

XII Meeting of National Coordinators		AIDE-MEMOIRE National Coordinators' Meeting	
Topic	Debate by IIRSA National Coordinators		
Date and Time	June 25, 2008 2:30 – 6:00 p.m. June 26, 2008 9:00 – 11:30 a.m.	Venue	BID/INTAL Head Office – 11 th floor Buenos Aires (Argentina)

Name of Participant	Title - Institution	E-mail
René Cortes	IIRSA National Coordinator – Infrastructure and Sustainable Energy Director (DNP)	rcortes@dnp.gov.co
Graciela Oporto	Undersecretary of Public Investment Territorial Planning	goporto@minplan.gov.ar
José Kinn Franco	Minister of Public Works, Services and Housing	jkinn@oopp.gov.bo
Afonso Oliveira de Almeida	Secretary of Planning and Strategic Investments	gabspi@planejamento.gov.br
Rigoberto García González	MOP International Coordinator	rigoberto.garcia@mop.gov.cl
Fernando Salgado	DIPLASEDE Coordinator	fsalgado@mtop.gov.ec
Roberto Salinas	IIRSA National Coordinator	rsalinas@pol.com.py
Jorge Bayona	IIRSA National Coordinator	jbayona@ree.qob.pe
Robby D. Ramlakhan	IIRSA National Coordinator	robbyramlakhan@yahoo.com
Pablo Genta Buzzetti	National Transport Director	pablo.genta@dnt.gub.uy
Luis Domingo Añazco	General Director	gvmopc@mopc.gov.py
Héctor Lápido	Technical Advisor – DNT Uruguay	hector.lapido@dnt.gub.uy
Celia Esther Cañete	Physical Integration and International Transport Director	ccanete@mre.gov.py
Rose Mary Antunes	Technical Advisor to Communications Ministry	rose.mary@mc.gov.br
Luz Helena Abello	Border Integration and Development Coordinator	luz.abello@cancilleria.gov.co
Paula Cruz	Specialized Professional – ST – DIES - DNP	pcruz@dnp.gov.co

Agenda	
Order	Topics Discussed
1	Future of the Initiative for the Integration of Regional Infrastructure in South America - IIRSA
2	The Role of Banks
3	Projects within the Implementation Agenda Based on Consensus (AIC)
4	IIRSA – UNASUR Relationship

Development	
Order	Important Aspects
1	<p>As to the future of the Initiative for the Integration of Regional Infrastructure in South America – IIRSA, countries agreed that a new timeframe should be fixed until 2020 in order to meet the needs of the new South American context and build a regional vision, include new projects and objectives, by resorting to longer-term planning systems. Therefore, an evaluation of the portfolio and AIC projects was suggested in order to determine the future of IIRSA.</p> <p>Attention was drawn to the following items, given their relevance for the future of IIRSA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Account for the role of the Initiative before governments - Work in harmonizing legislations. - Draw up a report including all the work to be undertaken during the rest of 2008 and 2009, prior to CDE's decisions.
2	<p>As for the role played by the banks, the following consensus was reached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The role of the Banks must be redefined within IIRSA and their actions evaluated. This discussion will form part

	<p>of the evaluation to be made of IIRSA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Integrating new banks such as BNDESA and Banco del Sur (Bank of the South) was proposed. On this topic, Colombia suggested that we could first invite them as observers, just as a delegate of the World Bank was invited to the CDE meeting in Montevideo in 2007. An interesting invitation should be drafted to encourage new banks to become interested in financing these projects.
<p>3</p>	<p>Considering the Implementation Agenda based on Consensus Projects, Colombia submitted a proposal to modify AIC projects, taking into account their execution level so far and the investments planned until 2010.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Priority projects must be selected so as not to cause any disbalance. -It is necessary to define the type of AIC that countries wish to have as well as its objective, taking into account that the reality of all countries is different from that in 2004. -The proposal is expected to be submitted at the CDE meeting in December, to look for political support for this proposal. -Colombia was suggested the possibility of replacing the projects that are not running smoothly so as not to alter its participation in the project groups. -Colombia undertook to review the proposal and analyze the political impact of replacing the projects. -A proposal was presented to evaluate the current state of the projects and the potential to change a project that is not working together with the political impact of such a decision. For this purpose, AIC should be analyzed within a mid-term perspective. -Incorporating Colombia's proposal in the evaluation of IIRSA was suggested in order to have a global idea of its current state and the operations underway.
<p>4</p>	<p>A discussion was held around two issues: the first one focused on how IIRSA understands UNASUR, and the second one concerned proposals on how to manage the relationship between both.</p> <p>First: How this relationship is to be understood?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -It was said that UNASUR is a political more than technical institution, whereas IIRSA is more technically oriented. -How IIRSA can have a positive impact on UNASUR process should be examined -IIRSA – UNASUR relationship is not very distinct. At UNASUR it is not clear either what these projects are for nor what will happen with them It is not certain whether this space will facilitate their implementation. <p>Second: Proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -A proposal was made for both fora to have a complementary role. There are many actions that are undertaken by IIRSA and cannot be undertaken at UNASUR and viceversa. At IIRSA, valuable technical contributions have been made, projects have been identified, integration and development hubs have been built , sectoral integration processes have been encouraged, etc. UNASUR is a political entity, which will facilitate project-related decisions. AIC projects can be UNASUR projects to boost their implementation. -At UNASUR, we can create a political framework for IIRSA, oriented to social policies, a sort of balance between the goals of huge trade flows and the goal of positively affecting the social context in which we wish to intervene. The purpose is to make this orientation gain political momentum. To this end, the strategic vision needs to be reinforced. -A request was made to ask the UNASUR Council a joint meeting in order to inform what IIRSA has achieved, what it is currently doing and its plans for the future in order to offer a clear guide on integration that might help projects to find stronger support. Colombia as GTI coordinator supported the request for the meeting; however, it decided to do so after the CDE so that such issue together with a clear guideline be discussed during the meeting. -It was suggested that IIRSA needs should be posed to UNASUR so that IIRSA may continue operating; for example, regulatory topics can be mentioned. These tasks may be presented as proposals from IIRSA to UNASUR. It should be borne in mind that IIRSA is not only a technical but also a political body. It was created by

	<p>the Presidents and there is an annual meeting of planning and infrastructure ministers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-It was pointed out that it is necessary to take profit of all that IIRSA has done, adapted to one reality, and instead creating two spaces for project definition purposes we could take IIRSA as the technical coordinating body and UNASUR as the space from where to boost the implementation of projects.-Within UNASUR, IIRSA has to continue fulfilling its role. For this purpose, it is necessary to define roles, so that in December Ministers can advance on this debate based on our discussion.
--	---