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Executive Summary

Introduction
This report provides the results of the final evaluation of the project “European Union – Latin America and the Caribbean Drug Treatment City Partnership”, commonly known as the “EU-LAC Drug Treatment City Partnership”.

Project Profile
The EU-LAC Project initiative, which was coordinated by CICAD and financed by the European Union (EU), brought together cities in the European Union, Latin America and the Caribbean in order to improve policy and city-level decisions on the quality and coverage of drug treatment and rehabilitation. Organised around three areas of action, this project marks the first cooperative initiative between Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean in the field of drug treatment at the local level. The project’s activities were organised into three working groups:

- Working Group on Improving Drug Treatment Public Policies and Inter-Agency Cooperation (Group 1)
- Working Group on Improving Drug Treatment Services in EU and LAC Cities (Group 2)
- Working Group on Treatment Alternatives to Incarceration for Drug-Dependent Offenders (Group 3)

Over the course of the project (February 2007 to December 2010), 49 cities from 41 countries participated in a variety of events including 10 fora, 4 study visits and knowledge exchanges and 2 summit meetings. In addition, the project led to the establishment of bilateral and multilateral agreements among 15 cities and the organisation of exchanges of best practices involving 12 cities.

Evaluation Background, Purpose and Methodology
In February 2011 CICAD contracted Universalia Management Group following a competitive bidding process to conduct an independent, summative and final evaluation of the project “European Union – Latin America and the Caribbean Drug Treatment City Partnership”, commonly known as the “EU-LAC Drug Treatment City Partnership”. The evaluation objectives were to assess and validate the results of the project; to analyse the effectiveness of its overall activities; to analyse lessons learned and to provide forward looking recommendations for potential new projects on drug treatment, as well as to assess the conditions for sustainability of the project’s results.

Methods of data collection included document review, semi-structured face-to-face and telephone interviews, email correspondence and a survey. The Evaluator consulted 43 individuals and reviewed over 30 documents, including audiovisual materials, and analysed the data through descriptive, content and comparative analysis.

Evaluation Findings on Programme Performance
Relevance
The project has been highly relevant for the funding and implementing agencies, as it is closely aligned with both the European Commission’s Latin American Regional Strategy Document, 2002-2006, and with the Hemispheric Drug Strategy adopted by the 47th Ordinary Session of the Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD) and endorsed by the General Assembly of the Organisation of American States in June 2010.
Furthermore, the project has been highly relevant for the participating cities, as it explicitly focuses on bringing the issues of drug treatment to the local level. The creation of three separate if complementary working groups within the project, allowed each city to concentrate specifically on the issue areas that they considered most relevant.

**Effectiveness**

In a little more than three years, and working with 49 cities in 41 very diverse countries, the EU-LAC Project has achieved or exceeded its planned specific objectives, has made some progress toward the overall objective, and has contributed to raising awareness of the importance of public policies, improved access to treatment and treatment alternatives to incarceration in the context of improving the quality and coverage of drug treatment and rehabilitation.

**Awareness-raising**

The EU-LAC Project has succeeded in raising awareness of the importance of:

- drug treatment to municipal public policies, and of the importance of municipal public policies for the effective delivery of drug treatment centres;
- reliable information systems about existing treatment services, treatment needs and treatment outcomes; and
- drug treatment as an alternative to incarceration for drug-addicted offenders.

**Capacity-building**

The EU-LAC project also successfully organised several capacity-building events to improve the policymaking capacity of cities, to improving the capacity of treatment service delivery agencies, and to promote of treatment alternatives to incarceration and to the sharing of best practices in the area of Drug Treatment Courts (DTCs). In addition, th project’s activities led directly to the development of data collection tools for the improvement of information systems in drug treatment. However, there is no evidence that EU-LAC Project’s activities had an effect on the provision of drug treatment services for diverse populations in the EU.

**Partnerships**

As a result of the EU-LAC Project, several participating cities and countries began or deepened collaborative initiatives internally between local government, central government agencies, health service providers and/or the justice system, reflecting best practices.

The EU-LAC Project fostered a number of bilateral and trilateral partnership agreements between cities in the EU and LAC regions, and also led to the establishment of a multilateral Partnership which expands on the project’s focus. In addition, the project provided the opportunity for the creation of the European Network of Drug Treatment Courts.

**Communications and visibility**

The EU-LAC Project provided a Project Website for participating cities and agencies which offered up to date information on the project’s activities and allowed stakeholders to exchange information and knowledge outside of project events.

In addition, EU-LAC Project activities were widely publicised through media that enhanced its visibility beyond direct participants.
Efficiency

The EU-LAC Project used its resources efficiently and creatively. The project had a total budget of EUR 1,573,618, including the value of the grant (EUR 1,400,639) and the contributions of CICAD. Through a realignment of the project’s activities to better reflect the conditions and interests of participating cities and countries, the project was not only able to meet or exceed most of its expected results, it also received important in-kind contributions for participating cities and form cities that hosted the project’s events.

The EU-LAC Project Management Team administered the project activities transparently, thus contributing to stakeholder commitment, and also displayed good organisational skills and high levels of commitment to the project’s objectives.

Sustainability

The EU-LAC project has made important strides to ensure the continuation of its achievements. As a result of the project’s activities, a number of stakeholders have undertaken concrete commitments towards maintaining partnerships beyond the project’s end. However, additional support is still needed to ensure the achievement and institutionalisation of the project’s overall objectives.

Conclusions, Lessons Learned and Recommendations

The EU-LAC Project was highly relevant in relation to the strategic objectives of the EU and CICAD, as well as to the perceived needs of participating cities and countries. In a relatively short period of time, the Project has achieved most of its planned results and activities and has made important strides towards the achievement of its overall objectives. The evaluation indicates that, overall, the project has fostered fruitful partnerships and agreements, facilitated knowledge exchanges and raised awareness among policy-makers, treatment service providers and professionals in the justice sector.

Lessons Learned

- Knowledge/awareness-raising can be a real achievement.
- Large events can be a catalyst for wide stakeholder engagement but do not guarantee sustained commitment.
- Building ownership is crucial for project performance and sustainability.
- Diversity can be a blessing and a curse.

Recommendations

- When designing a new joint project, CICAD and the EU may find it useful to make the design of the logic framework more participatory
- The EU and CICAD should take care that a clear emphasis is placed on ensuring collaboration among the relevant authorities for each participating city, at the regional and national level
- A longer timeline should be considered for designing future projects, in order to increase the likelihood of obtaining concrete results and ensuring the institutionalisation of the processes launched
- The EU and CICAD should continue to ensure the commitment and buy-in of participants through a mechanism of co-responsibility, which promotes both stakeholder ownership and project efficiency
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1. Introduction

Universalia is pleased to present the draft report on the evaluation of the EU-LAC Drug Treatment City Partnerships to the Inter-American Drug Abuse Control commission, Secretariat for Multidimensional Security (CICAD) of the Organisation of American States (OAS) and its partners. In February 2011 CICAD contracted Universalia Management Group following a competitive bidding process to conduct an independent, summative and final evaluation of the project “European Union –Latin America and the Caribbean Drug Treatment City Partnership”, commonly known as the “EU-LAC Drug Treatment City Partnership”.

1.1 Background

The EU-LAC Project initiative, which was coordinated by CICAD and financed by the European Union (EU), brought together cities in the European Union, Latin America and the Caribbean in order to improve policy and city-level decisions on the quality and coverage of drug treatment and rehabilitation. Organised around three areas of action, this project marks the first cooperative initiative between Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean in the field of drug treatment at the local level.

**EU-LAC Project Areas of Action:**
1. Development of local policies at the city level for drug treatment in Latin America, the Caribbean and the European Union
2. Upgrading drug treatment services and expanding cooperation with city government agencies to provide more effective treatment programmes
3. Promotion of drug treatment, supervised by the court system, as an alternative to incarceration for drug addicted offenders

Over the course of the project (February 2007 to December 2010), 49 cities from 41 countries participated in a variety of events including 10 fora, 4 study visits and knowledge exchanges and 2 summit meetings. In addition, the project led to the establishment of bilateral and multilateral agreements among 15 cities and the organisation of exchanges of best practices involving 12 cities. For further details on the background of the project, please refer to www.cicad.oas.org.

The total program budget (as agreed in the contract signed by the partners in December 2006) was EUR 1,573,618, including a grant of EUR 1,400,639 from the EU as well as contributions by CICAD.

1.2 Methodology

1.2.1 Evaluation Objectives and Framework

The objectives of the final project evaluation as outlined in the TOR were:

- To evaluate the management of the project, as well as its efficiency and effectiveness
- To analyse the management of the project’s implementation and to provide a summative evaluation of the project’s results
- To critically analyse the formulation, design, implementation and management of the project

---
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- To evaluate the institutional and financial sustainability of the interventions financed by the project
- To document lessons learned from the intervention regarding formulation, design, implementation, management and sustainability
- To make recommendations for the improvement of the future formulation and design of similar projects

1.2.2 Evaluation Process

Data collection and analysis were carried out by the Evaluator in close consultation with CICAD. Our overall approach to the assignment was consultative and utilization-focused, and was designed in alignment with UNEG Norms and Standards and the ethical code of conduct of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

1.2.3 Data Sources

There were two major sources of data for this review: people and documents (both traditional and audiovisual).

People: 43 individuals were consulted for the evaluation, either in person or by phone and/or email. Appendix IV lists all stakeholders from whom data were obtained.

Documents: The Evaluator reviewed and analyzed over 30 documents (EU-LAC reports and documents), including audiovisual materials developed around the project’s events. A list of documents and websites reviewed during the course of the evaluation is presented as Appendix V.

1.2.4 Methods of Data Collection and Analysis

Methods of data collection included document review, semi-structured face-to-face and telephone interviews, email correspondence and a survey.

The Evaluator used descriptive, content, and comparative analysis to analyse the data for this study. Validity was ensured through compliance with standard evaluation practices and through data triangulation (i.e., convergence of multiple data sources) when data were available. Based on the analysis, the Evaluator developed findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

1.2.5 Limitations of the Evaluation

The Evaluator encountered some limitations in conducting this evaluation which are summarized below.

- **Limited time and budget:** Only two weeks were allocated for data collection, which did not allow for extensive follow up or additional interviews that could have been relevant.

- **Low response rates:** While the response rate of telephone interviewees was high (12 out of 17), the response rate for the survey was low, and the limited time available for data collection did not allow for the extensive follow up required to increase the response rate for email-based surveys.

In light of these limitations, the data basis for the evaluation does not provide strong statistical significance. Rather, the analysis was based primarily on qualitative methods of analysis.

---
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1.3 Structure of the Report

This report is presented in seven sections. Following this introduction, Section 2 describes the Project goal and objectives and the framework for assessing the program’s performance; Section 3 explores the relevance of the project for the funding and implementing agencies as well as for the stakeholders; Sections 4, 5 and 6 respectively present evaluation findings on the program’s effectiveness and impact, efficiency, and sustainability. Section 7 provides the conclusions of the evaluation, lessons learned, and recommendations.

2. Program Objectives and Basis for Assessing Performance

2.1 Program Objectives

Program objectives refer to the overall achievements that a program intends to attain or contribute to (goal, impacts, outcomes, and outputs), and program logic (or theory of change) refers to the set of assumptions and causal relationships that link inputs and activities to the achievement of expected results in the short, medium, and long term. Together, these provide a logical explanation of how a program intends to work.

The EU-LAC Project Document, Logic Framework (logframe) and Action Plan define the project’s objectives and key guiding assumptions. The Evaluator undertook an analysis of the Action Plan, as it was the primary guide of the project’s implementation. An analysis of the logframe is provided, for reference purposes only, in Appendix II.

2.1.1 Action Plan

The process of implementation of the Project led to a significant reinterpretation of the logframe. The project participants in the launch event in Santo Domingo decided to develop an Action Plan for each of the three working groups that were formed (see Appendix III).

This Action Plan was faithful to the fundamental principles of the project document. However, it offered two advantages over the original logframe. First, it allowed the participating cities to take full ownership of the project, by consensually formulating a specific set of activities for each working group, and by explicitly signing on to one, two or all of the working groups.

The Action Plan outlined specific actions and activities tailored to the overall aims of each working group. A noteworthy adaptation of the original project design was the substitution of multi-city partnerships, coupled with formal bilateral agreements, for the original notion of twinned cities. As will be discussed in Section 5 (Efficiency) below, this realignment emphasised the creation of broad networks that had the potential to increase the reach of the project.

The Action Plan further clarified the project’s focus on raising awareness, building capacity, creating lasting networks and partnerships, as well as the sharing of best practices and exchanging of knowledge and experiences. As a result, the project’s core activities were more clearly aligned with its overall objectives.

2.2 Basis for Assessment

The Evaluator formulated an evaluation matrix (presented in Appendix I) that seeks to reflect both the project’s initial impetus and the way in which participant cities and countries reinterpreted it. The evaluation matrix therefore focuses on assessing the project’s relevance, its effectiveness in capacity-building and influencing processes, specifically around each of the three working groups. In addition, the evaluation matrix is intended to assess the project’s management in terms of the effectiveness of its
communications programme, and the efficiency with which its resources were managed. Finally, the evaluation matrix interrogates the extent to which the project built a solid basis to ensure the sustainability of its achievements.

3. Relevance

This section provides the evaluation findings on the relevance of the EU-LAC Partnership Project. Overall, the EU-LAC Project has been very relevant at the global level and it has helped to raise awareness in the participating cities and countries of the important role that cities and local authorities can play in improving drug treatment and rehabilitation, as well as of the scientific evidence supporting the role of treatment as an alternative to incarceration.

Finding 1: The EU-LAC Project is in line with the strategic objectives of both the EU and CICAD

The EU-LAC Project’s objectives and areas of involvement are strongly aligned with the strategic concerns of the EU and CICAD. Indeed, the European Commission’s Latin American Regional Strategy Document, 2002-2006\(^3\) outlines priorities of action that include the implementation of the Panama Action Plan of 1999 in the fight against drugs and crime. Furthermore, its underlying themes of providing increased attention to socially-excluded populations, decentralising policies, plans and actions to the local level and improving the capacities of local authorities are all reflected in the EU-LAC project’s priorities.

For its part, CICAD’s own Demand Reduction Program includes policies to prevent and treat drug use which are intended to be implemented at the local level. CICAD has also contributed to a growing interest among its member states in improving and updating criminal justice systems as well as drug laws and strategies, which is increasingly examining alternatives to incarceration for minor drug offenders. These priorities are also well reflected in the EU-LAC project’s intended activities and objectives. More importantly, the EU-LAC project dovetails with the Hemispheric Drug Strategy adopted by the 47th Ordinary Session of CICAD and endorsed by the General Assembly of the Organisation of American States in June 2010\(^4\).

Finding 2: Consulted stakeholders described the EU-LAC Project as highly relevant in the incorporation of best practices in the project’s three working groups

The participating cities and countries reflect a great diversity in the three areas of action for this project. In particular, they display wide variations in the extent to which they have developed policies at the local level, as well as in the institutional setting in which treatment centres operate and in their legal and judicial jurisdiction systems. In spite of this diversity, stakeholders unanimously indicated that the project’s objectives were closely aligned with their own priorities, although not necessarily in all three areas of action simultaneously. This alignment was the result of the decision to formally require each participating city or country to choose the working group in which it would participate. This process ensured the buy-in of participants and served to ensure that they would be involved in those activities that were of interest to them.

4. Effectiveness and Impact

This section provides a summary of the program’s overall effectiveness, and provides more detailed findings on the achievement of specific objectives, expected results and contributions to overall objectives and impact.

\(^3\) http://eeas.europa.eu/la/rsp/02_06_en.pdf

4.1 Overall Effectiveness

In a little more than three years, and working with 49 cities in 41 very diverse countries, the EU-LAC Project has achieved or exceeded its planned specific objectives, has made some progress toward the overall objective, and has contributed to raising awareness of the importance of public policies, improved access to treatment and treatment alternatives to incarceration in the context of improving the quality and coverage of drug treatment and rehabilitation.

As will be discussed in more detail in the sections below, the project has organised meetings, workshops, best practice exchanges and summit meetings; produced data collection tools and published two studies. Furthermore, there is evidence that the project has laid the foundations for sustained partnerships among cities in the European Union, Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as networks of experts and practitioners. In addition, there is evidence of increased awareness and capacity among stakeholders.

4.2 Effectiveness in Raising Awareness

Finding 3: The EU-LAC Project has succeeded in raising awareness of the importance of drug treatment to municipal public policies, and of the importance of municipal public policies for the effective delivery of drug treatment centres

Through the organisation of large-scale, high-profile international fora and working meetings, the EU-LAC project has brought together municipal authorities and central government agencies to discuss the relevance of local, city-level involvement in the policy-making and implementing processes for drug treatment services. Although many of the cities involved in the project do not have direct jurisdiction or experience in drug related policy or service delivery (including drug abuse prevention), consulted stakeholders indicated that through their participation in EU-LAC events they either became aware of the possibility of becoming actively involved either directly, by collaborating with central government authorities, or indirectly by designing local policies that would facilitate access to treatment services and/or by adapting centrally-designed services and policies to their specific local needs.

Some officials from central government agencies mentioned that prior to participating in this project the idea of working directly with local governments had not occurred to them. Conversely, for those cities that already had public policies in this area, officials who were interviewed during the evaluation mentioned that their participation in the project allowed them to “be re-energised” in their efforts in this area, by realising that they were not alone in facing these issues.

Generally, consulted stakeholders at the municipal level valued the opportunity to bring drug treatment policy to the local level, as it is in municipalities that the problems of abuse and trafficking are directly experienced. All consulted stakeholders stated that their participation in the project events had either generated an interest in the role of local-level public policies, reinforced their commitment to working with municipal authorities, or made them aware of the international dimensions of an issue they had only experienced locally or regionally.

Finding 4: The EU-LAC Project has raised awareness of drug treatment service providers, city authorities and central government agencies about the importance of having reliable information systems about existing treatment services, treatment needs and treatment outcomes

This project responds to a perception of a growing social and economic problem related to drug abuse. However, the design of appropriate policies and the provision of appropriate services are fundamentally
dependent on the existence and accessibility of reliable empirical evidence. It is currently an accepted foundation of good governance practices to base public actions on evidence-based policies. Of particular use in this sense was the EU-LAC sponsored study “Status of Drug Treatment at the Local Level (Cities): Information from 19 Cities from Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean”, which reflects the findings of a series of assessments of the status of drug treatment at the local level, focusing on care needs and the available supply of services. This had an awareness-raising impact in so far as some of the cities participating in the study had not previously conducted such an assessment and did not have the necessary data-collection tools. As will be discussed in Section 6 (sustainability) below, the assessment methodology and tools were designed by CICAD with significant technical contributions from the Inter-American Observatory on Drugs (OID), the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) and the Caribbean Community Secretariat (CARICOM), and in collaboration with participating cities specifically for this project, but was adopted and adapted by some participating countries for their own data collection purposes.

Finding 5: The EU-LAC project was especially successful in raising awareness of drug treatment as an alternative to incarceration for drug-addicted offenders

While the notion of drug treatment courts (DTCs) was not intrinsically the leading element of the project, it was a novel idea in most parts of both the LAC region and the EU. Similarly, while some countries had experimented with this model, participants in the project were not always aware of experiences in other countries. As a result of this project, cities and countries with experience in this field had the opportunity to become aware of and learn from the experiences of others. More importantly, several consulted stakeholders mentioned that through their participation in EU-LAC events in this area they became aware of the existing empirical evidence supporting treatment as an alternative to incarceration, which prompted them to consider the implementation of such systems in their own jurisdictions.

However, it was noted by some stakeholders that the focus of the project at the level of cities was problematic in this area, because the judicial system is usually organised at the national level, and therefore it would have been helpful to involve higher-level judicial authorities.

4.3 Effectiveness in Capacity Building

The objectives of the EU-LAC project were strongly anchored in capacity building:

* To help improve the policy-making capacity of partner cities to support the provision of drug treatment (...).
* (...)
* To sensitize family court prosecutors and judges to drug treatment and rehabilitation as an alternative to incarceration for petty drug offenders

The project activities to support these objectives relied on the organisation of learning events as well as on the exchange of experiences to communicate best practices in the three areas of action (public policy, treatment service provision, and treatment as an alternative to incarceration).

Finding 6: The EU-LAC project was successful in organising several capacity-building events to improve the policymaking capacity of cities

Following the creation of the Working Group on Improving Drug Treatment Public Policies and Inter-Agency Cooperation (Group 1) during the Project’s Launching event in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic in April 2008, two group-specific events were organised for Group 1: a study visit to Gothenburg, Sweden in May 2009 and a study visit to Segovia, Spain, in October 2009. Additional knowledge exchange activities took place at the Summit Meeting in Lugo, Spain, in April 2010 and in Coimbra, Portugal in

5 EU-LAC website (http://www.eulacdrugs.org/eulac/objectives)
September 2010. Participants consulted during the evaluation indicated that these events were especially useful to learn about best practices, as well as understanding how other cities had organised their collaboration with health services and judicial authorities and drawing inspiration from those exchanges. In addition, the study visits were particularly appreciated by municipal officials from cities that did not previously have experience in this field. Over 300 individuals participated in these events and were thus able to benefit from one another’s experiences and knowledge base.

In addition, these events provided the setting and impetus for the signing of bilateral agreements that served to build networks and partnerships (see Section 4.5 below).

**Finding 7:** The EU-LAC project was successful in organising several capacity-building events specifically geared to improving the capacity of treatment service delivery agencies

Following the creation of the Working Group on Improving Drug Treatment Services in EU and LAC Cities (Group 2) in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic in April 2008, three group-specific events took place for Group 2: in Montevideo, Uruguay in December 2008, in Montego Bay, Jamaica, in March 2009, and in San Miguel de Tucuman, Argentina, in September 2009. These three activities were workshops focusing on local assessments, information systems and strategic planning. In addition, knowledge exchange and workshops for Group 2 were also held during the Summit Meeting in Lugo and in Coimbra. Over 600 individuals participated in these events and were thus able to benefit from one another’s experiences and knowledge base.

**Finding 8:** The EU-LAC Project directly led to the development of data collection tools for the improvement of information systems in drug treatment

An important component of Working Group 2 was the development of data collection tools to be used at the local level, specifically the City Profile and Treatment Registration forms. The City Profile Form is intended to “provide a tool for local authorities responsible for organizing treatment services for their populations of problematic drug users that will help them gather and systematize the information needed for a rapid assessment of the current status of treatment in their sphere of action”6. This tool was instrumental in collecting previously unrecorded information that should provide the evidence base for the development of appropriate public policies and improved treatment service delivery, as well as for conducting a needs assessment at the local level in the participating cities. The Treatment Registration Form was developed as a means to share best practices in treatment information systems, in order to understand the performance of available treatment services. Both forms were developed collaboratively on the basis of existing tools in participating cities and those developed by CICAD and by the EMCDDA.

Interviewed participants were especially appreciative of the development of these two data collection tools, as they constituted important information sources for those cities that did not possess them previously, and an opportunity to fine-tune and improve upon existing tools for others.

---

6 Status of Drug Treatment at the Local Level (Cities): Information from 19 Cities from Europe, Latin America, and the Caribbean, p. 253
(http://www.eulacdrugs.org/fs/view/coimbra/documents/STATUS_OF_DRUG_TREATMENT_EU-LAC.pdf)
Finding 9: The EU-LAC Project was successful in organising several capacity-building events specifically focused on the promotion of treatment alternatives to incarceration and to the sharing of best practices in the area of Drug Treatment Courts (DTCs)

The Working Group on Treatment Alternatives to Incarceration for Drug-Dependent Offenders (Group 3) was created at the Launch Event in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, in April 2008. Subsequently, two group-specific exchange visits were organised: in Santiago de Chile, Chile, in March 2009 and in Ghent, Belgium, in June 2009. Furthermore, workshops dealing with drug treatment in prisons and with DTCs took place at the Lugo and Coimbra Summits in 2010. Consulted stakeholders who participated in these events mentioned that they provided excellent opportunities to learn about the different modalities that DTCs can take, as well as to become familiar with the scientific evidence supporting the implementation of DTCs.

Furthermore, the Project’s efforts in this working group contributed to the development of an evidence base for understanding and/or promoting DTCs, in particular by sponsoring the study “Establishing Drug Treatment Courts: Strategies, Experiences and Preliminary Outcomes” which was published during the Lugo Summit in April 2010. A further publication, “Court Supervised Treatment Alternatives to Incarceration for Drug-Dependent Offenders: the Drug Policy Agenda” is forthcoming.

“A lot of people attended [the workshops] and have been trained and become trainers for police officers, judges, treatment providers... Hundreds of people have now been trained in Jamaica alone.”

Jamaican interviewee

Finding 10: The great diversity of contexts and experiences in the three working groups provided a wealth of knowledge for participants. However, this diversity created some challenges

One of the strengths of the EU-LAC Project was that stakeholders were able to decide in which working group(s) they wanted to participate, enabling them to focus on areas that were of particular interest to them. However, a number of consulted stakeholders suggested that “there is some room for compartmentalising approaches” within each working group, in order to maximise the mutual exchange of knowledge and best practices. For instance, with regards to treatment alternatives to incarceration, the fundamental differences between civil and common law traditions on occasion made it difficult to communicate the different approaches to drug treatment courts and to see how they could be adapted from one tradition to the other.

An additional complication identified by a few respondents stem from the fact that linguistic differences were at times an obstacle to better cooperation.

Finally, some consulted stakeholders suggested that the different levels of experience with regards to drug treatment as well as in the socio-economic development of the participating cities meant that participants in the more specialised workshops were not always on the same page.

4.4 Effectiveness in Influencing Processes

Finding 11: As a result of the EU-LAC Project, several participating cities and countries began or deepened collaborative initiatives between local government, central government agencies, health service providers and/or the justice system, reflecting best practices

Several contacted interviewees noted that the joint participation of stakeholders from local governments, central-government agencies, health service providers and members of the justice system allowed them to better understand their own national context, to establish fruitful working relationships and to begin to design local projects to integrate the three areas of action of the EU-LAC project. All contacted stakeholders reported some progress in this direction.
For example, in Colón, El Salvador, the EU-LAC Project inspired the municipality to work with the police, health authorities and the Ministry of Justice to set up a drug-use prevention clinic. Similarly, in Argentina, the municipality of San Miguel de Tucuman has strengthened its working relationship with the Secretaría de Programación para la Prevención de la Drogadicción y la Lucha contra el Narcotráfico (SEDRONAR).

In the Dominican Republic, the holding of the Project’s inaugural event in Santo Domingo was seen as a catalytic event that provided the Consejo Nacional de Drogas (CND) with a stronger focus on rehabilitation. As a direct result of their participation in the EU-LAC Project, municipal and national officials in Santo Domingo initiated a collaborative project involving the CND, the Ministry of Health and the Consejo Nacional de la Niñez, which resulted in the opening of a treatment centre for drug dependent children and adolescents. In Jamaica, the knowledge exchange provided stakeholders with the necessary evidence base to lobby national authorities to continue or increase support for that country’s DTCs. In Mexico, the same process has led to the implementation of a pilot DTC project in the state of Nuevo León.

Finding 12: There is no evidence that EU-LAC Project’s activities had an effect on the provision of drug treatment services for diverse populations in the EU

While the project was successful in raising awareness and promoting networks and partnerships in participating EU cities (see section 4.5 below) regarding all of its broad areas of action, this element of the project’s objectives does not appear to have been equally successful. The Project’s overall objective explicitly seeks to “Contribute to improve the quality and coverage of drug treatment, rehabilitation and harm reduction for diverse populations in European Union, Latin American and Caribbean cities”7, and Expected Result 4 in the logic framework specifically aims to sensitise EU city mayors and authorities to the “need for specialised drug treatment programmes for LAC immigrant populations in EU cities”8. While the subject was discussed in many of the project’s workshops, and while the data collection tools included information regarding ethnic minorities, this does not appear to have translated into concrete action on the part of participating EU cities.

4.5 Effectiveness in Building Networks and Partnerships

Finding 13: The EU-LAC Project provided the opportunity for the creation of the European Network of Drug Treatment Courts

During an exchange visit to Ghent, Belgium in June 2009, in the context of Group 3 activities, judges, prosecutors and health sector professionals from Europe signed a letter of intent for the creation of the ENDTC and agreed upon a draft constitution for the ENDTC, including participants from Bulgaria, Belgium, Ireland, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom. Participants who were interviewed during the evaluation of the project noted that, while some of them had been working in this area for some time, they were not aware of similar experiences in other European countries. Furthermore, the topic of alternatives to incarceration is relatively new in most of Europe. A number of consulted stakeholders indicated that prior to their participation in the EU-LAC Project, they had no knowledge of the concept of DTCs, while others who were involved in pilot projects in this area indicated they had been unaware that other jurisdictions were implementing similar initiatives. These interviewees reported the idea of creating a formal network for regular knowledge exchanges was born as a direct result of the contacts and exchanges that took place during the EU-LAC sponsored events.

---

7 European Community Contribution Agreement with an International Organisation DRG/2006/126-777, Annex I p.3
8 Ibid., Annex C to Annex I, p. 2
Finding 14: The EU-LAC Project fostered a number of bilateral and trilateral partnership agreements between cities in the EU and LAC regions

Cities participating in bilateral and multilateral agreements in the context of the EU-LAC Project

* Barcelona (Spain)
* Conchalí (Chile)
* Cuenca (Ecuador)
* Ghent (Belgium)
* Lambayeque (Peru)
* Lourdes-Colón (El Salvador)
* Lugo (Spain)
* Mexicali (Mexico)
* Montevideo (Uruguay)
* Paramaribo (Suriname)
* Peñalolén (Chile)
* San Miguel de Tucumán (Argentina)

Source: www.eulacdrugs.org/eulac

One of the initial objectives of the EU-LAC Project was to promote the twinning of cities in drug treatment. While the formal twinning of cities was replaced with the broader notion of establishing partnerships, eight formal agreements have been entered into, involving eleven cities on both sides of the Atlantic. The agreements were entered into during the group-specific events (workshops, knowledge exchanges and study visits) and during summit meetings. As a result, the EU-LAC Project was able to closely link the processes of awareness-raising, capacity-building and formalising partnerships.

Finding 15: The EU-LAC Project led to the establishment of a multilateral Partnership which expands on the project’s focus

During the Summit Meeting in Lugo, Spain, in April 2010, EU-LAC participants adopted the Lugo Declaration, establishing the EU-LAC Partnership in Drug Demand Reduction. The Partnership was signed at the EU-LAC Meeting in Coimbra, Portugal, in September 2010. The creation of this partnership reflects the participants’ desire to continue the work that was initiated through the EU-LAC project, and lays the foundations for a sustained knowledge and experience exchange. Furthermore, the Lugo Declaration was formally incorporated into the Vitoria-Gasteiz Declaration of the II Forum of European Union –Latin American & Caribbean Local Governments\(^9\). This represents a direct effect of the EU-LAC Project, in so far as participant cities decided to involve other municipal and local government authorities in the Partnership.

4.6 Effectiveness of the Project Communications Programme

The project document’s planned activities included a communications programme to ensure not only communication among participants, but also the increased visibility of EU-LAC cooperation on issues of drug treatment and rehabilitation.

Finding 16: The EU-LAC Project provided a Project Website for participating cities and agencies

The logic of this project rested on the exchange of best practices and collaboration among participants. The geographic scope of the project — covering both sides of the Atlantic Ocean and spanning the Western hemisphere on both sides of the equator — meant that direct, face to face collaboration on an ongoing basis beyond the fora, study visits and workshops would have been costly and impractical. This challenge was alleviated to some extent by the development of a Project Website which served three important purposes. First, each working group had an online collaborative space where ideas and tools could be exchanged among participants. Second, the website was an important tool for disseminating information about project activities and publications. Finally, the website represented a valuable window into the project’s management, thus ensuring the transparency of its work.

Finding 17: EU-LAC Project activities were widely publicised through media that enhanced its visibility beyond direct participants

The EU-LAC project created a website (www.eulacdrugs.org) in English and Spanish that provides information on the project’s background and context, as well as on all project events and products. With the end of the project, a new webpage has been created within CICAD’s site (http://www.cicad.oas.org/Main/Template.asp?File=/reduccion_demanda/eulac/main_ENG.asp).

In addition, coverage of the project’s activities and events was ensured through EU-LAC-issued press releases and interviews, as well as communications emanating from the cities hosting the events. Over 155 news items were produced during the course of the project. Moreover, the EU-LAC project was publicised through CICAD’s own website (five instances). In addition, a number of radio and television interviews took place in the context of the summit meetings, a wealth of audio-visual material was distributed to participants and is available at both websites, and the host cities of events publicised them intensively at their own cost.

Furthermore, formal presentations of the project were made regularly to the CICAD Commission, the Meetings of European Cities against Drugs in Istanbul and Milan (2007), the X High-Level Meeting of the Coordination and Cooperation Mechanism on Drugs between the European Union and Latin America and the Caribbean (2008), at CICAD/OAS 45th Regular Session (2009) and the EuropeAid Meeting in Brussels (2009), among others.

4.7 Impact

The EU-LAC Project conducted a wide array of awareness-raising and capacity-building activities, producing in addition two data collection tools and three substantive publications. In this respect, it has generally met its targets regarding expected results. As discussed in sections 4.1 to 4.6, there is evidence that it has made significant progress with regards towards its specific objectives. Of special note is the fact that participants have expressed an interest in continuing the project, have begun consultations for collaborations, and in some cases have started the implementation of policies, services or other collaborations that stakeholders attribute directly to the EU-LAC Project activities.

However, the relatively short duration of the project and the incipient character of the initiatives undertaken under its aegis make it difficult to determine lasting impacts of the project.

It is however possible to state that the project has laid essential groundwork for its envisaged impact or overall objective. Given the preliminary nature of the awareness-raising and capacity-building on best practices, as well as the relative novelty of the underlying approach of the project, it is clear that achievements made to date will not be sufficient, without active follow-up, to ensure that the desired impact is ultimately achieved.

5. Program Efficiency

5.1 Efficiency in the Use of Resources

Finding 18: The EU-LAC Project used its resources efficiently and creatively

The EU-LAC Project had a total budget of EUR 1,573,618, including the value of the grant (EUR 1,400,639) and the contributions of CICAD. The original project document contemplated the organisation of two high-level policy conferences, the completion of drug treatment needs assessments in 10 LAC cities, the twinning of approximately 10 cities on both sides of the Atlantic, and the participation of approximately 200 city leaders and 150 judges and prosecutors. In actuality, the EU-LAC Project
organised 10 fora, 4 study visits and knowledge exchanges and 2 summit meetings, conducted treatment needs assessments in 19 cities in both LAC and EU cities, contributed to the creation of a partnership of 49 cities, and welcomed 1,976 delegates.

The expanded reach of the project was made possible by three important factors. First, at a conceptual level, the decision was taken by the implementing agency to replace the twin city approach with the creation of multi-city partnerships that would both increase potential synergies and generate economies of scale. Second, the original logframe of the project was revised to remove certain line items that, upon further study, were unnecessary. This included in particular the provision of 20 computers for participating cities, since those that chose to participate were already equipped in this regard. Similarly, the provision of technical expertise and funding for the needs assessments was revised downwards, given that the majority of the cities involved were able to conduct them without project funds.

The final factor that allowed the project to have a broader reach was the introduction of a mechanism of co-responsibility, which required participating cities to formally commit to the specific activities outlined in the plan of action for the working groups in which they decided to participate, and in addition made participation conditional on each city covering the expenses of part of their delegation. This mechanism of co-responsibility also translated into host cities for events providing important in-kind contributions.

As a result, the project was able to redirect resources to maximise the impact of its activities, and to cover higher than expected staffing costs. Exhibit 5.1 below illustrates the project’s efficiency on the basis of the results achieved compared to the expected results from the original project document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expected Results</th>
<th>Results Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High-level conferences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other workshops (fora, study visits, knowledge exchanges)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment needs assessments</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating cities</td>
<td>10(^{(1)})</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection tools (treatment forms)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates</td>
<td>280(^{(1)})</td>
<td>1,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected in-kind contributions from cities</td>
<td>USD 0.00</td>
<td>USD 934,810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(1)}\) Based on budget provisions in original project document

### 5.2 Overall Management of the Project

**Finding 19: The EU-LAC Project Management Team administered the project activities transparently, thus contributing to stakeholder commitment**

The overwhelming majority of stakeholders consulted during this evaluation expressed a high level of satisfaction with the Project Management Team, citing in particular the transparent manner in which the project’s governing structures were instituted, as well as the smooth flow of communication between the Project Management Team and participating cities.
Finding 20: The EU-LAC Management Team displayed good organisational skills and high levels of commitment to the project’s objectives

All consulted stakeholders praised the Project Management Team for organising a number of successful large-scale events. In particular, participants interviewed during this evaluation appreciated the early availability of information about events and the accessibility of event materials, although some respondents suggested that improvements in the availability of translated materials would be desirable.

Notably, the majority of consulted stakeholders cited the enthusiasm and commitment of the Project Management Team as one of the project’s most important strengths, which they credited with generating their own enthusiasm and commitment to the project.

6. Sustainability of Results

As noted in section 4.7 above, the relatively short duration of the project means that at least some of its activities were only beginning to bear fruit. Furthermore, the translation of increased awareness and capacity into concrete, sustainable achievements is a relatively slow process. However, there are encouraging signs that at least some of the project’s results will be sustained.

Finding 21: Stakeholders have undertaken concrete commitments towards maintaining partnerships beyond the project’s end

The Lugo Declaration and the formal signature of the EU-LAC City Partnership in Drug Demand Reduction in Coimbra represent a formal commitment of participating cities and countries in the EU-LAC Project to expand the partnership from drug treatment to drug demand reduction. This indicates that the partnership model responds well to the needs and expectations of the stakeholders. More importantly, it represents a transfer of ownership of the project from the funding and coordinating agencies to the stakeholders themselves. In addition, at the Coimbra forum, representatives of 27 participating cities committed themselves to meeting in Chiclayo, Lambayeque, Peru in 2011 in order to continue their collaboration beyond the end of the EU-LAC Project.

Finding 22: Additional support is still needed to ensure the achievement and institutionalisation of the project’s overall objectives

While in some cities and countries, interagency collaborations are being designed and pilot projects are being implemented, it must be remembered that the project’s very innovative approach was virtually unknown in many countries in Latin America and the Caribbean. Hence, although a large number of people have been sensitised to the need to provide treatment and rehabilitation services to drug dependent individuals, a critical mass is unlikely to have been created, and additional efforts of advocacy, awareness-raising and capacity-building are likely to be needed to ensure the institutionalisation of the project’s achievements.

7. Conclusions, Lessons Learned and Recommendations

7.1 Conclusions

The EU-LAC Project was highly relevant in relation to the strategic objectives of the EU and CICAD, as well as to the perceived needs of participating cities and countries. In a relatively short period of time, the Project has achieved most of its planned results and activities and has made important strides towards the achievement of its overall objectives. The evaluation indicates that, overall, the project has fostered fruitful partnerships and agreements, facilitated knowledge exchanges and raised awareness among policy-makers, treatment service providers and professionals in the justice sector.

7.2 Lessons Learned

Based on the observations and findings outlined in this evaluation, we would like to highlight the following lessons that can be taken from the EU-LAC Project experience.

- **Knowledge/awareness-raising can be a real achievement.** While the notion of ‘awareness-raising’ is often vague, it was appropriate in the context of the EU-LAC Project. One of the key achievements was to provide stakeholders with information on issues that were relevant, yet truly new to them. The importance of “sowing the seeds” for future work should not be underestimated.

- **Large events can be a catalyst for wide stakeholder engagement but do not guarantee sustained commitment.** There is strong evidence to suggest that the large fora in Santo Domingo, Lugo and Coimbra acted as catalysts, in so far as they served to sensitise a wide range of stakeholders and generate a willingness to engage in joint action. However, while in this case the events prompted concrete commitments in the form not only of joint declarations but also the formal creation of the EU-LAC Alliance and the ENDTC, as well as bilateral and multilateral agreements among participating cities, it remains to be seen whether these can be sustained in the longer term without ongoing catalytic efforts.

- **Building ownership is crucial for project performance and sustainability.** While the notion of ‘ownership’ has at times been overused, it seems clear that it can represent and generate lasting commitment. The participatory reinterpretation of the project which took place during the Santo Domingo Forum directed the three Working Groups towards activities that were directly relevant to the participating cities. In addition, the introduction of co-responsibility requiring participating cities to engage their own resources literally made them stakeholders in the endeavour.

- **Diversity can be a blessing and a curse.** One of the defining characteristics of the project was its wide-ranging and inclusive scope. Not only were the participating cities on both sides of the Atlantic and of the Equator, but the nature of the policy-making, health service delivery and legal-judicial environments varied widely, from local governments with strong and long-standing programmes to address drug treatment, to cities that had little or no communication with central authorities. As a result, the opportunities for learning from different contexts and experiences were vast. At the same time, not all participant cities benefitted equally from these exchanges. Similarly, some regions did not always feel sufficiently represented in the project’s management structures.

7.3 Recommendations

The following recommendations to CICAD and the EU, based on the analysis and findings of the Evaluator, are presented with a view to increasing the effectiveness of future project initiatives.
Recommendation 1: When designing a new joint project, CICAD and the EU may find it useful to make the design of the logic framework more participatory

The evaluation highlighted the fact that the initial logic framework was strongly focused on outputs and did not always clearly articulate the links between these and higher level objectives. Furthermore, some of the assumptions on which the outputs were based proved inaccurate. Ultimately, the project was reinterpreted into the Action Plan for the three working groups, which outlined concrete activities tailored to the concerns and interests of stakeholders. This characteristic was repeatedly cited as one of the project’s strengths, as well as an element that fostered commitment and enthusiasm among participants.

Recommendation 2: The EU and CICAD should take care that a clear emphasis is placed on ensuring collaboration among the relevant authorities for each participating city, at the regional and national level

One of the most innovative elements of the EU-LAC Project was its focus on local authorities. However, as has been mentioned, very few municipal entities have jurisdiction regarding health services, and even fewer are able to influence judicial processes and drug control guidelines. The simultaneous involvement of all the relevant authorities and stakeholders is a key factor to ensure the success of a local-level intervention that operates in a centrally defined policy and institutional context.

Recommendation 3: A longer timeline should be considered for designing future projects, in order to increase the likelihood of obtaining concrete results and ensuring the institutionalisation of the processes launched

The processes of awareness-raising and capacity-building are intrinsically long-term endeavours, in particular when they focus on innovative policy approaches and technical expertise. The translation of the knowledge and skills acquired into concrete, institutionalised practices requires additional time as well as technical and financial support. While the EU-LAC Project aimed to construct self-sustaining networks and partnerships among participating cities and countries, it is clear from the responses of consulted stakeholders that the sustainability of project achievements depends to a large extent on the continuation of the support and direction provided by the financing and implementing agencies.

Recommendation 4: The EU and CICAD should continue to ensure the commitment and buy-in of participants through a mechanism of co-responsibility, which promotes both stakeholder ownership and project efficiency

As was noted in Sections 5.1 and 7.2 above, the EU-LAC Project operated on the principle that participating cities should contribute to financing their participation in project events, as well as formally commit to the plan of action of the working groups in which they chose to participate. While this could have been interpreted as a gate-keeping technique, in actuality it provided an incentive for participating cities to focus their involvement in those working groups that best responded to their interests, and to ensure that they made the most of their participation. In addition, this approach widened the impact of the project’s awareness-raising and capacity-building activities, in that it allowed for a significantly larger number of participants than was originally envisaged and generated important savings. Such an approach should serve as a model for future projects in a context with increasing constraints on available resources.
## Appendix I Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Key Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Sub-Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Data Collection Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Context/ Rationale</td>
<td>1.1 What is the logic model underlying CICAD intervention?</td>
<td>1.1.1 What are the results-chain linking inputs to ultimate outcomes?</td>
<td>• Objectives of the CICAD EULAC Model</td>
<td>CICAD Results Based Logic Framework</td>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Definition and assumptions of capacity building</td>
<td>Program stakeholders: CICAD Professional Staff</td>
<td>Interview sessions with program stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Expected outputs and outcomes CICAD EULAC interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Extent to which there are logical cause-effect linkages among inputs, outputs and outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Key activities and elements of CICAD EULAC interventions (program components; partnerships; criteria of selection, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2 What are the underlying assumptions in the logic model? Do they continue to be valid?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Role of local government in drug treatment</td>
<td>Program Stakeholders: CICAD Professional Staff; Municipal government partners.</td>
<td>Interview sessions with program stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Relative benefits of treatment versus incarceration</td>
<td></td>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assumption that networking of cities leads to improved learning and hence improved effectiveness and efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.3 Are there any important missing assumptions?</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Contextual factors</td>
<td>Program Stakeholders: CICAD Professional Staff</td>
<td>Interview sessions with program stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Capacity factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Key Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Sub-Questions</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Sources of Data</td>
<td>Data Collection Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.0 Program Effectiveness | Effectiveness in raising awareness | 2.1 To what extent do the project’s activities increase cities’ awareness of the importance of drug treatment services? | 2.1.1 How have cities benefitted from the project? | ● 2.1.2.1 Data on inclusion of drug treatment in city’s public policy agenda  
● 2.1.2.2 Data on city’s provision and/or support to treatment services  
● 2.1.2.3 Data on provision and/or support to treatment as an alternative to incarceration | Mayors; Project staff; Project reports | Interview sessions with project stakeholders  
Document review |
|  | Effectiveness in building capacity of local governments | 2.2 To what extent has the project contributed to increasing the capacity of local authorities to design public policies, deliver treatment services and promote/implement treatment as an alternative to incarceration? | 2.2.1. How has the project enhanced the capacity of cities to design and/or implement public policies in the area if drug treatment? | ● Data on policy making processes, knowledge of related issues among policy-makers | Mayors; Project staff; Project reports | Interview sessions with project stakeholders  
Document review |
|  |  |  | 2.2.2 How has the project enhanced the ability of cities to improve delivery of drug treatment services? | ● Data on existence/presence of qualified treatment staff; knowledge of best practices | Mayors; Treatment specialists; Project staff; Project reports | Interview sessions with project stakeholders  
Document review |
|  |  |  | 2.2.3 How has the project enhanced the ability of cities to design and implement treatment as an alternative to incarceration? | ● Data on knowledge of best practices among judiciary staff (judges; prosecutors, defence attorneys) | Mayors; Judiciary personnel (judges, prosecutors, defence attorneys, probation officers); Project staff; Project reports | Interview sessions with project stakeholders  
Document review |
| 2.3 Effectiveness in influencing the policy-making, treatment and judicial processes at the city level | 2.3.1 How have the project’s activities affected the design and/or implement public policies in the area if drug treatment in participating cities? | ● Data on inclusion of the topic in policy agenda, negotiation with national/regional authorities on jurisdiction  
● Content of policies pre- and post intervention | Mayors; Project staff; Project reports | Interview sessions with project stakeholders  
Document review |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Key Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Sub-Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Data Collection Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3 To what extent have the project activities contributed to transforming the design of public policy, the delivery of treatment and the judicial process for drug addicts involved in petty crime?</td>
<td>2.3.2 To what extent have the project's activities led to the provision of more and better treatment services?</td>
<td>• Data on quality/modal and/or accessibility of delivery of drug treatment services</td>
<td>Treatment specialists; Project staff; Project reports</td>
<td>Interview sessions with project stakeholders</td>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.3 To what extent has the project contributed to the development and implementation of judicial processes focusing on treatment as an alternative to incarceration?</td>
<td>• Data on the existence/implementation and/or promotion of court supervised treatment alternatives to incarceration for drug-dependent offenders</td>
<td>Judiciary personnel (judges, prosecutors, probation officers; defence attorneys); Project staff; Project reports</td>
<td>David sessions with project stakeholders</td>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness in building networks and partnerships</td>
<td>2.4.1 What tools has the project provided to facilitate networking?</td>
<td>• Data on the existence of networking tools</td>
<td>Mayors; Project staff; Project reports</td>
<td>Interviews sessions with project stakeholders</td>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 To what extent has the project facilitated the building of networks/communities of practice among participating cities?</td>
<td>2.4.2 To what extent were these tools used by participating cities?</td>
<td>• Data on the usage of networking tools</td>
<td></td>
<td>Document review</td>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.3 What are the participants' perceptions of the usefulness of the networking tools?</td>
<td>• Data on the participants' perceptions of usefulness of tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengths and Weaknesses</td>
<td>2.5.1 What features of the project most contribute to its objectives?</td>
<td>• Data on difficulties attributable project design (objective and perceived)</td>
<td>Mayors; Treatment specialists; Judicial actors; Project staff; Project documents and reports</td>
<td>Interview sessions with project stakeholders</td>
<td>Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 What are the project's primary strengths and weaknesses</td>
<td>2.5.2 What features of the project impede the achievement of its objectives?</td>
<td>• Data on features of the project that facilitate reaching project objectives (objective and perceived)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Key Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Sub-Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Data Collection Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.0 Program Efficiency | 3.1 How cost-effective is the project? | 3.1.1 To what extent do the initiatives supported by EULAC make the best use of available resources to design policies, provide treatment services and promote treatment as an alternative to incarceration? | • Number of project events  
• Number of cities/participants attending project events  
• Number of users of project tools (website, publications, data collection tools...)  
• Total project costs | Project documents; Project staff | Document review  
Interview sessions with project stakeholders |
| | 3.2 How efficient is the overall management of the project? | 3.2.1 Have the project’s management structures contributed to the efficient management of the project | • Perceived strengths and weaknesses of project management structures  
• Evidence of project monitoring and evaluation system  
• Evidence of collaboration across working groups and cities  
• Strategic recommendations for improving the management of project activities | Project stakeholders; Project documents; Project reports | Interviews with stakeholders  
Document review |
| | 3.3 Are the three working groups of the project efficient? | 3.3.1 What is the relative efficiency of the three working groups? | • Perceived strengths and weaknesses of the three working groups | Project stakeholders; Project documents; Project reports | Interviews with stakeholders  
Document review |
| 4.0 Relevance | 4.1 To what extent is the EULAC investment in the Cities Partnership model relevant for the achievement of drug treatment goals at city and regional levels | 4.1.1 Is there a demand for the capacity-building interventions of the EULAC project? | • Perception of project quality  
• Perception of project relevance  
• Perceived link between EULAC project activities and improvements in drug treatment in the three working groups of the project | Project stakeholders; Project documents; Project reports | Interviews with stakeholders  
Document review |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Key Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Sub-Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Data Collection Tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>To what extent is the project providing an adequate catalytic and supportive role in intervention design and implementation?</td>
<td>4.2.1 To what extent are city-level project stakeholders satisfied with feedback from EULAC project/CICAD?</td>
<td>Perception of city-level stakeholders of relevance of EULAC/CICAD</td>
<td>Project stakeholders; Project documents; Project reports</td>
<td>Interviews with stakeholders Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Sustainability</td>
<td>5.1 To what extent are the project initiatives likely to be sustained in the long-term?</td>
<td>5.1.1 Are cities/countries hosting events willing to increase their contributions?</td>
<td>Potential and existing trends in donor contributions</td>
<td>Project stakeholders; Project documents; Project reports</td>
<td>Interviews with stakeholders Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1.2 To what extent are the project activities sustainable without EU financial support?</td>
<td>Evidence of alternative sources of funding</td>
<td>Project stakeholders; Project documents; Project reports</td>
<td>Interviews with stakeholders Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1.3 What are some key lessons learned from project operations to date for future program sustainability?</td>
<td>Suggestions for operational improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II Logic Frame Analysis

Logic Framework Analysis

The Evaluator considered the logframe (the revised October 2008 version) and found that it provided an overview of the key changes the project set out to achieve at different levels. The logframe’s vertical alignment between overall objectives, specific objectives, expected results and activities is generally sound, as there is a clear overall logical link between these elements. However, there are some inconsistencies in that a number of expected results and activities are in fact targets. Similarly, the horizontal logic of the logframe (intervention logic, objectively verifiable indicators of achievement, sources and means of verification and assumptions) contains some misalignments, in particular at the higher levels of overall objectives and specific objectives.

For example, the overall objectives are appropriately stated as: “Contribute to improving the quality and coverage of drug treatment, rehabilitation and harm reduction for diverse populations in European Union, Latin American and Caribbean cities to ensure that the care provided to them is appropriate”. However, some of the corresponding indicators are in fact targets and would more appropriately correspond to more specific objectives, for instance, “better record-keeping on patients”, “networks of treatment providers established and functioning” and “EMCDDA’s treatment demand indicator adopted in LAC cities”. As an illustration, it is also unclear, prima facie, why the latter is a necessary component of the contribution to improving the quality and coverage of drug treatment. There is further inconsistency in terminology regarding indicators and sources and means of verification.

At the level of terminology, the term “intervention logic” is misleading in this context, in so far as the statements included under this column constitute targets (the specific changes the project sought to achieve), as opposed to outlining the theory of change underlying the project’s purpose.

As a result of these inconsistencies, the evaluator found that in practice the guiding logic of the project’s activities was directed by an implied theory of change as well as by the specific objectives and expected results in the Action Plan adopted in Santo Domingo, rather than explicitly by the overall objectives as outlined in the logframe.
### Appendix III Action Plan adopted by the Working Groups

#### Anticipated actions and activities Working Group 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 1</th>
<th>Study of different models and experiences of inter-agency cooperation: local, regional and national</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.1.</td>
<td>Each participating city will describe its form of organization, competencies and available infrastructure, as well as the way in which all institutions involved interact in the area of drug treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.2</td>
<td>Study visits to observe different experiences: Sweden, Spain, Portugal, Chile, Argentina among others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.3</td>
<td>Seminar on coordination among networks and institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action 2 Evaluation and Report**

| Activity 3.1 | Presentation of results at the Lugo city forum |
| Activity 3.2 | Final Report of Activities |

#### Anticipated actions and activities Working Group 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 1</th>
<th>Carry out local assessments of the status of drug treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.1.</td>
<td>Assessments of availability of and demand for treatment at the city level (on-line and workshop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.2</td>
<td>Publication of a study detailing the findings of the local assessments <em>(document)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Action 2 Formulation of local drug treatment strategies**

| Activity 2.1. | In cooperation with national drug commissions (or the equivalent), conduct a workshop on strategic planning in preparation for formulation of local drug treatment plans *(training)* |
| Activity 2.2. | Development of a strategic plan for drug treatment, rehabilitation and aftercare in cooperation with national and regional institutions (infrastructure, financing, competencies) in accordance with the circumstances of each country, region and municipality. This plan should include different levels of local services *(online and document)* |

**Action 3 Improvement of patient information and data collection systems**

| Activity 3.1. | Technical meeting to compare and develop a record-keeping system for patients in drug treatment, based on existing systems. *(meeting)* |
| Activity 3.2. | Seminar to share the record-keeping system with participating cities-countries *(workshop)* |
| Activity 3.3 | Implementation of the record-keeping system |
| Activity 3.4 | Preparation and publication of guidelines on developing a drug treatment record-keeping system at the local level |

**Action 4 Improvement of local treatment capacities for specific needs, including high risk population and socially-excluded groups, rehabilitation and aftercare programs**

| Activity 4.1. | Updates to drug treatment protocols currently being prepared by CICAD). Development of guidelines to be adapted to circumstances of participating cities *(document)* |
| Activity 4.2 | Protocol implementation: Training in application of the Treatment Protocols for priority target groups as discussed during the Santo Domingo Forum (face to face and on-line training) |
| Activity 4.3 | Dissemination of the Protocols: best practices and guidelines *(document)* |
| Activity 4.4 | Development of quality assurance system (monitoring, indicators for evaluation). *(document)* |
## Anticipated actions and activities Working Group 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 5</th>
<th>Evaluation and Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5.1</td>
<td>Presentation of results at the Lugo city forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 5.2</td>
<td>Final Report of Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Anticipated actions and activities Working Group 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 1</th>
<th>Assessment to be conducted in each participating city (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.1.</td>
<td>Completion of an assessment form to be developed by CICAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 2</strong></td>
<td>Exchange visits to study the applicability of different models to their own jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2.1.</td>
<td>Comparison of different models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2.2.</td>
<td>Exchange visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 3</strong></td>
<td>Development of a strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.1.</td>
<td>Generation of indicators to evaluate effectiveness of the different models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.2.</td>
<td>Drafting of a strategic plan of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 4</strong></td>
<td>Implementation of a pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4.1.</td>
<td>Implementation of the pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4.2.</td>
<td>Evaluation of the implementation of a pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action 3</strong></td>
<td>Evaluation and Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.1</td>
<td>Presentation of results at the Lugo City Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3.2</td>
<td>Final Report of Activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IV Stakeholders Consulted

TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS

- Carlos Ramalheira, Regional Director, Institute for Drugs and Drug Addiction of Coimbra, Portugal
- Guillermo Gonzalez, Alcalde Municipal de Colón, El Salvador
- Gustavo Segnana, Coordinador de cooperación y financiamiento internacional, SEDRONAR, Argentina
- Hon. Cecil Joseph, Mayor, Roseau, Dominica
- Ivelisse German, Encargada de la Dirección de Tratamiento y Rehabilitación, Consejo Nacional de Drogas, República Dominicana
- Judge Jorn Dangreau, Court of first instance and DTC, Ghent, Belgium
- Justice David Fletcher, Presiding Judge, North Liverpool Community Justice Centre, United Kingdom
- Justice Stephanie Haisley, President, DTC, Kingston, Jamaica
- Lucero García, Dirección General de Cooperación y Asuntos Internacionales, Comisión Nacional contra Adicciones, México
- Ove Lundgren, Co-ordinator (drug related issues) City of Gothenburg
- Raúl Antonio Gómez Guerrero, ex-Alcalde de la ciudad de San Ramón de Ajuela
- Rodrigo Portilla Huidobro, Asesor técnico, Área de Tratamiento y rehabilitación, CONACE, Chile
- Terrence Fountain, Deputy and Head Manager of the National Drug Information Network, National Anti-Drug Secretariat, The Bahamas
- Anna Chisman, Senior Advisor and former Head of Demand Reduction, CICAD

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS

- Alicia Guerra, Directora Regional de Salud, de la Región Este de la Intendencia de Montevideo, Uruguay
- Assoc. Prof. Hristo Bozov, Deputy-Mayor of the City of Varna, responsible for Health and Social Services, Prevention of Drug Abuse and Human Trafficking, and Chairman of the Anti-Drug Committee, Varna, Bulgaria
- Brice De Ruyver, Director of the Research Group IRCP and Full Professor, Department of Criminal Law and Criminology, Ghent University, Belgium
- Carmen Basadre Vázquez, Tenienta de Alcalde y Concejala de Bienestar Social e Igualdad del Concello de Lugo, España
- Charlotte Coleman, Scientific Researcher (Institute for International Research on Criminal Policy –IRCP), Department of Criminal Law and Criminology, Ghent University, Belgium
- Deyse Maria Chicere da Costa, Coordinadora de Educación en Salud y Presidente del Consejo de Atención a las Drogas del Municipio de Niterói, Brasil
• Dr. Eileen Mac Lachlan, formerly Government Expert Group (GEG) and National Coordinating Entity (NCE) to the MEM/CICAD/OAS, formerly Coordinator National Drug Programme, and currently Executive Secretary to the National Drug Council, St. Kitts-Nevis

• Dr. Luis Enrique Dorantes Marínez, Director General del Instituto de Psiquiatría del Estado de Baja California (IPEBC), Secretario Técnico del Consejo Estatal contra las Adicciones de Baja California (CECABC), Mexicali, México

• Dr. Sharon Halliday, Consultant Psychiatrist for St. Kitts-Nevis, Member of National Council on Drug Abuse Prevention, MEM/GEG representative for St. Kitts-Nevis

• Dra. Janina del Socorro Noguera Padilla, Médico Salubrista, Concejal Propietaria de la Alcaldía de Masaya, Secretaria del Consejo Municipal de la Alcaldía de Masaya, Nicaragua

• Filip De Sager, Drug Policy Coordinator, City of Ghent, Belgium

• Freya Vander Laenen, Director of the Research Group IRCP and Professor Department of Criminal Law and Criminology, Ghent University, Belgium

• Giselle Amador Muñoz, Directora Posgrado Drogodependencias, Universidad de Costa Rica

• Guillermo Gonzalez, Alcalde Municipal de Colón, El Salvador

• Héctor Zambrano Rodríguez, Secretario de Salud de Bogotá, Colombia

• Isabel Ribas Seix, Delegada de Salud Pública, Ayuntamiento de Barcelona, España

• Kristian Hölge, Regional Legal Advisor for Latin America and the Caribbean, Legal Assistance Programme in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAPLAC), United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

• Lourdes Sevilla Carnero, Coordinadora de Tratamiento de la Gerencia de Prevención y Rehabilitación del Consumo de Drogas, DEVIDA (Comisión Nacional de Drogas de Perú)

• Ma. Eugenia Sanchez, Directora de Salud en el Ayuntamiento de Barcelona, España

• Nery Saldarriaga de Kroll, Enfermera Cesante de la Facultad de Enfermería de la Universidad Nacional Pedro Ruiz Gallo, Presidenta de la RENAMA (Red Nacional de Mujeres Autoridades), Lambayeque, Perú

• Norma L. Jeffrey-Dorset, Substance Abuse Prevention Officer, Antigua and Barbuda

• Ove Lundgren, Co-ordinator (Drug Related Issues) for the City of Gothenburg, Sweden

• Raúl Antonio Gómez Guerrero, ex-Alcalde de la ciudad de San Ramón de Ajuela, Costa Rica

• Raul Omar Plee, Fiscal General ante la Camara Nacional de Casación Penal, Argentina

• Steven Alfaísi, Chair of the National Anti-Drug Council, Suriname

• Terrence Fountain, Deputy and Head Manager of the National Drug Information Network, National Anti-Drug Secretariat, The Bahamas

• Vera Violeta Barahona Hidalgo, Jefe Reducción de la Demanda del Instituto sobre Alcoholismo y Farmacodependencia (IAFA), Costa Rica

• Víctor Hugo Echeandía Arellano, Asesor del Ministro de Salud del Perú

• Yvonne Roepel-Soeratram, Lawyer/Coordinator CICAD Desk Suriname, Working Group Drug Treatment Court, Secretary, Policy Advisor on Drugs and Drug-Related Matters, Suriname
IN-PERSON INTERVIEWS

- Antonio Lomba, EU-LAC Project Manager, CICAD
- Dr. Francisco Cumsille, Coordinator, Inter-American Observatory on Drugs (OID), CICAD
- Dr. Luis Alfonzo, Demand Reduction Specialist, CICAD
- Gonzalo García-Belenguer, EU-LAC Project Assistant, CICAD
- Luis Villalobos, Demand Reduction Specialist, CICAD
Appendix V Documents Reviewed

PROJECT DOCUMENTS

- Estimate detail of in-kind contributions (2007-2010)
- EU-LAC Drug Treatment City Partnership, Interim Report, July 2008-June 2009
- EU-LAC Results ppt presentation
- European Community Contribution Agreement with an International Organisation DRG/2006/126-777 (Project document)
- Evaluación Foro Santo Domingo
- Letter of Intent for the Creation of the EU-LAC City Partnership in Drug Demand Reduction, signed in Coimbra, Portugal, September 24, 2010
- Marco Lógico del Proyecto EC Revisado, Octubre 2008

DOCUMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS

- De La Haye, Winston; Portilla, Rodrigo (2010); “Status of Drug Treatment at the Local Level (Cities): Information from 19 Cities from Europe, Latin America, and the Caribbean”; prepared for the Coimbra City Forum: Municipal Drug Policies, September 22-25, 2010, Coimbra, Portugal
- Declaración de Vitoria-Gasteiz, II Foro de Gobiernos Locales de la Union Europea, America Latina y el Caribe, Innovando desde lo local (Vitoria, 5,6 y 7 de mayo de 2010), (http://www.femp.es/files/11-1083-fichero/Declaración%20del%20II%20Foro_UELAC_Vitoria.pdf)
- Hemispheric Drug Strategy, Adopted by the Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD) at its 47th Regular Session, May 2010

WEBSITES

- EU-LAC Drug Treatment City Partnerships website (www.eulac.org)
- Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission, Secretariat for Multidimensional Security, Organization of American States website (www.cicad.oas.org)
- Lugo Summit website (www.lugosummit.org)
AUDIOVISUAL MATERIALS

- Forum of Coimbra, Portugal 22-25 September, CD
  - EU-LAC Project promotional video
  - Lugo Declaration
  - Opening Speech
  - Presentations

- EU-LAC Video at Coimbra:
  - Interviews with participants
  - Presentations

- Proyecto EU-LAC videos on vimeo (http://vimeo.com/16893960)