Replies by the countries to the implementation of the recommendations of the second evaluation round of the MEM
The 2002 CICAD Declaration in Mexico City confirmed the value of applying recommendations made to the reports made by the Governmental Experts Group (GEG) of the Multilateral Evaluation Mechanism.

The operational process of the Multilateral Evaluation Mechanism (MEM) anticipates a follow-up report where the implementation of recommendations will be evaluated.

Thus, according to the established timeframe, in May 2003 the follow-up forms were sent to the member states, which were to be completed by October 2003, the deadline set by the Commission.

Thirty-three answers were received. These answers were compiled by the MEM unit and then they were made available to the Governmental Experts Group, during the first recommendation follow-up session, which took place in Brasilia, from November 3rd to 7th, 2003.

For this session, the GEG prepared the drafts of the recommendation fulfillment follow-up reports, which will be sent to the countries so they can make commentaries regarding the follow-up reports.
Finally, the 2nd Follow-up session, which will take place in February 2004, the GEG will create the final reports. In these reports, the efforts made by the countries to implement the recommendations will be evaluated. The reports will be published after the Commission approves them.

The answers given by the countries to the follow-up forms allow us to anticipate an effective evaluation. They will surely detect progress and also the need to intensify efforts.

The Member States have indicated that, in some cases, they have completed the implementation of recommendations, and that the implementation is in progress in others. Still, some recommendations, according to what was answered, have yet to be implemented.

In accordance to the answers given by the Member States, today the hemisphere, due in part to the implementation of the recommendations given by MEM, counts with better means of confronting the existing drug problem.

Central Coordinating Entities have been created where they previously did not exist. Programs dealing with the prevention of consumption of drugs have been developed along with the development of follow up and certification mechanisms for professionals that work with drug addiction. The information gathering systems have been updated with regard to the effects of consumption, morbidity, and mortality. Statistical controls have also been strengthened. Today, more countries have indicated that they have completed the establishment of systems to estimate, monitor, and eradicate crops. Also, more countries count with regulatory systems for the monitoring and control of chemical substances.
According to the answers provided by the member states, the number of countries that have ratified the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime and its protocols and the Inter American Convention Against Corruption has increased. Also, according to the answers, border control mechanisms have been strengthened to face the development of new illicit drug trafficking routes that have arisen as consequence of displacement.

The answers frequently express the complex and extended legislative processes that delay the implementation of recommendations that are related to institutional strengthening, national strategies, and the ratification of conventions.

Legislative complexity is also mentioned as one of the causes that explains the delays in the implementation of recommendations related to money laundering, firearm trafficking, and to the extension of prevention programs in the workplace and in the private sector. In order to implement preventive programs in the private sector, it is necessary to create a legal framework in order to impose the development of such programs.

Weak economic situations, a lack of financial, training, human, and technical resources have been mentioned as motives for the delay in the execution or the full implementation of the recommendations related to demand reduction, institutional strengthening and national strategy, supply reduction, and control measures of all kinds. In order to overcome these difficulties, requests for technical and financial assistance have been made.
The evaluation of answers is under way. However, this brief description allows us to conclude that even though we are facing a difficult reality, the commitment of the countries with the MEM is firm and permanent.

According to the answers of the countries for which their evaluation is pending, 81 recommendations have been completed, 186 are being executed, and 53 have not been started.

This demonstrates that the MEM is an evaluation mechanism and also a tool that stimulates action on the countries. Thus, when they work towards the fulfillment of recommendations, they optimize efforts and consolidate the principle of shared responsibility.