



Ministerio de Desarrollo Sostenible

Viceministerio de Recursos Naturales y Medio Ambiente

Feedback for writing the new RAF Document Circunscripción del Cono Sur

What can be considered as an ‘excluding’ or ‘including’ framework?

During the Workshop in Paris, all Council Members agreed that the RAF should be of *inclusive* nature. Nevertheless, we believe that the result of the proposed models will result in a *excluding* system for allocating resources. *Excluding* because GEF funds do not have the objective, neither sufficient magnitude to deal, manage or solve problems resulting from economic policies, governance or others of macro-level dimensions, in any of the member countries. Since GEF funds can not solve macro-level problems (and not include them), the only possible use of such indicators is to exclude, based on a macro-political assessment. This type of assessment is not under the spirit of GEF at least until now; then macro-economic, social or governance policies and their associated indicators of performance can not and should not be part of a Resource Allocation Framework (RAF).

Additionally, we believe that such a RAF (especially models 1 and 2) is *excluding* because it is an *ex-ante* mechanism that pre-judges results and outcomes of projects. On the other hand, we consider that an *ex-post* RAF is *inclusive* and much more valuable and useful since it allows for flexibility, learning and adaptation.

Does it make sense to use CPIA indicators within a GEF RAF?

CPIA indicators are not only part of an excluding system (see above), but their implementation will increase bureaucracy and cause additional costs which the Secretariat mentioned has not yet calculated. To better understand this question, we should ask, what is the nature and spirit of the GEF? (Secretariat has promised to include a section about it). Being sarcastic if GEF is not particularly special, then we should not have created it. On the contrary and in order to save money, we should have used financial mechanisms and institutions already established such as the World Bank, Interamerican Development Bank (IADB), International Fund Corporation (IFC) or other similar. We strongly believe GEF is special and its singularity and differences with other financial entities should be maintained.

If new models reflect the historical distribution, then why develop a new RAF based on different criteria?

Council members agreed in Paris that a RAF based on the new framework (in particular Model 2) reflects closely the historical distribution of GEF resources. If that is true, it is logical to think that the new RAF should be based on the present one. We consider that the current system should be evaluated and analyzed in order to improve it and we should not create a new one in which the country members have not reached a consensus and does not fit the specific objectives of the GEF. In conclusion, it is necessary to assess the present system for allocating resources. Doing this, it is essential to take into account all its components, including the implementing agencies as well as donors. Not looking at the current framework as a whole will conduct us to fail in giving good and accurate recommendations.


Erwin Ángel Aguilar Antunes
VICEMINISTRO DE RECURSOS
NATURALES Y MEDIO AMBIENTE
Ministerio de Desarrollo Sostenible