

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES



INTER-AMERICAN DRUG ABUSE CONTROL COMMISSION

cicad

THIRTY-EIGHTH REGULAR SESSION
December 6-9, 2005
Washington, D.C.

OEA/Ser.L/XIV.2.38
CICAD/doc.1466/05
5 December 2005
Original: english

**PRE-INTERGOVERNMENTAL WORKING GROUP (IWG) REPORT
TO THE 38TH REGULAR SESSION OF CICAD**

**Pre-Intergovernmental Working Group (IWG)
Report to the 38th Regular Session of CICAD,**

Chairman, Senior Director Barry MacKillop

**Pre-Intergovernmental Working Group (IWG) Report
to the 38th Regular Session of CICAD,
Chairman, Senior Director Barry MacKillop**

Introduction

Good morning.

My name is Barry MacKillop. I am the Senior Director of the National Strategies Division within the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.

As many of you may recall, at the 36th Regular Session of CICAD, the Commission agreed to convene an Inter-governmental Working Group (IWG) meeting to review the Multilateral Evaluation Mechanism (MEM) prior to the beginning of the Fourth Round Evaluation.

Although it is customary to hold an IWG prior to the beginning of each round, it was clear to all member states that the MEM process had significantly matured and, as such, required a thorough review to ensure its relevancy and effectiveness.

The third round demonstrated that countries were more committed to the MEM than ever before. This was evident by the increase in transparency, as well as in the quality and quantity of information submitted to the Governmental Expert Group (GEG).

Nevertheless, as all of us present here today know, growth is always accompanied by growing pains, and during the third round, several challenges and issues arose, which highlighted gaps within the MEM system that needed to be addressed.

Many countries recognized that this IWG would need to move beyond simply reviewing the mechanism – It would require us to ask some difficult questions, to think outside of the box, and to develop proactive solutions.

Canada wanted to take the lead on this project for a number of reasons, particularly because we believe that the MEM is a dynamic tool and one of the best examples of multilateral cooperation.

The MEM is proof that 34 countries, whose histories, cultures and current domestic realities which extend over a wide spectrum, can come together and agree to be open and accountable to one another for the greater good of the hemisphere.

Canada is honored to have been given the confidence and support of the Commission to Chair and lead this important undertaking.

Our work began immediately following the 37th Regular Session of CICAD, which was generously hosted by the government of the Dominican Republic.

The high-level of interest and commitment to this process was immediately witnessed by the Bolivian delegate's proposal to hold a Pre-IWG brainstorming meeting, given the significant amount of work and high-priority issues.

This excellent proposal set the wheels in motion, and Canada worked closely with the CICAD Secretariat over the summer to ensure that the Pre-IWG would be a productive meeting which would set the stage for a successful IWG and a better and stronger product at the end of the day.

Countries dutifully completed forms on MEM indicators that the Secretariat sent out to member states over the summer, together with draft proposals on MEM operational issues for comments, and from October 3rd to 7th 2005, in Washington, D.C., twenty-one (21) countries actively participated in the Pre-IWG meeting.

On behalf of Canada and, if I may say so, the CICAD Secretariat, I want to thank each participant for all of your hard work and commitment. We recognize that this meeting and the extra work completed over the summer were not in your original work plans or budget.

The participants of the Pre-IWG delved into 5 key areas of the MEM:

- MEM Operational Process Issues;
- The Questionnaire of Indicators;
- Recommendations;
- The MEM Cycle; and
- The proposed creation of a MEM Style and Format Manual.

For each of these topics, the MEM Unit developed detailed proposals based on observations from member states and consultations undertaken with the GEG experts, National Coordinating Entities (NCEs), and the heads of section within the CICAD Secretariat.

The preparatory IWG meeting consisted of the MEM Unit presenting their proposal on each of these 5 issues, followed by an open discussion, at which time delegates could accept or reject the proposal, make amendments or present new proposals.

MEM Process Paper

In general, each of the MEM Unit's proposals were accepted, with amendments, and recommended to the IWG for approval with the exception of the MEM Cycle proposal.

In its discussions surrounding the length of the Cycle, the pre-IWG delegates agreed that the MEM Unit would further develop the preferred options presented - a 2.5 year cycle and a 3 year cycle – and examine the impact of two new proposals that were raised at the meeting, including an annual evaluation of determined themes, and an annual evaluation of half of each of the four MEM sections. (Demand Reduction, Institution building, Supply Reduction, Control Measures).

Although we were not able to reach consensus on the cycle, delegates provided key observations for the IWG's consideration on this issue, including:

- That the cycle should allow for an annual publication to the OAS General Assembly;
- That a reasonable amount of time be given to the National Coordinating Entities (NCEs) to complete the questionnaire; and
- That a realistic timeframe be provided to countries to implement recommendations.

I will now provide you with a summary of the discussions surrounding the other areas of the MEM process, namely MEM operational issues, the questionnaire of indicators, the recommendations and the style and format manual.

Before I do so, however, I note that the MEM Unit's original proposals on these issues have been made available to you through a web link, along with a document entitled "Preparatory Intergovernmental Working Group Recommendations".

This document, which reflects the agreements and consensus of the meeting as well as points raised for further consideration will provide the foundation for discussions at the IWG in February.

MEM Operational Process Issues

Many of the challenges that arose during the third round evaluation were caused by a lack of understanding regarding the roles and responsibilities of the various players, reports and mechanisms within the MEM process.

Based on consultations undertaken in the summer, the MEM Unit developed guidelines within the revised version of the operational process paper to distinguish and manage the characteristics, roles, functions and operations of the GEG experts, the GEG working groups, the alternates, the National Coordinating Entities, the MEM Unit and the Secretariat, which included a proposal for the basic structure of the GEG, the use of Alternates so as to benefit from their expertise, and the various responsibilities which the Experts and coordinators should undertake.

Drafting and operational guidelines were also proposed regarding the characteristics of the various MEM Reports, the In-Situ Visits, the Solidarity Fund, and the role of the IWG, such as encouraging all countries to provide contributions to the Solidarity Fund regardless of how small the donation may be, the MEM Unit preparing the first narrative drafts of the reports, and a method for promotional country visits.

The MEM Unit's detailed proposals on operational process issues were approved with minor amendments for recommendation to the IWG.

The Questionnaire of Indicators

Rather than a indicator by indicator review, the Pre-IWG looked at each section of indicators and agreed that there is a need to clarify, simplify and reduce the number of indicators, while preserving the integrity of the MEM and ensuring the relevancy of each indicator.

Consensus was reached to recommend to the IWG the elimination of the indicators on displacement and transnational organized crime. It was thought that the information sought under the displacement indicator was being better captured under a variety of other indicators.

Similarly, the information on transnational organized crime is also being captured by the OAS through the work of the Special Committee on Transnational Organized Crime. There was a tendency, by delegates, toward eliminating the indicators related to corruption and firearms.

Two options arose in regards to the indicators related to money laundering. Delegates agreed that although Money Laundering is directly linked to drugs, the excessive number of money laundering indicators found in the MEM create an imbalance within the MEM and its priorities.

The first option suggests eliminating questions within the indicators and using the indicators to produce a table of contents and guidelines for the GEG to use in determining what key information should be imported from more authoritative alternative sources on the issue of money laundering, such as the Financial Action Task Force and the World Bank.

The second option recommends eliminating all indicators related to money laundering while still including a section on money laundering, which would rely on information collected by other more specialized organizations.

Recommendations

Regarding the discussion on recommendations, consensus was reached on the proposal to have the MEM Unit develop clear guidelines for the drafting of recommendations.

While the pre-IWG did not recommend establishing limits on the number of recommendations that could be given to a country, it did recommend that guidelines include three key caveats.

Firstly, that the GEG should take into consideration the particular situation of each country in making recommendations;

Secondly, that in determining the number of recommendations, the GEG should keep in mind that the evaluation process should be seen by the evaluated country as constructive; and

Thirdly, that the MEM Unit should develop guidelines for addressing reiterated recommendations, as well as recommendations that are directly linked to indicators which may be eliminated.

Delegates also stressed the point that in order to maintain a high-level of transparency within the MEM process, no recommendations should be presented to the Commission for approval that have not first been reviewed by the National Coordinating Entity.

There was a consensus that the MEM cycle should allow sufficient time for countries to implement recommendations before follow-up reports are published and that countries should inform in some way the level of priority assigned to each recommendation.

Format & Style Manual

The MEM Unit proposed the creation of a format and style manual to guide experts in drafting high-quality, uniform and valuable national reports. Currently, because of a lack of such guidelines, national reports vary greatly in style and quality.

The Pre-IWG delegates agreed that the IWG should consider for approval the creation of a Format & Style Manual, with the caveat that the style-related agreements, reached by the GEG for the formal drafting of reports during their working sessions, also be captured.

Conclusion

I hope that I have been able to give you an idea of the significant amount of groundwork and the issues that we covered during the Pre-IWG.

All these issues will be discussed in more details in the February IWG meeting.

Because of the secretariat's active consultations, delegates were presented with strategic and concrete proposals, which they were then able to build upon during those four days in October.

The Pre-IWG recommendations were carefully considered and developed, and I am confident that they will provide a solid foundation for our work to come over the next months as we all prepare for the IWG.

We still have a lot of work ahead of us before we are able to present the Commission and the Organization of American States with recommendations to make the MEM a stronger and more effective tool.

Because of this, I encourage all of the CICAD member states to remain committed to the IWG process and carefully review the Pre-IWG recommendations, as well as the preparatory material that the Secretariat will be distributing prior to the IWG.

In order to ensure a successful and productive meeting everyone must come prepared to advance our discussions to date.

Now, I would like to turn to the issue of logistics.

The IWG meeting is scheduled to take place from February 21-24, 2005, in Washington, D.C.

Although we thought that the meeting would be held in Canada, after examining several options, it was agreed that Ottawa may not be the most convenient and cost-effective location.

Firstly, many of you may not consider the climate in Ottawa in the month of February to be very hospitable.

Secondly, and more importantly, most countries agreed that an effective IWG meeting should include easy access to the expertise provided by the heads of section within the CICAD Secretariat.

And lastly, after doing a cost-comparison we found that holding the IWG in Washington would save the Secretariat a significant expense, which given the financial pressures that the organization is currently under, this is a fact that we simply can not afford to ignore.

So it is with regret that we have to say that the meeting will not be held in Canada.

I hope you can all understand and I look forward to working closely with you at the IWG in February.

Thank you