



17th St. & Constitution Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Estados Unidos de América

Organización de los Estados Americanos

T. 202.458.3000
www.oas.org

COMISIÓN INTERAMERICANA PARA EL
CONTROL DEL ABUSO DE DROGAS

CICAD

Secretaría de Seguridad Multidimensional

FIFTY-FIFTH REGULAR SESSION
April 29-May 1 2014
Washington D.C.

OEA/Ser.L/XIV.2.55
CICAD/doc.2115/14
5 June 2014
Original: Spanish

FINAL REPORT
(DRAFT)

**Note to Commissioners: Kindly send your comments to this draft report by August 3rd, 2014 to the
CICAD Executive Secretariat.**

I. BACKGROUND

Article 21 of the Statute of the Inter-American Drug Abuse Control Commission (CICAD) establishes that the Commission shall hold two regular sessions per year: one to address general topics and one to deal with specific technical concerns identified by the Commission or such other matters as may require its special attention. The Statute also provides that special sessions shall be held whenever the Commission so determines or at the request of the majority of its member States.

Pursuant to the provisions of Articles 20 and 21 of the Statute, it was decided that the fifty-fifth regular session would be held April 29 to May 1, 2014, in Washington, DC.

This report provides a summary of the presentations made during the sessions including reference numbers of the detailed documents, a list of decisions, and a summary of the most relevant points made by the delegations during the discussions.

II. PROCEEDINGS

1. Welcoming remarks

Presenters:

a. Ambassador Andres Gonzalez Díaz, Permanent Representative of Colombia to the OAS

Ambassador González welcomed the delegates to the fifty-fifth regular session of CICAD and marked the official opening of the inaugural session. The ambassador then introduced Dr. James Cole, Deputy Attorney General of the United States.

b. Dr. James Cole, Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice, United States

Dr. Cole highlighted the changes in drug policy being implemented by his country's government, especially with regard to policies aimed at individuals who committed offenses related to illicit drugs that did not represent a grave danger to the society at large. In that regard, Dr. Cole indicated that his government considered that the policy of incarcerating persons for minor drug offenses had resulted in the overcrowding of jails in the United States, had increased the costs of operating jails and had diverted resources that could be allocated to combating and pursuing more dangerous crimes and criminals.

Last, Dr. Cole reiterated the United States' commitment to combating drug traffickers, heads of drug cartels and any other criminal deemed to represent a serious public danger.

c. Dr. Fernando Ruiz Gomez, Vice Minister of Public Health and Service Delivery of Colombia, CICAD Chairman

On behalf of the Chair, Dr. Ruiz Gomez made the opening remarks of the fifty-fifth regular session of CICAD.

Dr. Ruiz Gomez recalled that the present debate on drug policies in the hemisphere was originated at the 2012 Summit of the Americas when the Heads of State of the region charged the OAS with producing a report on the effectiveness of current drug policies which will have a defining moment during the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS, in September 2014.

Dr. Ruiz Gomez referred to the agenda item focusing on the exchange of experiences with regard to alternatives to incarceration for law offenders who were also drug dependent, and pointed out the increase in the inmate population due to drug offenses, the lack of access to treatment and the difficult access to social services, as well as the vulnerable situation of certain social groups and the risks they faced.

He also emphasized that Colombia had sought and considered minimum points of consensus that required approaches other than mere repression. In that regard, Dr. Ruiz Gomez indicated that the current session of CICAD had addressed small-scale drug trafficking which involved segments of the population impacted by their social vulnerability.

Furthermore, Dr. Ruiz Gomez pointed out that during the previous session of CICAD a number of approaches were presented which pointed to the need to strengthen the focus on public health in the formulation of drug policies from a comprehensive perspective.

d. Mr. Hugo De Zela, Chief of Staff, General Secretariat of the Organization of American States

Speaking at the opening session on behalf of Dr. José Miguel Insulza, Secretary General of the OAS, Ambassador De Zela emphasized the fact that the session was being held at a time when the drug problem in the Americas and the efforts to control drug abuse had become a focal point in the public policy agendas of the countries in the region, following the Secretary General's presentation of the Report on the Drug Problem in the Americas last year.

Ambassador De Zela further indicated that, in the Inter-American stage, the debate had been based on two real political milestones in recent history. First, Ambassador De Zela mentioned the report published by the OAS in 2013, pointing out that the report indicates that drug addiction is a disease and that drug dependents should be treated as suffering from a disease and not as criminals. He reminded delegates that, according to the report, the criminalization of the possession and use of drugs and the corresponding incarceration penalties had led to, among other effects, worrisome levels of overcrowding in jails without a significant impact on the reduction of drug trafficking or drug use. The other political milestone mentioned by Ambassador De Zela was the Declaration of Antigua adopted by the 34 active member States at the General Assembly of the OAS in June 2013, in Guatemala, which called for the holding of a Special Session of the OAS General Assembly for the purpose of discussing the drug problem.

Another interesting development in this process of open discussion of the topic in the region, Ambassador De Zela pointed out, was the regulation of the sale and consumption of cannabis in the states of Colorado and Washington in the United States, and in Uruguay, and he attached special significance to the holding of the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS this coming September in Guatemala.

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

The Commission approved the draft agenda (CICAD/doc.2073/14 rev.2) and the draft schedule of activities (CICAD/doc2074/14 rev.2) without modifications.

3. Working Group to review the CICAD 2013 draft Annual Report to the General Assembly and Draft Resolution Paragraphs

The Chair of the Commission convened a working group to review the draft Commission's Annual Report to the General Assembly (CICAD/doc.2076/14 rev.1) and draft resolution paragraphs (CICAD/doc.2077/14 rev.2).

4. Panel: Drug trafficking in small quantities: Diagnosis and Current Challenges

Presenter: Julián David Wilches Guzmán, Director of Drug Policy and Related Activities, Ministry of Justice and Law, Colombia (CICAD/doc.2095/14)

Mr. Wilches emphasized topics relating to the organizational structure of micro-trafficking and small-scale drug dealing. He highlighted the existence of areas with high levels of criminal activity as the result of a planning process by criminal organizations and explained the dynamics of small-scale drug dealing in those areas.

Panelists:

a. Vitore Maximiano, Secretary of National Drug Policy, National Secretariat of Drug Policy (SENAD), Brazil (CICAD/doc.2091/14)

Mr. Maximiano described the profiles within the inmate population in Brazil and the 113% increase of that population between the years 2000 and 2010. He pointed out that 25% of inmates are in jail for illicit drug trafficking. The panelist presented a research study, conducted in 2011 by the University of Sao Paulo, on the distribution of drug quantities based on the drugs seized from persons arrested. Last, Mr. Maximiano emphasized the need to establish objective criteria to define quantities for personal use, transport for traffic and drug trafficking.

b. Jose Antonio García, Director for Global Commitment, National Commission for Development and Life without Drugs (DEVIDA), Peru (CICAD/doc.2090/14)

Mr. Garcia addressed cocaine transportation routes in Peru, domestic drug production and the interaction with drug cartels abroad for the micro-commercialization of drugs. The presenter pointed out that there was a close relationship between increased public insecurity and micro-commercialization, and explained that the structure of the micro-commercialization of drugs and sales methods were based on commercialization networks operated by gangs and families, and that the sale of drugs via the internet was becoming increasingly popular.

c. Harold Pollack, Helen Ross Professor of Social Services Administration, University of Chicago (CICAD/doc.2097/14)

Professor Pollack spoke about the relationship between drugs, violence and firearms sales in the city of Chicago and described seven strategies to reduce violence. The presenter explained that it was necessary to approach the drug problem from a broader perspective and that policies that focused on the relationship between alcohol and crime and polydrug use must be improved. Furthermore, Professor Pollack pointed out that there was little evidence to indicate that an increase in law enforcement activities translated into an increase in the price of drugs in the streets. However, according to the results of a research study, an increase in the number of arrests correlated with a lower price for drugs available in the streets.

Comments by delegations

Chile: The Chilean Delegation explained the micro-trafficking situation in Chile, a topic that has been incorporated into the country's criminal code and which includes the methods used by traffickers. The delegation also reported that Chile has implemented the program "Inform Safely" which allows the public to provide information about this crime to the police in a secure manner.

Paraguay: Paraguay reported that the country has experienced an uptick in the trafficking of small quantities of drugs and that, for this reason, the government devised a strategic plan which includes a free telephone line for citizens to report crimes or procure information.

Venezuela: The delegation explained the measures undertaken by the government to combat micro-trafficking, including the establishment of a free telephone line to receive information about crimes and the creation of community information networks to help neutralize gang activity. In addition, the delegation reported that the government is promoting extracurricular activities for children and youth and other community based prevention programs.

Grenada: Grenada informed that the most significant drug-related problem in the country is possession of marijuana and noted that the quantities of drugs seized from micro-trafficking were increasing.

Mexico: The Mexican Delegation addressed the country's experiences in combating retail drug dealing through the social prevention of violence and police operations. The delegation explained the legal reforms and actions undertaken to combat micro-trafficking within a strategy focusing on public health and emphasizing respect for human rights.

Argentina: Argentina described the dynamics of micro-trafficking in the country and its relationship to the violence it engendered. The delegation also addressed the negative impact of the drug problem on children, families, the education system and social networks. Furthermore, the delegation of Argentina expressed its belief that a bilateral and multilateral approach is needed to confront this problem.

5. Discussion regarding the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS on the World Drug Problem in the Americas

The Chair opened the discussion and then yielded the floor to Ambassador Paul Simons, Executive Secretary of CICAD, who introduced the document "CICAD: Programming, Projects and Initiatives with Reference to the Declaration of Antigua" as reference of the work done by the countries and the Executive Secretariat to articulate collectively operational paragraphs of the Declaration of Antigua. Primarily, Ambassador Simons emphasized paragraph 20 of the Declaration which refers to the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS and the specific actions being undertaken in preparation for the session. Ambassador Simons underscored the activity in the region as well as the ideological alignment of the Declaration of Antigua with the Hemispheric Drug Strategy and its Plan of Action.

Comments by delegations

Peru: The Delegation of Peru requested that this topic be addressed within the framework of CICAD 55, given the significance of the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS in Antigua, Guatemala. The delegation called attention to the importance of being able to prepare adequately the Special Session during the meeting of CICAD and to learn of the positions of the countries.

Canada: Canada expressed its agreement with Peru's request and considered that, in order for the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS to be productive and useful, it must be nurtured by a process

of experts and evidence. Moreover, Canada added, it would be appropriate to discuss the preparation process with the host country (Guatemala) and listen to their ideas.

Chile: With regard to the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS, the Chilean Delegation stated that this was a political not technical meeting that would examine the continuity of the Declaration of Antigua which has elements that fall within the responsibilities of CICAD but others that are outside its competence. Chile asked the delegate of Guatemala for guidance in that regard.

Mexico: Mexico emphasized that the purpose of the session is to carry out an analysis from a broad, plural and comprehensive perspective that includes the pillars of supply and demand reduction, with components of focused international cooperation, and aimed at specific actions and results. Given the lack of available information, the Mexican delegation felt it would be important to make room during the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS for countries to make presentations and exchange information in order to guide and support drug policies with a public health approach. The delegation also pointed out the importance of maintaining a social, preventive and individual centered perspective.

Guatemala: As host of the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS, the Delegation of Guatemala indicated that the country was ready to prepare, organize and support the implementation of the activities. The delegation also pointed out that it needed inputs in order for decisions to be made at the highest level.

Venezuela: Venezuela requested clarification regarding the expected outcome of the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS and the process for developing the resulting documents.

Peru: The Peruvian Delegation expressed its agreement with Venezuela's request and added that, although the context of the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS is political, the debate must be based on two essential documents: the Hemispheric Drug Strategy and the Declaration of Antigua. The delegation agreed with Chile and Guatemala regarding the political nature of this debate, but it also made the point that, within the framework of CICAD, the Hemispheric Drug Strategy encompassed every aspect of the global drug problem. The delegation of Peru considered that CICAD could be a component to adequately channel and prepare the work being done. Peru also proposed that the discussions be supported by a document that could serve as the basis for future work and as input to the Special Session of the United Nations in 2016.

Canada: Canada emphasized that the Hemispheric Drug Strategy and its Plan of Action covered the range of policies and topics that were still applicable and those that were currently under discussion. The Canadian delegation pointed out that, given the lack of time, it was necessary to have a clear idea, during this CICAD meeting, of what was expected to be accomplished and how to carry it out over the next five months. Canada considered that CICAD, through the MEM, had the responsibility of identifying where the Hemispheric Strategy had been implemented effectively, where more efforts needed, and whether there were any additional considerations that needed to be taken into account in the next Plan of Action. The delegation explained that it was important not to retrace the process that led to the Declaration of Antigua.

Colombia: The Delegation of Colombia emphasized that the General Assembly of the OAS includes and transcends the mandate of CICAD. It is, the delegation said, a political forum that must encompass all the dimensions of the problem from a broader perspective. Given the need for a methodology and a product, the delegation proposed granting Guatemala three weeks to present a proposal for inputs needed. Colombia expressed the belief that CICAD had an important role to play, contributing to the discussion in Guatemala additional inputs such as a work document that summarizes and brings to the forefront the essence of what is taking place and what should be the future of drug policies. Colombia also proposed

that Guatemala take into account the conclusions of the Chair and the results of the working group on alternatives to incarceration.

Chile: The Chilean Delegation added that, as a technical body, CICAD must provide multidisciplinary inputs but that the final decision is political and broader, and, therefore, the final product must come from the Permanent Council or some other higher authority. Chile expressed the opinion that Guatemala should let all members know what the central theme would be and what type of document would result from the session.

Ecuador: The delegation expressed its agreement with the positions of Venezuela, Peru and Canada. With regard to Colombia's proposal, Ecuador offered the possibility to work collectively in the development of the methodology to be used in the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS.

United States of America: The United States Delegation stated that the essential documents to evaluate the situation in the hemisphere, without reinventing processes, were the Hemispheric Drug Strategy and its Plan of Action. The delegation added that CICAD should play a role in this process, acknowledging the fact that it will proceed at a higher level and that, eventually, a political discussion will take place in Guatemala. The United States said that it was not necessary to renegotiate documents that had already been agreed to and adopted. The delegation further stated that, given the proximity to the holding of the Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly (UNGASS) in 2016, this was an opportunity for the Hemisphere to lead the process with an innovative declaration that redefined the global drug problem.

Executive Secretariat: The Secretariat reiterated its readiness to collaborate with member States to produce appropriate inputs. The Secretariat added that the MEM process is on schedule, but that the final reports would not be ready by September and emphasized the importance of determining what type of inputs could be provided to the Foreign Affairs Ministers for the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS.

Chair: The Chair summarized the comments of the delegations and inquired with Guatemala about the possibility of presenting a work methodology that included the Hemispheric Drug Strategy and its Plan of Action in preparation for the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS.

Guatemala: The Delegation of Guatemala indicated that the work methodology and proceedings were already established in the provisions of the General Assembly and that it would be more appropriate for this exercise to be carried out in conjunction with the other member States. Furthermore, the delegation pointed out that the Declaration of Antigua (Article 20) mandated CICAD to provide inputs to the General Assembly and said that there were also other actors that must develop inputs.

Colombia: Colombia proposed that it would be useful for Guatemala to present a draft agenda, list of topics and inputs, for consideration by the other member States, in preparation for the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS.

Guatemala: The delegation accepted Colombia's proposal that Guatemala develop possible inputs.

Chair: The Chair confirmed the agreement that the delegation of Guatemala work in this area and for the Executive Secretariat of CICAD to provide support to the process of consolidating these documents.

Peru: The Delegation of Peru expressed its support for the agreement and pointed out that the development of a work plan and framework were still pending in preparation for the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS.

Chair: The Chair concluded that Guatemala would lead the process to develop a work plan, in collaboration with the other member States.

Guatemala: The delegation requested information as to where it should present the proposal.

Executive Secretariat: The Secretariat clarified that the Permanent Council, through a process already established and regulated, would gather all inputs.

Mexico: The Mexican Delegation considered the delegation of Guatemala to be the focal point to present all types of inputs and proposals from any country for the upcoming Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS.

Nicaragua: The Delegation of Nicaragua expressed the opinion that the proposal should be presented to the Permanent Council and, from there, derive a series of initiatives and actions. The delegation requested clarification regarding the objectives of this meeting, given the position of certain countries with very concrete plans, such as the legalization of drugs, and the role of producer and consumer countries with regard to this subject area.

Decision of the Commission

The Commission agreed that the Delegation of Guatemala would work on the topics to be discussed at the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS, with the support of the Executive Secretariat of CICAD, in order to consolidate the inputs and documents to be gathered by the Permanent Council.

6. Report on the conclusions of the *side-event*: “Retail distribution of illegal drugs and local responses to drug markets” and Panel: Cities, Consumption and Drug-trafficking in Small Quantities: Comprehensive Prevention Strategies

Moderator: Juan Carlos Garzon, Woodrow Wilson Center

Mr. Garzon addressed the dialogue that is taking place between governments and civil society members regarding drug-trafficking in small quantities, and explained the impact, trends and local challenges.

Panelists:

a. Alejandro Ivelic, Adviser, Office of the Attorney General, Chile (CICAD/doc.2100/14)

Mr. Ivelic presented statistical data regarding prevalence in urban consumption in Chile, breaking down the information by age, socioeconomic level and type of substance. Mr. Ivelic also explained the background and evolution of drug-trafficking organizations in Chile: criminal organizations that bring the drugs in and criminal organizations dedicated to the sale of drugs, which are known as neighborhood organizations. Last, the panelist explained how Chilean legislation differentiated micro-trafficking from trafficking.

b. Sergio Berni, Secretary of Security, Ministry of Security, Argentina (CICAD/doc.2103/14)

Mr. Berni addressed how the legal system of Argentina approached drug-trafficking in small quantities and explained the impact of drug-trafficking in small quantities on the legal, health, economic and territorial areas. The panelist also reported on his country’s project in the city of Rosario where small-scale drug-trafficking activities were detected as a result of police corruption and social inequity.

c. Jim Pugel, Former Seattle Police Chief, LEAD (Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion)

Mr. Pugel addressed the high number of sentences imposed on non-violent drug users in the city of Seattle and explained the complications brought about by that situation. Later, the panelist spoke about the LEAD Program to provide alternatives to incarceration for those individuals and reported on the results.

d. Maria Mercedes Dueñas, Coordinator of the Area of Reduction of Drug Consumption, UNODC, Colombia (CICAD/doc.2104/14)

Ms. Dueñas spoke about the micro-trafficking problem in Colombia and presented statistical data on youth in cities and marginal-urban areas that are exposed to the sale of drugs, either as a means of subsistence or for personal use. The panelist also emphasized the importance of a comprehensive vision to confront the problem and reported on some lessons learned.

e. Carmen Fernandez Cáceres, General Director, Youth Integration Center, Mexico (CICAD/doc.2102/14)

Ms. Fernandez addressed retail drug trafficking in Mexico City, where there is a breakdown of the social fabric and where the main victims are children and youth. The panelist provided an epidemiological overview of Mexico City and statistical data on marijuana and cocaine consumption. Ms. Fernandez also reported on the National Program for the Social Prevention of Violence and Crime and described the most significant challenges faced by the program. The speaker then yielded the floor to Ms. Ariadna Camacho, Director of Citizen Engagement and Local Crime Prevention, who pointed out that the drug problem must be approached as a health and public security problem and explained how the program was conducting the analysis of violence prevention (CICAD/doc.2101/14).

Comments by delegations

Paraguay: The delegation reported on the pilot programs being carried out in Paraguay regarding community prevention.

Chile: The Chilean Delegation pointed out that a good economy increases the demand for drugs and brings about a migration of criminal activities. The delegation also described drug-trafficking methods within its territory and how those drugs are commercialized in small quantities.

Argentina: The delegation indicated that micro-traffickers were, in many instances, more vulnerable and that micro-trafficking not only existed in cities but also in rural areas.

Peru: The Peruvian Delegation addressed the actions its government was taking to combat retail drug-trafficking, which also included preventive measures in accordance with the reality of the population, and explained that civil society played an essential role in making those measures work.

Uruguay: The delegation inquired about social policies for those individuals arrested during police operations in the city of Rosario.

7. Judicial reform and alternatives to incarceration: *Experiences*

Moderator: Judge Justice Kofi Barnes, President of the International Association of Drug Treatment Courts (IADTC) and the Canadian Association of Drug Treatment Courts (CADTC), Judge of the Superior Court of Ontario, Toronto, Canada

Judge Kofi Barnes spoke about alternatives to incarceration emphasizing the great diversity of existing needs depending on the priorities of each country in confronting the problem. In addition, Judge Barnes presented a video about the work done, in collaboration with the Executive Secretariat of CICAD, on Drug Treatment Courts.

Presenters:

a. His Excellency Ivor Archie, President of the Supreme Court of Trinidad and Tobago

Mr. Archie began his presentation indicating that he believed his country was willing to make legal changes in order to differentiate between the various scenarios of criminal activity related to drug trafficking. In that regard, Mr. Archie said that it was necessary to review the processes followed by countries to accomplish the different legal reforms adopted to confront the problem and emphasized that prison overcrowding had been and continued to be one of the great challenges facing the region. Mr. Archie then explained how judicial proceedings had been speeded up in Trinidad and Tobago in order to confront the problem, and described the process followed to incorporate the Drug Treatment Courts (DTCs) model through CICAD.

b. Doris Maria Arias Madrigal, Judge of the Third Chamber of the Supreme Court of Justice, Costa Rica (CICAD/doc.2107/14)

Judge Arias described the changes occurring in the dynamics of the drug problem in Costa Rica, which led to an increase in drug consumption. The presenter explained that, due to this situation, the country, with the support of CICAD, had implemented the Drugs under Judicial Supervision Program (PTDJ) in order to provide alternatives to incarceration and reported on the challenges faced and results obtained during this experience.

c. Randall Worrell, High Court Judge, Barbados

Judge Worrell addressed the legal situation, challenges and judicial reforms that must be undertaken by Barbados in order to provide appropriate legal treatment to drug users who exceed the legal limits and traffickers of small quantities and outlined the criteria used currently to prosecute these persons. The presenter expressed the opinion that in order to achieve change, it is necessary for all interested parties to have the will to change, to involve civil society, and to be in contact with the communications media.

Comments by delegations

Grenada: The Delegation of Grenada described the initiatives its country was implementing with regard to alternative sentencing and considered that having a good relationship with the communications media was very important. The delegation also inquired with the panel about the reasons for reducing the inmate population.

The panel explained that there were socioeconomic reasons given that jails had a large number of inmates who were awaiting trial and who did not have resources for legal representation, and that the resources allocated to the penitentiary system could be channeled toward other sectors.

Trinidad and Tobago: The delegation made reference to the high level meeting held in Vancouver regarding specialized courts and their results. The delegation also emphasized the importance of working with the communications media on the subject of Drug Treatment Courts and highlighted the support role played by CICAD in this area.

Peru: The Peruvian Delegation stressed the importance for strategies in this subject area to have a health perspective. The delegation also explained the circumstances in which drug doses were allowed for personal use, as well as the implementation of Drug Treatment Courts in Peru.

Paraguay: The Delegation of Paraguay shared the country's experience with regard to the living conditions of inmates and social reinsertion programs for underage youth. The delegation stated that the country was willing to review its legislation to adapt it to hemispheric trends.

Panama: The delegation shared the country's experience with Drug Treatment Courts and the coordination necessary to carry out the implementation of the program.

Mexico: The Mexican Delegation shared the country's experience with broadening the Drug Treatment Courts model, emphasizing that these efforts are being carried out using a comprehensive clinical and criminogenic approach.

United States of America: The United States delegation recalled the country's experience during the 80s decade and the measures taken which led to the massive growth of the penitentiary system through mandatory minimum sentences. The delegation also reported on the progress made since that time, by resorting to more fitting alternatives.

Ecuador: The Delegation of Ecuador described the most recent reforms to the Ecuadorian Criminal Code, and explained the range of penalties imposed in order to avoid the imposition of excessive sanctions.

Chile: The delegation shared the country's experience with Drug Treatment Courts and the challenges faced in order to implement these courts permanently. In addition, the delegation detailed the legal framework that regulates this system.

Canada: The Canadian Delegation addressed the changes in the country's Drug Strategy and its legislation and explained Canadian legal provisions regarding drug dependents and how Drug Treatment Courts function.

Brazil: The delegation described existing alternatives to incarceration in Brazil and inquired whether Drug Treatment Courts or other mechanisms were being used in more serious cases.

In response, the panel indicated that, at present, those mechanisms were generally utilized for low level offenses but that possible alternatives to be applied in more serious cases were being analyzed.

Argentina: The Delegation of Argentina stated that, in their country, there was a very high percentage of individuals in jail who had not been sentenced and described the challenges faced with the justice system and the communications media. The delegation also shared Argentina's experience with a pilot Drug

Treatment Courts program being implemented in the Province of Salta for persons who have committed minor offenses.

8. Judicial reform and alternatives to incarceration: *Initiatives*

Presenters:

a. Presentation on sentencing reform, Jonathan Wroblewski, Department of Justice, United States of America

Mr. Wroblewski addressed the history of drug abuse in the United States of America and explained the factors that led to the reduction of crime. The presenter also reported that the United States Department of Justice was developing a strategy to reduce the cost of incarceration in order to invest more effectively in treatment, prevention and intervention. Mr. Wroblewski also reported that his country was exploring the possibility of reducing mandatory minimum sentences for minor drug offenses, taking into account the capacity of the government to improve the opportunities available to offenders in order to prevent recidivism.

b. Presentation of Working Group initiative on Alternative Proposals to the Penal and Correctional Treatment, Julián David Wilches Guzmán, Director of Drug Policy and Related Activities, Ministry of Justice and Law, Colombia (CICAD/doc.2109/14)

Mr. Wilches addressed the details of the analysis to be conducted by the Working Group on Alternative Proposals to the Penal and Correctional Treatment and made reference to the related background elements in the Hemispheric Drug Strategy and the Report on the World Drug Problem in the Americas. The presenter explained that the Working Group would consist of a group of experts designated by the member states, a technical support group, and the government of Colombia would serve as the coordinator. Mr. Wilches also reported that the Ministry of Justice and Law of Colombia, with the support of CICAD, would coordinate the drafting of the Technical Report, which is to be produced by the Technical Support Group and submitted to the Working Group for comments. The progress report would be presented at the fifty-sixth regular session of CICAD and the final report at the fifty-seventh regular session.

Comments by delegations

Brazil: The delegation expressed its wish to join the working group.

Canada: The Canadian Delegation inquired about the funds to be used to make this working group operational.

The Executive Secretariat explained that this group would be financed with funds specifically allocated to this area and that some sections of the Executive Secretariat would provide technical support.

Trinidad and Tobago: The delegation stated that, in principle, they agreed with the proposal and said that they would like to have more information in order to decide whether to join the working group.

Uruguay: The Delegation of Uruguay explained that there was no specific background on alternative measures to incarceration. However, the delegate said, the Rehabilitation Institute had been implementing drug supervision and control measures.

Bolivia: The Bolivian Delegation inquired with the delegation of Peru about alternative penalties for coca producers.

Peru: The Delegation of Peru explained that its legislation understood the drug production situation and did not penalize producers but those individuals involved in the commercialization of coca leaf. The delegation also expressed its interest in joining the working group.

Colombia: The Colombian Delegation said that it hoped that this experience would be an input for other long-range projects and that the report they proposed would be limited to the search for alternatives to incarceration.

Julián Wilches: Mr. Wilches indicated that the working group would meet twice, which would allow for the drafting of an intermediate report.

9. Health issues and policies related to cannabis

Introduction: Michael Botticelli, Acting Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP), United States of America

Mr. Botticelli pointed out the multiple problems associated with drug use; he emphasized the subject of treatment and the elimination of the stigmatization of persons with substance abuse problems; he emphasized the challenge of perceived risk in relation to the legalization of marijuana; and he mentioned that alliances would multiply and that the experiences generated would be taken into account in the development of policies.

Presenter: Wilson Compton, Deputy Director, National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), United States of America (CICAD/doc.2105/14)

Mr. Compton addressed the effects of marijuana on the brain, body and behavior. He also emphasized the importance of the social environment in the prevention of first-time drug use among adolescents and said that the changes in marijuana policy had been disseminated throughout the country and, therefore, it was important to pay attention to developments in the states of Colorado and Washington.

Comments by delegations

Mexico: The Mexican Delegation consulted with the panel regarding measuring consumption in relation to campaigns to legalize marijuana and about the methodology used to conduct the studies on this topic.

The panel explained that there was some evidence for the measurement of consumption in relation to the campaigns to legalize marijuana, but that the evidence was not sufficient, since there were many factors involved. At the same time, the panel indicated that several research studies on this subject area were being done in Mexico, especially in collaboration with the “Ramon de la Fuente Muniz” National Psychiatric Institute.

Nicaragua: The Delegation of Nicaragua inquired about the position of the United States Congress and NIDA regarding the legalization of marijuana.

The panel responded that there was diversity of opinion regarding the legalization of marijuana and that they favored further debate on the subject.

Peru: The Peruvian Delegation commented about their country's experience with the decriminalization of drug use and pointed out that prevalence numbers were significantly lower, but that Peru's adolescent population appeared particularly vulnerable to developing problem consumption and high risk behavior. Furthermore, the delegation added, in general, Peru opposes the legalization of drugs.

Chile: The Delegation of Chile consulted with the panel about the existence of any studies on marijuana becoming a gateway drug.

The panel responded that there were studies done that showed the connection between alcohol, tobacco and marijuana consumption with other drug use but that it was not the sole factor, rather, it was a combination of several factors that led to dependence.

El Salvador: The Delegation of El Salvador asked whether there was a specific profile of the staff or professionals who cared for persons with marijuana dependence problems.

The panel responded that it depended on the particular situation in each country and its legislation, but that the typical staff consisted of physicians, psychologists, social workers, counselors, and that the level of training and qualifications varied from state to state. The panel added that interventions for marijuana-related problems were psychosocial.

Trinidad and Tobago: The Delegation of Trinidad and Tobago informed that the country was conducting a study on the effects of marijuana and reported an increase in the potency of the drug based on anecdotal evidence. The delegation also provided detailed information regarding family-based preschool prevention programs that had been implemented in Grenada.

Canada: The Canadian Delegation asked why the perceived risk of drugs had declined during the 90s decade and what were the lessons learned.

The panel responded that they were not sure about the reasons, but that it could be related to the prevention campaigns launched, although no direct correlation between prevention campaigns and marijuana use had been detected.

The Bahamas: The Delegation of The Bahamas inquired about the approach to alcohol and tobacco use compared to the approach taken with marijuana use.

The panel responded that each substance should be considered separately and that the impact of the open sale of marijuana within a legalization framework was not known. In addition, the panel indicated that it was important to apply a comprehensive, clear and didactic approach that would allow for the effective communication of the harm associated with consumption.

Uruguay: The Uruguayan Delegation addressed the background and grounds for the law to legalize marijuana in Uruguay.

Executive Secretariat: The Executive Secretariat consulted with the panel regarding the limitations to carry out research studies on marijuana in the United States.

The panel responded that there were some restrictions but that, for the time being, they had no problem obtaining marijuana needed to carry out research studies.

10. Challenges and impact of cannabis regulation

Moderator: Beau Kilmer, Co-Director, RAND Drug Policy Research Center

Mr. Kilmer provided the context and background for the cases in Uruguay and in the states of Colorado and Washington and explained the differences with the case in the Netherlands. Mr. Kilmer pointed out that there was a lot of uncertainty surrounding this subject but, on the other hand, he considered that the best way to learn more about the various aspects involved in the legalization of marijuana was for all interested parties to have an open discussion on this topic.

Presenters:

a. Julio Calzada, Secretary General, National Council on Drugs, Uruguay

Sociologist Calzada spoke by phone with the panel and delegations and described the most recent developments regarding the legalization of marijuana in Uruguay. Secretary Calzada explained in detail the legislation which sought to solve problems such as the incompatibility between decriminalizing marijuana use but criminalizing the acquisition of marijuana, the stigmatization of drug users and the black market. Mr. Calzada also indicated that the country had been working on the design of methods to regulate marijuana and monitor the implementation of the related legislation.

b. Peter Reuter, Professor, University of Maryland (CICAD/doc.2094/14)

Professor Reuter addressed the various policies and evaluation mechanisms that could be implemented to regulate the sale of marijuana, and pointed out that it was important to be flexible about the regulations used in order to be able to modify them in the event they did not produce the results expected.

c. Barbara Brohl, Executive Director, Colorado Department of Revenue, State of Colorado (CICAD/doc.2087/14)

Ms. Brohl explained the process to legalize marijuana in the state of Colorado and the details of the legislation. Ms. Brohl also addressed the objectives of the regulations and the challenges faced by the state of Colorado.

d. Kevin Sabet, Director, Drug Policy Institute, University of Florida (CICAD/doc.2088/14)

Mr. Sabet explained the context and the background for the legalization of marijuana in the United States of America. Mr. Sabet referred to the case of the state of Colorado which, he thought, would not show any noticeable results in the short term and expressed concern with the accelerated pace at which initiatives to legalize marijuana in other states were advancing, something that would make any type of prior research on the subject more difficult before the initiatives become law. Another concern expressed by Mr. Sabet was that the commercialization of marijuana could become an industry generating billions of dollars.

Following the presentations, the panel discussed the influence of the medical marijuana market on the legalization of marijuana, the various commercialization models that could be used, and the need to be

flexible when implementing legislation in order to be able to modify it if it did not produce the results expected.

Comments by delegations

Ecuador: The Delegation of Ecuador inquired about the limits established by the Colorado law and how was production regulated.

The panel responded that there were no controls established regarding production for personal use and explained how the limits for production and possession were determined.

Mexico: The Delegation of Mexico referred to the results of studies done in Mexico on medical marijuana which found that there were other legal products that were more effective.

Guatemala: The Guatemalan Delegation reported that it was identifying topics relating to alternatives to drug control policies for the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS. The delegation thought it was important to present to the UNGASS 2016 session, a view of what the member States wanted to accomplish in the hemisphere, and to that end, it was important to take maximum advantage of the experiences with legalization which will help produce inputs.

The panel explained that evaluations would be conducted, but that they would not be ready for 2016.

Canada: The Delegation of Canada said that there would not be enough time to evaluate legalization policies for 2016 and expressed reservations about the impact those policies would have on reducing crime and violence in the hemisphere. The delegation also expressed Canada's strong opposition to decriminalization and legalization and asked the panel for information on how marijuana sales taxes were handled.

The panel provided information on how those taxes were distributed and used in Colorado. Furthermore, the panel said, those taxes could be adjusted in the future.

El Salvador: The Delegation of El Salvador asked the panel to describe how the traceability of the marijuana plants functioned.

The panel explained how the control system operated and added that the system was controlled by the state.

Brazil: The Brazilian Delegation inquired about control measures carried out by the state to verify the residence of sellers; about the existence of a registry of cannabis buyers; regarding the incarceration of persons for illicit trafficking; and regarding the status of persons who were arrested before the new legalization framework went into effect.

The panel made clear that the state controlled the residency status of sellers, not buyers; it explained the existing limits for purchasing marijuana; and pointed out that the courts were still debating what to do about persons who were arrested for possession of cannabis before the law went into force. The panel then indicated that the state did not keep a record of cannabis purchases.

Argentina: The Delegation of Argentina said that society was driving its country to engage in the debate about marijuana. The delegation expressed its agreement with the position of the delegation of Canada that the legalization of marijuana would not reduce violence, but that regulating it could be of help in the area of mental and social public health.

The panel indicated that it was very difficult to control the illicit market and that state regulation went hand in hand with some type of legalization.

Spain: The Spanish representative provided clarification regarding cannabis clubs in Spain.

Bolivia: The Delegation of Bolivia compared the debate over marijuana to the coca leaf situation and proposed to seek new approaches in order to develop peaceful solutions.

Uruguay: The Uruguayan Delegation pointed out that the case of Uruguay did not constitute a model but, rather, it had been adapted to the specific reality of the country and that these laws could be reverted in the future if it was deemed that they were not producing the expected results.

Canada: The Delegation of Canada described some of the problems faced by law enforcement and the correctional system and expressed the opinion that there were regulatory options available within international conventions on drugs, without the need to legalize marijuana. The delegation urged member States to review the texts of the conventions to see that there was great flexibility to address the drug problem.

Executive Secretariat: The Secretariat made observations with regard to the work being done in the state of Colorado, about the dynamics of the market, and regarding the concerns that still existed at this stage.

At the same time, the panel emphasized the importance that any intent to sell marijuana to minors be investigated in order to prevent this segment of the population from consuming these products.

11. Panel: European perspective of the drug problem and cooperation with the Americas

Moderator: Dr. Francisco Cumsille, CICAD/OAS

Dr. Cumsille highlighted the role and history of European and Spanish cooperation with CICAD in specific areas of interest and that the results were known and highly valued by member States.

Panelists:

a. Roland Schaefer, Director for the Americas, European Exterior Action Service (EEAS)

Director Schaefer underscored the need for a frank debate of the drug problem that would guarantee effective and coherent responses. Mr. Schaefer outlined the cooperation initiatives of the European Union and their relevance, considering that both supply and demand aspects needed to be addressed with equal intensity using a holistic approach. The director explained that cooperation actions in the Americas had a renewed approach to harm reduction and the drug problem as a health problem. Director Schaefer pointed out the measures to reduce the supply of drugs, adapting legislation through judicial cooperation and money laundering control actions. The presenter also emphasized the impact of new psychotropic substances as a challenge that deserves special consideration.

b. Teresa Salvador, Director of the Coordination and Implementation Entity (ECE), Cooperation Programme between Latin America and the European Union on Drugs Policies (COPOLAD) (CICAD/doc.2079/14)

Director Salvador explained the evolution of drug policies placing emphasis on some current aspects of the cooperation between the European Union and the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States, and pointed out that progress had been made with regard to experience, evidence and availability of validated models and tools which provided for more effective mutual cooperation. In this context, Director Salvador explained the origins of COPOLAD, the activities carried out and the most significant achievements of the program. Dr. Salvador informed the meeting that the program would be extended for another year in order to avoid a gap between the 1st and 2nd phase which the European Commission was currently preparing. Dr. Salvador announced the next bi-regional meeting of COPOLAD, which would concentrate on exploring the structural and evidence bases for drug policies, with a focus on public health, and would be held on June 17, 2014, in Athens, Greece.

c. Dr. Francisco Babin, Governmental Delegate for the National Plan on Drugs of the Ministry of Health, Social Services and Equality (MSSSI), Spain (CICAD/doc.2078/14)

Dr. Babin explained the historical background of the drug problem in Spain and presented the overview of the country's drug policy explaining its beginnings and most significant background elements. He also covered the social and institutional response mechanisms implemented, especially with regard to the existing treatment and assistance systems in Spain. In addition, Dr. Babin explained the Spanish government's position with regard to the global debate on drugs and, specially, as it relates to the existing myths about cannabis consumption in the country. The presenter also made reference to the challenges of disseminating the prevention message to the population and offered data indicating that, in general, the Spanish population wanted the government to increase its efforts to prevent the consumption of cannabis.

d. Alexis Goosdeel, Unit Chief, European Monitoring Center for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) (CICAD/doc.2089/14)

Mr. Goosdeel presented a summary of the history of the European Union's approach to the drug problem, pointing out that the organization had very little exclusive competence on drug matters and that the responsibility in that area was more or less shared among the member States. The presenter reported on key findings made by the Monitoring Center for Drugs and the changes that had come about in the drug market during the last few years. In addition, and as a way to emphasize the magnitude of the public health problem, Mr. Goosdeel contributed data and references of the hidden Hepatitis C epidemic, which is transmitted through drug use faster than HIV. Last, the presenter referred to the document "Building a National Drugs Observatory: A Joint Handbook", developed jointly with CICAD, which had made it possible to set criteria and move toward a more coherent view of the problem and the response alternatives.

Comments by delegations

Guatemala: The Delegation of Guatemala agreed that it was important to strengthen international cooperation and expressed its concern with new the substances that emerge every year. In addition, the delegation reported that Guatemala was Co-Chair of COPOLAD and that it had recently joined GAFISUD.

Chile: The Chilean Delegation made an inquiry about movement toward a common legislation among the countries and a common approach to guidance and coordination with civil society.

The panel indicated that there was no goal of developing common legislation between Latin America regions and the European Union but that there was a goal of common cooperation, and noted that there had been convergence in some actions.

Mexico: The Mexican Delegation provided information regarding activities carried out in cooperation with COPOLAD and the results achieved in those efforts.

Chile: The Delegation of Chile underscored the relevance of the COPOLAD project and outlined the activities that would be developed in the future within the program's framework.

Peru: The Peruvian Delegation emphasized COPOLAD's holistic approach and proposed strengthening integration efforts through this program and to intensify collaboration and coordination between agencies in order to share the necessary strategic information.

Panel: Mr. Goosdeel informed that EMCDDA would submit its annual report on May 27.

Comments and suggestions made by the Chair

The Chair reiterated the importance of strengthening efforts in all areas in the permanent cooperation with Europe and among countries in the region. The Chair also pointed out that the panel had addressed all the aspects and stages that needed to be considered in this process, which had already experienced intense cooperation and achieved significant results, and which should continue through existing regional mechanisms in this subject area.

12. Panel: Situation analysis and responses to synthetic drugs and New Psychoactive Substances (NPS)

Moderator: Dr. Julián Wilches, Director of Drug Policy and Related Activities, Ministry of Justice and Law, Colombia

Panelists:

a. Martin Raithelhuber, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Regional Report 2014 SMART Latin America (CICAD/doc.2081/14)

Mr. Raithelhuber provided an overview of the synthetic drugs and New Psychoactive Substances (NPS) problem such as it appears in the joint publication of CICAD and UNODC on amphetamine type stimulants (ATS) in Latin America which was recently published. The presenter described the global growth of NPS, the challenges of controlling them, and the resources UNODC made available to help States combat the problem. Mr. Raithelhuber also urged the countries to include NPS in their efforts to combat the drug problem in the region.

b. Mathew Nice, Precursors Control Section, Secretariat of the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) (CICAD/doc.2086/14)

Mr. Nice made a presentation on the growing problem of NPS and provided information regarding the various initiatives implemented by international organizations to confront the problem. The presenter

placed special emphasis on the projects being implemented by the International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) and called on all member States to join those efforts.

c. Jocelyn Kula, Health Canada (CICAD/doc.2106/14)

Ms. Kula addressed Canada's approach to the NPS problem. Ms. Kula provided an overview of the various existing types of NPS and presented some statistical data on the incidence of these substances in Canada, as well as explaining the legal framework to control most of these NPS. Ms. Kula also provided information about the monitoring tools that Canada utilizes to determine the presence and use of NPS, and to obtain information on the possible harm these substances may cause. Finally, the panelist described the challenges Canada faces to combat these substances.

Comments by delegations

Paraguay: The Delegation of Paraguay reported that synthetic drugs labs had been found in Paraguay and requested assistance to provide training to operational, judicial and laboratory staff in order to confront this challenge quickly and effectively.

Panama: The Panamanian Delegation shared their country's experience with the control of chemicals and pointed out that no NPS related cases had been detected in the country.

Mexico: The Delegation of Mexico described the case of an ornamental plant that was used as a hallucinogenic and was sold via the Internet. In addition, the delegation provided information regarding the steps taken by the federal police to control this situation.

Ecuador: The Delegation of Ecuador provided clarification of the prevalence data presented by Mr. Raithelhuber, comparing the use of amphetamine type substances to the use of cannabis in Ecuador. According to the official data, the delegation indicated, cannabis was the most used drug in the country.

United States of America: The United States Delegation expressed its concern with the proliferation of NPS, which constitutes a serious global problem and reported that the United States had resorted to a law on similar substances in order to deal with NPS. Furthermore, the delegation indicated that voluntary cooperation was critical.

Chile: The Chilean Delegation pointed out that its country was joining the ION project and underscored the importance of exchanging information in order to confront the NPS problem. The delegation also expressed the need to conduct more research in order to be able to understand the risks associated with NPS consumption and to adequately train law enforcement personnel to combat the problem.

Peru: The Delegation of Peru indicated that there had been a noticeable increase in the quantity of ketamine entering the country.

Brazil: The Brazilian Delegation reported that the government had added 22 new substances to their list of controlled substances and emphasized the importance of international cooperation in order to identify the new drugs.

Executive Secretariat: The Secretariat explained that the subject of NPS was discussed by the Group of Experts on Chemical Substances and Pharmaceutical Products and that this topic would continue to be discussed in the future. The Secretariat then explained the actions being carried out jointly with JIFE and UNODC to combat the problem.

Comments and suggestions made by the Chair

The panel exchanged ideas regarding the NPS market. Among the main ideas discussed was the notion that, unlike traditional micro-trafficking of drugs, NPS were sold in relatively “invisible” markets, via the Internet and through contacts with friends, elements which presented different marketing patterns than those detected in traditional drug markets. Furthermore, the panel noted that NPS were appearing quickly in the market and, therefore, it was important for individuals responsible for combating this problem to have updated information available.

13. Multilateral Evaluation Mechanism – Report of the Governmental Expert Group (GEG) and preliminary results of the sixth round.

Presenter: Mr. Dave Alexander, General Coordinator of the GEG (CICAD/doc.2080/14)

Mr. Dave Alexander informed the Commission of the work carried out by the Governmental Expert Group (GEG) during the Sixth Evaluation Round, and reported that the Group had completed the first review of the country reports and forwarded the preliminary evaluations to the member States for their comments and clarifications, which were expected back by June 1. The General Coordinator also reported that the thematic working groups would meet at the end of July to review the information received from the countries, and would convene the Second Drafting Session at the end of September after which the final draft reports would be presented at the Fifty-Sixth Regular Session for consideration and approval. Immediately afterwards, Mr. Luis Adrián Noble of the Executive Secretariat presented the preliminary results of member States’ compliance with the 27 MEM recommendations (CICAD/doc.2083/14).

Comments by delegations

Trinidad and Tobago: The Delegation of Trinidad and Tobago pointed out that the holding of two meetings to review the 34 reports had been inevitable due to circumstances that had arisen at the moment, and that it was awaiting with great interest the information to be provided by member States to complete the final reports.

Canada: The Canadian Delegation expressed its satisfaction with the execution and results of the last meeting, since it considered that the objectives of the meeting were achieved.

United States of America: The United States Delegation expressed interest in the reports of the Sixth Evaluation Round as well as stating its satisfaction with the new MEM methodology and format. The delegation also made known its interest in having the Governmental Expert Group meet again to refine the MEM methodology.

Ecuador: The Delegation of Ecuador expressed its hope that the established deadlines be met in order to bolster existing resources.

14. Panel: Linking National Drug Commissions with the health sector to address the drug problem from the public health perspective

Moderator: Michel Perron, Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse (CCSA)

Panelists:

a. Howard Cotto, Commissioner, El Salvador, and Víctor Odmaro Rivera Martínez, Director of Regulation of the Ministry of Health, El Salvador (CICAD/doc.2110/14)

Commissioner Cotto provided information with regard to the coordinated, comprehensive and balanced actions carried out by the National Anti-drug Commission (NAC), which is composed of the Ministry of Health, the Higher Council for Public Health, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of Justice and Public Security, and explained how PROCCER had made a significant contribution to the process of joining efforts to address the drug problem in the country. Dr. Rivera reported on current policies in El Salvador to provide care to persons suffering from drug addiction within the framework of the National Health Policy 2009 – 2014, and he considered health to be a right that forced governments to rethink the provision of care from a public health perspective.

b. Juan Carlos Molina, Secretary for the Prevention of Drug Addiction the Fight against Drug Trafficking (SEDRONAR), Argentina (CICAD/doc.2112/14)

Mr. Molina explained that, in Argentina, a paradigm change was proposed, going from a Public Health approach to a Social Health approach. The presenter described this concept as a holistic paradigm with four components: social inclusion, reconstruction of the social fabric, improvement proposals and empowerment. Mr. Molina also pointed out that alcohol and psychotropic drugs were the main components of the drug problem in the country. In order to provide adequate care, the presenter proposed a response based on investment and social inclusion. Last, Mr. Molina underscored the adoption of the Law on Prevention which promoted prevention and assistance and supports the work of prevention, inclusion and assistance centers.

c. Luis Alfonzo, Substance Abuse Counselor, Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), (CICAD/doc.2082/14)

Dr. Alfonzo explained that PAHO had planned the necessary activities that are promoted by the Regional Strategy, which encourages a public health approach. Dr. Alfonzo pointed out that this public health approach required a legal framework and the reallocation of resources through a multidisciplinary approach. The presenter highlighted joint efforts between various national and regional institutions citing as an example the Joint Regional Program CICAD-PAHO.

d. Esther Best, Manager, National Drug Council, Ministry of National Security, Trinidad and Tobago (CICAD/doc.2111/14)

Ms. Best pointed out that drug dependency was a public health problem and that Trinidad and Tobago was currently promoting alternatives to incarceration. The presenter emphasized the work done by the National Drug Council with other national and international institutions. Ms. Best also reported that Trinidad and Tobago had updated its prevention programs to better reach the target population. Last, Ms. Best highlighted the fact that Trinidad and Tobago had a strategy to address health problems associated with supply reduction; that Drug Treatment Courts had been recently introduced following the situational

analysis conducted with the support of the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH) Canada and PAHO, and that a pilot program of the PROCER program had been implemented.

Comments by delegations

Grenada: The Delegation of Grenada underscored the importance of the program mentioned by Trinidad and Tobago, “*Eva goes to foreign*”, and pointed out that Grenada was implementing a similar program.

United States of America: The United States Delegation explained that health care reform in the country required that health care services providers take into account care services to treat disorders caused by substance abuse and pointed out that there was evidence of the benefit in channeling efforts toward the vulnerable youth population.

Mexico: The Mexican Delegation highlighted that Mexico was prioritizing the integration of prevention and care in health services by increasing capacity and infrastructure, with special attention being paid to in-patient treatment centers. The Delegation also explained the obstacles that limited those efforts.

Peru: The Delegation of Peru underscored the importance of working with a public health perspective and highlighted Dr. Alfonzo’s presentation regarding the comprehensiveness of the problem and the need for coordination and planning.

15. Remarks by Secretary General, Dr. José Miguel Insulza

The Secretary General stated that the debates taking place regarding the drug problem had generated a great amount of expectation. The Secretary explained that he was making the necessary preparations for the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS to be held in Guatemala, and that it was imperative for all the efforts of CICAD to be focused on supporting the work that is to be undertaken during that event.

16. Presentation of the Integral Study of the Coca Leaf

Presenter: Mr. Felipe Cáceres García, Vice Minister of Social Defense and Controlled Substances, Bolivia

Vice Minister Cáceres acknowledged that there had been a substantial and positive change in multilateral forums in recent years, stating that he valued all the knowledge gained after each meeting. The Vice Minister reiterated that the issue of the coca leaf was cultural and that thanks to the new approach being implemented, currently there are fewer hectares dedicated to coca crops and fewer laboratories. Vice Minister Cáceres introduced Mr. Marco Antonio Ayala, who presented the results of the Integral Study of the Demand for Coca Leaf in Bolivia (CICAD/doc.2099/14). Mr. Ayala explained that this study analyzed the production, commercialization, routes and consumer demand of the coca leaf, and included a study of commerce across borders.

17. CICAD Executive Secretariat Work Plan

Presenter: Ambassador Paul Simons, Executive Secretary, CICAD

a. Execution of the 2013 Work Plan

Ambassador Simons presented the results and products of CICAD Executive Secretariat’s 2013 Work Plan (CICAD/doc.2084/14), as mandated in Objective 7d of the Hemispheric Plan of Action 2011-2015.

The presentation included the topics of contributions, support to member States and the activities of the six CICAD Executive Secretariat Sections.

b. Report of the 2014 Work Plan

Ambassador Simons presented the CICAD Executive Secretariat 2014 Work Plan to the Commission (CICAD/doc.2085/14). Ambassador Simons explained that this presentation is required under Objective 7d of the Hemispheric Plan of Action 2011-2015, according to which the Executive Secretariat is tasked with presenting its work plan on an annual basis at the spring meeting of the CICAD Commission. The Work Plan was presented to the Commissioners for their approval in accordance with the objectives and actions of the Hemispheric Drug Strategy and Plan of Action.

c. Web Page on Cannabis

Ambassador Simons presented to the Commissioners a web page developed by the Executive Secretariat which provides detailed information on cannabis, such as its effects on health and health-related answers among others. The web page can be viewed at the following link:

http://www.cicad.oas.org/Main/Template.asp?File=/drogas/cannabis/default_spa.asp.

Comments by delegations

Trinidad and Tobago: The Delegation of Trinidad and Tobago conveyed its satisfaction with the work carried out by CICAD in Trinidad and Tobago and in the Caribbean region, especially with regard to capacity strengthening. The delegation accepted the 2013 report and supported the 2014 work plan.

Canada: The Canadian Delegation gave its support to the work carried out in 2013 as well as to the general topics of the 2014 work plan, and inquired about the possibility of holding the next meeting of CICAD in conjunction with the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS. The delegation also inquired about the type of activities planned using the contributions of the Open Society Foundations (OSF) and about the apparent similarity between the activities of the Global SMART project, which is implemented with UNODC cooperation, and other activities being carried out by CICAD.

With regard to the possibility of holding the next meeting of CICAD in conjunction with the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS, the Executive Secretary pointed out that since that session was scheduled for September, not enough time would have elapsed to be able to hold another meeting of CICAD. With regard to the type of activities being planned using future OSF contributions, the Executive Secretary stated that there was no agreement signed, only an offer to underwrite studies on the prevalence of drug use in certain countries. With regard to the apparent similarity between United Nations' programs, the Executive Secretary explained that there was no duplication of efforts and pointed out the differences between the activities carried out within the framework of the Global SMART program and other activities implemented by CICAD in the area of synthetic drugs.

Canada: The Canadian Delegation proposed having only one meeting of CICAD this year and to consider the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS as a second session.

Executive Secretariat: The Executive Secretary consulted with the Commissioners about the possibility of limiting the number of CICAD meetings to one annual session and referred to some of the benefits of holding one annual session. The Secretary emphasized that given that the statute of CICAD establishes two annual sessions, a recommendation of change of the Statute by the Commissioners would be needed in order to be evaluated by the Permanent Council of the OAS.

United States of America: The United States Delegation voiced its agreement with the proposal of the Executive Secretariat.

Venezuela: The Venezuelan Delegation stated that it was not taking a position either in favor or against the number of sessions of CICAD per year and emphasized that in order to make this change, first the Statute of CICAD needed to be amended through the appropriate channels.

Mexico: The Delegation of Mexico supported the 2014 work plan and emphasized the importance of making substantial contributions and to take advantage of the urge to find common ground among the differences.

Decision

The Commission approved by consensus the CICAD Executive Secretariat 2014 Work Plan.

18. Consideration and approval of draft CICAD Annual Report 2013 (CICAD/doc. 2076/14) and the Draft Resolution for the forty-fourth session of the OAS General Assembly in June 2014

The Delegation of Colombia chaired a working group parallel to the forty-fifth regular session of CICAD that drafted the modified documents from the 2013 CICAD Draft Annual Report (CICAD/doc.2076/14 rev.2) and the draft paragraphs for the Resolution related to CICAD (CICAD/doc.2077/14 rev.4 – in English - and rev.4 corr.1 – in Spanish) for the forty-fourth session of the OAS General Assembly in June 2014. These documents were approved by the Commission by consensus.

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

Pan American Health Organization (PAHO): The PAHO delegate requested support to follow up on the commitment made by member States in the Executive Council of PAHO, in compliance with the Declaration of Antigua, to produce a report on the response capacity of the public health systems of the countries which would serve as input for the Special Session of the General Assembly of the OAS, to be held in September in Guatemala, and explained the actions that are being carried out to fulfill this commitment.

Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA): The WOLA representative highlighted the work of CICAD in promoting open discussions at the various sessions and also expressed his organization's hope that the commitment to this important debate in the region on alternative policies to combat the drug problem in the America continued. The representative also addressed the actions being carried out by WOLA with regard to drug legislation and incarceration and underscored that abusing the use of incarceration for minor drug offenses was one of his main concerns and would be one of the most relevant points made in the next report produced by his organization.

Russian Federation: The representative of the Russian Federation emphasized that these CICAD sessions were taking place at a significant moment for the global community given that, just a month earlier, the United Nations meeting on narcotic drugs had been held in Vienna, which produced a balanced ministerial declaration regarding compliance with the Political Declaration and Plan of Action on International Cooperation Towards an Integrated and Balanced Strategy to Counter the World Drug Problem of 2009. The results of the report, the representative said, would serve as the basis for the

preparation of the Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly to be held in 2016, which would focus on the world drug problem. The representative also conveyed Russia's concern with the increasing calls for reviewing existing international drug control laws legalizing the so called light drugs, including marijuana, and emphasized that marijuana consumption constituted a danger to public health.

Spain: The representative of Spain announced that the COPOLAD Program of the European Union, managed by Spain, would continue and that Spain was very interested in retaining that leadership position and to have the support of the OAS for the benefit of its member States.

20. Topics, dates and site of the fifty-sixth regular session of CICAD

Guatemala: The Delegation of Guatemala announced that it would assume the Chair of CICAD and that it was already in the process of organizing the next regular session which would be held in November 2014 in Guatemala City.

Mexico: The Mexican Delegation requested assurance that civil society and academia would continue to participate in the future.

21. Other topics and closure

Peru: The Peruvian Delegation reported that the Government of Peru had announced its candidacy to the Vice Chair of CICAD for the period 2014-2015.

Vice Minister Fernando Ruíz Gómez, Chair of CICAD, presented to the Commission the Chair's conclusions (CICAD/doc.2069/14) in which it enumerated a series of topics that were part of the debates carried out in the framework of this event and closed the fifty-fifth regular session of CICAD.

III. DECISIONS

The Commission took the following decisions:

1. Approval of the CICAD Executive Secretariat 2014 Work Plan (CICAD/doc.2085/14).
2. Approval of the draft CICAD Annual Report 2013 (CICAD/doc.2076/14 rev.2) to the forty-fourth regular session of the General Assembly of the OAS, June 2014.
3. Approval of the Resolution paragraphs corresponding to CICAD (CICAD/doc.2077/14 rev.4 in English and rev.4 corr.1 in Spanish) for the forty-fourth regular session of the General Assembly of the OAS, June 2014.
4. Approval of the composition of the Working Group initiative on Alternative Proposals to the Penal and Correctional Treatment.

IV. PARTICIPANTS

1. CICAD Member States

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

2. Permanent Observers

Spain, Russian Federation, France, Italy.

3. Specialized International and Regional Organizations

Police Community of the Americas (AMERIPOL), European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA), International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL), Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), World Bank, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

4. Civil Society

Asuntos del Sur, Collective for an Integrated Drug Policy (CUPIHD) - Mexico, Espolea - Mexico, Coalition for Harm Reduction, Intercambios Civil Association (Argentina), International Drug Policy Consortium (IDPC) – Canada, Open Society Foundations (OSF), Washington Office on Latin America (WOLA), and the Woodrow Wilson Center.