crime network avoids being subject to tax.⁵
- Supporters of legalisation have argued legalisation takes the profits away from organised crime. However, legalisation of cannabis such as the case in Colorado, may have resulted in an increase of organised crime activity. The number of court filings in Colorado that were linked to cannabis charges increased almost fourfold from 31 in 2012 to 119 in 2017. The types of charges that increased most were manufacturing of cannabis or cannabis products (25 to 142) and possession of cannabis with intent to sell (32 to 124).

Summary of Term of Reference a)

This submission maintains there is considerable scope to increase utilisation of the existing WA Police Drug Diversion Program through adjustment of current legislation and policies instead of considering legislative change to enable the Portuguese model of decriminalisation.

⁴ <https://www.rmhidta.org/html/2016%20FINAL%20Legalization%20of%20Marijuana%20in%20Colorado%20The%20Impact.pdf>

⁵ <https://www.watoday.com.au/world/north-america/the-hard-part-is-getting-californians-to-buy-their-weed-legally-20190103-p50pde.html>

Increasing use of Diversion would see more offenders diverted to a health intervention rather than a criminal justice intervention (prosecution) – this effectively increases the relative weighting given to health interventions.

b) A comparison of effectiveness and cost to the community of drug related laws between WA and other jurisdictions

WA Police Force considers it does not have the capacity to make a submission on the comparative effectiveness and cost to the community of drug laws between WA and other jurisdictions. The complexity and scale of a comparison of this kind, encompassing State, Territory and International drug laws, may be worthy of further research.

However, if the intent of the question is to consider if the balance of demand, supply and harm reduction efforts is providing the best possible cost-effectiveness, then the WA Police Force suggest the following research on prohibition, diversion and community attitudes to drug policies may assist to understand the effects and cost-benefit of the current police contribution.

Research on prohibition⁶

- Prohibition keeps the price of illicit drugs very high (to compensate for the high risk). Higher price means lower use (and vice versa).
- Prohibition restricts availability
- Dependent drug users cite “fear of prison” and “troubles with the courts and police” as two of the main reasons why they enter treatment.

Other measures of the effectiveness of supply reduction

The National Drug Strategy Household Survey 2016:

Q. Have you had the opportunity or offer to use (selected drug) in the last 12 months?

- A. Cannabis – NO – 78.8%
- Methamphetamine – NO – 96.5%
- MDMA – NO – 93.6%

Therefore, a large majority have not had the offer or opportunity to use illicit drugs due to supply reduction restricting availability.

Q. Factors influencing the decision never to try an illicit drug:

- 73% - just not interested
- 43% - reasons related to health or addiction
- 31% - reasons relating to the law**
- 25% - Don't like to feel out of control
- 23% religious or moral reasons
- 19% - didn't think it would be enjoyable
- 18% - fear of death

Therefore, “reasons relating to the law” are a significant influence on the decision not to try an illicit drug. Examples of successful supply reduction measures are:

⁶ Weatherburn D. *The pros and cons of prohibiting drugs*. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology 2014. Vol 47(2) p176 – 189.

- Reducing the supply of leaded petrol, and replacing it with OPAL fuel, has reduced petrol sniffing in remote communities.
- Restricting the supply of inhalants in hardware stores has reduced volatile substance use.
- An Irish study found substantial reductions in use of NPS among adolescents entering treatment 6 – 12 months after legislation prohibiting NPS use, supply and sales⁷.
- Availability is a key factor influencing use of other substances, such as cannabis and alcohol⁸

Cost effectiveness of Diversion Vs Prosecution

- In 2011, Shanahan⁹ conducted a survey with NSW Police officers (n = 94) to measure the time taken to process a cannabis possession offence and the number of officers involved.
- The conclusion from this research was that issuing an adult cannabis caution (3.7 hours) saves 13.2 hours police time compared to preparing for a future court attendance (16.9 hours).
- Further research by Shanahan in 2015¹⁰ used an online survey of 998 individuals, who had recent contact with police for cannabis use/possession, to assess outcomes and cost-effectiveness of diversion for cannabis offences.
- This research found that a caution/diversion notice was no less effective than the 'charge' option but significantly less expensive (\$318 compared to \$1,918). Diverted offenders reported benefits in terms of improved employment prospects, relationships with family, partners and friends, and in their perception of police legitimacy.
- The NSW Auditor-General's Performance Audit of cannabis cautioning found that the diversion of over 39,000 minor cannabis offenders from the courts had saved at least \$20 million in court costs over 10 years¹¹.

Measures of community support for drug policy¹² –

Support for actions taken against people found in possession of methamphetamine for personal use:

A caution/warning or no action	4%
Referral to treatment or education program	46%
Fine	15%
Community service or weekend detention	9%
Prison sentence	24%

⁷ Smyth B, James P, Cullen W, Darker C. "So prohibition can work?" *Changes in use of novel psychoactive substances among adolescents attending a drug and alcohol treatment service following a legislative ban*. International Journal of Drug Policy 26 (2015), 887-889.

⁸ Babor et al. Alcohol: No ordinary commodity. Research and Public Policy (2nd ed) Oxford. Oxford University Press.

⁹ Shanahan, M. 2011. *Assessing the economic consequences of two cannabis policy options* School of Public Health and Community Medicine. Sydney: New South Wales. PhD Thesis (unpublished).

¹⁰ Shanahan M, Hughes C and McSweeney T *Australian police diversion for cannabis offences: Assessing program outcomes and cost-effectiveness*. National Drug Law Enforcement Research Fund (Final report approved but awaiting publication).

¹¹ New South Wales Auditor-General's Report Performance Audit: The Effectiveness of Cautioning for Minor Cannabis Offences, Sydney, 2011. Available at: www.audit.nsw.gov.au

¹² National Drug Strategy Household Survey 2016

Summary of Term of Reference b)

In considering the effectiveness of drug-related laws, WA Police Force suggest the quoted research on prohibition; the cost effectiveness of diversion; and community attitudes to drug policies can assist in assessing the relative impact of supply, demand and harm reduction strategies.

c) The applicability of alternate approaches to minimising harms from illicit drug use from other jurisdictions to the Western Australian context, and

WA Police Force acknowledges that there are several alternate harm minimisation approaches from other jurisdictions that will probably be raised in other submissions. These approaches include Medically Supervised Injection Facilities (Kings Cross), Pill Testing (ACT) and provision of Naloxone (New York Police Department).

We do not wish to comment on these approaches at this stage. WA Police Force focus remains on supply reduction and minimising harm through maximising use of existing drug diversion programs to divert drug offenders into treatment and .

In terms of the Portugal approach, WA Police Force consider it is pertinent to note that by far the greatest illicit drug issue Portugal sought to address was the use of heroin (depressant) whereas the illicit drug of primary concern in W.A. is methamphetamine (stimulant).

It is interesting to note that since 2000 W.A. has seen a remarkably similar and dramatic heroin overdose reduction trend as Portugal. It raises the question whether it was the introduction of the CDDA that has brought about the improvements in Portugal or it was the global heroin shortage brought about by increased law enforcement seizures and reduction in production identified by researchers¹³ .

Summary of Term of Reference c)

The WA Police Force submission focuses on maximising use of existing drug diversion programs as an alternate approach that diverts drug offenders into treatment rather than prosecution.

¹³ Degenhardt L. Day C. and Hall W. *The causes, course and consequences of the heroin shortage in Australia*. National Drug Law Enforcement Research Fund. Available at www.ndlrf.gov.au

d) Consider any other relevant matter

Options for enhancing utilisation of drug diversion

Review policy and/or legislation to broaden eligibility criteria for diversion.

- (Legislative change) Expand access to the CIR diversion option by legislative change to remove the provision of the *Misuse of Drugs Act 1981* that precludes persons from eligibility if they have ever had a previous minor cannabis-related conviction.
- (Legislative change) Consider incorporating the current policy-based ODIR diversion option into the *Misuse of Drugs Act 1981*. It is suggested that this would enhance the validity of the ODIR in the eyes of offenders and issuing officers.
- (Legislative change) In the course of the above, enable persons under 18 years to be given an ODIR. The consequential amendments to the *Young Offenders Act 1994* to enable the above could also create a new type of option, 'Intervention' for both the CIR and ODIR to be termed, instead of 'Infringement.'
- (Legislative change) Consider moving the eligibility criteria for the CIR and ODIR options into the *Misuse of Drugs Regulations 1982* so that the laws are agile enough to adapt to emerging drug type and usage trends.
- (Policy change) Review the current policy-based precluding criteria that preclude a person that has ever been convicted of a serious violent or serious drug related offence. Access to the CIR and ODIR options could be expanded if a three or five year conviction lifespan is applied to the precluding convictions.

Consistent National Reporting

- Currently the Australian Crime and Intelligence Commission Illicit Drug Data Report (ACIC – IDDR) includes cannabis diversion (CIR) activity by police only and no other illicit drug diversion (ODIR).
- It is suggested that W.A. could help to raise the profile and standing of drug diversion by requesting that the ACIC-IDDR reports all diversion activity.

Other issues to consider

- Any measure that has the potential to increase or normalise illicit drug use is not supported by the WA Police Force. For example, drug-affected driving is of significant concern from a road safety perspective.
- Some people purchase and consume illicit drugs despite knowing it is illegal to do. However, for many other people who may be considering trying illicit drugs, the fact they are illegal can serve as a deterrent effect and prevent harms. There is growing evidence which supports that relaxing of drug laws such as legalisation can lead to increased illicit drug use. For example, Colorado reported that in 2017, 15.5% of adults reported cannabis use in the past 30 days, compared to 13.6% in 2014, a significant increase. Also, in 2017, 7.6% reported daily or near daily use. This compares to 6.0% in 2014, a significant increase.
- There is a misperception that cannabis is a soft drug that doesn't present the same level of harm compared to methamphetamine and other illicit drugs. However, in reality this is not the case. For example, the Curtin-Monash Accident Research Centre found of the 312 illicit drug related driver/rider fatalities analysed, THC (signifying the past use of cannabis) was the most frequently

detected substance accounting for 64.8% of positive tests, followed by methamphetamine (26.6%) and MDMA (5.7%).¹⁴

- The Australian Institute of Criminology (2017) paper entitled 'Marijuana legalisation in the United States: An Australian Perspective' published in Trends & Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice No. 535 may be of interest to the Committee¹⁵.
- While the paper relates to medicinal and recreational cannabis in the United States, the paper highlights the complexities of any change to the regulatory regime surrounding illicit drugs. The paper examines some of the preliminary research on legalisation but notes it may take up to 10 years to properly assess the direct impact of the changes to drug laws occurring in the US.
- In the road safety context, whether or not an illicit drug is classified as illegal, legal, decriminalised or medicinal is irrelevant. The presence of illicit drugs in the body while driving poses an increased collision risk.
- While there are multiple mechanisms for police drug diversion (caution, fines, referral etc.) there is little research on which is the most effective mechanism and little consideration of the preferred mechanism for police. Are fines better than cautions? Is referral better than a fine? Under the Harm Minimisation framework of the National Drug Strategy, diversion to treatment or education is preferred to fines or court.

Summary of Term of Reference d)

- The WA Police Force submission presents options for increasing utilisation of drug diversion programs, areas of research to improve effectiveness, and raises the risk of increasing illicit drug use through relaxation of drug laws.

¹⁴ Palamara, P.; Broughton, M.; Chambers, F. (2014) *Illicit drugs and driving: An investigation of fatalities and traffic offences in Western Australia*. Curtin-Monash Accident Research Centre. https://c-marc.curtin.edu.au/local/docs/final-drugs-and-driving-november-2014_upload.pdf

¹⁵ Homel, P and Brown, R. (2017) *Marijuana legalisation in the United States: An Australian perspective*. Australian Institute of Criminology, Trends and issues in crime and criminal justice No. 535 June 2017

Appendix 1: CIR and ODIR (eligibility criteria)

CANNABIS INTERVENTION REQUIREMENT (CIR)

The Cannabis Intervention Requirement (CIR) is a legislatively supported drug diversion option for police.

Police Manual (DD 1.1) states officers should issue a CIR whenever the person is eligible. Should there be reasonable grounds to with-hold use of a CIR the reason should be recorded in the narrative of the Incident Report.

ELIGIBLE OFFENCES (Personal Use)

- Possession of 10 grams or less of natural cannabis (Includes Seeds) s.6(2) MDA
- Possession of any drug paraphernalia containing detectable traces of cannabis s.7B(6) MDA

A CIR cannot be given for any cannabis plant under cultivation, cannabis resin or any other cannabis derivative (eg. Resin, Oil) and cannot be given for synthetic cannabis.

ELIGIBLE PERSONS

- Adults that have never had a CIR or been previously convicted of a S.6(2) or s.7B(6) MDA offence involving cannabis (Legislatively-based preclusion)
- Juveniles aged 14 and over that have had no more than 1 previous CIR
- No previous convictions for a serious violent or sexual offence (Defined in DD 1.1)
- No previous convictions for a serious drug offence (Defined in DD 1.1)

OTHER DRUG INTERVENTION REQUIREMENT (ODIR)

The ODIR scheme provides a diversion option for dealing with adult illicit drug offenders in a manner that will tackle their use of drugs and associated problems. Diversion strategies aim to prevent future drug driven interaction with the judicial system and reduce the compounding impact on Police resources.

Police Manual (DD 1.2) states the issue of an ODIR should be considered for use in the first instance. Prosecution of Adult offenders, by either arrest or summons, should only be used if the offender does not meet the eligibility criteria.

ELIGIBLE OFFENCES (Personal Use)

- Simple possession or use of prohibited drugs s.6(2) MDA (Drugs must be for personal use) and or
- The possession of drug use paraphernalia s.7B(6) MDA
- An ODIR can be issued for synthetic cannabis related offences

ELIGIBLE DRUG QUANTITIES

- A ¼ or less of the amount listed in schedule 5 MDA e.g. heroin, methamphetamine, cocaine = 0.5 grams or less applies

- Tablets/tabs – a quantity of 2 or less applies
- Ambiguous drugs e.g. mushrooms or steroids, no set quantity if the case officer is satisfied the offence is a simple possession of drug offence, then an ODIR can be used

ELIGIBLE PERSONS

Adult individuals that could be charged with a s.6(2) and/ or s7B(6) MDA offence and who have no:

- Prior convictions for drug dealing offences or 'serious violent' or 'sexual offences'. This also includes prior convictions for 'serious violent' or 'sexual offences' as a juvenile. (Ref DD 1.2.1)
- Persons who have received a CIR or cannabis related simple offence infringement under a previous scheme are still eligible for an ODIR.

Appendix 2: Current Police Drug Diversion Programs in Australia – for people aged 18 years and above

	Cannabis		Other Illicit Drugs	
	Legislation	Policy	Legislation	Policy
NSW		Cannabis Caution		
Qld	Police Drug Diversion Program (PDDP)			
Vic		Cannabis Caution Program		Drug Diversion Program
SA	Cannabis Expiation Notice (CEN)		Police Drug Diversion Initiative (PDDI)	
WA	Cannabis Intervention Requirement (CIR)			Other Drug Intervention Requirement (ODIR)
Tas		Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative (IDDI)		Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative (IDDI)
ACT	Simple Cannabis Offence Notice (SCON)	AOD Diversion Program		AOD Diversion Program
NT	Illicit Drug Pre-court Diversion Scheme			Illicit Drug Pre-court Diversion Scheme

Appendix 2 shows that diversion for cannabis offences takes a variety of forms, from cautions (in NSW, Vic) to fines (in SA, ACT, NT) and referral to treatment (in WA, Qld, Tas).