De la lectura de 11 countries:

En el abstract lo dice todo. Las lecciones:

1. MBIs can be important means of introducing some *added* efficiency to already existent CA instruments
2. The scope of MBIs must match institutional capacity
3. The introduction of MBIs must be “*gradual and flexible”* to be “consistent” with “ongoing institutional changes”.
4. “strong need to *channel revenues to local authorities* to finance building of institutional capacity”
5. International donor agencies are more prone to recommend OECD solutions, “with little regard to institutions issues”
6. “Increased *information sharing* in a south-south dialogue would benefit all parties”

Badly designed institutions, such as environmental assessments that are too de demanding and act as barriers to economic “development”, stiff regulations that are virtually unenforceable, “administrative jurisdictions open to interpretation”, are “unsustainable institutions”.

Hablan de smaller institutions y decentralization of authority como mecanismo para construir sustainable institutions.

Overlapping mandates among different sectoral agencies is common

“continued development – of either weak or strong MBI instruments – requires: (i) institutional strengthening, in particular through human resource development and through financial support to local agencies; and (ii) taking into account existing political priorities and economic reforms.

“Experience has shown that chances of achieving long-term institutional sustainability increase if three conditions are met: first, institutional structures and mandates should be *flexible”,* best achieved by relying as far as possible on existing capacity and mechanisms. Second *adequate financing* mechanisms should be available, best achieved through…providing them with some form of long-term self-financing. Third, initial development should focus on areas were early successes are likely, best achieved by *phasing development* of institutional capacity and through outlining high priority targets for intervention.”

**Market based instruments in LAC (una diferencia conmigo es que su categoría de MBIs es más general).**

Puedo agregar a este paper en las citas cuando digo que México no ha funcionado.

Colombia and Mexico: lack of appropriate design of the instrument, …, incompatibility with the available monitoring system, and inadequate planning of its coverage. These factors have resulted in fierce public and political opposition and have undermined political support.” **OK. Lo dijiste. Pero no estás explicando bien por qué. Además lo principal es que las public utilities no pagaban. Eso no lo sabes. Y no tenes la perspectiva para saberlo habiendo escrito esto dos años después que se implementó el programa. Yo soy capaz de observar que los problemas persistieron y que esa falta de soporte político inicial se mantuvo – hasta incrementó – y puede estar de tras de la falta de nuevos intentos de implementación de IEs en esos países.**

No seas malo. Lo que cuenta del ECP de Santiago es lamentable. Cuando escribieron eso (1998?) no tenían mucha información. Dicen que few transactions, although compliance con emissions permits has improved, y que reformas legales están en curso para arreglar los problemas legales de las definiciones de los permisos, para reducir la incertidumbre sobre “effective enforcement” (esto no quiere decir nada!). **nada de esto se hizo bien**. La incertidumbre continuó, etc…**No podes sacar lecciones validas hoy con la perspectiva del ECP en 1999.**

Pg. 196: “Ear-marking is gaining consensus. It makes easier to build consensus, remove barriers (?), and guarantee budget resources to finance environmental institutions.

**Conclusions**

**Lack of enforcement increased the uncertainty of the regulation.**

**MBIs *increased* the technical and financial burden on already existent fragile existent institutions.**

**“One opportunity lost is LAC countries have failed to talk each other about their successes and mistakes.”**

“International agencies and donors are prone to recommend OECD solutions with little regard to local institutional issues” Exchange of experiences has historically concentrated in a north-south direction”. **This article starts filling the gap of experience exchange in the region, further initiatives should be supported**”.

Summary of conclusions:

*There has been a substantial implementation with MBIs in LAC*

*The primary historical role of MBIs in LAC is to raise revenue.* (Entonces no son MBIs, no seas malo). ***“Other potential objectives – such as reduction of environmental impacts or improving the cost-effectiveness of regulations – have been underemphasized or not attained.*** A strong need exists to *channel revenues to local authorities* to assist in building institutional capacity.

*Public awareness is low and uncertainty is high.*

***Institutional constraints to MBi implementation remain pervasive:* underfunding, inexperience, lack of political will, or unclear jurisdictions. Y aca viene lo del abstract de las *gradual and flexible reforms. YO ACÁ PUEDO DISCREPAR PORQUE HA SIDO GRADUAL EN MUCHOS CASOS (SI NO TODOS LOS QUE YO ANALIZO) E IGUAL HA FRACAZADO.*** *A NO SER QUE SEA GRADUAL LO QUE DICE POR ALLI QUE EMPEZAR CON 3 PESOS. PERO NO VALE LA PENA, ME PARECE.* **Y un problema importante de la gradualidad es que puede ser legalmente complicada. (Mirá CR. Yo mismo hago el punto que los municipios no pueden poner impuestos. Si eso es así no vas a poder empezar “gradualmente “ por los municipios más ricos, legalmente.**