



This project is funded by the European Union



NATIONAL DRUGS OBSERVATORIES

# 1<sup>st</sup> COPOLAD II ANNUAL MEETING National Drugs Observatories

Jamaica, 5<sup>th</sup> – 9<sup>th</sup> December 2016



FIIAPP  
COOPERACIÓN ESPAÑOLA



MINISTERIO DE SANIDAD, SERVICIOS SOCIALES E IGUALDAD

SECRETARÍA DE ESTADO DE SERVICIOS SOCIALES E IGUALDAD  
DIRECCIÓN DEL COORDINADOR PARA EL MONITORIAL SOBRE DROGAS



European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Opening Session

- Dr. Winston De La Haye, Chief Medical Officer, Ministry of Health, JAMAICA
- Ambassador Malgorzata Wasilewska, Head of EU Delegation, JAMAICA
- Teresa Salvador-Llivina, Director of COPOLAD
- Francisco Cumsille, Director of CICAD-OAS
- Cécile Martel, EMCDDA

Chairperson: Noelia Llorens, DGPNSD - Spain

During this session, each representative of the organising institutions of the meeting highlighted the importance of countries counting on a National Drugs Observatory (NDO), as one of the key instruments for informed decision-making in the definition of public drugs policies. Similarly, each speaker pointed out the contribution that each institution, in the framework of COPOLAD, is carrying out with the aim of contributing to the achievement of this goal by the CELAC countries, sustainably, beyond the duration of COPOLAD.

### Mapping the situation of NDO in CELAC, 2016 Presentation of the results

- María Verónica Brasesco, SEDRONAR - Argentina
- Héctor Suárez, JND – Uruguay

Chairperson: Michael Tucker, NCDA - Jamaica

During this session the preliminary data of the study carried out in the framework of COPOLAD, during 2016, by a group led by the Observatories of Argentina and Uruguay were presented: Follow-up study (2011-2016, of the situation of NDOs of Latin-America and basic mapping of NDOs in the Caribbean (2016)), pointed out that there existed many weaknesses which affected a majority of Latin-American countries in order to collect and disseminate relevant and quality information for the formulation of policies. This second study has served to describe the current situation and needs of the NDOs in the 33 CELAC countries. This allows defining the operative aspects of this component, particularly for the adjustment of activities to the different groups of countries, with the aim to establish or strengthen the role of NDOs in the countries of the region. The study provides relevant data on:

- The follow-up of the situation of NDOs in the countries under study in 2011 (resources available to carry out their tasks, adoption of sustainable information systems and information needs), identification of advancements and opportunities for improvement.
- The current situation of NDOs of CELAC countries, not included at that time (Latin-American countries that did not respond in 2011 and Caribbean countries, a region incorporated to COPOLAD II).
- The diagnostic about the current capacity of collection and dissemination of information of the CELAC countries. This way, the study will allow the organisation of working groups (WG) to approach and adapt the activities to the priorities of the subgroup of countries.

### Organisation of the Working Groups for Component 1 (I)

- Teresa Salvador-Llivina, Director of COPOLAD

Chairperson: Antonio Ybarra, CND – Cuba

In this session the Director of COPOLAD presented a brief summary of the COPOLAD Programme (2016-2019), giving a special welcome to the countries that have joined the programme in this second phase, passing on to describing the



This project is funded by the European Union

goals of this Annual Week of Observatories, and how the results of the study presented at the preceding session will facilitate the methodological orientation of the final contents of the of the Working Groups (WG) as foreseen in COPOLAD II for component 1 (Observatories). The study offers a real vision of the capacity of each NDO, according to the development phase taking place in each country, also considering the interest shown by the participants in the meeting, expressed in the following sessions of this 1<sup>st</sup> COPOLAD II Annual Week of Observatories.

**Institutional Coordination Session for the definition of WG**

- Teresa Salvador-Llivina, Director of COPOLAD
- María Verónica Brasesco, SEDRONAR - Argentina
- Héctor Suárez, JND – Uruguay

Chairperson: Nadja Porcell, CONAPRED – Panamá  
Facilitator: Artur Malczewski, NBDP - Poland

During the session, the organisation of the first two working groups foreseen in Component 1 was discussed (Act. 1.3; 1.4). It was agreed to establish two groups, that would also split into two subgroups according to working language (English/Spanish), the groups will be finally confirmed according to the countries that –during the session- expressed interest in participating in each of them (leaderships and participants).

Discussion summary Act. 1.3. Promotion of the implementation of Early Warning Systems (EWS).

Goal: To organise an activity that is able to facilitate and promote the establishment of EWS in countries that already count on a stable National Drugs Observatory (NDO). The importance of regional collaborations in drugs monitoring was emphasised. Some countries expressed interest in the European experiences in monitoring of drugs and drug dependencies (e.g. Colombia). The challenge of drugs monitoring, as was pointed out by some countries (e.g. Barbados), is the arrival of new psychoactive substances. Several countries were interested in the implementation and development of the EWS for new psychoactive substances (e.g. Ecuador, Colombia, Barbados, Mexico, Uruguay, Chile). The UNODC representative shared the opinion that it is worth to look at the experiences of countries that already count on experience in the implementation of EWS, e.g. Uruguay, Chile, Colombia. It would help to develop an optimal EWS model for Latin-America and the Caribbean.

Interested countries: Argentina, Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay y Trinidad and Tobago.

Summary of Act.1.4. discussion. Piloting of monitoring instruments

Goal: To identify a relevant indicator for decision-making in drugs policies, of which there are no available validated instruments/protocols in different populations or that have not been developed/implemented. During the session different indicators of relevance on which to focus the work of this group were explored. Among them, the protocol for treatment, quality of treatment services and referents in this field (e.g. Mexico, Argentina). Some countries expressed interest in developing indicators of drug supply reduction (e.g. Colombia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Barbados). For Colombia, the issue of the purity of drugs was of special importance. Another important issue for participants was direct and indirect morality. The protocol and comparability of regional data were also discussed. Finally, it was agreed to constitute a working group centred on designing studies to evaluate and validate indicator scales of “problematic drug use”.

Interested countries: Argentina, Antigua y Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Dominica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, Panamá Peru, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Suriname, Uruguay.

**Institutional Coordination Session for the definition of WG for Component 1 (II)**

- Teresa Salvador-Llivina, Director of COPOLAD
- María Verónica Brasesco, SEDRONAR - Argentina
- Héctor Suárez, JND - Uruguay

Chairperson: Andrés Rodríguez, ICD – Costa Rica  
Facilitator: Noelia Llorens, DGPNSD - Spain

The next session allowed exploring the organisation of the other two work groups foreseen for Component 1 (Act. 1.5; 1.6.). It was agreed that two groups would be establish, which at the same time would articulate into two subgroups according to working language (English/Spanish), the groups would finally conform according to the countries that – during the session- expressed interest in participating in each of them (leaderships and participants).



This project is funded by the European Union

Summary of Act. 1.5. discussion. Strengthening NDO for the elaboration of the First Country Report

Goal: To support interested countries in the elaboration of the first country report, as basis for promoting and facilitating the establishment / consolidation of NDO as key references for decision-making in drugs policy in each country. The countries are at very different stages in this task, very often they are not aware of the information that is available in the country, and they only focus on the dissemination of surveys, which in reality only provide a part of all drug-related information that is collected by different entities in the country. Other countries have progressed a lot in this issue and can help a lot in this point. Consolidating all available information on drugs in one unique document allows seeing the existing needs, it helps to improve quality and allows the assessment of the responses that are being given to emerging problems. The country report puts the drugs issue on the political agenda and gives institutional strength. In order to do that, the goal of this work group is to establish a starting point, a basic report that allows having that country view and to achieve that it is established periodically, taking into account the different starting points of the interested countries.

Interested countries: Jamaica, Guyana, Guatemala, Grenada, Dominican Republic, Cuba, Colombia, Ecuador, Belize, Barbados, Antigua & Barbuda, Brazil, Bolivia, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Mexico, Surinam, Trinidad & Tobago, Panama, Venezuela, St. Kitts & Nevis.

Summary of Act. 1.6. Discussion. Capacity to elaborate threat reports: Maps of problematic drug use and new threats.

Goal: To advance in the availability of systematised approach methods that allow developing exhaustive informative maps of new threats in participating countries (appearance of new substances or new patterns of use of already known substances). In some occasions, surveys and other available indicators do not allow responding to the need for information that arises from specific changes related to drug use by population groups at high risk or vulnerability situations. These situations require putting the focus on emerging threats and, for that, specific methodologies are required which are capable of identifying what is happening, and to orientate appropriate preventive measures before the problem reaches a larger dimension, whose control requires an investment in greater efforts and costs. These methodologies will depend on the characteristics of what is intended to study (population groups, substances, etc.). The diversity of the realities of the participating countries require synthesising methods that are adaptable to the situation of each country and their different threats.

Interested countries: Due to the characteristics of this Activity, the inclusion of CELAC countries in each group articulates according to the criterion of availability of an implemented EWS. According to this criterion, the CELAC countries that have some kind of development in relation to the implementation of Early Warning Systems are Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia y Uruguay. But the reach of the products that will be developed will include, as targets, all of the countries interested in identifying new threats within their territory, and using appropriate methodologies (e.g.: Brazil, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Cuba y Mexico).

**Subject 1:**

**The Public Health approach to drug policy and the role of National Drug Observatories (NDO)**

- o Francisco Cumsille, Director of OID-CICAD
- o Cécile Martel, EMCDDA
- o Omowale Amuleru-Marshall, St. George University, Granada
- o Fernando Rodríguez Artalejo, Professor of Public Health at the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain

Chairperson: Martín Mosqueida, CONADIC – Mexico

Facilitator: Oscar Duarte, SICAD - Portugal

**Marya Hynes, “The public health approach to Drugs policies and the role of National Drugs Observatories”,** presented the key components of evidence-based medicine as an applicable approach to drugs policies; Essential functions in the field of health and developing some of them, such as: monitoring, evaluating and analysing the particular problems in each country; stages in the public health paradigm. She highlighted the role of the Observatories in: defining drug-related problems; measuring its magnitude; understanding the key determinants, and allowing the evaluation of action plans and programs.

**Cécile Martel, “The public health approach to drug policy and the role of NDO”,** presented the historical perspective of how the EMCDDA was created, as well as the NDO of each country in the European Union and at which stage they are now. In the same way, which were the tasks on which the EMCDDA first focused, including: diagnostic of the epidemiological situation through General Population Surveys (GPS) and the definition of indicators (KI), as: Treatment (TDI), problem drug use (PDU), drug-related deaths (DRD); drug-related infectious diseases (DRID), market indicators,



This project is funded by the European Union

etc.; as well as tracking data of social responses (prevention, treatment, harm reduction, social re-integration); vigilance of new trends (new drugs, new threats and developments). She finished presenting a summary of the current role of the EMCDDA, within the framework of the current European situation in different areas and the responses mediated by countries, and having as objective the development of practical tools for informed decision-making by national policy authorities, within the framework of the National Drugs Strategy of the EU (2013-2020):

**Omowale Amuleru, “Substance use disorders: A public health approach for the Caribbean”**, presented his vision of the Caribbean countries; and explored various conceptual aspects about public health; differences between medicine and epidemiology; differences between the classical model of primary, secondary and tertiary prevention the step towards the model of universal prevention; identifying the main challenges in the promotion of wellbeing; the role of the harm reduction approach; and the control of the impact of consumption of the most prevalent drugs: alcohol and tobacco.

**Fernando Rodríguez Artalejo, “The public health approach in drugs policies and the role of NDO”**. Explored how public health can help to combat and control drug use and its associated problems, considering data on prevalence and abuse in Europe, Latin-America and the Caribbean, and its impact on health indicators. He presented the goals of health policy in this field, as well as the measures that can be adopted, and the role of NDO as institutions capable of influencing political decisions; emphasising the need for counting on quality indicators capable of responding to the specific needs of evidence-based decision-making.

The discussion was centred on: a) how NDO should support public policy makers in program development and public policy decisions, based on the strongest available scientific evidence; and b) NDO should provide reliable information for decision-making, and promote the updating of drug problem management models in all countries.

<b>CURSO A</b> <b>Research methods</b>	<b>Chairperson:</b> <b>Cejana Passos, SENAD - Brazil</b>
<b>Subject 2:</b> <b>Epidemiological research applied to population studies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Fernando Rodríguez Artalejo, Professor of Public Health at Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain</li> </ul> <p>Rapporteur: John Swift, ONDCP – Antigua &amp; Barbuda</p>

The session highlighted the usefulness of epidemiological studies in exploring the drugs phenomenon. It was pointed out that epidemiological research applied to population studies looks at the threats and risks of carrying out epidemiological studies. The essential components of epidemiological proposals and the importance of the study design and methodologies in meeting the objectives of the study were also explained. It was suggested that we need to justify whether or not it is worth answering the question. Research is justified by developing new knowledge.

The classification and types of methods used in epidemiological studies that are useful for understanding the drug problem which may inform policy and interventions (analytical studies; cross cutting studies descriptive studies; cohort studies; case studies; clinical trials). Epidemiological studies are studies conducted on population. They are cheap and rapid but we cannot generalise the results individually. The pros and cons of the data collection methods which researchers need to take into account were also explored.

<b>Subject 3:</b> <b>Validity of a study</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Fernando Rodríguez Artalejo, Professor of Public Health at Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain</li> </ul> <p>Rapporteur: Uki Atkinson, NCDA - Jamaica</p>
---	--

The key concepts relating to the validity of research studies were presented. These include precision of results, internal validity, external validity, selection bias and controlling for confounding factors. Professor Artalejo provided several examples of international studies to highlight the concepts that he taught. It was emphasized that precision is more important than validity given that it relates more to the quality of information/data. Additionally, the magnitude of random errors is important when determining precision and impacted by study size, standardized conditions (which are very important to reducing errors) and variability for repeated measurements.

Selection bias was also explained in relation to cross sectional, case control and cohort studies, respectively and strategies for preventing selection bias were discussed. These include ensuring good definitions of the population, the sample frame, avoiding strict time-frame limitations and minimizing non-response for prevalence studies; selection of incidence sample for case control studies and strict selection criteria for cohort studies.



This project is funded by the European Union

In relation to confounding factors, it was highlighted that these take us away from the real effects/associations and result in either over or under estimation depending on the direction of the effect. Controlling confounding factors by randomization, restriction and matching was explained and it was emphasized that a careful understanding of multivariate analysis to account for confounding variables is important.

Given time constraints, the two case study articles were discussed among the group highlighting methodological challenges and strategies to address them. The session was highly interactive and provided an excellent basis for in-depth understanding of the topic.

<b>Subject 4:</b> <b>Multimethod design – Trendspotting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Jane Mounteney, EMCDDA</li> </ul> Rapporteur: William Eugenio Cabanillas, DEVIDA - Peru
--	--

Multimethod designs (MD) offer an alternative for the exploration of the drug use problematic in a situation of limited resources, rapid changes in the market and drug use, emergence of new drugs and natural restrictions to the traditional research methods among specific and “hidden” populations. The orientation of these designs aims at increasing our understanding of drug demand and supply articulating quantitative and qualitative methodologies. In general terms, MD generate information through mixed methods and rapid assessment methodologies: data review, electronic surveys, expert presentations, focus groups and analysis of mass media and social media networks. Assuming a paradigm based on pragmatism, MD uses the triangulation and convergence of research methods to obtain a contextualised knowledge about drugs phenomena.

In the European context, since 2011 the application of MD has improved the knowledge on topics associated to the market and use of heroin, outbreaks of phentaniil use, availability of methamphetamines, Internet drug markets and the problematic use of new substances. Clearly, the applications and themes of exploration of MD are plenty, contributing to evidence-based policies and interventions. The next steps for the evolution of this work are related to setting up protocols (e.g. development of manuals) and strengthening the *trendspotting* networks.

In accordance to the work done during the session, the pertinence of adopting MD to deepen into various main topics associated to drugs in our countries was made clear. At the same time, it became clear that there currently exist platforms of actors, interventions and various resources for their possible adoption. It is acknowledged that the application of MD, within the framework of the work of NDO, can improve the work of inter-institutional coordination among the different actors working on drugs supply and demand, as well as the generation of periodic reports of policy recommendations.

<b>Subject 5:</b> <b>Qualitative research and ethnographic studies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Héctor Cardona, Professor at Fundación Universitaria Sanitas, Colombia</li> </ul> Rapporteur: Jonathan Yearwood, NCSA - Barbados
---	---

Three theoretical concepts highlighted by Professor Héctor Cardona:

- The Cultural context of drug use as represented by the perceptions, beliefs and values of people who use and distribute drugs.
- The moral perspective of the individual and the community as to whether the use and distribution of illegal drugs are right or wrong.
- The phenomenon of drug use as it relates to the daily experiences of persons who use and distribute drugs.

All of them allow a qualitative approximation to the knowledge of drug-related problems and, therefore, key complementary information to epidemiological studies.

<b>Subject 6:</b> <b>Indirect methods of estimation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Rosario Queirolo, Professor at the Universidad Católica de Uruguay</li> </ul> Rapporteur: Javier Paspuel, STD - Ecuador
--	--

The goal of the session by Professor Queirolo was focused on showing how to reveal hidden populations through indirect methods of measurement and estimation. In this context, people who use drugs are considered a hidden population as are the victims of domestic violence, racism, etc.

The solutions pass by two estimation models presented during the session: Respondent-Driven Sampling and post-stratification models.



This project is funded by the European Union

<b>COURSE B</b> <i>Essential concepts of the work of the Observatories</i>	<b>Chairperson:</b> Alma Cecilia Escobar, CNA – El Salvador
<b>Subject 2:</b> <b>What is a NDO?</b> <b>Manual EMCDDA/ OID</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Marya Hynes, Specialist on Drug Research, Inter-American Observatory on Drugs (OID-CICAD)</li> </ul> <p>Rapporteur: Marie Emika Exeus, DNCN - Haiti</p>

The day began with Marya Hynes' presentation « What's a National Drug Observatory » (NDO)  
The objective of the presentation is to give an idea of what an observatory should be. A NDO is an organization that aims to provide, for its home country, factual, objective, reliable and comparable information concerning drugs and drugs addiction and their consequences. It is important for an NDO to produce information.

Functions of a NDO can be articulated in:

- Data collection and monitoring at the national level
- Identification of national sources of drug-related information and identifying their strengths and gaps; Establishment a National Drug Information Network together with the partners and resources identified in the activity above; Maintenance of the drug information Network
- Analysis and interpretation of the information collected: a) The NDO thus act as a knowledge broker, explaining the data to all who need to understand; b) The NDO should utilize expertise in providing scientific, unbiased and non-speculative interpretation of data collected; c) The NDO has to verify the viability of the information and compare it to other data collected, examine the contextual information is necessary to interpret it.
- Reporting and communication of the results: a) Reporting and communicating results should be seen as the most important task of the NDO; b) Ultimately, outputs are what justify the NDO's existence.

<b>Subject 3:</b> <b>General concepts: statistics and epidemiology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Francisco Cumsille, Director de OID-CICAD</li> </ul> <p>Rapporteur: Juan Pablo López, SND - Paraguay</p>
---	---

Cumsille began his presentation "Introduction to Statistics": The role of scientific evidence in the public health.

Mains themes

- Scientific evidence
- Public policies

How they communicate? Hemispheric Strategy; Development and implementation of national policies against drugs

Evidence Vs Scientific evidence: Evidence refers to information that already exists, no matter how it was obtained. Sometimes, the messenger is more important than the message. Scientific evidence refers to information obtained through objective and valid methods and that includes a high level of credibility. To generate information, it is important to have a question.

Investigation: A good investigation must be planned and correctly executed. We need time to do it.

Statistics: The study of collecting, analysing, interpreting, presenting and organising data on a target population.

Unit of analysis: what is the population you want to study?

You have to respect the unit about which you are doing investigation: health professional, treatment centres and household.

Unit of sampling: e.g.: study to measure the prevalence of drug use in university, school and the population (age 12-64).

Method used: simple random sampling, systematic, by conglomeration etc.

We have to emphasize that there are associate risks in the process.

<b>Subject 4:</b> <b>Introduction to epidemiology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Marya Hynes, Specialist on Drug Research, Inter-American Observatory on Drugs (OID-CICAD)</li> </ul> <p>Rapporteur: Jaime Vanegas, CNCCO - Nicaragua</p>
--	---

Concepts explored in this session: Study: Includes activities such as epidemiological vigilance, observations, hypotheses-testing, analytical investigations and experiments. Distribution: It refers to the analysis that shows when, where, and which type of individuals are affected. Determinants: It includes the factors that influence health, either physical, chemical,



This project is funded by the European Union

biological, social, cultural, economic, genetic or behavioural. Health-related states or phenomena: It refers to diseases, causes of death, behaviours such as smoking, positive health states, reactions to prevention programmes and use of health services. Specific populations: Populations with identifiable characteristics, for example, member of a specific profession. Application to control and prevention: Those are the goals of public health: to promote, protect and reinstall health. Epidemiology includes a series of actions and studies; local and national monitoring systems, study of drug use. Prevalence: the proportion of individuals in a population presenting a specific disease at a given time. Numerator: Number of existing cases of a disease at a given moment. Denominator: Population Exposed to the Risk. Emphasis: Presence or absence of the disease. The period of time is arbitrary; it is like “a photo” at a given time. Uses: It estimates the probability of disease in a population in the time period in which it is studied. Useful for the study of the burden of disease in chronic processes and its implications for health services. Incidence: Frequency of appearance of new cases of a disease in a period of time (no. of new cases). Numerator: Number of new cases of a disease during a specified period of time. Denominator: Population Exposed to the Risk. Emphasis: That the event be a new case. The moment at which the disease starts. Uses: It expresses the risk of passing from the healthy state to the state of disease. The main measure is the frequency of diseases or acute processes, but it is also used for chronic diseases. More useful than prevalence in causation studies.

We studied the quantitative methods: The importance of the seriousness of data to investigate a problem The application of quantitative methods The definition of the research question We saw a brief comment on the studies: the y can be Surveys, Observations, Cohort studies, Experimental, etc. The most important is data collection: numerical or observable facts obtained during the research, the influences throughout time and their Trustworthiness. Description of Observations; statistical Description, Organisation and sum of data. Use of Data: to reinforce the evidence, Contrast hypotheses, evaluate data, statistical Inference, generalise conclusions, recommend interventions or preventive programmes. Results must appear in peer-reviewed journals. How do we use Quantitative data in the Public Health System? Treatment, Prevention, etc. Epidemiological research: EPI: Among, Over; DEMOS: Population Goals: Aetiology of the Disease, History and prognosis of the disease

*Epidemiology in the context of drugs.* It has it as a goal to investigate how drugs move between populations, to determine the prevalence of drugs in the community, the study of the history of drug use in the community, to evaluate the existence of prevention and treatment services, to provide evidence for policy decisions, regulations and interventions. The following questions were asked: ¿Can you describe drug use in your country by time, place and population? Do you have supporting data? Each country gave answer; nevertheless, the conclusion was that we do not have the information or scientific evidence that would allow us to reply to that question properly.

We studied the concepts of: Endemic: systematic, regular and without noticeable variation presence of population affected within a demographic segment. Epidemic: the significant increase of cases relative to habitually observed data (Outstanding increase of the endemic reality). Finally, we studied the statistics applied to the drugs problem; Basic Measures such as the Median, Mean, Mode, Percentile, etc. and their implications for a policy of prevention and a policy of treatment.

<b>Subject 5: Introduction to the evaluation of programmes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pernel Clarke, Coordinator of Information and Research for the Caribbean, Inter-American Observatory on Drugs (OID-CICAD).</li> </ul> <p>Rapporteur: Indirah Belle, BNDA - Bahamas</p>
--	---

At the start of the session, participants were introduced to the importance of evaluation as well as the common reasons why people don't evaluate programs. From the onset participants were engaged in the learning process and invited to provide their opinions on, “Why it was necessary to evaluate?”

Comments coming from a representative of Grenada emphasized the fact that evaluation ensures that time and resources are not wasted. The delegate from Dominica spoke about the process of evaluation helping with accountability. The representative from Guatemala spoke about its utility relative to it being a means by which we discover how the program is performing well or badly and how improvements can be done to achieve objectives. Another important point raised in the discussion had to do with replication. Another respondent from Grenada stated that “When programs are evaluated and there is a discovery that they are effective the evaluation results can assist with the replication of that program”. Other reasons provided by Mr. Clarke included the opportunity to be informed about unintended outcomes and to keep donors informed.

The main reason provided as to why people do not carry out evaluations included fear. Fear had to do with the fact that the program has not worked and this may have implications for waste of resources, funding, etc. Additionally, some



This project is funded by the European Union

people share a philosophy that evaluations are irrelevant to what they do. Another important reason was lack of expertise. Participants were encouraged to seek assistance and work closer with colleges and other agencies in their respective country that have the relevant expertise. Another key point expressed in this session was made by El Salvador who mentioned that evaluations should be objective and carried out by independent individuals.

After this discussion, Mr. Clarke presented an overview of the types of evaluation and how they are used in the field. Following this, a step by step approach to creating an evaluation plan was presented. He discussed each component of the plan which range in sequential order from documenting the project/program goals and objectives; preparing the logic model and evaluation questions; data collection and sampling; data analysis and reporting. Participants were also provided with a basic guideline of the skill sets of a good evaluator and reminded of the ethical, cultural and community considerations when conducting an evaluation.

The session ended with students engaging in a practical exercise. Students were grouped into two groups, which was based on the language spoken, English or Spanish. Each group was asked to develop a logic model and an evaluation plan based on information in a case study. Students had to choose one case study from three options based on scenarios involving the following: 1. Airing radio and television advertisements on the dangers of drug use. 2. Lectures and presentation on drug use and abuse in local schools. 3. Provisions of drug treatment services. Both groups presented on the case study no. 2 having to do with the prevalence of drug use in general and drug use by elementary and secondary students. Due to time constraints both groups were only able to develop a logic model for the scenario and discuss some steps of the evaluation plan. Mr. Clarke explained that the logic model describes the program/project as a picture or diagram. In developing a basic logic model answers to four questions had to be provided. (1) Who and with what resources? (Input) (2) What will be done? (Activities) (3) What will be produced? (Output) (4) What are the short, medium and long term effects of the program (Outcome)?

The Spanish group presented first and began by explaining that the time was inadequate but would present on what they had. The presenter began by explaining the goal of the program and provided the action steps leading up to the evaluation process. He explained that the goal of the program was to increase the awareness of harms of drug use; decrease the prevalence among those who consume and guide them toward appropriate treatment. He further explained that a series of discussions would be held with students, administrators, parents and treatment providers to obtain information and establish agreements. Following these activities time would be spent developing curriculums/course materials on the harms of drug use; alternatives to drug use and putting in place the necessary support mechanism for students using and abusing drugs. He also stated that a survey would be developed so that information can be obtained at the start of the program, which can be compared to a later time. Following these activities an evaluation plan would be developed.

The English group presented next on the same scenario. The first presenter discussed the components of the logic model based on information from the scenario. The second presenter spoke about the action steps of the evaluation process. The main points of this presentation included: ethical approval; conducting a needs assessment; the use of a comparison group and the design of interventions for both primary and secondary school students. Additionally, carrying out a pre and post tests to measure students' change of knowledge / behaviour over time and the design of interventions for both prevention of drug use and treatment for drug abuse.

<b>Subject 6: How to present the information and interpret the results</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Novie Younger-Coleman, Professor at University of West Indies, Jamaica</li> </ul> <p>Rapporteur: Carlos Javier Capote, ONA - Venezuela</p>
--	---

A variety of means exist to present information in a qualitative or quantitative way. The important thing is to clearly identify what is being measured and characterized, e.g. populations or groups. Through different studies, it will be possible to interpret the data obtained in samples, prevalence, life cycles, benefits in the population, follow-ups and variations. It is important to point out that non-responses in the data collected in the instruments should be considered in the analysis.

The Cross Sectional study brings us, besides the characterization of the sample studied, strengths and weaknesses, through a historical data making evaluation and follow-up. During a process of data analysis, it is necessary to identify or classify the variables (categorical and discrete), (qualitative or quantitative) starting with the median and the average.





This project is funded by the European Union

When presenting the results, it should be considered that in a written report it is preferable to display the data in tables; in the case of presentations it is preferable to do it in graphics; and if the intention is to show the totality of the qualitative data it is recommended to use box plots.

Estimates and intervals: The average, the standard estimates, the confidence intervals, allow us to characterize the data that are closer to the reality of what is studied, as well as the difference between two groups adjusted to reality.

Analysis, Interpretation and Presentation of Results: Nowadays statistical analysis are carried out through computer programs, using statistical packages. These packages are integrated systems of computer programs, designed for data analysis. Each package has its own format, instructions, procedures and features.

The analysis of the data is conducted a data matrix stored in a file, the type of analysis will be determined by the level of measurement of the variables, the hypotheses and the interest of the researcher through descriptive statistics for each variable.

The frequency distributions can be presented in an absolute or relative way. With respect to relatives, they can be graphically presented, taking into account the main tendencies (trend, median and average), variability and deviations.

In some cases, it is necessary to use inferential statistical analysis that allows generalizing a sample to the population, in order to test hypotheses and estimate parameters.

When conducting a scientific investigation, it is necessary to take into account the confidence intervals, the probability of making a mistake or to go wrong, which make parametric statistical tests necessary

<b>Subject 7: Introduction to qualitative methodology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Héctor Cardona, Professor at Fundación Universitaria Sanitas, Colombia</li> </ul> <p>Rapporteur: Marco Ayala, CONALTID - Bolivia</p>
---	---

Objective: "To facilitate a methodological understanding"

Competencies: Characteristics – Methodological principles

Development: Observatories from local to national; Documents are not circulated within the network and are not known; Methodological consultancies.

Principles: Important knowledge and method...; Descartes: dualism; Newton: direct observation; How much difference is there in diversity.

Are quantitative methods sufficient? Give value to the investigated subject who knows the experiences; Epistemological movement; Diversify methodologies; New forms of human relations; Sensitive perception; Seeking other methods; Poor representativeness...; Different projects have been worked on the topic, especially Chile-Brazil-Spain.

Comments: Bolivia: Complementary methods; Nicaragua: Qualitative – Measurable depth; Necessity to conduct this type of study; Poland: Combined methods according to necessity; El Salvador: Complementary methods; Better way to explain ...; Grenada: New alternatives; Jamaica: Research support; Mexico: Perception;

Change of paradigm: quantitative studies are not the only ones; complements are missing...

Conclusions: Conductive methods; Complementary; In-depth studies; Perception of the research areas in which surveys are not used...; Participation and in-depth factors; The researcher is more important than the respondent

<b>Plenary Session Research Agenda discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pernel Clarke, OID-CICAD</li> <li>○ Marya Hynes, OID-CICAD</li> </ul> <p>Chairperson: José Marín, SENDA – Chile Facilitator: Ioanna Yasemi, ADC - Cyprus</p>
---	---

The objective of the session was to lend space to OID-CICAD to explore with the countries research priority needs in the CELAC region, as well as training requirements, which would be used to draft a respective plan for the next 2-4 years.



This project is funded by the European Union



During the debate, these were clarified and classified into the following categories: General population studies; School surveys; Specific research on heroin; Driving under the influence of drug use; Monitoring and evaluation of harm reduction; Harmonisation of services; Market and consumption of NPS; Qualitative study on alcohol use; Infectious diseases among IDUs; Prison studies; Clinical control trials on pharmacological treatment of methamphetamine use; Evaluation of prevention and treatment programmes;

Training needs, on the other hand were categorised as follows: Early Warning System; Data analysis; Indirect methods ad estimations; Meta-analysis of indicators to inform drug policies; Strengthening NDOs; Epidemiological studies; Translation of evidence into policy; Treatment/ responses to co-morbidity

As it was pointed out, although COPOLAD does not include the incorporation of studies in its work plan, the above-mentioned specifications will be taken into consideration by OID-CICAD for funding purposes and drafting of the work plan.

**Conclusions, evaluation and diplomas Closing Session**

- o Michael Tucker, NCDA Director – Jamaica
  - o Teresa Salvador-Llivina, Director of COPOLAD
  - o Marya Hynes, OID-CICAD
  - o Jose Daniel Marín Montecinos, SENDA - Chile
- Chairperson: Rafael Sánchez, SECCATID – Guatemala  
Facilitator: Viktor Mravčík, VLADA – Czech Republic

During the closing session, the Director of COPOLAD invited representatives of each of the participating regions in the 1<sup>st</sup> COPOLAD II Annual Meeting of the Observatories, to elaborate a synthesis about what they considered that they had taken from the week, in terms of goals reached, definition of the foreseen work groups (goals, agreed methodology, expressions of interest by participating countries, etc.), composition and approach of work groups, capacity-building sessions were carried out. The general feedback by participants was very positive, agreeing that the experiences exchanged between the EU and CELAC regions must be kept and reinforced through the development of the foreseen activities in the COPOLAD work plan. The international organisations (EMCDDA, CICAD) that participate in COPOLAD as collaboration bodies, highlighted that the high level of mutual communication and cooperation reached up until now are essential to contributing to reach the goal of this Component of COPOLAD: the strengthening and consolidation of NDO in each country.

The Director of COPOLAD closed the session appreciating the active and excellent participation of all the countries and organisations, and informing that the final proposal on the contents of the work groups will be defined until March/April 2017, taking the exploratory exercise carried out during the week into account, the identified needs, as well as the expressions of interest and leadership shown by each country to contribute to the advancement of the foreseen activities.