

Mobilizing New and Different Voices in Drug Policy Reform

Prepared by: Matt Wilson, Program Manager, GDPP

Date of Review: November 9, 2015 (8:00-9:30AM, Room 7A)

Parameters of the Portfolio

Currently, the field of international drug policy reform lacks both geographical and thematic diversity. This body of work (see Annex 1) represents Global Drug Policy Program's strategy of supporting the entry of groups not previously working on drug policy reform into the movement and becoming public advocates for drug policy reform in their own right. This review includes our work with women's rights groups, medical professionals, scientists, economists, law enforcement, and human rights activists between 2009-2014. Excluded from this review is our effort to increase engagement with the development community, as this is now a discrete component of GDPP's strategy and a body of work still ripening. It will undergo a focused review in the coming year, though lessons from the present review will certainly benefit that work.

Our Ambitions

In our current 2014-2017 strategy, under Concept 2, *drug policy reform advances in key countries*, and *national leaders advocate publicly for progressive change to the global drug control regime*, we state the following two strategic categories:

- A. Strengthen and sharpen existing reform movements in key countries.
- B. Bring new voices to drug policy reform debates in key countries, regionally and internationally, including NGOs and international organizations not centrally focused on drug policy.**

This review focuses on the second of these two ambitions. As demonstrated by a survey of past GDPP strategies since 2009, this is not a new ambition for the Global Drug Policy Program, but has been a consistent focus since the inception of the program. In our 2016-2019 strategy, this ambition is again articulated in our (a.) global and regional reform sub-theme and (b.) national reform sub-theme of our 2016-2019 strategy.

In short, our goal has been to expand the range of stakeholders with a commitment to drug policy reform. We recognize that the drug policy reform community is small and that on its own, in isolation from other movements, it is very unlikely to affect such a complex global problem. Our aim is to make more explicit the links between drug policy and a range of other social justice concerns. Our strategies have identified the following sectors as such potentials: agricultural policy, child protection, civil liberties, criminal justice, health services, HIV and AIDS, human rights, international security, prison reform, law enforcement, public health, social and economic development, women's health and rights,

and youth. Our 2016-2019 strategy adds LGBTQ rights, racial and ethnic equality, environmental awareness, and poverty to this list.

GDPP seeks to identify gaps in the reform space where we feel there is an important but under exploited nexus between drug policy and a particular constituency or issue. Our assumption is that by increasing understanding of the intersection of drug policy and these other issues among concerned stakeholders, we will expand the range of individuals and organizations actively pursuing drug policy reform and thereby increase the scale and scope of the movement. In addition to building the movement, we believe that expanding the range of stakeholders invested in drug policy will increase legitimacy of reform in international debates at the UN and regional bodies, increase pressure on national policy makers, and raise public awareness as people connect drug policy issues to those that they already care about. Through our various activities, we sought to identify new partners and access new avenues for change. This was pursued by supporting a number of activities and tools, including convening's, exchange visits, grants to peer based organizations, research and publications, public education, and media outreach.

Our Place

The field of drug policy reform, in comparison to other social movements such as HIV/AIDS or climate change, is young and still maturing. On the whole, the field is occupied by a relatively small number of organizations, academics and activists with an explicit focus on drug policy reform. With some notable exceptions, donor engagement and activism is most developed in the field of health based advocacy and service delivery to high-risk drug using populations and, in some domestic contexts, around cannabis liberalization.

GDPP sits in a unique position of being one of a few, and the only major international donor, with an explicit mandate to support policy advocacy around drug policy reform. Our support seeks to go beyond interventions concerning public and individual health to those that seek to affect the large policy issues that arise from the demand, transit, and supply of an illicit commodity. Through the lens of our strategy, cannabis reform is seen as one tool to increase pressure for international regime change, but remains a lower priority in relation to efforts targeted at drug reform around so-called "hard" drugs. GDPP is the primary donor to many reform-oriented organizations with a high profile, such as the Global Commission, Transnational Institute and the International Drug Policy Consortium. We work in concert with International Harm Reduction Development Program, Latin America Program, OSIEA, OSIWA, and US Programs, but also seek to avoid duplication of efforts.

Through our efforts in regions with nascent drug policy reform, such as within Africa and Asia (subject to a later review), and in supporting groups currently outside of the drug policy reform movement to advocate for reform, we hope to strengthen the field over the coming years.

Our Work – Progress and Limitations

Reviewing the grants and activities included in this portfolio demonstrates that our efforts have concentrated mostly in establishing links with the following sectors: medical professionals, scientific researchers, law enforcement, women's rights, and human rights. We assumed that each of these, if brought to the table, would become strong advocates and add more complex dimensions to the debates over reform. Looking backwards, we did not take a consistent approach to each sector, but instead utilized a range of tools to surface new partners, capture the attention of potential allies, build networks of like-minded peers, and support advocacy initiatives meant to target new constituencies.

Convenings

Since 2009, we have supported a number of convenings aimed at bringing together a new sector and individuals with a stated or potential stake in drug policy reform. We envisioned that these convenings would be an opportunity for peer-to-peer discussions that would initiate and strengthen their engagement in the field and we hoped that new projects and networks would emerge.

Examples of this are two convenings we held for active law enforcement in Rio (2011) and Frankfurt (2013). Recognizing the work that US programs and IHRD are both undertaking on policing, we saw an opportunity to cross-pollinate among law enforcement representatives from different geographical regions. In Brazil, the organization Viva Rio was a natural host because of their work with the Latin American Commission on Drugs and their ongoing relationship with the Rio police around anti-violence and anti-gun initiatives. The meeting itself was cohosted by the Rio Police, who were able to extend invites and provide a peer based platform for exchange. Around 25 active police from Latin America and Europe attended. This was followed by a second event in Frankfurt at the request of a German participant in Rio. The second meeting was focused on policing and public health, using the "Frankfurt way" as a model for discussion, and was attended by 60 participants from 17 countries. A third meeting was to be held in Seattle to showcase the Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion (LEAD) program, but following the end of Jim Pugel's term as Police Chief of Seattle, the convening did not move forward, although there remains potential for a future meeting.

While the events themselves were successful in terms of furthering discussion and promoting new relationships, and provided a platform for frank discussion and networking, it remains unclear for us what the lasting outcomes are. Sustainability of such efforts is an inbuilt problem without a clear institutional lead to maintain engagement. As Kasia notes, GDPP itself was able to expand our network with active, reform minded police. This has proven useful to the program at various moments. While there continues to be some communication between members, a hoped for "Drug Police Reform Commission," or sustained platform, did not materialize. Supporting the development of convenings is very dependent on intensive GDPP staff engagement as initial drivers and how much agency we should exert in driving a sustained platform, given our own limitations in staff time and capacity, are an open question.

Another example is a modest convening we supported of horticulturalists researching the opium poppy. Although we partnered with a committed individual and believed that the symposium would help humanize illicit poppy growers, participants could not see beyond the illicitness of the growers'

activities. The solution that was proposed by the symposium (i.e. substitution of an alkaloid-free poppy variety) greatly misunderstood the drivers of illicit production and the very utility of growing the opium poppy – cash from the opium. The lesson learned from this event is that engagement with unknown constituencies brings with it risks and we should not be overly optimistic that the case for reform will be persuasive to all audiences and result in positive outcomes.

A much more successful example of a convening was the meeting we co-hosted with GIZ on the nexus between land rights and drug crop cultivation. This meeting was the first to bridge these two worlds and the overlapping concerns between these two communities were greatly appreciated and enriched by the exchange. Challenges remain on how to sustain follow through, but this initial meeting led to later co-sponsored events with GIZ at the annual World Bank conference on development and at a European Development Days conference in Brussels. As a result of these events, GDPP now has a good working relationship with key interlocutors at GIZ and is coming to know its partners. As we continue to mature our work in the development portfolio, this type of convening has been of great utility.

Exchange Visits

Exchange visits refer to support we have provided for a “new or different” advocate or organization to either 1) travel as a spokesperson in support of reform or 2) network with international drug policy organizations. The two aims are slightly different, with the former meant to bolster reform efforts elsewhere and the latter meant to “internationalize” domestic advocates. Underpinning both forms of exchange, though, is the expectation of internationalizing an ally’s work in order to contribute to reform and expand the movement through outreach to new constituencies.

GDPP’s engagement with Jim Pugel is an example of mobilizing a “new or different” advocate to be an active contributor to international reform. As interim Chief of Police of Seattle, Pugel was instrumental in establishing the LEAD program which diverts people who use drugs and sex workers into social services prior to arrest. While LEAD is a major grantee of USP and IHRD, we imagined that Pugel’s engagement in different countries would bring international attention to the LEAD model and bolster efforts of police reform in other countries.

The most successful exchange seems to have occurred in Poland, where Chief Pugel was hosted by the Polish Drug Policy Network (PDPN). He was able to engage with local police in both closed-door and training sessions for 50 active police officers, a public debate, and meetings with local NGOs. His visit garnered media attention in Poland calling attention to police practices and a story in the *Seattle Weekly*. PDPN benefited from his visit by establishing deeper relationships with Warsaw City Police and was able to develop jointly with the police a guideline for implementing the 2011 *Drugs Act*. While an isolated success, this demonstrates the potential that an alternative reform voice can have to convene new constituencies and bolster the positioning of a national partner.

An example of networking with international drug policy organizations is the small support we provided to the National Advocates for Pregnant Women (NAPW) in 2011 to help them expand their network by making connections with international drug policy organizations. We funded NAPW to attend the

International Harm Reduction Conference and follow-up with networking. NAPW is a longstanding OSF grantee and a natural ally in drug policy, but had previously been engaged only on US domestic issues and, as noted in their eligibility assessment, had limited success in broader policy advocacy beyond individual case work. It was our aspiration that NAPW leadership could form lasting alliances with international drug policy organizations and expand their advocacy capacity around issues specific to the gender impacts of drug policies. The outcomes of this grant are encouraging, as partnerships were formed with GDPP grantees (Release, IDPC, International HIV/AIDS Alliance, and Danish “Street Lawyers”). While the long-term contribution of NAPW’s engagement in the international sphere is still unfolding, it should be noted that the Women’s Rights Program has engaged NAPW via the shared framework on drugs in collaboration with GDPP and IHRD to engage national and international women’s rights organizations around UNGASS.

Peer Representative Advocacy Support

We have supported organizations with an explicit mission to engage new constituencies in reform. These groups have tended to be led or co-directed by peer representatives motivated to increase sectoral engagement in reform. Support to these organizations is intended to build lasting and sustained engagement. On the whole, these have been very difficult grants to manage and have struggled to achieve their strategic aims. Two examples serve to illustrate the challenges we’ve faced.

International Doctors for Healthier Drug Policy originated from a convening of medical professionals in 2009, and was then granted core funding from GDPP and IHRD to establish a functioning network aiming to empower health professionals around the world to be advocates for drug policy reform, to share drug policy reform experiences, and to provide access to relevant materials and advocacy tools. Originally led by a practicing doctor, Chris Ford, it quickly became clear that she did not possess the required advocacy experience or know-how to run this organization effectively. An executive director was hired to lead advocacy and Ford became the Clinical Director. The organization’s effectiveness has languished on several fronts. First, they remain highly dependent on OSF funding, with their other funding coming from pharmaceutical interests, which is a concern we’ve noted on several occasions. Second, they have prioritized building a membership role of medical professionals (presently at some 1,138 individuals from nearly 90 countries), but have not formed a clear strategy on how to engage and utilize members to be public advocates. Their current approach is to develop regional networks and national leads, but it is not clear they have the capacity to function as a secretariat or resources to really empower these networks.

Our commitment to IDHDP is driven by a belief in the power with which doctors can speak about reform. However, our own commitment (and theirs) to that vision has seemed more persuasive than the impact of the organization to date. While we have helped Ford see the need for a co-director with advocacy experience and encouraged them to increase their public communications, we’ve been at a loss as to how to help them build their capacity to better mobilize their membership base and hone their strategic vision. Shortage of funding appears to be a constraining factor in membership engagement, but we’re loath to increase our funding commitment. After years of funding them well

above the 1/3rd, in the past grant cycles we've moved their support to below the threshold, hoping this will truly motivate their fundraising efforts.

GDPP and IHRD gave start-up funding and have continued to support the International Center for Science in Drug Policy. It has been led by two highly credible and widely respected drug policy researchers, Dr. Evan Wood and now Dr. Dan Werb. ICSDP was meant to engage scholars from the social, medical and biological sciences as new and credible voices in drug policy reform advocacy. We hoped that this would mean producing original materials that would speak directly to, for example, the anthropological, sociological, biological, environmental science, etc. case for drug policy reform. That type of work has not been forthcoming. Instead, ICSDP has produced good drug-related research and publicized it widely, but it has been more effective at addressing the general public and engaging the media than mobilizing academic scholars for advocacy purposes. While this has certainly contributed to informed debate, it has not expanded the movement of drug policy reformers into new academic circles. ICSDP has become a highly credible voice in its own right, and while they have been a strong partner and successful at raising funds from other donors, our original ambitions for the group needs to morph with the space they are occupying. Part of the challenge in engaging new continuances via experts in drug policy is that they may be less willing to dedicate themselves to the task of bringing along new voice, a long and difficult process very different from the expertise they've developed, than producing their own work.

Support for Research and Publications

GDPP has supported research centers and strategic publications as a vehicle to foster understanding of a particular nexus with drug policy and garner legitimacy for the issue among specialized audiences. Although we believe these initiatives have had good impact value, we have had mixed success with these efforts in terms of their engaging new audiences.

Following the successful monograph issued by LSE-IDEAS, "Governing the Global Drug War", which received wide media attention, we supported the development of "The Expert Group on the Economics of Drug Policy." The Expert Group, which included 4 Nobel Prize Economists, endorsed a second report issued by LSE-IDEAS, "Ending the Drug Wars." Again, this report had a major media impact, but it was also hoped it would help capture the attention of economists. While LSE is a logical platform, the report itself was light on substantive economic analysis that would capture the attention of this highly specialized field. It is also clear that the target audience was not economists per se, but a broader audience of policy makers, advocates, and interested public.

A potentially more impactful engagement with a specialized audience of health professionals was the special issue of the British journal *Lancet* on drugs and HIV, compiled by Johns Hopkins University. It was launched at the International AIDS Conference of 2010 in Vienna and is still regarded as one of the most valuable resources on this topic. To date, the articles in the series have acquired more than 1,250 citations collectively. Unlike the policy report issued by LSE, the *Lancet* is circulated among a specialized audience and the peer reviewed articles addressed the concerns that this readership would expect. The

current collaboration between GDPP and IHRD on the Lancet funded by the shared framework is another example that we hope can be an important advocacy tool in debates.

Supported by GDPP and IHRD, the International Center on Human Rights and Drug Policy at the University of Essex has also established itself as a key player in linking drug policy with human rights bodies, particularly within the UN system and special procedures. The ICHRDP develops human rights research and analysis in the area of drugs, and calls particular attention to the incoherence between human rights mandates and drug control bodies of the UN. While their effort to develop a dedicated journal to human rights and drug policy has yet to mature or attract broad attention in the human rights community, their direct engagement with UN special procedures has aided in the inclusion of human rights analysis of drug policies in regard to health and arbitrary detention. Integrating human rights principles into drug control regimes is necessary for better drug policies. At least as far as UNGASS goes, engaging the UN human rights architecture in the drug policy debate is of key significance and ICHRDP has been an effective partner in helping to do so.

Discussion Points on Lessons Learned

- **Narrow Strategic Focus on Select Constituencies**
A survey of past strategies reveals the expansive area of “social justice concerns” GDPP has sought to connect with. While many of these sectors are overlapping, GDPP may benefit from identifying and targeting just a few important hinge issues and pursuing them more fully. There is a significant transaction cost and learning curve in moving between sectors. Persuasively engaging with a new sector will be time intensive and involve a long process of identifying allies, fostering their capacity, understanding fully the field in which they work, and developing sector specific engagement plans. We have had more success when we have started with an obvious ally, such as NAPW or land rights professionals, who had an understanding of the key issues being debated in drug policy and the impacts of drug policies to their field of work. We also had a clear sense of where the mutual interests lie. With other organizations, in contrast, we have been less successful when the starting point is closer to square one and we must endeavor to educate the partner in “drug policy 101.” In the future, the risk of expending resources to try and bring a potential partner up to speed and, in the result have them *not* engage with our issues along our goals must be weighed against the potential for having a particular new voice in the debate. In the past, we’ve approached such decisions from a perspective of optimism that the reform viewpoint would be sufficiently persuasive.
- **Clarify Short-, Medium- and Long-term Approach to Movement Building**
Admittedly, fostering new advocates in any field is a difficult task with great uncertainty, false starts, misdirection, and sustainability challenges. However, we have tended to approach these efforts by throwing a few, modestly sized balls into the air and seeing which ones are caught and carried forward and which are dropped. This approach has led to some good successes, but has also meant wasted resources in other cases. In the future, a graduated engagement approach – starting with a more extended period of relationship building and capacity building on the

subject, leading to some small initial collaboration, and then ramping up our support – may be a good response to reduce risk.

- Sustainability of Convenings

While convening can be a useful tool in exploring a potential nexus and peer-to-peer exchanges, they also tend to rely on a high amount of agency and time commitment from GDPP staff. As a short-term strategy meant to bring people together, this is fine, but if the continued existence of a network is dependent on OSF staff engagement, this is not particularly sustainable. As it stands, we are not currently very successful at transferring ownership of some initiatives. One disappointment we've experienced is when no partners or projects emerge from a convening. However, it may be expecting too much that a single contact will surface a sustained partnership without prolonged relationship building. It may be that a better approach to such convenings is to first develop the capacity of an individual partner or consultant who will orchestrate the convening and be in a position to take on the work once the meeting has ended, rather than GDPP drive the efforts with unknown results on the back end.

- Challenges of Peer-Led and Peer-Based Membership Organizations

We've experienced little success in developing an effective peer driven organization that is able to mobilize its constituencies beyond passive support. It is not clear to us how we should support a peer-based membership initiative to better its strategic aims or what an effective model might be. We may have lacked sufficient attention to capacity building with these grantees or expected more than such networks can give without much greater resources.

- Engage with Sectoral/Trade Specific Publications

We have had limited success in bringing cross-sectoral engagement in drug policy with publications that don't hail from within the trade. If we seek to bring awareness of a nexus between drug policy and a new audience, it may be better to approach the new audience on their own turf, as we did with the *Lancet* publication, than expect their attention to be drawn elsewhere. While we've not tried all too much of this, it may be an area of further development.

Annex 1: Support for New and Difference Voices in Drug Policy Reform between 2009 and 2014

Thematic Efforts: Doctors, Law Enforcement, Scientists, Women’s Rights, etc.					
GRANTEE ORGANIZATION	PROJECT TITLE	Tool	GRANT ID	GDPP Investment \$	PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Viva Rio	Strategic Meeting on Public Security and Drug Policy	Convening	OR2011-20446	107,000	The purpose of this grant was to support Viva Rio in providing logistic support to the Strategic Meeting on Law Enforcement and Drugs convened by the Military Police of Rio de Janeiro State on 19 to 21 September 2011 in Rio de Janeiro. The meeting brought together active Police Officers in command positions with field experience in the subject. Participants presented and discussed innovative examples of security programs in regard to drugs that go beyond repressive strategies.
akzept e.V.	International Conference on Drug Policy and Policing	Convening	OR2013-06964	110,185	Akzept convened the first International Conference on Drug Policy and Policing in Frankfurt on Main in Germany which aimed to bring together police officers from around the world. The participants included officers who support drug policy reforms, including decriminalization and regulation, and other officers who may be open to a discussion on policy alternatives and revision of police responses to drug enforcement. The conference was officially hosted and endorsed by the Frankfurt Police Department, which has been active in the planning of the program, and the Frankfurt City Drug Agency, Hessen State Ministry of the Interior.
Medical University Vienna	Substance abuse during pregnancy: prevention, detection and treatment	Convening	OR2011-20441	24,631	GDPP supported a symposium in Montevideo, Uruguay at the 10th World Congress of Perinatal Medicine on November 9, 2011. The aim of the symposium was to provide education to South-American treatment providers of pregnant women who are frequently homeless and suffer from infectious diseases.
University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences	Scientific Symposium on Papaver Somniferum	Convening	OR2009-15536	20,000	Convene the first international symposium on the horticulture of Papaver Somniferum in late 2009. This three day event brought together poppy researchers from around the world to discuss the horticulture, economics and farming systems for culinary, industrial, medicinal and illicit poppy.
Polish Drug Policy Network via Association JUMP 93	Jim Pugel’s visit in Poland. Police officer in political action.	Exchange Tour	OR2014-12696	10,698	Organized meetings and training courses with Jim Pugel – chief of Police Department from Seattle, Washington State, where marijuana was recently legalized for personal, recreational use - in order to raise public awareness and promote drug policy reform in Poland

Public Defender Association	Racial Disparity Project 2014/LEAD	Exchange Tour	OR2014-13962	13,500	GDPP and IHRD have arranged international presentations by Seattle LEAD stakeholders, primarily with Seattle Police Chief Jim Pugel in Beirut, Vilnius, Frankfurt and Warsaw.
International Doctors for Healthy Drug Policies (IDHDP) via Substance Misuse in General Practice CIC and International Harm Reduction Association	International Doctors for Healthy Drug Policies	Grant	OR2009-16396, OR2011-19502, OR2012-36048, OR2013-03623, OR2014-17168, OR2015-20145	499,500	The project brings together medical doctors from all over the world to share experiences, expertise and good Practice in reducing the harms caused by drug use and by the existence of poor drug policies. The main goal is to develop a powerful global network of doctors that's able to work with other networks of professionals (e.g. lawyers, nurses) to apply pressure to bring about change in policies that adversely affect people who use drugs.
International Community of Women Living with HIV/AIDS (ICW) Asia Pacific	Strengthening HIV Positive Women Using Drugs's Voice in South Asia	Grant	OR2010-16765	23,000	This grant was to support ICW Asia Pacific to develop an advocacy plan by and for HIV positive women using drugs and to come up with a comprehensive strategic and planning exercise leading to the implementation of a coherent programme and the creation of a Think Tank by and for women living with HIV/AIDS drug users in South Asia. It would aim to critically review current policies and programmes and support ongoing advocacy efforts to be more effective through the direct involvement of HIV positive women who use drugs.
National Advocates for Pregnant Women (NAPW)	Pregnant Drug Using Women, Policies that Promote Safe Motherhood and Child Well-Being	Grant	OR2011-19360	25,000	The grant was aimed at strengthening and building working relationships with international allies to advocate on behalf of pregnant and parenting drug-using women in the U.S. and internationally. NAPW acted as an information and resource center to its international allies and expanded their ability to bring international human rights principles into their missions to protect the dignity and human rights of pregnant and parenting women.
International Centre for Science in Drug Policy (ICS DP) via St. Paul's Hospital Foundation	International Centre for Science in Drug Policy	Grant	OR2010-17781, OR2011-34533, OR2012-01945, OR2014-14555	354,890	ICS DP produces evidence-based advocacy tools (scientific consensus documents) for drug policy reform and mobilizes scientists from disciplines with low engagement in drug policy reform efforts to take part in reform activities with a focus on advocacy efforts related to the lead up to UNGASS2016.
University of Wisconsin	Pain & Policy Studies Group (PPSG)	Grant	OR2010-17411	152,808	Support a new staff position of a Legal and Policy Researcher to increase the PPSG's credibility in both fields of pain management and OST, especially as recent efforts have included an increased focus on legal approaches to improving access to opioid medications.

Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health	Lancet Series: HIV and Injection Drug Use	Grant	OR2009-15640, OR2010-17951, OR2011-32845	150,758	Lancet (World Leading Medical Journal) commissioned a series on the global HIV epidemic among injection drug users. Consisting of six review articles, it was published as a booklet and launched at the XVII International AIDS Conference in Vienna 2010. The goal was to refocus the international HIV research agenda and encourage support to address the broad spectrum of issues faced by injecting drug users.
International Centre on Human Rights and Drug Policy via National University of Ireland and the University of Essex	Promoting Postgraduate Teaching and Research on Human Rights and Drug Policy	Grant	OR2009-16216, OR2011-19457, OR2012-00583, OR2014-14415	221,083	The Human Rights Centre at the University of Essex is one of the leading institutions for the study of human rights, globally known for its human rights curriculum and for implementing cutting-edge research and projects with practical impact in the human rights world. They are dedicated to developing and promoting innovative and high quality legal and human rights scholarship on issues related to drug laws, policy and enforcement. Founded in 2009, the HRDP is the only institute in the world specifically dedicated to the development and promotion of human rights research and analysis in the area of drugs. The Centre advances and promotes high quality legal research on human rights and drug issues, and makes this analysis and research available to civil society advocates and the broader human rights and academic communities.
Pivot Legal Society	Criminalization, harm reduction and human rights	Grant	OR2012-37169, OR2013-07010	35,000	Support advocacy and strategic litigation to advance the right to harm reduction and sex work decriminalization in Canada
Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, Poland	Rights of people with addictions	Grant	OR2013-08909	25,000	Based on research into court and prosecution files of drug offences, the project conducted trainings for prosecutors from eastern Poland. A legal act is also being drafted, which will comprehensively regulate issues concerning drug dependency and the assurance of professional and appropriate assistance for people with drug dependency. The project is geared towards the inclusion of drug dependents in the modern public health care system and into preventative treatment, instead of relying on reactive criminal procedures.
London School of Economics - IDEAS	The Expert Group on the Economics of Drug Policy	Grant	OR2012-22794, OR2013-03757, OR2014-17826	329,827	Establish the Expert Group on the Economics of Drug Policy and conduct research to inform its work. The Expert Group offers a rigorous economic critique of the global drug control regime in time for the UNGASS on Drugs in 2016. Members were chosen based on their being: (a) a leading, internationally known figures in the economics discipline; and/or (b) leading applied economists or economic practitioners. Members of the Expert Group are expected to publicly endorse the findings of the group.