



OAS | More rights
for more people

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSE
TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE ON THE
EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT**

MAYO, 2024

SECRETARIAT: Secretariat of Multidimensional Security

DEPARTMENT: Inter-American Committee Against Terrorism

SIGNED BY: Alison August Treppel-Executive Secretary CICTE

NAME OF THE EVALUATION: External Evaluation of the project titled “Countering Illicit Trade of Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear (CBRN) Materials in Free Trade Zones (FTZs) of Latin America- SMS-2001”

PERIOD OF EVALUATION: From September 30, 2021, To September 30, 2023

EVALUATED PROJECTS: Countering Illicit Trade of Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Materials in Free Trade Zones (FTZs) of Latin America (SMS-2001)

NAME OF THE EVALUATOR: Achim Engelhardt

The main objective of this document is to identify the necessary actions that need to be implemented by the executing agency to respond to the recommendations made in the external evaluation. The area should state whether they accept or not such recommendations and provide an explanation on how they will be responded or incorporate them in the future. The Department of Procurement Services and Management Oversight (DPMO) will follow-up on the implementation of the recommendations based on the actions identified.



RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSE

Recommendation 2: CICTE Management	Accepted	Not accepted
<p>Use relevant indicators of the general framework of supporting Weapons of Mass Destruction non-proliferation in the Americas also in the projects under the framework. This would ensure a clear contribution of new projects' goals to the framework purpose and of the new project's purpose to the framework's outputs.</p>	X	
<p>Response: This recommendation will be taken into account for future projects linked to the implementation of UNSC resolution 1540 regarding the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.</p>		
Key Actions		
Description	Date of implementation	
<p>1.1 During the project design, CICTE will coordinate with DPMO to ensure that indicators are relevant and according to goal and purpose-level indicators.</p>	2024/2025	
<p>1.2 CICTE will design the indicators according to the SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound) criteria.</p>	2024/2025	
<p>1.3. CICTE has been working with some potential donors using new indicator measurement models such as the European Union's OPSYS.</p>	February 2024	

Recommendation 3: CICTE Management	Accepted	Not accepted
<p>In a context where cost benefit analysis is extremely challenging due to the illicit nature of trade addressed by the CICTE project, the CICTE should support its main counterparts in national AEO programs and Mutual Recognition Agreements to monitor the cost effectiveness of those measures. Comparing trade with and without those programs and agreements provides powerful arguments to national governments and donors for funding. CICTE support could include: i) sharing the monitoring methodology from Brazil and Paraguay with other interested countries; ii) widely disseminating monitoring results through OAS channels; and iii) jointly organizing dissemination events with national customs agencies as part of future projects.</p>		X



Response:

Beneficiary countries usually do not have enough information and statistics regarding supply chain security programs related to illicit trade of CBRN materials, which made it difficult to evaluate the cost-benefit analysis in this project. In addition, countries do not share the information related to sensitive materials. The information related to WMD (dual use materials) globally is considered classified as it is related to sensitive items. One of the objectives of the Non-proliferation regimes is to protect data related with trade, industries, investigation and other information that can be used to develop WMD or their means of delivery.

Key Actions	
Description	Date of implementation
N/A	
N/A	
N/A	

Recommendation 4: CICTE Management	Accepted	Not accepted
For new projects, CICTE should enhance the quality of its project indicators. Particularly output-level indicators should be results-based rather than activity-based. (see also R5).	X	

Response:

This recommendation will be taken into account for future projects when designing the project indicators.

Key Actions	
Description	Date of implementation
1.1 During the project design, CICTE will coordinate with DPMO to ensure that indicators are relevant and according to goal and purpose-level indicators.	2024 – 2025
1.2 CICTE will design the indicators according to the SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound) criteria.	2024 - 2025
1.3. CICTE has been working with some potential donors using new indicator measurement models such as the European Union's OPSYS.	February 2024

Recommendation 6: CICTE Management:	Accepted	Not accepted
Though CICTE can mainly implement its mandate through projects, its small core staff plays a vital role in maintaining contacts with customs agencies and other related actors, particularly in periods when no projects are implemented. Maintaining and expanding this invaluable engagement to the extent possible is strongly recommended.	X	



Response:

Despite not having further funds for certain programs, CICTE staff will continue to maintain engagement with government stakeholders through different trade related security programs.

Key Actions	
	Date of implementation
1.1 CICTE will continue engaging with border control agencies such as Customs, Police, and other governmental agencies through the Initiative Coordinated Border Management.	2024-2025
1.2 Other CICTE programs such as Maritime and Port Security, Supply Chain, Cargo and Container will allow CICTE maintain contacts with customs agencies.	2024-2025