

PI 3.1 – Financial Resources Available for Implementation of RCA Activities

Criteria 1 – Projects identify 25% of components / activities as EB

Result: Inadequate

- Possible recommendations to NRs:
 - Remove this requirement as it runs contrary to good project design
 - Replace with a new criteria?
 - *PAC – Funds as a percentage of total budget*
 - *Biennium budget allocated to RCA from all sources grows year-on year*
 - *Project have clearly identified potential EB contributors*
- Possible changes of methodology for FR:
 - Remove / replace subject to NR approval
 - Change PI?
 - *Financial resources available for implementation of RCA needs?*

Let's Pause for a Moment...

- What does the PI actually say?
 - *Required financial resources available for the full implementation of the RCA activities*
- So why is the target criteria solely focused on EB contributions?
- Respecting the demands on the TCF, are EB contributions the issue? Or is it TCF allocation to the RCA?

Year	Curr.	TCF Budget			EB	
		TCF Target	Alloted for RCA Proj		Total for RCA Proj	% of TCF Contr
			Total	% of TCF		
2001	USD	73000000	4800000	6.58	72965	1.52
2002		73000000	4718280	6.46	425163	9.01
2003		74750000	4067000	5.44	543394	13.36
2004		74750000	4338000	5.80	336639	7.76
2005		77500000	3968000	5.12	282600	7.12
2006		77500000	3854000	4.97	824470	21.39
2007		80000000	3510000	4.39	304500	8.68
2008		80000000	3440000	4.30	414250	12.04
2009		85000000	2850000	3.35	163693	5.74
2010		85000000	2250000	2.65	148611	6.60
2011	EUR	70434000	1300000	1.85	850000	65.38
2012		62302500	1850000	2.97	188888	10.21
2013		71443000	1660000	2.32	318825	19.21
2014		69221750	1420000	2.05	214434	15.10
2015		69797000	1420000	2.03	458478	32.29
2016		84456000	1420000	1.68	537200	37.83
2017		84915000	1880000	2.21	83149	4.42
2018		85700000	1400000	1.63	508970	36.36
2019		86200000	1657000	1.92	216960	13.09
2020		88061000	1827487	2.08	203830	11.15

What do the numbers tell us?

- The allocation of TCF to the RCA has dropped substantially as a percentage since 2008
- EB contributions as a percentage have bounced around a lot, but generally gone up
- Need to recognise that the TCF is actually already an EB fund
- So again... why the focus on EB contributions in the target criteria?

Efforts to increase EB contributions

- WG on Financial Gap Analysis and Resource Mobilisation established by the NRM in 2017
- WG suggested an AFRA-style “RCA Fund” but ultimately rejected by NRs
- Two explicit requests have been put to Permanent Missions in 2018 and 2021 for EB contributions, but have not generated any contributions

What's missing?

- What are the allocations to Asia-Pacific *non-Agreement* regional projects?
 - Is the RCA percentage going down due to non-Agreement regional funding going up?
- Recognise that TCF allocation should be needs based
 - Would be useful for presentation from Secretariat as to how TCF budgets are allocated between national, regional agreement and regional agreement projects
- Need this information from Secretariat

Suggested Recommendation:

The RCA-FP provide a report to the 2021 GCM on:

- How TCF budget is allocated between national, regional agreement, and regional non-agreement projects
- TCF allocation for RCA vs regional non-agreement projects in Asia-Pacific over the past 20 years

Where to from here?

- Subject to review of the information provided by the Secretariat, suggest a new Target Criteria that Looks to compare TCF funding for RCA against that of regional non-agreement projects in Asia-Pacific
- Challenge will be determining what an appropriate split looks like:
 - Base on percentage of MS that are members of the RCA?
 - Base on total population of RCA vs non-RCA?
 - Ideally needs to have some needs basis to split