

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES



INTER-AMERICAN DRUG ABUSE CONTROL COMMISSION

cicad

THIRTY-FOURTH REGULAR SESSION
November 17-20, 2003
Montreal, Canada

OEA/Ser.L/XIV.2.34
CICAD/doc1278/03
17 November 2003
Original: English

Governmental Expert Group (GEG) Report
On the first Drafting Session Evaluation of Recommendations
For period 2001 – 2002 to the Inter-American Drug Abuse Control
Commission's (CICAD) Thirty – Fourth (34th) Regular Session

**Governmental Expert Group (GEG) Report
On The First Drafting Session Evaluation Of Recommendations
For Period 2001-2002 To The Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission's
(CICAD) Thirty-Fourth (34th) Regular Session**

Montreal, Canada November 17-20, 2003

1. The First Drafting Session for the Evaluation of Recommendations by the Governmental Expert Group (GEG) of the Multilateral Evaluation Mechanism (MEM) was held in Brasilia from November 3-7, 2003. The session was fully supported by the Government of Brazil.
2. We wish to thank General Paulo Roberto Uchoa, National Secretary of the Anti-Drug Division of the Brazilian National Secretariat of Drugs (SENAD), as well as all SENAD personnel for their tremendous contribution. We appreciate their efforts in organizing and executing the event, and the kind courtesies extended to the group of experts and the support unit of the MEM.
3. The objective of the session was to evaluate progress made towards the implementation of recommendations emanating from the Second Round of Evaluations 2001-2002, which were sent to the member countries of the Organization of American States (OAS). In order to carry out the evaluation, the Executive Secretariat designed an ad hoc format that was sent to the member countries to assist in collecting information pertinent to progress made towards the fulfillment of recommendations. This format thus served as the instrument, which facilitated the evaluation process and the conclusion deriving there from.
4. Consistent with MEM's evaluation guidelines, which stipulates that each country must be individually evaluated by peers, the thirty-four (34) countries evaluation was carried out by four (4) working groups that developed rough drafts, which were subsequently presented to, discussed and approved by the experts in plenary. As a consequence of the consensus of plenary on the evaluation of each of the thirty-four (34) reports, the preliminary results will be sent to countries pointing out areas that remain to be pursued in order to fulfill the recommendations. Each preliminary report also included the assessment and conclusions of the experts deriving from the evaluation. The process requires that each country be afforded the opportunity to respond either by way of comment, refute, or supplying new information so as to ensure appropriate dialogue with member states. This process invigorates and enriches the evaluation and is a distinct characteristic of the MEM.
5. The Governmental Expert Group (GEG) evaluated responses to the recommendations submitted by thirty-three (33) countries; one country did not respond. Although this was only a preliminary evaluation session to be followed up by a final session in February 2004, there were indicators of qualitative advances and progress by countries across the hemisphere.
6. National Anti-Drugs Plans were being developed and implemented. Central Coordinating Mechanisms were being established. Demand Reduction Programmes aimed at preventing

and reducing consumption were being strengthened and expanded. Treatment, care and rehabilitation have acquired a new focus. A number of countries have signed, ratified or are in the process of adapting United Nations and Organization of American States (OAS) Conventions and Model Regulations; while control mechanisms for pharmaceuticals and chemical substances were being improved. Border control by law enforcements aimed at preventing transshipment have strengthened, while anti-money laundering laws were also being strengthened, as well as the adherence to the conventions and protocols for the control of firearms trafficking.

7. The reports showed that of a total of three hundred twenty (320) recommendations, eighty-one (81) were completed, one hundred eighty-six (186) were in progress and fifty-three (53) have not yet started. Countries indicated that the main problems encountered in fulfilling the recommendations were: legislative complexities in adopting and adhering to International Conventions; lack of financial, technical and human resources and training, as well as weaknesses in the coordination of national institutional supply control agencies. But it's clear that the work has been steadfast.
8. As was mentioned earlier, there were recommendations that were still in the process of being implemented while others were not yet started. It is important to note that some of these recommendations were being reiterated from the First Evaluation Round 1999-2000. This indeed is a matter of concern and the GEG urges that they be overcome before the start of the Third Round of Evaluations 2003-2004.
9. Beside the deficiencies indicated in the reports evaluated by the GEG, there were other areas that the GEG considered necessary to bring to the attention of the Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission's (CICAD) Commissioners. To mention a few of the more prominent:
 - The lateness by countries in designating and approving appropriate funding for the attendance of experts to evaluation sessions;
 - The absence of experts by some countries from evaluation sessions which causes undue pressures in the effective execution of the process;
 - The intermittent non-submission of reports (response) by countries, which prohibits evaluation;
 - The poor quality of reports (response) submitted by some countries, which also prohibits proper evaluation.
10. The sum total of the above, is that the process is not being facilitated with the level of precise response to the MEM Questionnaire (indicators), and the lack of preparation as a consequence of late and inconsistent designation of experts, or non-designation, grossly affects the work of the GEG. These issues slow down the process considerably and extend work-hours far beyond normal work-days. Another area observed is that on occasions the Expert designated to the GEG was not resident in country but elsewhere, which caused some degree of limitation in the dynamics of the evaluation, by not being directly involved with the problem of drugs at the national level. It is the view of the GEG, that an expert appointed from within country and being actively involved in the field in an area of drug prevention

would greater enrich the process. In effect, if these general administrative issues were to be addressed, the work of the GEG would be further enhanced.

11. The evaluation also confirmed the reality of the drug phenomenon and the violent sub-culture it has created in the hemisphere, as it continues to undermine the rule of law and democratic governance. We are faced with the challenge of overcoming this menace that erodes the hemisphere's socio-political and economic stability; thus, denying the people from the quality of life they divinely deserve. Today, the goal of the Hemispheric Strategy, which is to eradicate the production and trafficking of drugs, must be resolutely pursued in order to recourse the scourge and preserve the well being of our peoples. To this end, the GEG reaffirmed its commitment in Brazil.
12. The picture of the work of the MEM thus far, reflects the Hemisphere growing qualitatively in a uniformed and standardized level of preparedness to effectively combat the problem of drugs in all its manifestations. Since the First Evaluation Round (1999-2000) to present, countries have continued to improve national and international mechanisms within the framework of the MEM Indicators and the guiding principles of the MEM process. This, objectively, lends towards the actualization of the Hemispheric Anti-Drug Strategy from a common unified standard platform across countries. It also demonstrates the political, administrative and operational will by member states to reduce demand and supply. It is out of this framework that the on-going battle to quantitatively reduce production and trafficking to a controllable level shall emerge. The MEM is indeed the **“Process-Facilitator”** for the success of the Hemispheric Anti-Drug Strategy. The mechanism provides for greater and improved cooperation and coordination among countries; a fundamental pre-requisite of CICAD.
13. The continued participation of countries by their compliance with the indicators, recommendations and the attendance of experts to the GEG working sessions is paramount. The GEG urges CICAD to exhort every effort to express the importance of the MEM as a tool for the full application of the Hemispheric Anti-Drug Strategy and to encourage countries to continue to ensure full participation. The evaluation process will continue to inform countries of their level of preparedness, effort and participation, as well as the measure of success achieved, qualitatively and quantitatively, both at the National and Hemispheric levels. To achieve any true measure of success, then it is necessary that the principle of “Shared Responsibility” must be applied by member states.

Thank you.

Ornel H. A. Brooks
Executive Director
National Drug Abuse Control Council (NDACC)
Vice-Chairman, Governmental Expert Group (GEG)