



17th St. & Constitution Avenue N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
United States of America

Organization of American States

P. 202.458.3000  
[www.oas.org](http://www.oas.org)

**INTER-AMERICAN DRUG ABUSE  
CONTROL COMMISSION**

**CICAD**

Secretariat for Multidimensional Security

**FIFTY-SIXTH REGULAR SESSION  
November 19-21, 2014  
Guatemala City**

**OEA/Ser.L/XIV.2.56  
CICAD/doc. 2162/14  
24 March 2015  
Original: Spanish**

**FINAL REPORT**

## I. BACKGROUND

Article 21 of the Statute of the Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD) provides that the Commission shall hold two regular sessions per year, one an ordinary session, the other to address specific technical topics determined by the Commission or such other matters that require its special attention. The Statute also provides that the Commission shall hold special sessions whenever it so decides or at the request of a majority of its member states.

Pursuant to Articles 20 and 21 of the Statute, it was decided that the fifty-sixth regular session would be held in Guatemala City, Guatemala on November 19-21, 2014.

The present report gives a summary of the presentations made during the sessions, including the reference numbers of specific documents, and a list of decisions. It also includes a summary of the most important points made by the delegates during the deliberations.

## II. MINUTES

### 1. Opening remarks

#### Presenters:

#### a. **Dr. Carlos Arturo Morales López, Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs, Colombia**

As outgoing chair of CICAD, Dr. Morales López opened the fifty-sixth regular session of CICAD. He welcomed the delegations present, and outlined the work to be done during the meeting, particularly with regard to the preparation of the Plan of Action 2016-2020 of the Hemispheric Drug Strategy. It should be based on a rigorous assessment of what had been achieved with the Plan of Action 2011-2015, the difficulties, constraints and strengths of the Plan of Action 2011-2015, so that courses of action can be drawn up to ensure greater and better achievements in the fight against drug trafficking and its dire consequences.

#### b. **Ambassador Adam Blackwell, Secretary, Secretariat for Multidimensional Security, Organization of American States (CICAD/doc.2152/14)**

Ambassador Blackwell welcomed the delegations on behalf of the Secretary General, José Miguel Insulza, and underscored Guatemala's leadership on regional and global drug issues. Guatemala is a country where important meetings have been held on the topic, including the present session of CICAD, which has raised the policy political profile of the issue throughout the hemisphere. He also noted the leadership of the OAS Secretary General in providing the platform needed for frank discussion of the problem, without which, it would not have been possible to carry out this work and pursue the entire process. These discussions also grew out of the meeting of Heads of State [and of Government] in Cartagena de Indias in 2012, which discussed two matters of grave concern: the increase in drug trafficking and drug use in the hemisphere and drug-related violence, and organized crime.

#### c. **His Excellency Otto Pérez Molina, President of the Republic of Guatemala (CICAD/doc.2153/14)**

The President of Guatemala welcomed the delegations to the fifty-sixth regular session of CICAD. He explained that Central America's geographical location was strategic for drug trafficking, and that, together with the interdiction efforts of several countries in the hemisphere, had provoked an upsurge in violence that was unprecedented in the region, and had created a serious problem for the region's institutions and social fabric. It was for that reason that at the 2012 Summit in Cartagena de Indias, Guatemala had asked the Heads of State to assess the need for discussion of a new approach to the fight against drugs and together with the Governments of Mexico and Colombia, had requested the United Nations General Assembly to convene a special session to evaluate the successes and failures of the world drug policy, which will take place in 2016. The President stressed that governments should keep an open mind and a constructive approach to developing and strengthening national strategies on the basis of scientific evidence and knowledge, and thus find effective solutions.

## **2. Adoption of the draft agenda and draft schedule of activities**

The Commission adopted the draft agenda (CICAD/doc.2116/14 rev.3) and the draft schedule of activities (CICAD/doc2117/14 rev.2) without amendment.

## **3. Election of the Chair and Vice Chair of CICAD**

In accordance with Articles 22 and 23 of the Statute, the Commission elected the Republic of Guatemala by acclamation to serve as Chair of CICAD for the 2014-2015 term of office, and the Republic of Peru to serve as Vice Chair.

## **4. Follow-up on the resolution of Guatemala 2014 "Reflections and guidelines to formulate and follow up on comprehensive policies to address the world drug problem in the Americas" (CICAD/doc.2143/14), and the Declaration of Antigua 2013 "For a comprehensive policy against the world drug problem in the Americas"**

### **Presenter: Ambassador Paul Simons, Executive Secretary of CICAD**

Ambassador Simons said that there were three main guidelines for the work assigned to CICAD in this session: the Declaration of Antigua, Guatemala, "For a comprehensive policy against the world drug problem in the Americas", the Hemispheric Drug Strategy and the Resolution "Reflections and guidelines to formulate and follow up on comprehensive policies to address the world drug problem in the Americas" adopted by the forty-sixth special session of the OAS General Assembly. He informed on the main areas in which the Executive Secretariat of CICAD has been working as described in the various paragraphs of the Declaration of Antigua and the resolution of Guatemala of 2014 (CICAD/doc.2143/14). Ambassador Simons invited the delegations to determine how the Executive Secretariat could support the various approaches that member states wish to take to implement this Resolution.

## **Comments by the delegations**

**Guatemala** explained the background to the documents that now guide the hemisphere's policy on the world drug problem, starting with the events at the forty-third regular session of the OAS General Assembly in 2013 up until the forty-sixth special session of the General Assembly of the OAS held in September 2014, which adopted the Resolution "Reflections and guidelines to formulate and follow up on comprehensive policies to address the world drug problem in the Americas".

**Argentina** spoke of the change of paradigm that had occurred in his country, where a new human rights based approach is now being taken in the context of human development and social inclusion, creating the conditions and opportunities necessary to ensure full integration of individuals into society based on the design and implementation of a full development project.

**Ecuador** stated that there were three topics that needed to be addressed: recognition of the social matrix that strengthens the drug phenomenon; identification of faulty approaches and practices that are not useful in dealing with the drug issue, and recognition of experience in the framework of new approaches to addressing the problem.

**Peru** said that the document distributed by the Executive Secretariat was very useful, in that it shows the holistic way in which the drug problem is being addressed in the region. He suggested including those points in the Resolution that had been left out, such as issues related to alternative development, supply reduction, drug dealing and other points.

## **5. Preparation of the Plan of Action 2016-2020 of the Hemispheric Drug Strategy, pursuant to the mandate contained in the Resolution of Guatemala (CICAD/doc.2144/14)**

**Presenter: Ambassador Paul Simons, Executive Secretary of CICAD**

Ambassador Simons presented a proposed schedule for drafting the Plan of Action 2016-2020 of the Hemispheric Drug Strategy, pursuant to the mandate contained in the Resolution of Guatemala, based on the following key components: the current Hemispheric Drug Strategy; the results of the Plan of Action 2011-2015 based on the information obtained through the MEM; scientific evidence obtained with the support of the Inter-American Observatory on Drugs and the national observatories; the experiences of the member states and the indicators of impact as to the causes of the problem and the new challenges, and the progress made by specialized agencies and other pertinent sectors.

### **Comments by the delegations**

**The Dominican Republic** urged the delegations to support the schedule proposed by the Executive Secretariat for development of the Plan of Action 2016-2020.

**Panama** voiced its support for the proposal, and volunteered to form part of the Group that would work on developing the Plan of Action 2016-2020.

**Mexico** said that the Guatemala Resolution of 2014 represents a way of addressing the world drug problem on the basis of consensus, shared responsibility and common interests, and proposed that the working group to draft the Plan of Action 2016-2020 be headed by the Government of Guatemala. He expressed his delegation's support for the proposed timeline presented by the Executive Secretariat.

**Guatemala** reiterated its commitment to play an active part in the working group, agreed to chair the group, and supported the timeline proposed by the Executive Secretariat.

**Peru** said it was in agreement with the proposal presented by the Executive Secretariat, and proposed that the membership of the working group be open, and that the group could be divided into subgroups to discuss each of the areas of the Plan. Peru also supported the idea of working on the basis of the draft prepared by the Executive Secretariat, and suggested that it would be best if that draft could be made available before the fifty-seventh regular session. Peru seconded Mexico's motion to name Guatemala as the leader of the working group, and offered its full support to achieving the proposed objectives.

**Trinidad and Tobago** said that it supported the draft schedule presented by the Executive Secretariat for development of the Plan of Action 2016-2020.

**Chile** said that it supported the proposed timeline presented by the Executive Secretariat for development of the Plan of Action 2016-2020 and offered its support for the process.

**Canada** felt that the Executive Secretariat's experience with the MEM had led to the identification of gaps. The delegate suggested that the first draft to be prepared by the Executive Secretariat include the documents mentioned in the present session, such as the Hemispheric Drug Strategy, the Declaration of Antigua, Guatemala "For a comprehensive policy against the world drug problem in the Americas", the resolution entitled "Reflections and guidelines to formulate and follow-up on comprehensive policies to address the world drug problem in the Americas" of the forty-sixth special session of the OAS General Assembly, and inputs from the MEM, which should represent the consensus reached. Canada offered its full support for the development of the Plan of Action 2016-2020 and volunteered to participate in the working group. The delegate said that the workload should be shared equally, since this is a multilateral agency. In closing, the delegate reiterated that the new Plan of Action should be shorter, more general and thoughtful, and should take into consideration the lessons and analysis of results of the MEM, as well as the policy guidelines provided by the General Assembly.

**Colombia** stated its support for the proposed schedule presented by the Executive Secretariat for developing the Plan of Action 2016-2020.

**United States** voiced its support for the Executive Secretariat's suggestion that it prepare a first draft, and offered its support for and active participation in the development of the Plan of Action 2016-2020.

**Brazil** said that it endorsed the proposed timeline presented by the Executive Secretariat for development of the Plan of Action 2016-2020, and offered its support to the working group that would be constituted for that purpose.

**Paraguay** said that it endorsed the proposed schedule presented by the Executive Secretariat for development of the Plan of Action 2016-2020.

**The Bahamas** supported the proposed timeline presented by the Executive Secretariat for development of the Plan of Action 2016-2020.

## **Decisions**

The Commissioners approved the draft schedule presented by the Executive Secretariat and decided to form a working group, headed by Guatemala to develop the Plan of Action 2016-2020.

## **6. Multilateral Evaluation Mechanism (MEM) – Presentation of the report of the Governmental Experts Group (GEG) (CICAD/doc.2139/14)**

**Presenter:** Dave Alexander, Drug Control Officer, Drug Control Secretariat of Grenada and Coordinator General of the GEG

Mr. Alexander gave an overview of the work carried out by the GEG, including the drafting sessions in plenary and the meetings of the thematic working groups. He also presented an analysis of the

implementation of the recommendations by thematic area, and said that he would present a detailed analysis once the Commission had approved the reports. Mr. Alexander also described the challenges that had arisen in applying the new evaluation methodology and the lessons learned for future evaluation, and then introduced the thirty-four national evaluation reports (CICAD doc.2148/14) for consideration by the Commission.

### **Comments by the delegations**

**Argentina** requested that a footnote be added to Recommendation 22 in its evaluation report.

**Canada** requested that two footnotes be added to Recommendation 24 in its evaluation report.

**Dominican Republic** requested that a footnote be added to Recommendation 2 in its evaluation report.

**Venezuela** requested an editorial change in its evaluation report.

**Mexico** reiterated that the MEM is the only valid tool in the hemisphere for evaluating drug control policies.

### **Decisions**

The CICAD Commission approved the thirty-four national evaluation reports from the Sixth Evaluation Round of the MEM.

### **7. Remarks by Ambassador Albert Ramdin, Assistant Secretary General, Organization of American States (CICAD/doc.2159/14)**

Ambassador Ramdin spoke to the importance of the forty-sixth special session of the OAS General Assembly, the resolution “Reflections and guidelines to formulate and follow up on comprehensive policies to address the world drug problem in the Americas” and the initiative “The Voice of the Youth of the Americas”, in which young people from a number of member states made concrete proposals on finding new approaches to the world drug problem in the region.

Ambassador Ramdin said that the Report on the Drug Problem in the Americas was the start of a very important dialogue about the challenges that the hemisphere will face in the coming years. He said that the revised Plan of Action of the Hemispheric Drug Strategy should cover both the current and future situation in the hemisphere. He stressed the importance of carrying out evidence-based programs, and of continuing to support scientific research and data gathering. He also suggested that the Plan should provide for options to allow member states to address the drug problem in accordance with their own circumstances. In closing, Ambassador Ramdin made reference to the Multilateral Evaluation Mechanism (MEM), stating that it had evolved as a tool and had become a model for the collective measurement of progress in drug control.

## **8. Control of Chemicals and Pharmaceutical Products – Presentation of the Report of the Group of Experts (CICAD/doc.2129/14 and CICAD/doc.2134/14)**

**Presenter:** Gisele Bellido Luglio, Operations Manager, Registry of Controlled Goods, National Superintendency of Chemicals Inputs and Controlled Goods (SUNAT), Peru, and Chair of the Group of Experts

Ms. Gisele Bellido Luglio introduced the report of the meeting of the Expert Group on Chemical Substances and Pharmaceutical Products, which took place on August 18-22, 2014 in Lima, Peru. She gave an overview of the topics and new threats identified by the experts and the working subgroups. Ms. Bellido also presented the Group's action plan for consideration and approval by the Commission.

### **Comments by the delegations**

**Argentina** discussed the work that the country has been doing to investigate New Psychoactive Substances (NPSs) and reported that Argentine agencies are working to control these drugs and the chemicals used to produce them.

### **Decisions**

The Commission unanimously adopted the report of the Expert Group on Chemical Substances and Pharmaceutical Products, its recommendations and plan of action.

## **9. Control of Chemicals and Pharmaceutical Products – Institutional strengthening of administrative control and interdiction capacity of chemical substances used in the production of synthetic drugs (CICAD/doc.2131/14)**

**Presenter:** Hernán Bernal, Consultant, Expert on Chemical Substances, PRELAC project, UNODC Regional Office in Peru

Mr. Bernal presented the results of a study conducted by UNODC's PRELAC project on the technical and logistical capacities of the forensic laboratories of Argentina, Panama, Chile, Guatemala and Colombia to deal with the growing problem of synthetic drugs. The study discussed the gaps in the monitoring and control of these substances, and the countries' needs on the issue.

### **Comments by the delegations**

**The Chair** considered that this is a growing problem in region, but that the dimensions of the problem need to be determined and the impact of these drugs measured.

**Canada** said that it is a growing threat to the health of Canadians, and in order to deal effectively with such a large problem, it would have to be broken down into smaller parts. The delegate referred to the manual prepared by the Expert Group to establish designated ports. The delegate also spoke of the importance of adopting Article 12.10 (b) of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, 1988 and of having the capacity to measure the legitimate needs for chemical substances.

**Chile** said that the member states needed to include these drugs in their legislation, inasmuch as many chemical-based drugs are not regulated, and they need the tools to deal with the problem. The delegate

also explained how the information exchange mechanism operates in Chile, but added that other control mechanisms are also needed, along with training on the subject.

**Paraguay** explained that synthetic drugs are a new threat for Paraguay, where there have been seizures of ecstasy and clandestine ecstasy laboratories have been discovered. The country requested technical assistance to deal with this problem.

**Panama** recognized the need to strengthen institutions for the control de chemical substances, and highlighted the work of PRELAC. The delegate also stressed the need to continue to work on identifying shortcomings evident in this field.

**Guatemala** noted the ease with which young people obtain synthetic drugs, and felt that all agencies should be aware of and alert to the problem, and should coordinate among themselves so as to deal with it more effectively. The delegate explained that many of the precursors for these drugs come from China, and that once Guatemala had been in contact with China, the inflow of precursors was reduced to a certain extent.

**United States** said that it had encountered more than 240 new psychoactive substances (NPSs), which it sees as a growing problem. The delegate said that constitutional constraints make it difficult to control the NPSs coming onto the market and offered support and technical assistance in dealing with the problem.

**Brazil** stated its concern over the problem of synthetic drugs, particularly when they are sold over the Internet, and felt that countries needed to have mechanisms to deal with electronic sales of drugs. The delegate explained that Brazil is adding twenty-three substances to its control schedule, all of them synthetic. He also felt that an early warning system was needed to identify new drugs and add them to the control system.

**Peru** underlined the need to analyze the problem of synthetic drugs in the same way as the PRELAC Project had done. The delegate considered that observing and identifying gaps in the controls is no different from what the drug traffickers do, and that this is how the countries should proceed to strengthen their controls in this area.

## **10. New approaches to drug law enforcement and responses to organized crime – conclusions of the side event**

**Presenter:** Eric Olson, Associate Director, Latin American Program, Woodrow Wilson Center

Mr. Olson introduced the results of the side event held on November 18, which had been attended by eleven countries of the region and members of ten non-governmental organizations. Its purpose had been to examine new approaches to enforcing drug laws and to find satisfactory counter-responses to organized crime and drug trafficking. Mr. Olson presented an assessment and analysis of the current situation, and proposed a set of recommendations.

## **11. Panel: Perspectives on regulated markets**

**Moderator:** Héctor Mauricio López Bonilla, Minister of the Interior, Guatemala

**Panelists:**

**a. Dr. Lidia Amarales, Director, National Service for Prevention and Rehabilitation of Drug and Alcohol Use (SENDA), Chile (CICAD/doc.2145/14)**

Dr. Amarales made a presentation on the problem of tobacco use in Chile, and showed statistics on tobacco use and mortality rates. She discussed regulatory measures and treatment and follow-up programs, and described the outcomes of laws on the matter enacted in Chile and how they had evolved over time. Dr. Amarales also described the challenges still ahead nationally and regionally, and some of the measures that Chile has taken to address them.

**b. Maristela Monteiro, Advisor, Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) (CICAD/doc.2135/14)**

Dr. Monteiro discussed the alcohol problem in the Americas, which she said was the main risk factor for people aged 15-49. She gave statistics on the health problems caused by alcohol, and described the most effective public policies that came out of the Global Strategy to Reduce the Harmful Use of Alcohol, adopted by the sixty-third World Health Assembly in 2010. Dr. Monteiro also talked about the various measures that States might take to reduce alcohol use, but stressed that there were limits on the governments' regulatory capacities. She felt for that reason that the case of alcohol is not a good reference point for the debate on the regulation of marijuana.

**c. Julio Calzada, Secretary General, National Drug Board, Uruguay**

Mr. Calzada outlined Uruguay's successes in regulating the tobacco market, and noted that a reduction in the prevalence of tobacco use had been observed. He considered that there were important similarities that could be applicable to other substances, and stressed the importance of discussing the issue of regulated markets and to find a solution for cannabis users, who are currently putting their money on a daily basis into irregular markets. Mr. Calzada therefore considered it important to engage in dialogue to build a consensus between legalization and prohibition, and underscored the importance of using special regulations for products such as alcohol, tobacco and marijuana. In conclusion, he said that Uruguay wished to share its experience with the rest of the hemisphere, in order to maintain a public health and human rights approach to cannabis use.

**d. Maurice Bailey, Director of Judicial Reform, Ministry of Justice, Jamaica (CICAD/doc.2147/14)**

Mr. Bailey gave the history of cannabis regulation in Jamaica, and explained the different penalties that had been imposed over the years. He described the measures that are currently applied, and highlighted the importance of drug treatment courts (DTCs) as one of the alternative measures operating in Jamaica since 2001, a model that is now being expanded in the country. Mr. Bailey also discussed Jamaica's experience in 1977, when a Joint Select Committee of Parliament recommended decriminalizing possession of small quantities of cannabis for personal use and for medical use under prescription. He concluded by explaining the details of a proposed amendment in 2014 to the Criminal Records (Rehabilitation of Offenders) Act 1988, which proposed expunging the criminal record for offenses of smoking marijuana (ganja) and possession of smoking utensils.

**Comments by the delegations**

**The United States** explained the legal, health, financial and law enforcement complications that had arisen as a result of legalization of marijuana in the States of Alaska, Colorado and Oregon, and in the

District of Columbia, in counterposition to U.S. Federal law, and considered that marijuana continues to be regarded as a dangerous substance. For this reason, he was concerned over the impact that these legalization processes might have on people's perceptions about marijuana use. The delegate also said that his country respects the sovereignty of States and their commitment to the international conventions, which provide some room for flexibility in their implementation.

**Mexico** underlined the importance of considering alcohol and tobacco as not ordinary products and regretted that many governments have still not taken more drastic measures. He added that strategies for the control of these substances should be coordinated with other health and educational measures. The delegate explained the measures that had been taken in Mexico to control the use of alcohol and the accompanying awareness campaigns.

**Ecuador** explained the country's approach to drug policy, which focuses on public health and respect for human rights; described how the Ecuadorian penal laws criminalize the trafficking of narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances using a four-level scale, and the applicable sanctions, which observe the principle of proportionality, noting that possession for personal use is not punished by law; and informed that Ecuador is monitoring experiences with marijuana in Portugal, Uruguay and the United States with a view to enriching an open debate and in the future have a regulatory framework for cannabis that will respond to the country's needs.

**Peru** explained that it is considering a large increase in tobacco tax as an effort to reduce tobacco use. The delegate presented statistics on alcohol and marijuana use by high school students, which he saw as alarming, and reiterated that the country is not in favor of legalizing any drugs.

**Canada** discussed a reduction in tobacco use in the country thanks to prevention programs, and said that most public spaces in Canada are now smoke-free. The delegate considered that policy institutions should be aware of the effects of tobacco, so that they can apply preventive measures to reduce tobacco use. Canada also referred to the illicit tobacco market in Canada, which exists despite the fact of a regulated market, and explained how the authorities are dealing with the situation.

**Argentina** said that the country is promoting discussion of marijuana, and explained that regulation of marijuana does not imply legalization, but rather a measure not to criminalize marijuana use, involving a public health approach to those currently using.

**Costa Rica** explained that marijuana use was never criminalized in the country and explained the efforts that had been made to lessen penalties for drug dealing, as well as to prevent alcohol and tobacco use and to educate young people and adults on the topic.

**Grenada** discussed the question of alcohol: in 2010, Grenada had adopted additional control measures, which, while beneficial, had not been able to reduce alcohol use. He added that a new alcohol policy is planned for May 2015. As to cannabis, the country felt that while it does not produce significant quantities of marijuana, its presence in the country is worrisome.

**Brazil** explained the policies it has implemented to reduce tobacco use, which had yielded good results, as well as the changes made in regulating alcohol, which he felt could be improved. On the matter of cannabis, the delegate said that Brazil was interested in the experiences of other countries, and would be awaiting the outcomes of processes under way, so as to enrich discussions on the subject with the public and civil society.

**Paraguay** referred to his country's policies on tobacco control, and said that tobacco use had been reduced, but that positive results had not been achieved in the area of alcohol control del alcohol. He also

stated his concern over marijuana use and considered that legalization would not reduce trafficking or other effects of organized crime.

**Dominican Republic** considered that the international conventions make it impossible to establish a regulatory system for marijuana, since those instruments restrict use of marijuana to medical and research purposes. He also described the way in which the Dominican Republic's legal system treats this issue. On the question of alcohol, he considered that alternatives be found to increasing alcohol tax as a means of controlling alcohol use, since such measures might encourage people to seek out more harmful substances.

**Panama** said that the low prevalence of tobacco use in Panama is due to the regulatory framework and the prevention strategies that had been put in place. The delegation also said that despite these outcomes, much prevention work remains to be done in the schools.

**Suriname** stated that one of the country's priorities is to reduce substance use by young people, and therefore the sale of alcohol and tobacco to young people is prohibited. Also, marijuana users are referred to treatment centers. The delegate stated that Suriname is opposed to legalization of marijuana.

## **12. Panel: Marijuana for medical use**

**Moderator:** Francisco Cumsille, Coordinator, Inter-American Observatory on Drugs, CICAD/OAS

### **Panelists:**

**a. Raúl Martín del Campo Sánchez, Director General of the National Center for the Prevention and Control of the Addictions (CENADIC), Mexico (CICAD/doc.2140/14)**

Dr. Martín del Campo presented a document on the scientific basis for marijuana use for medical purposes. He concluded that using the evidence-based medicine model, the benefits of commercial cannabinoids are minimal and are not better than other medications of recognized effectiveness. He added that there is no evidence to suggest that medical use of cannabis is better than conventional treatment.

**b. Kevin Sabet, Director of Drug Policy, University of Florida, United States (CICAD/doc.2133/14)**

Dr. Sabet made a presentation on the availability and use of evidence about marijuana use for medical purposes, and concluded that there is no evidence to justify smoking marijuana for medicinal purposes. He also said that there is not sufficient evidence on the use of cannabis derivatives as medication, but that the small amount of evidence available indicates that there are some applications for these products.

## **Comments by the delegations**

**Uruguay** reported that Uruguayan law would regulate cannabis for medical and recreational use, but that the regulations on medical marijuana had not yet been finalized. The delegate said that it was important to have good scientific results, and suggested that this is an issue that should be discussed in more detail.

**Canada** explained how the system of medical marijuana operates in Canada and the challenges the country is facing on the issue.

**Jamaica** reported that the country has conducted scientific research on marijuana for medical use, thanks to special agreements with Ministry of National Security, and said that the principal challenge is to develop a system that will enable the universities to carry out research on the matter. He said that it was important to achieve a balance between the revenue that might derive from a system of medical marijuana and the impact on health, among other things.

**Paraguay** considered that, on the basis of the presentations that had been made, it was clear that smoked marijuana cannot be considered as medicine, in light of its harmful effects. The delegate also said that CICAD should consider setting up a regional center for research on marijuana.

**Moderator** concluded that there was a need to fill the gaps in the evidence on medical marijuana, and endorsed Paraguay's suggestion that a regional center be set up to examine the question in greater depth.

### **13. Taking control: Pathways to drug policies that work, Global Commission on Drug Policy (CICAD/doc.2156/14)**

**Presenter:** Zara Snapp, Policy and Communications Officer, Global Commission on Drug Policy

Ms. Snapp made a presentation in which she proposed that a new international framework for drug control be developed to replace measures based on repressive ideologies with more humane and effective policies designed on the basis of scientific evidence and public health and human rights principles. She thus considered that the special session of the UN General Assembly (UNGASS) in 2016 would represent an opportunity to amend the international drug policy regime, and she made a number of recommendations on the principal points that should be included in the proposed new international framework.

#### **Comments by the delegations**

**Mexico** considered that it was important to capture all the information, statistics and studies being collected and developed by civil society, and to examine the consequences of current drug policies, looking forward to UNGASS 2016, which offers major opportunities.

**Colombia** said it was important to have been able to present both the views of the Global Commission on Drug Policy and the contributions of civil society to the United Nations General Assemblies.

**Uruguay** said that each country was sovereign in determining its own policies, since circumstances are different in each country and the international conventions offer flexible interpretations that allow for policies to be developed on this matter.

**The United States** considered that many of the arguments put forward by the Global Commission on Drug Policy coincide with topics discussed in CICAD and that are part of U.S. drug policy. However, one must be cautious in speaking of a global framework, since it is more effective to work within the framework of the international conventions and take advantage of the flexibility they offer. The delegate said that he differed with the Global Commission on Drug Policy's analysis of regulated markets for very dangerous substances such as amphetamines, heroin and cocaine, and suggested rethinking that recommendation.

**The Executive Secretariat** noted the wide variety of initiatives and reforms already implemented in many CICAD member states, and invited the Global Commission on Drug Policy to learn of the work that member states had done, with the support of CICAD, on the subject of alternatives to incarceration.

#### **14. Panel: Challenges and Strategies in addressing the Drug Problem from a public health perspective in Central America**

**Moderator:** Gerardo Isaac Morales, Assistant Director General for Development Challenges, Global Issues Bureau, Secretariat of Foreign Relations, Mexico

Mr. Morales explained that public health and demand reduction issues hold an important place on the governments' agendas and said that there is a consensus in the region on using a public health approach as the appropriate way of addressing the problem. He also emphasized that CICAD's mission is to strengthen national health systems, and said that countries need to allocate adequate budgets for this issue.

#### **Panelists:**

- a. Nelson Armando Guzmán, Director of Cooperation and Inter-Institutional Relations of the Executive Secretariat, Council of Ministers of Health of Central America and the Dominican Republic - COMISCA (CICAD/doc.2137/14)**

Mr. Guzmán explained the mission and structure of the Council of Ministers of Health of Central America and the Dominican Republic (COMISCA) of the Central American Integration System (SICA) and the mechanisms for coordination with other agencies in the region. He said that regional integration is key to producing development policies that are common to the members of SICA, and showed the structure of the region's public health policy. He also described the regulations and policy on drugs based on the Central American Security Strategy and the declaration adopted by the fifteenth meeting of heads of state and government in the region. Mr. Guzmán also discussed the budgetary shortfalls in the region in the mental health area, and in conclusion, presented the results of the First Central American-Mexico Subregional Forum.

- b. Eugenia Mata, Costa Rican Institute on Drugs (ICD) (CICAD/doc.2150/14)**

Ms. Mata described Costa Rica's experience with strengthening its national treatment system with the support of civil society. She presented statistics on the prevalence of drug use in Costa Rica and the situation with regard to human resources who provide services to drug-dependent people. Ms. Mata also discussed the activities and achievements of the PROCCER program.

- c. Luis Alfonzo, Advisor, Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) (CICAD/doc.2138/14)**

Dr. Alfonzo considered that the public health approach to the problem of psychoactive substance use has been pushed into the background and urged the governments to address the subject. He explained the implications of the public health approach and the interventions that may be done from the health arena, and said that there is a need for an overall strategy for human resources training to build professional identities that prioritizes the countries' actual circumstances.

#### **Comments by the delegations**

**Paraguay** said that during the fifty-fifth regular session of CICAD, Paraguay had stated its concern over the low quality of treatment services. The delegate thanked PAHO for its technical cooperation in

implementing the minimum standards of care, and thanked CICAD for its assistance in implementing the PROCCER project.

**Panama** described the progress that had been made in accrediting [treatment] facilities, and what had been achieved in the framework of the PROCCER project. The delegate also explained the work being done with PAHO on primary health care.

**Guatemala** explained his country's advances in the area of public health, specifically in projects spearheaded by SECCATID.

**Argentina** said that his country has made progress toward a holistic approach to the problem, and discussed the actions that SEDRONAR had taken in that regard. He added that the country has approved legislation in support of prevention, treatment, rehabilitation and aftercare.

**Uruguay** underscored the importance of the connection between the prevention of drug use and care for drug users, and pointed to the need to join efforts at the hemispheric level.

**Mexico** described the advances that had been made in implementing the PROCCER project, the public policies adopted in the country and explained how government agencies coordinate with each other in the context of the comprehensive program for the social prevention of violence and crime, which includes the drug issue as one of its components.

**United States** noted the success of the PROCCER project, and stated its interest in supporting training activities in the context of programs defined in the UTC (Universal Treatment Curriculum) and the UPC (Universal Prevention Curriculum).

## **15. Experiences and lessons learned by countries in the hemisphere on addressing the use of air and land space by narcotrafficking (CICAD/doc.2157/14)**

**Presenter: Héctor Mauricio López Bonilla, Minister of the Interior, Guatemala**

Minister Bonilla presented a geo-strategic analysis of the drug trafficking situation, covering both traditional threats as well as emerging problems, and described the activities that Guatemala is carrying out in cooperation with neighboring countries and others in the region. He explained the security and counter-drug structure in the country and the results obtained as a result. Minister Bonilla also described the principal lines of action of the country's inter-agency drug control strategy. In closing, he referred to the concept of shared responsibility and reported on a significant reduction in inflows of chemical precursors thanks to implementation of the strategy for the control of chemical substances.

### **Comments by the delegations**

**Argentina** provided information on the country's new air interdiction initiative.

**Peru** offered assistance and cooperation on this matter.

**Ecuador** described his country's system for the control of chemical substances, which has been used as a model by other countries of the region.

## **16. Lessons learned in the fight against drug trafficking (CICAD/doc.2154/14)**

**Presenter: Lieutenant Colonel Javier Neira Peraza, Colombian Air Force**

Lieutenant Colonel Neira gave an overview of the situation in the region with regard to drug trafficking by air, and described the efforts of the Colombian Air Force to address this problem. He described the routes used by cocaine traffickers and Colombia's air interdiction strategy, and noted that in 2013 and 2014, illicit drug trafficking flights had been almost completely eliminated.

### **Comments by the delegations**

**Peru** spoke of the balloon effect that had occurred in drug production areas in the Andean region as the result of the success of Colombia's anti-drug efforts.

**Guyana** reported that it had discovered a drug trafficking semi-submersible constructed in Guyana.

## **17. Money Laundering Control – Presentation of the final report of the Group of Experts (CICAD/doc.2128/14 and CICAD/doc.2119/14)**

Mr. Mena, Chief of CICAD's Anti-Money Laundering Section reported on the initiatives taken by the Group of Experts on Money Laundering Control (GELAVEX) over the period 2012-2014, including the Group's recommendation on building the capacities of the authorities responsible for control of money laundering and related offenses; improving the efficacy of international cooperation on asset recovery; developing and/or strengthening forfeiture systems, including asset investigation; the administration of assets of criminal origin, and moving forward with a study of methods and instruments that would enable analysis of risk factors to be conducted in cooperation with specialized international agencies.

**Presenter: Carlos Díaz Fraga, Secretary General, National Anti Money Laundering Secretariat of Uruguay and Chair of the Group of Experts**

Dr. Díaz discussed the challenges that organized crime poses for the region, and summarized the activities of the Group of Experts and its working subgroups over the 2013-2014 period: the working sessions had been held in Washington, DC and Montevideo in May and September 2014 respectively. He submitted the following documents developed by GELAVEX in 2013-2014 to the plenary: Analysis of systems for the collection of data on seized and forfeited assets of illicit origin in the member states of the OAS; the Technical Assistance Program on International Cooperation in Asset Recovery; the Supplementary Study on the Procedures and/or Criteria for International Cooperation in the Sharing of Seized Assets; the Comparative Report on Work Plans, Products and Contacts of GELAVEX Strategic Partners; the Guide for the Management of Seized Businesses; and the Outcomes of the survey regarding the safety and integrity of personnel tasked with the fight against money laundering and related offenses. In closing, Dr. Díaz presented the Strategic Plan 2015-2017 and the Work Plan 2014-2015 for the consideration and approval of the Commission.

### **Comments by the delegations**

**Panama** stated its support for the activities of GELAVEX, and endorsed the candidacies of Peru and the Dominican Republic for Chair and Vice Chair of the Group.

**Paraguay** stated that in May 2014, the country had achieved its first conviction for money laundering. The delegate also said that it had signed a memorandum of understanding with the OAS to begin the BIDADAL project, in an effort to improve the management of forfeited assets. He said that Paraguay supported the candidacies of Peru and the Dominican Republic.

**Nicaragua** considered that it was necessary to improve the region's national money laundering control systems.

**El Salvador** endorsed the candidacies of Peru and the Dominican Republic.

## Decisions

The Commission approved the report of the Group of Experts on Money Laundering Control for the period 2013-2014 and the recommendations, documents, Strategic Plan 2015-2017, and Work Plan 2014-2015 contained therein. It also approved the candidacies of Peru for Chair of the Expert Group for the 2015-2016 term of office, and of the Dominican Republic for Vice Chair for the same term.

### 18. Money Laundering Control – Strategic priorities in addressing money laundering

**Moderator:** Nelson Mena, Chief, Anti Money Laundering Section, CICAD/OAS

Mr. Mena described some of the programs being carried out by the Executive Secretariat of CICAD, highlighting the launch of the Technical Assistance Program on International Cooperation in Asset Recovery.

**Presenter:** Mariano Federici, Regional Adviser for Latin America, International Monetary Fund (IMF) (CICAD/doc.2151/14)

Mr. Federici said that it was necessary that the IMF and CICAD continue to coordinate their activities to fight organized crime, drug trafficking and money laundering. He described the technical assistance activities of the IMF, noting particularly the support provided to a number of States on development of national strategies to address these crimes, explaining the chief components of such strategies. In conclusion, he reiterated the IMF's readiness to cooperate with CICAD/OAS, and to publicize or circulate the recommendations and other documents developed by the GELAVEX.

### Comments by the delegations

**Panama** spoke of the progress that had been made in this area thanks to the support of the IMF, and described good practices in Panama in the area of asset recovery and sharing of the proceeds of crime in cases of international cooperation with a number of countries. He also said that Panama had recently approved a law on organized crime that set up joint investigative teams of public prosecutors from Panama and other countries on the issue of money laundering and organized crime, and that this is producing positive results.

**Peru** discussed the importance of exchanging information among agencies on the issue of the seizure and freezing of assets, and described good practices by Peru's Financial Intelligence Unit (FIU).

**Dominican Republic** described the composition and operations of the country's National Anti-Money Laundering Committee.

**Costa Rica** explained the work of the Costa Rican Institute on Drugs to prevent money laundering, and detailed the way in which funds derived from forfeited assets were allocated.

**United States** said that it considered that asset recovery through international cooperation should be improved.

#### **19. Maritime Narcotrafficking – Presentation of the Report of the Group of Experts (CICAD/doc.2130/14 and CICAD/doc.2136)**

**Presenter:** Orlando Enrique Grisales Franceschi, Director, Counter-drug Office, Colombian Navy and Chair of the Group of Experts

Mr. Grisales presented the report of the most recent meeting of the Group of Experts on Maritime Narcotrafficking, and described the discussions that had taken place during the meeting and the tasks that each of the subgroups had carried out. He then listed the documents developed by the Group, which he presented to the Commission, along with the Expert Group's plan of action, for consideration and approval.

#### **Decisions**

The Commission approved the report of the Group on Experts on Maritime Narcotrafficking, including its recommendations, documents and plan of action, and convened the Group to meet in 2015.

#### **20. Maritime Narcotrafficking – Situation in the region of maritime narcotrafficking**

**Moderator:** Ziggy Malyniwsky, Chief of the Supply Reduction Section, CICAD/OAS

#### **Presenters:**

- a. **Mario Germán Rodríguez Viera, Commander of the Naval Fleet, Colombian Navy (CICAD/doc.2147/14)**

Commander Rodríguez gave an overview of the maritime narcotrafficking situation in the region, and explained the problems and challenges it represents. He described the techniques used by drug traffickers, and the initiatives and operations being carried out to counter them. Commander Rodríguez reported on a plan, developed by Colombia, to set up an International Maritime Center to Counter Drug Trafficking (CIMCON), and discussed future challenges and the importance of international cooperation in addressing this problem.

- b. **Lou Orsini, Senior Maritime Law Enforcement Adviser, Office of Law Enforcement Policy, United States Coast Guard (CICAD/doc.2132/14)**

Mr. Orsini made a presentation on the multilateral approach to maritime counter-drug operations, and reported on the details of "Operation Martillo". He described the various bilateral and multilateral accords that have been entered into on this issue and the tools that had been used in the context of transnational cooperation. Mr. Orsini emphasized the importance of mutual support in dealing effectively with maritime narcotrafficking, and said that CICAD's efforts needed to be complemented with national efforts, creating a link between the Expert Group on Maritime Narcotrafficking and the Multilateral

Maritime Counterdrug Summits. He also urged all member states to participate in the Expert Group, and said that the products coming out of the Group should be evaluated.

### **Comments by the delegations**

**Panama** said that international cooperation was necessary and important in dealing with maritime narcotrafficking, and listed the successes that Panama had achieved as a result of bilateral accords. The delegate also stated his country's interest in participating in CIMCON, and asked that the possibility of reintroducing the topic of maritime narcotrafficking into the Multilateral Evaluation Mechanism (MEM) be reconsidered.

**Peru** explained the drug production process that takes place before maritime narcotrafficking, and how cocaine trafficking routes and consumer markets had changed. He added that given the complexity of the problem, it was important to focus on countries where cocaine originates, and proposed the formation of a working group to look into this issue.

### **21. Alternatives to Incarceration – Report of the Working Group (CICAD/doc.2141/14) and next steps**

**Moderator:** Vitore Andre Zilio Maximiano, Secretary, National Secretariat for Drug Policy (SENAD), Brazil

#### **Presenters:**

#### **a. Javier Florez, Director, Drug Policy Office, Ministry of Justice, Colombia**

Mr. Florez described the work carried out by the Working Group on Alternatives to Incarceration and the technical support group during 2014, which had resulted in the draft of the first technical report on alternatives to incarceration. He explained that the main objective of the report was to identify alternatives to the excessive use of incarceration for drug-related crimes, based on the experiences of different countries around the world, in order to present to member states a gamut of possibilities that could advance in the design and implementation of effective, human-rights based policies. Mr. Florez reported that a deadline of three months had been set (until February 20, 2015) for member states to review the draft and forward their suggestions and comments on it.

#### **b. Rodrigo Uprimny, Legal technical lead, Working Group on Alternatives to Incarceration**

Mr. Uprimny discussed why it was important to design and implement alternatives to incarceration in the area of drugs. He presented the conceptual, regulatory and methodological approaches used by the Technical Support Group (TSG), and highlighted the main points of the forty-one alternatives that had been identified for analysis as instructed by the Commission. He presented conclusions that pointed out some guiding principles on the adoption and development of some of these alternatives, recognizing the importance of bearing in mind the context and differing needs of each country.

#### **c. Geoffrey A Henderson, Judge, International Criminal Court, The Hague (CICAD/doc.2158/14)**

Judge Henderson encouraged judicial officers to take a new approach based on a therapeutic response, in an effort to mitigate litigants' problems, and presented the initiatives undertaken by Trinidad and Tobago to this end. He discussed the work that had been done by the Working Group on Alternatives to

Incarceration to institutionalize this new approach and to examine best practices. Judge Henderson said he felt it important to undertake coordinated strategies involving a number of national institutions, in order to make efficient use of the justice system and remove minor drug-related offenders from the prison system.

**d. Eric Green, Director of Policy Coordination, Office of Policy, Planning and Coordination, International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, Department of State, United States**

Mr. Green underlined the importance of alternatives to incarceration in developing balanced drug policies, and described the challenges encountered in developing institutions that will provide a range of responses to the problem. He made suggestions for inclusion in the report, and explained the U.S. approach to alternatives to incarceration, particularly the role of the Federal “Smart on Crime” initiative, which introduced the question of proportionality.

### **Comments by the delegations**

**Costa Rica** described his country’s experience with its program of drug treatment under court supervision (PTDJ), which is similar to the drug treatment court model, and added that the country is conducting complementary activities such as the PROCCER project.

**Guatemala** presented prison data showing that 9% of prisoners had been involved in drug-related crimes, and said that extending alternatives to incarceration to other offenses might be explored. He also reported that the country has included at least 12 of the 41 proposals made by the report in its national prevention plans and strategies.

**Ecuador** felt it important that the Working Group had included Ecuador’s experience in the report: he explained the situation in Ecuador, described the measures the country had taken with respect to alternatives to incarceration, and said that an evaluation of them would be conducted in August 2015. He said that the Executive Secretariat should continue to support the member states on this issue.

**Peru** explained his country’s participation in the working group on alternatives to incarceration and the advances Peru has made in this area. He considered that any document that presents alternatives to incarceration must be concordant with the international convention, and that such alternatives should not be made available to drug dealers.

**Trinidad and Tobago** said it was important that the Executive Secretariat of CICAD provide support to the Government of Colombia and other States interested in following up on the report in the coming months.

**Panama** discussed how his country had included alternatives to incarceration and social inclusion in its national drug strategy 2012-2017. He explained how CICAD had supported Panama in the development of its Court-supervised Drug Treatment Program (PJTD) and described its achievements as well as the challenges that had arisen.

**Canada** explained that the basis of sentencing in the criminal code in Canada is that sentences should be proportionate to the seriousness of the offense and the offender’s degree of responsibility. He described the country’s experience with drug treatment courts, and offered the working group on alternatives to incarceration information on pre-trial, trial and post-trial measures. He said it was important to treat possession and trafficking differently, and reiterated that it was important to be guided by the provisions of the international conventions.

**Argentina** explained the dynamics of drug dealing and the violence it produces, and spoke of the negative impact of drug dealing on young people, families, the education system and social networks. He thought that the State should focus on criminal prosecution of the highest links in the chain, and avoid any strategy that would revolve around criminalizing poverty. He also reported that Argentina is working to amend its legislation, to ensure that law does not punish possession of certain substances, and that progress is being made toward establishing a drug treatment court.

**Grenada** indicated that the member states still face many challenges in implementing these measures, given the limited set of options available, and for that reason, the working group and the Government of Colombia are facing great challenges ahead.

**Chile** recognized the need to move forward on proportionate sanctions for drug-related offenses, and explained that under Chilean law, a criminal approach is the only one contemplated for drug trafficking. He questioned whether the report was compatible with the international conventions, and requested the group to confine itself to the mandate it had been given and bear these comments in mind in the technical report. At the same time, he offered Chile's support for continued work on the subject.

**Mexico** described the expansion of the drug treatment court program in 2014, with support from CICAD on the basis of Memorandum of Understanding.

## **22. Report by the Executive Secretary of CICAD (CICAD doc.2155/14)**

Ambassador Simons discussed CICAD's achievements in the region in the areas of policy development, institution building, capacity building, research and multilateral evaluation. The Executive Secretary referred to the benefits of CICAD's Professional Exchange Program, which began in 2012, and outlined the challenges that would face the Executive Secretariat in 2015. Ambassador Simons spoke of the importance of working within the framework of the Hemispheric Drug Strategy, the Declaration of Antigua, Guatemala "For a comprehensive policy against the world drug problem in the Americas", and the resolution "Reflections and Guidelines to formulate and follow up on comprehensive policies to address the world drug problem in the Americas" adopted by the forty-sixth special session of the OAS General Assembly.

### **Comments by the delegations**

**Brazil** explained the challenges that had arisen with regard to the issue of smokable cocaine, and highlighted the importance of the PROCCER project, saying that the country was interested in contributing to the training of demand reduction personnel.

**El Salvador** reported that the country had completed a household survey in the area of demand reduction, and that the information produced would be used to update demand reduction activities. He detailed some of the most significant findings of the study.

**Peru** referred to the coca crop eradication activities that had been carried out in Peru.

**Trinidad and Tobago** acknowledged the support that had been provided by CICAD, and outlined the programs in which Trinidad and Tobago had worked in conjunction with the Commission.

## **23. Election of officers of Groups of Experts**

**a. Maritime Narcotrafficking**

The Commission approved Colombia's candidacy for Chair of the Expert Group on Maritime Narcotrafficking.

**b. Chemical Substances and Pharmaceutical Products**

The Commission approved Ecuador's candidacy for Chair of the Expert Group on Chemical Substances and Pharmaceutical Products.

**24. Remarks by Permanent Observers to the OAS, and International and Regional Organizations and Civil Society Organizations accredited to the OAS**

**The Russian Federation** reiterated its commitment to the international conventions, and stressed its interest in continuing to cooperate with CICAD in constructing the international community's antidrug agenda, as well as in professional training. He said that it was important to do more work on the issues of synthetic drugs and money laundering, and to continue to provide support for treatment and aftercare programs and for the civil society organizations that are working on these issues.

**25. Topics proposed, dates and place for the fifty-seventh regular session of CICAD**

The Commission decided that the next regular session of CICAD would be held at the end of April 2015 in Washington, D.C. The Chair of the Commission and the Executive Secretariat of CICAD will advise the Commissioners of the exact dates on which the session would be held.

The delegate of Canada suggested that the next regular session cover the topics of information exchange on chemical precursors, synthetic drugs and New Psychoactive Substances (NPSs), using the databases of international organizations, among law enforcement and border control officials. The delegate suggested that the topic of youth prevention education be included, specifying which methods had been successful and which not, including effective means of reaching young people, messages that might produced the desired effect, and other related topics that the demand reduction experts of the Executive Secretariat might wish to present.

**26. Other business**

Grenada introduced a proposal (CICAD/doc.2161/14) to gather information that would supplement the national reports of the Sixth Evaluation Round of the MEM. He said that the Commission's mandate was that the MEM reports should evaluate the implementation of the Plan of Action 2011-2015 of the Hemispheric Drug Strategy (2010), while the current national reports give information only up to June 2014. He said that the supplementary information would cover the period June 2014 to June 2015 and would serve as input to the working group that would develop the Plan of Action 2016-2020. He emphasized that this would not be a continuation of the evaluation, but would simply have as its purpose gathering up-to-date information on the actions taken by member states on the recommendations that had not been implemented. He also presented a work schedule for collecting this information in 2015.

**Comments by the delegations**

**Panama** supported the proposal by Grenada and said that it was necessary to have complete information, which would be useful for the group that will draw up the Plan of Action 2016-2020.

**Paraguay** supported the proposal, and committed to providing supplementary information as per the proposed timeline. The delegate considered that the information would be a very important tool for the working group on the Plan of Action 2016-2020.

**Ecuador** supported the proposal and said that it was important that the working group on the Plan of Action 2016-2020 have inputs updated to June 2015.

**Suriname** supported the proposal, and said that the supplementary information would be beneficial in developing the Plan of Action 2016-2020.

**Dominican Republic** supported the proposal as being apposite and useful for the working group on the Plan of Action 2016-2020.

**Peru** supported the proposal as presented.

**Guatemala** supported the proposal and recalled that the mandate of the working group on the Plan of Action states that the most recent progress and actions by member states to implement their national antidrug plans must be taken into account.

**Trinidad and Tobago** seconded the proposal and said that this work would enable the countries to have up-to-date information.

## **Decisions**

The Commission unanimously adopted the proposal by Grenada, along with the work schedule (CICAD/doc.2161/14).

## **27. Closing session**

Minister Héctor López Bonilla, Chair of CICAD, thanked the member states, and spoke of the importance of the human being as the center of action in the search for new alternatives to deal with the drug problem. He then closed the fifty-sixth regular session of CICAD.

### III. DECISIONS

The Commission took the following decisions:

1. Adopted the draft agenda (CICAD/doc.2116/14 rev.3) and the draft schedule of activities (CICAD/doc.2117/14 rev.2).
2. Elected Guatemala and Peru as Chair and Vice Chair of CICAD for the 2014-2015 term of office.
3. Approved the formation of a working group to amend the Plan of Action 2011-2015 of the Hemispheric Drug Strategy (2010), to be chaired by Guatemala.
4. Approved the timeline proposed by the Executive Secretariat of CICAD for the drafting of the Plan of Action 2016-2020 of CICAD's Hemispheric Drug Strategy (CICAD/doc.2144/14).
5. Approved the report of the Governmental Experts Group (GEG) of the Multilateral Evaluation Mechanism (MEM) (CICAD/doc.2139/14).
6. Approved the thirty-four national reports of the Sixth Evaluation Round of the MEM (CICAD/doc.2148/14).
7. Approved the report of the Group of Experts on Chemical Substances and Pharmaceutical Products, including its recommendations and Plan of Action (CICAD/doc.2129/14). It also approved the candidacy of Ecuador to serve as Chair of the Group.
8. Approved the report of the Group of Experts on Maritime Narcotrafficking, including its recommendations, documents and plan of action, and convened the Group to meet in 2015 (CICAD/doc.2136/14). It also approved the candidacy of Colombia to serve as Chair of the Group.
9. Approved the report of the Group of Experts on Money Laundering Control for the period 2013-2014, including its recommendations, documents, Strategic Plan 2015-2017, and the Work Plan for 2014-2015 (CICAD/doc.2119/14). It also approved the candidacy of Peru to serve as Chair, and the Dominican Republic to serve as Vice Chair of the Group of Experts for the 2015–2016 term of office.
10. Agreed that comments be sent to the Executive Secretariat of CICAD on the first draft report of the Working Group on Alternatives to Incarceration within three months (up to February 20, 2015). The Government of Colombia will use these inputs to present the final report to the Commission at its fifty-seventh regular session. The Executive Secretariat of CICAD will continue to support the member states in the development and implementation of such alternatives as the member states wish to explore.
11. Approved the proposal by Grenada on the request to member states for information supplementing the MEM on the period June 2014-June 2015, as well as a work schedule (CICAD/doc.2161/14). The details would be worked out in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of CICAD, the Coordinator of the GEG, an on-line working group and the Executive Secretariat of CICAD.

## **IV. PARTICIPANTS**

### **1. Member states of CICAD**

Argentina, The Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, United States, Uruguay and Venezuela.

### **2. Permanent Observers**

Russian Federation, Spain, United Kingdom.

### **3. International and specialized regional organizations**

Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), World Bank.

### **4. Civil society**

Asociación Costarricense para el Estudio e Intervención de Drogas (ACEID); Centros de Integración Juvenil, A.C. (Mexico), Espolea (Mexico), Grupo Ceiba (Guatemala), Woodrow Wilson Center; Global Commission on Drug Policy, Asociación Civil Intercambios (Argentina), International Drug Policy Consortium (IDPC), Canada; Open Society Foundation (OSF); Washington Office on Latin American Affairs (WOLA).