REPORT OF THE GOVERNMENTAL EXPERT GROUP (GEG)
OF THE MULTILATERAL EVALUATION MECHANISM (MEM)
Distinguished Officials, Members of the Commission, and delegates to this fifty-sixth regular session of the Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission, I greet you on behalf of the Governmental Experts Group (GEG), of the Sixth Evaluation Round of the Multilateral Evaluation Mechanism (MEM), in the capacity as its General Coordinator.

Prior to the Second Plenary Session convened 22 to 27 September 2014, in Washington D.C., on-line and in-person meetings were held by the five (5) Thematic Groups, during the summer, to review and amend the thirty-four (34) national reports. These amendments were in response to updates and information provided by countries, in accordance to requests by the GEG at the conclusion of the Continuation of the First Plenary Session in February 2014. These meetings provided an excellent platform for the Second Plenary, and therefore contributed immensely to a successful Session.

Commissioners, I am pleased to report that the review of the draft national reports of the thirty-four (34) countries was completed at the Second Plenary by Experts and Alternates from thirty-one (31) member states. Experts from Guyana, Nicaragua and Suriname were not present. This assignment was accomplished with intensive work carried out during the Plenary.

The national reports evaluated the countries’ compliance with the twenty-seven (27) recommendations, based on the Plan of Action (2011-2015) of CICAD’s Hemispheric Drug Strategy of 2010. In total, there were nine hundred and eighteen (918) recommendations for thirty-four (34) countries in the thematic areas of Institutional Strengthening (3 recommendations); Demand Reduction (7 recommendations); Supply Reduction (5 recommendations); Control Measures (11 recommendations), and International Cooperation (1 recommendation). Bear in mind that in the area of Supply Reduction, the five recommendations were only applied to nine countries that were considered major producers of illicit crops. Therefore, the five recommendations did not apply to the remaining 25 countries.

An analysis of the status of implementation of recommendations by thematic areas indicates the following:

i. Compliance Of Recommendations (N=918) For The 34 Countries, By Evaluation Scale

- Completed: 40 %
- Mostly completed: 23 %
- Partially Completed: 15 %
- Started: 4 %
- Not Started: 4 %
- Not Applied/Not Applicable: 14 %

ii. Compliance Of Recommendations Completed By Thematic Area
Control Measures (n=374): 51%
Institutional Strengthening (102): 43%
Demand Reduction (n=238): 39%
International Cooperation (n=34): 34%
Supply Reduction (n=170): 16%

iii. Compliance Of Recommendations Not Started By Thematic Area

Demand Reduction (n=238): 8%
Control Measures (n=374): 5%
Supply Reduction (n=170): 2%
International Cooperation (n=34): 0%
Institutional Strengthening (102): 2%

iv. Comparison Between Recommendations (N=918) Completed And Not Started By Region

North America (n=81 recommendations evaluated on 3 countries): 82% completed; 1% not started
South America (n=270 recommendations evaluated on 10 countries): 47% completed; 3% not started
Central America (n=162 recommendations evaluated on 6 countries): 40% completed; 2% not started
Caribbean (n=405 recommendations evaluated on 15 countries): 28% completed; 7% not started

The detailed analysis on the compliance of recommendations will be available once the reports have been reviewed and approved by the Commissioners and, pertinent adjustments have been made, if necessary.

Commissioners, the new methodology employed to prepare and evaluate the reports, encountered challenges outlined in my reports at CICAD 54 and 55; however, with your guidance, the support and hard work of the MEM Section and the GEG members, it was possible to surmount these challenges and even compile, from the rich debates, valuable contributions for the future work. There is also need for greater precision between the recommendations and the criteria as set out in the Handbook on Evaluation Criteria. The GEG determined that most countries in the hemisphere are not significant producers of illicit crops.

This issue created significant debate during the plenary sessions regarding the application of an appropriate evaluation rating to deal with this matter. The issue of supply reduction as it pertains to illicit
crops, and the formulation of recommendations in this area, should also be given further attention.

The drafting of the recommendations could also be improved. Some recommendations lacked clarity, and led to varying interpretations. The GEG also wishes to suggest the need for improving the definition of terms and phrases. The paucity and ambiguity of information provided by some countries made it difficult for the GEG to evaluate the information. These matters, along with other challenges which would be elucidated during this meeting and other fora, should be given due consideration for future MEM evaluations.

Despite these hurdles, the GEG was able to complete the review of the 34 country reports. The robust discussions at the Plenary Sessions resulted in the clarity of views on the evaluation mechanism, and led to the production of a high standard of reports.

Commissioners, the GEG recognizes the significance of the MEM and its role as an important tool in the Hemispheric Drug Strategy and Plan of Action. We are most appreciative of the recognition given to the MEM, both in the Declaration of Antigua of 2013 and at the Special Session of the General Assembly, held here in Guatemala in September 2014. We believe that this process is a key element to strengthen and expand CICAD’s initiatives in the area of drug control.

On behalf of the GEG, I wish to thank the CICAD Executive Secretariat, and in particular the MEM Section, for its assistance to the GEG. I also wish to express my congratulations to Emilia Ramirez Alfaro, Deputy Coordinator of the GEG, who is the Expert from Costa Rica, for her excellent assistance during the Evaluation Round. Special thanks to Angela Crowdy who served as Coordinator for the MEM Section, at the commencement of the evaluation round, and to Sofia Kosmas who is now the Acting Coordinator. The transition was seamless; Sofia has done an excellent job. I also wish to thank the MEM Section team for its valuable support and assistance to the thematic groups, and to the members of the GEG for their diligent work in this process.

Distinguished Commissioners, I wish to thank all member states for their continued support of this valuable multilateral process. Thank you.

Dave Alexander  
General Coordinator  
Governmental Expert Group