

CARIBBEAN CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

Report on Interventions made at GEF Seminar on Resource Allocation Framework, September 27-28, 2004. Paris, France.

BACKGROUND

Dr. Joth Singh, Executive Director of the Caribbean Conservation Association, and GEF NGO Regional Focal Point for the Caribbean region was requested by members of the GEF NGO network to represent GEF NGOs at the GEF Seminar on Resource Allocation Framework held in Paris France during September 27-28, 2004.

The RAF seminar was convened in keeping with the request made at the May Council meeting to further advance the work of the development of a resource allocation framework for the GEF. The term “Resource Allocation Framework” has replaced the term “Performance-based Framework” which was felt not to entirely represent the philosophy behind the required allocation system.

The discussions at the seminar focused around a working document produced by the GEF Secretariat) for discussion. This document presented three options (and associated simulations). All three models were based on two components, which the council agreed should constitute a resource allocation framework for the GEF. These components are: (i) assessments of country-potential to generate global environmental benefits in the focal areas of biodiversity and climate change, and (ii) ratings of country-performance based on macro, sectoral, and portfolio performance indicators.

The options presented were (1) Country Allocation Model, (2) Country & Group Allocation Model, and (3) Rules-based allocation model.

In preparation for the meeting, requests were made to the GEF-NGO Network for comments on the circulated document entitled “ GEF Resource Allocation Framework” (August 5, 2004). The only response was received from Rebecca Livermore of Conservation International.

This report does not attempt to provide a synopsis of the entire seminar but focuses on the interventions made by the GEF NGO representative at the meeting. A detailed report on the meeting has been compiled by the GEF Secretariat.

INTERVENTIONS MADE BY GEF NGO REPRESENTATIVE.

The following interventions were not made collectively but at different points in the discussions.

1. NGOs would like to compliment the GEF Secretariat on the excellent quality of the document produced on the proposed Resource Allocation Framework.

- We recognize that this is a politically charged issue and believe that the document presents a range of options worthy of consideration.
2. We would like to point out up front that we are opposed to the Country Allocation model where an ex-ante allocation system is being proposed. Our objection to this approach include (i) the creation of a sense of entitlement thus eliminating competition and therefore lowering of the quality of proposals and projects, and (ii) the resulting small allocations for some countries which results in insufficient funds to bring around the desired environmental improvements in these countries.
 3. We are curious of the option of the “current arrangement” and the advantages and disadvantages of maintaining this model, or a modification thereof, particularly in light of the reference in the document to the choice of weights that results in a distribution that closely matches the historical distribution of resources at the GEF. It seems to us that if you are trying to replicate this distribution that there is merit in the system currently being used.
 4. As a group, the “rules-based” model is most consistent with our view on resource allocation to bring about global environmental benefit. We have previously expressed the view that poor performance should not necessarily become a barrier to GEF funding. In contrast, we suggest that poor performance should be seen as an indication for poor capacity and should lead to stronger capacity building efforts supported by GEF. We therefore express our preference for the rules based model, but recognize that the associated complexities with managing this process may prove to be a hindrance in its implementation.
 5. We recognize the GEF Secretariat’s tendency towards the Country and Group Allocation Framework Model and in this eventuality would wish to see strong emphasis on capacity building in countries evaluated as showing poor performance.
 6. We also contend that proposed country performance indicators do not take into account civil society capacity. Civil society organizations have demonstrated that they can be effective instruments for achieving GEF objectives.
 7. We fully support the recommendation that in view of the fact that performance-related issues are outside the remit of community groups and NGOs that resources allocated for the Small Grants Programme be outside the Resource Allocation Framework. In addition, the recommendation that an amount of GEF resources be earmarked outside the framework for medium-sized project proposals from NGOs is also fully supported.
 8. The policy recommendation adopted in Beijing on improving country level performance clearly indicated that improved country performance is subject to improved performance of the whole GEF system, including the GEF Secretariat, Implementing Agencies and the performance of the donor countries. This issue is not reflected in the secretariat’s document.
 9. We compliment the drafters of the document on the inclusion of data generated through NGO activity and would like to encourage the GEF to

integrate new datasets and to continue to refine the biodiversity indicators with the support of NGO scientists.

10. NGOs will not support the exclusion of countries where there is a high opportunity to bring about global environmental benefits, because of low country performance. As presented earlier, this in the majority, if not all cases, is due to low capacity. We therefore recommend consideration of merging of attributes of the country & Group allocation model and the Rules-based model.
11. We believe that the three options presented do not present any viable model in their current form. Consideration needs to be given to the following: (i) fully investigating using a modified version of the current model; (ii) developing a hybrid between the Country and Group Allocation model and the Rules-based model.