



ILPES - INSTITUTO LATINOAMERICANO DE  
PLANIFICACION ECONOMICA Y SOCIAL  
NACIONES UNIDAS - CEPAL - PNUD  
GOBIERNOS DE AMERICA LATINA Y EL CARIBE

SECRETARIA DE  
PLANEAMIENTO DE LA  
PRESIDENCIA DE LA NACION  
REPUBLICA ARGENTINA



IV Conferencia de Ministros y Jefes de Planificación de América Latina y el Caribe  
IV Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America and the Caribbean  
IVe Conférence des Ministres et Chefs de Planification de L'Amérique Latine et des Caraïbes

---

Buenos Aires, 9 y 10 de mayo de 1983

E/CEPAL/ILPES/Conf.4/L.7



REPORT SUBMITTED BY THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE

IV CONFERENCE OF MINISTERS AND HEADS OF PLANNING OF LATIN  
AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Buenos Aires, 9 and 10 May 1983

83-12-2233



## A. ATTENDANCE AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

### Date and place of the meeting

1. The fourth Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America and the Caribbean was held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, on 9 and 10 May 1983. The fifth Meeting of the Technical Committee of the Latin American Institute of Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) was held concurrently with the Conference.

### Attendance

2. Participants in the Conference included the Vice-President of the Republic of Ecuador and the Ministers, Heads of Planning or other representatives Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela (see annex I for the list of participants).

3. The United Nations Secretariat was represented by observers from the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development (DTCD) and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO).

4. The following United Nations bodies were also represented: the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the United Nations University (UNU).

5. Representatives from the following United Nations specialized agencies also attended: the International Labour Organization (ILO), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the World Health Organization (WHO) and the World Bank.

6. Representatives were also present at the meeting from the following intergovernmental organizations: Board of the Cartagena Agreement (JUNAC), Commission of the European Communities (CEC), Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), Latin American Energy Organization (OLADE), Latin American Integration Association (ALADI) and Organization of American States (OAS).

7. The following non-governmental organizations were represented by observers: Ibero-American Co-operation Institute (ICI), Inter-American Planning Society (IAPS), Inter-American Public Budget Association (ASIP) and Latin American Council for the Social Sciences (CLACSO).

8. Dr. Raúl Prebisch, who formerly served as Executive Secretary of ECLA and Director General of ILPES and is now Director of the CEPAL Review, attended by special invitation. In response to an invitation issued by the Government of Spain, Mr. Miguel Muñiz, Secretary-General of Economic Affairs and Planning and Mr. Pedro Pérez Fernández, Director-General of Planning in the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Finance, also attended as special guests.

In addition there were some forty observers from the host countries, including the Secretaries of Planning of the majority of the provinces of Argentina.

#### Opening ceremony

9. At the opening ceremony of the Conference, the floor was taken by Mr. Leonel González, Secretary-General of the National Economic Planning Council of Guatemala and Chairman of the third Conference, who noted the importance of the meeting for the exchange of experience at a time of generalized crisis in the region. With regard to the agenda, he drew the attention of the delegations to the variety of situations faced by the countries and to the fact that the parameters and circumstances which had obtained some years ago were no longer valid. He said that between 1980 and now profound changes had occurred in nearly all parts of the world, so that it was necessary to review and adjust the planning system, putting priority on the participation of those affected by the problems to which the state of least development gave rise, who were also the users of the projects and the recipients of the concrete action taken by the governments. Today's problems called for new emphasis and perhaps for the adoption of measures to which consideration had not been given in the traditional approaches to planning. Finally, he pointed

out that it was necessary to do everything possible to ensure that the Conference came up with directives to make planning more effective within a plan of participation designed to resolve or alleviate the present socio-economic crisis, reactivate the economies of countries and initiate a process of integral development.

10. Mr. Enrique V. Iglesias, Executive Secretary of ECLA, then addressed the participants. He said that the meeting was being held at a time of severe crisis, which combined the characteristics of a conjunctural crisis and the occurrence of structural phenomena which were difficult to manage. All this meant that the current year was one of the worst in the past half century in the economic history of the region.

11. He pointed out that the international crisis had hit the region with great force, not only because of its vulnerability in external matters but in some cases also because of lacunae in domestic policy. For that reason, it was of great urgency to relieve the effects of the recession and prepare for a period of economic development which would be different from the development known in recent years. He was convinced that the crisis would be surmounted and the important thing now was to think about the post-crisis stage. In the future economic policy would be determined by three great requirements: the need to promote economic activity, to try to manage economies as efficiently as possible and to safeguard equity. The next stage of development would aim more at domestic matters, and it would be for the planning bodies of Latin America and the Caribbean to ensure the effective use of economic resources and the co-ordination of national policies. Finally, he stated that the meeting would serve as an occasion to think about the present situation and to give new vitality to planning.

12. Mr. Hugo Navajas-Mogro, UNDP Assistant Administrator and Regional Director for Latin America, said that the crisis in the international co-operation system was due to the difficult period which the world economy was passing through. In spite of the fact that available resources for assistance had diminished considerably, in the majority

of the cases it has been possible to continue and even expand the projects thanks to the contribution made by the countries concerned through the shared-cost facilities. The composition of the demand for co-operation in the period 1982-1986 had varied from the preceding period, with an increase in the fields of production and productivity, rather than in institutional support. As for the sector which included development planning, there had been an increase in the demand for projects in support of operational planning and a decrease in the number of projects for co-operation in more global aspects of planning. He went on to say that planning was still a valid instrument for rationalizing the basic economic and social processes and was still very valuable as an instrument of government although in many situations its time horizon had been reduced.

13. The new challenges and those of the past had brought planning face to face with a multitude of criteria. At the present point of the crisis, ILPES was initiating a new phase with a renewed programme of services to the subregions with the greatest needs. The institution could play an important role as promoter and organizer of horizontal technical co-operation in activities which drew upon the capacity achieved by the planning systems of many countries.

14. Finally, he said that the continuation of ILPES' work was related to the financing of its activities and that UNDP's support, which represented close to a third of the institution's budget, could be maintained only until 1985. Nevertheless, other alternatives were being sought to stir up the will to support this institution, with which UNDP had maintained ties for so long.

15. After thanking the host country for the concrete support it had provided in respect of the preparation and holding of the meeting, Mr. Alfredo Costa-Filho, Director-General of ILPES, drew attention to the importance of the two forums which were opening. The first of these forums, i.e., the Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning, had come at a particularly timely moment since it would allow for an open dialogue concerning the worsening of the external disequilibrium and its

repercussions on the life of each country. In the future, the governments would have increased responsibilities in matters relating to the interpretation, orientation and reactivation of their economic and social development with a view to its becoming self-sustaining over a long period. In those circumstances, planning again emerged as an irreplaceable instrument for articulating new approaches to the co-ordination of policies of the public sector and the promotion of general well-being. This would call for a restructuring of the planning systems applied in the past. He went on to say that the concepts and procedures related to planning would differ from country to country but that in any case governments would manage to co-ordinate their policies as effectively as possible and that in these times of crisis the planning ministers and bodies were institutional resources of growing strategic importance to accomplish that purpose.

16. Later he drew attention to the fact that it had been possible for the Executive Secretary of ECLA and the UNDP Regional Director of Latin America -high officials from two of the bodies sponsoring ILPES- to take part in the meeting and expressed his gratitude for the representation of many governmental and non-governmental bodies.

17. As for the second forum, i.e., the fifth Meeting of the Technical Committee of ILPES, he said its importance could be compared only to that of the ECLA meeting at which the Technical Committee had been founded in May 1961. It should also be borne in mind that it was being held at a critical time for planning in Latin America and the Caribbean.

18. In essence, both forums had a common cause -first to promote the exchange of recent experiences among national planning bodies, thereby helping to strengthen them; and second, to serve as a reminder in the region of the role of ILPES, whose central objective had always been to strengthen the planning bodies.

19. Finally, he said that the substantial support now being provided for the Institute was a mark of the will of the country members to found and maintain their own multilateral bodies which, together with other United Nations regional bodies, helped to strengthen the region's collective

capacity for achieving the kind of self-sustained development which would operate efficiently at the economic level and fairly at the social level.

20. In welcoming the participants on behalf of the government of his country, Major General José Miret, the Secretary of Planning of Argentina, said that the international community was facing a series of challenges which showed the need for restructuring the international order. The world economic crisis, which was due, among other things, to the rise in the price of petroleum, had made it necessary to be unified in criteria and attitudes in order to come up with a formula which would make it possible to bring the crisis to a quick end since it placed international peace and security in jeopardy. The crisis was not cyclical but had come as a consequence of structural imbalances underlying nearly all segments of the international economic system and in order to overcome it, it was necessary for the international community to put into action a concerted and sustained programme aimed at reactivating the world economy and accelerating the progress of the developing countries. In this framework, planning was a very important tool for tackling the problems of the region.

21. Today's world was one of conflict and uncertainty and was troubling in ways, and it was becoming increasingly necessary to be able to rely on planning mechanisms which supported the action taken by those managing the economy and helped to reduce uncertainty and to design suitable growth plans and strategies. In that process it was necessary to do whatever possible to ensure that not only was each individual case examined but that the possibilities for success of the long-term strategies were also taken into account.

22. He went on to draw attention to the support which ILPES provided for strengthening the planning system and pointed out that it had acted as a catalyst for national, regional and subregional efforts. He said that in addition to carrying out its basic functions, it had continued to strengthen its operational programmes and to promote the exchange of experience, plans, programmes and projects as well as joint programming at regional and subregional levels. He also praised its capacities



for adapting to the advances made in planning techniques. For those reasons, it was necessary to ensure that the Institute remained a centre where experts could gather and to consolidate its presence as a regional and intergovernmental mechanism for co-operation in planning and co-ordination of economic policy.

23. In conclusion he drew attention to the importance of the meeting for reducing the uncertainty concerning the region's future and articulating the process of regional development in a changing world.

#### Election of officers

24. The Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning elected the following officers:

Chairman:	Argentina
First Vice-Chairman:	Ecuador
Second Vice-Chairman:	Suriname
Third Vice-Chairman:	Bolivia
Rapporteur:	Costa Rica

#### Agenda and documentation

25. The deliberations were held on the basis of the agenda contained in document E/CEPAL/ILPES/Conf.4/L.1. To facilitate the debates, the participants had before them the documents prepared by ILPES which are listed in annex 2 to this report.

#### Organization of work

26. The deliberations of the fourth Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America and the Caribbean, which was held at the General San Martín Cultural Centre, took place in plenary sessions and in a working session. In plenary, the delegations described the evolution of planning in their respective countries and made general comments on the current economic and social situation, the way in which it was reflected in the region and measures for overcoming the crisis. Those delegations which did not take the floor said that they would subsequently have sent to ILPES reports on the planning situation in their countries so they could be issued together with the other documents emanating from the meeting.

27. On 10 May, simultaneously with the Meeting of the Technical Committee of ILPES, a working session was held in which ILPES' and ECLA's staff introduced the technical documents prepared by the Institute. This working session made it possible for those delegation members who did not take part in the meeting of the Technical Committee and the observers from the various governmental and non-governmental bodies to become more familiar with the studies prepared by the secretariat and to exchange view in that connection.

#### Plenary meetings

28. The Conference met on plenary on 9 and 10 May. In the course of the deliberations, a consensus was reached to the effect that the crisis felt in nearly every part of the world had had particularly severe effects on the Latin American and Caribbean region and that planning was a valuable instrument for formulating strategies for overcoming that crisis.

29. The first plenary meeting was opened with a statement by the Director of ILPES who referred to the current situation in respect of planning in the region and to the great challenges to it. He mentioned the important role which the State must assume in the stages of development of the countries and of the region.

30. He referred to the definition of new strategy lines and to the need to bring decisions affecting the short, medium and long term into harmony with each other.

31. He mentioned the need for an in-depth study of the public sector, especially the entrepreneurial and decentralized part of that sector, towards which the majority of State resources were being channelled.

32. He touched upon the topic of participation in planning, drawing attention to the need for plan objectives and targets to reflect the real interests of the various social groups. He pointed out that it was necessary to emphasize the social aspects of development.

He also referred to the external sector, pointing out that a follow-up mechanism would make a basic contribution to enhancing the information available to national economies.

33. He drew attention to the origin of the subject-matter nuclei of the ILPES work programme which clearly reflected the present needs of the member countries.

34. In the statement he made to the plenary meeting, the Vice-President of the Republic of Ecuador made reference to the serious crisis facing Latin America and the Caribbean and to the urgent need to find new channels for development. He said he had a great deal of confidence in planning and did not believe that it had failed or that the solution lay in the market. He added that it was necessary to strengthen planning as an instrument of government and referred to his own country's experience.

35. He mentioned the need for strengthening the process of integration to permit harmonious development within the region and a better relationship with countries outside it.

36. He referred to the pressing need to pay attention to the social sector in order to assuage the frustration of the masses.

37. At the end of his statement he congratulated the Government of Argentina on the way it had organized the Conference and drew attention to the considerable work which ILPES had carried out and its responsibility for strengthening planning in the future. He also mentioned the part ECLA had played.

38. A representative pointed out that in the countries of the region the crisis was due to unresolved structural problems and that under the influence of the external sectors, the countries had adopted economic policy measures based on neo-liberal theories which had held back growth and led to high costs for the population. In his country, planning had had to be carried out in a difficult framework and a profound change in the world economy was being predicted which would not necessarily result in a very favourable economic order for the developing countries.

39. Another representative pointed that appropriate and careful planning could become an instrument for combating the economic crisis originating in the developed centres but that for that very reason it was incapable of successfully battling the obstacles in the way unless the planning role was strengthened with far-reaching structural changes, political decisiveness and the establishment of fair economic relations between the developed and developing countries. He referred to the achievements of ILPES and said he was confident that its activities would be revitalized and given new impact.

40. One of the participants said that in view of the economic and social crisis through which the region was passing, it was the meeting's responsibility to unite in the quest for ways of overcoming it. He strove in favour of planning and said he did not believe that the crisis was due to a failure of plans and models. There was need to study the mistakes but not to return to the days in which development was subject to the laws of supply and demands. As for the regional level, he said his government had favoured the adoption of a common strategy for meeting the crisis. Latin America and the Caribbean had sufficient resources for harmonious development within the region and for achieving better terms of negotiation with the more advanced countries. He hoped that the meeting would come up with a recommendation which would provide a broad frame of reference in which the region's development problems could be overcome.

41. Referring to the profound crisis which had overtaken the region, one delegation said that where trade was concerned, what was true of one country was not necessarily true for all and that those developing countries which were able to make their financial flows viable by increasing international trade had had to adjust to the new market conditions with the result that their liquidity problems were made worse. This situation showed the advisability of multilateral bodies' concerning the creation of a mechanism for clearing the debts accumulated by the countries of the region. The problems which the countries of the region were confronting were analogous as were the solutions sought and there was

need to seek formulas for making the national markets more receptive to the products of the regional economy and taking better advantage of regional complementarity to various ways in which ILPES could help the countries of the region were cited, and confidence was expressed that Latin America and the Caribbean would soon show clear signs of recovery.

42. Another delegation said that as things now stood economic co-operation among the developing countries was becoming necessary not only for achieving the economic self-reliance of them and increasing their bargaining power with the North but also as a way of structuring international relations in general. With regard to planning, it was more important than ever to tackle the problems now confronting national and international development. Some countries of the region had experienced gradual deterioration in recent years, because among other things, they had left planning aside as an instrument of development; whereas others had given it the importance it deserved.

43. The same delegation then referred to the importance of ILPES for the region, praised the work it had performed in its 21 years of existence and said that concrete efforts should be made to strengthen its ability to act dynamically and flexibly in meeting the needs of various countries. ILPES was an important support element for the renovation and conceptual and technical adaptation required under current conditions in Latin America and for that reason it was the most appropriate forum for the programming and exchange of ideas and for the formulation of procedures for resolving technical and practical problems at national, subregional or regional level.

44. One delegation drew attention to the importance of the Conference in the exchange of experience concerning planning facilities, the results obtained, the obstacles met with and the various approaches designed for surmounting them. It agreed with other delegations that the region had the means to surmount the present crisis and said that experience should be need for austerity in the management of finances, for fulfilling every aspect of any commitments undertaken and for upholding the principles of economic freedom which would provide a framework for new growth of the economy.

45. A representative expressed the view that in the present almost universal crisis situation, it was important to link planning with economic policy. He suggested that the concept and methodology of planning should be reviewed and pointed out that after 21 years it was reasonable for ILPES to rethink its principles. Future planning would be strengthened if areas omitted before were included. There was need to strike a better balance between economic policy and planning. In his country the crisis had made it necessary to devote more time to economic policy but an effort was being made to see that the planning bodies did not overlook the long and medium terms. It was important that the subject-matter nuclei proposed in the ILPES programme of work should include the articulation of the decision-making process. He stressed ILPES' role in the furtherance of international economic relations and the insertion of Latin America and the Caribbean.

46. In describing the recent economic evolution of his country, one representative told the meeting about the national development plan which was being implemented and said that it was accompanied by a new strategy which was part of the "back to the land" movement. He explained the broad action lines contained in the short- and medium-term economic policy and said that at present the technicians of his country were attempting with ILPES support to improve the formulation of plans and programme and project follow-up.

47. A representative said that the present period of uncertainty and economic and social crisis meant that planning was an imperative for rationalizing the conditions in which international competition took place. He referred to planning in his own country and said that it was upheld in the political Constitution and that its characteristics, contents and depth had diffened as depending the goals pursued and conditions in the country changed. The crisis through which Latin America and the Caribbean were living made it obligatory to link planning

up with shortterm policies. In order to face the challenges of national and international development, planning should be flexible and participative so as to respond to the specific needs of Latin American countries and face up to the effects of the protectionist and adjustment policies of the more developed economies with greater solidarity and confidence.

48. Referring to the legal and institutional evolution of planning in its country, another delegation said that the law promulgated in 1981 had marked the transition from passive and receptive planning to active and promotional planning geared to satisfying the aspirations of the community and to providing concrete measures for achieving the targets of change at which its government was aiming.

49. Representative referred to the concordance between the guidelines proposed by ILPES in the field of economic and social planning and those applied in its country. State intervention and development planning could not be separated since planning related to the orientation and co-ordination of the operation of basically complex and interrelated mechanisms. He described the economic programming practiced in his country and referred to the instruments of short-, medium- and long-term planning. With regard to participation, he referred to the policies of municipalization and regionalization and said that the system applied was based on the principle that planning could not be separated from the decision centres. In respect of the co-ordination of the global planning of the Latin American and Caribbean economies, he said his delegation was of the view that, in spite of the various politico-social situations obtaining on the continent, there were ample possibilities for co-operation in different fields and he mentioned the role which ILPES might play in that respect.

50. Another representative referred to the influence exerted by foreign capital on the development efforts of his government. He said that by comparison with the other Caribbean countries, his own country had the advantage of a very small external debt and the

availability of an appreciable volume of assistance resources for development. Regrettably, this had not helped to change the socio-economic system.

51. The same representative said that owing to the interruption of bilateral aid, his Government had been compelled to restructure national planning with a view to transforming the economy, meeting its development objectives and establishing economic and political independence.

52. The representative of an island State of the Caribbean described the system of planning now applied in his country, which, he said, fell within the framework of participative democracy. The development plan contained a number of steps, and also provided for vigilance as to its implementation. He said he was convinced that the only way of devising a systematic and realistic plan was to increase the degree of democratization in it.

53. Referring to the increasing incompatibility of short and medium-term policies, one representative observed that the result of it had been that in many countries planning had become less effective. He went on to describe the recent experience of his own country and said that planning had the important role of setting the order of priorities in the use of resources so that they could be channelled towards those sectors considered to be of priority importance. Among other things, planning had continued to stimulate mechanisms for economic deconcentration, improving the procedures for programming investments and seeing that due attention was paid to the social aspects of development. He also referred to the project for regionalizing the country and to the way in which environmental problems, the programming of public investment and international technical co-operation were being handled. He drew attention to the role of planning in the efforts to solve the problems arising out of the international crisis which had been aggravated by natural disasters.



54. A representative pointed out that the future of Latin America and the Caribbean seemed to be in jeopardy and said that in the present circumstances the work of ILPES seemed more relevant than ever. He added that a change in the traditional development models had been suggested under the banner of austerity. This change would make it necessary to increase the ratio of product to capital, i.e., to reduce the cost of growth, and he suggested that ILPES could act as a centre for discussion on the ways of achieving that goal. The requirements of the present economic situation had given rise to new subjects for discussion, such as critical poverty and the integration of women in development. If in the future planning became less abstract, perhaps the existing gap between economic policy and planning would be closed. Later on he referred to the challenge faced by his own country, which had resulted in the adoption of planning as an action instrument of the government. He said that a system of planning adapted to the realistics of national life was being designed and that it had been agreed that that system should supply the leadership of the State.

55. The representative of a country which had been issued a special invitation to participate in the Conference said that recourse had been had to planning to cope with a situation characterized by sharp economic imbalances, rigidity and bottlenecks in the productive apparatus. The plans were characterized by their selectivity, prepared by the decision-making centres themselves and carried out by a staff which was kept as small as possible. He went on to point out that the medium-term plans were linked to the short-term policy in that they were integrated into the annual budget and to the reviews carried out each year. The fact that his country had a very decentralized system which presented serious problems confirmed the need for a plan. He pointed out that at present the plans were negotiated and approved democratically by the parliament, which made a concrete commitment to them. As for the co-ordinates in which the plans were framed, he said that they consisted in supply-side reactivation, the restructuring of the sectors in crisis and the distribution of the costs of the crisis among the economic agents in an effort to promote solidarity.

56. All the delegations which took the floor expressed their appreciation for the hospitality of the Government of Argentina and congratulated the Secretary of Planning on the excellent way in which he had organized the fourth Conference.

57. During the plenary meeting Dr. Raúl Prebisch took the floor by special request of the officers.

58. Dr. Prebisch opened his statement by expressing his satisfaction at the fact that the 21st anniversary of ILPES was being celebrated on Argentine soil. He noted the importance of the meeting and said that the current economic crisis drew attention again to the need for and importance of planning. He reminded the meeting that the idea of creating the Institute had not been based on theory but on the conviction that there was a need for creating a body in which research, training and advisory services could be made available on this major subject.

59. He went on to refer to the main economic problems today, among which he mentioned those related to the infrastructure of and imbalances in the economy. The latter included the imbalance between the rate of consumption and that of the accumulation of reproductive capital. He said that this imbalance had emerged in the periphery before it had appeared in the centres and that it had given rise to social inflation. That kind of inflation could not be fought off with the monetary instrument, which could be used effectively when the power relations were different. He expressed consternation concerning those people who tried to explain redistribution only in terms of economic theory and maintained that social factors were exogenous. Because of them the distance between economic theory and reality was growing.

60. Later he said that inflation was one of the factors which had impeded the advance of planning and that there would be no progress in that connection unless inflation was attacked at its roots. He laid stress on the fact that no country was free from structural imbalances and cited the case of a developed country in which conflicts concerning income distribution had reached a critical point. He also said that problems

relating to the accumulation of capital and to distribution would not be solved by the play of market forces nor by the distributive struggle but would finally be settled by a broad social consensus within a democratic State.

61. Still speaking on the topic of structural imbalances, he referred to the imbalance in foreign trade. In the 1970s many economists had let themselves be swayed by the prosperity of the centres to the point where the idea of import substitution became an abomination. However, today there was need to return to that notion, and ILPES and ECLA could be very influential in that regard.

62. The imbalances had to be corrected gradually, and to be successful, it was necessary for the countries of Latin America to co-operate with each other. It was also important for there to be co-operation among the international financial bodies. Integration was a topic which was again gathering momentum but of course that did not mean that the ideas of 25 years ago had to be repeated.

63. He referred to the movements in the foreign sector, a topic which had been given little consideration in the region. In his view fluctuations abroad should be considered to be a fundamental part of the development problem.

64. He also referred to ecology and pointed out that much environmental deterioration had been produced by a lack of foresight, whereas planning was precisely a matter of foresight.

65. Finally, he spoke of ECLA's efforts to see that governments and scholars perceived that the periphery presented specific problems which could not be resolved through practices and theories drawn from different societies. The centres had to be renewed inasmuch as they still advocated anachronistic and counterproductive theories, as for example when they recommended that the market forces be allowed free reign in international trade while they themselves broke their own rules by establishing prohibitions and restrictions

on competition from the periphery. Something could be learned from the experience of the centres, but they should not be taken as a paradigm, nor should they be allowed to exert undue influence.

Working session

66. In introducing the document entitled Planning and economic and social policy in Latin America and the Caribbean (E/CEPAL/ILPES/Conf.4.L.5), the representative of ILPES expressed gratitude for the good reception which the planning bodies of the member countries had given to the survey in which they had been asked to provide information in compliance with the basic objectives of the System of Co-operation and Co-ordination among Planning Bodies in Latin America and the Caribbean and stressed the importance of that survey for increasing the knowledge of the states of planning in the region. With regard to the analysis of the conceptual framework of the processes of planning and economic policy in Latin America, he said that the recession of the 1970s had been superseded by a certain amount of revitalization in the 1980s. There was need to add what Dr. Prebisch had on the preceding evening called *social use of the economic surplus* to the arguments in support of planning, which also included the drawbacks of the market and the need for less uncertainty as regarded the future.

67. He went on to say that a revival of planning was beginning to be noted and that the fact that the countries were committing their resources to the preparation and publication of a plan was already a big step. In speaking of approaches to planning without published plans, he gave as an example the system of Governmental Conclaves which was applied in one country and said that this amounted to indicative planning. He pointed out that with development plans countries had managed to affect innovations in the co-ordination of economic policy. With regard to the development strategies formulated and implemented in the period 1980-1982, the participants' attention was drawn to the difficulties of that period and the way in which the situation at that time had determined economic policy. Finally, he said the most important

thing was to articulate the linkages between planning and short-term economic policy.

68. Responsibility for presenting the experience of planning in the Caribbean area had been given to an ECLA staff member whose work was well known in the Caribbean. He opened his statement by stressing the fact that the context of planning was different in the Caribbean. Owing to the small size of the island economies, it might be said that they had to export everything they produced in large quantity. The openness of the economies and the uncertainty which was due to their external dependence were facts which could not be avoided. From the institutional point of view, the problems to which the co-ordination of planning and policies gave rise made it difficult to establish a strong central planning mechanism. He referred to the state of planning in the subregion and said that up until 1979, the year in which the first meeting of Caribbean Planners had been held, planning activities had centered around the preparation of an inventory of the situation. Later at the second meeting, the governments had earmarked specific sectors for action as a kind of technical co-operation among developing countries. Currently progress was being made in the study of the topics selected, and the third meeting of planners, which had been held recently, had approved the future work programme and added the topic of planning and social policy in the micro-States to its agenda. The agenda of that meeting had also covered ILPES participation.

Under that item the document Planning and development in the Caribbean area: Background and prospects (E/CEPAL/ILPES/Conf.4/L.6) had been presented, the study having been updated to contain the information provided by the governments. The ILPES representative had provided information concerning a proposed ILPES unit for the Caribbean for which would cover advisory services, training and research were envisaged. The governments had adopted that proposal in principle and had asked for more details concerning the project

especially its financial repercussions, so that it could be submitted to the next session of CDCC for consideration at ministerial level.

69. With regard to the incorporation of an environmental dimension in planning, an ECLA staff member referred to the ECLA/UNEP programme of action on the interrelation of the environment and development. He pointed out that after progress had been made on the research into this matter and specifically on the processes which linked the management of natural resources and the environment with development, it had been concluded that the next step would be planning. In that respect, he said a number of points should be made. It was of course common for studies to contain an analysis of the influence of environmental development on the conservation of resources, but in addition it was important to consider the positive aspects of the matter, i.e., the use of science and technology for deriving benefits from the resource endowment and managing it appropriately. In the second place, resources should be considered from the ecological point of view if any benefit was to be derived from the way in which they were interrelated. Thirdly, owing to the financial crisis, the environment had dropped in the order of priorities although environmental management and development management were clearly related. He pointed out that there was need to distinguish between short- and long-term policies so that the former, which were aimed, inter alia, at fiscal equilibrium, were tied in with questions of population and health and other topics viewed in a broader perspective. There was need to seek effective ways of linking planning related to the management of economic policies more explicitly to the whole series of long-term variables. Finally, reference was made to the ECLA/UNEP project on the incorporation of the environmental dimension in the processes of development for which case studies were being carried out in consultation with national planning and environmental offices, after which methodologies would be devised.

70. A member of the ILPES Technical Council was responsible for explaining the main aspects of social participation in the planning process. He pointed out that the planning strategy model which had been applied in the region up to the end of the 1970s had been based on the assumption that a State was by nature a force for organization and reform, capable of imposing the solutions best for the society as a whole. The criticism levelled at this strategy made it necessary to rethink its socio-political hypothesis, or the role which the State could play in respect of development policy in heterogeneous societies. This thought process had led to proposals which could be grouped under two headings.

71. First, there were those who affirmed that it was impossible to settle conflicts of power which had as an adverse effect on State action making it necessary to impose the order needed by the development process; second, there were those who, while not denying that there were opposing interests, suggested that they could and should be reconciled and that planning could play an important role in that respect. The latter alternative constituted the doctrine underlying participative planning, which was supported by two different arguments, depending on whether it is viewed from the point of view of the governed or of the governing. From the first perspective, the affirmation of the need for reconciliation was one way of defending democratic values. On the other hand, from the point of view of those who governed, participative planning was an essential mechanism for finding points of convergence. Actually they were two sides of the same coin in that democratic participation was necessary for the reconciliation of interests. He finished by stating that in a democratic society, participative planning was a valuable instrument for providing solutions to problems relating to the accumulation and use of capital and to the distribution of the fruits of development.

72. In the ILPES study of the question, an effort had been made to clarify the concept of participative planning, to identify the main obstacles to it and to list the main activities performed in the region in that respect. The experience of Latin America in that connection was rich and varied and had been acquired at various levels: at the level, through global stimulating the creation of national planning bodies and strengthening them; at the sectoral level, through, furthering the participation of the population in specific programmes and at the level when attempts were much to decentralize the planning system to increase the participation of communities and social groups and when encouragement was given to the participation of specific groups in programmes which affected them directly.

Place and date of the next conference

73. The representative of Mexico announced his Government's offer to serve as the site of the fifth Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America and the Caribbean. The delegations were very happy to accept this offer and supported it unanimously agreeing that the meeting should be held in May 1985.

Closing ceremony

74. In the closing ceremony of the Conference, attribute was paid to Dr. Raúl Prebisch and a commemorative medal in recognition of his years of labour on behalf of international co-operation was bestowed upon him. After a short statement of gratitude by Dr. Prebisch, the Rapporteur read out a summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached at the meeting.

75. On behalf of the participating delegations, the representative of Bolivia took the floor and expressed the gratitude of all the participants for the courtesies provided by the host country and for the magnificent way in which the Conference had been organized and serviced. He noted that all those present had displayed renewed confidence in planning and he said that the meeting had been both realistic and hopeful.



76. The Director of ILPES expressed his gratitude for the valuable presence of the Ministers and Heads of Planning and of the observers and said he appreciated the great support enlisted for ILPES.

77. The meeting was closed by Major General José Miret, who spoke on behalf of the Government of Argentina in expressing gratitude for the participation of the delegations and observers and great satisfaction with the results obtained.

B. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS EMANATING  
FROM THE MEETING

78. The Rapporteur read out a summary of conclusions and recommendations emanating from the exchange of views and from the statements made at the meeting. Its text is as follows:

"The meeting was opened with a statement by the Director of ILPES. The floor was then taken by the heads of delegation of the member countries.

"The following conclusions and recommendations relating to the work performed by ILPES and to its future programme of work have been taken from the statements made by the representatives:

"(i) Representatives support the programme of work, especially in respect of the priority subject-matter nuclei, and are happy and confident that ILPES will strengthen its future co-operation activities, including those relating to Central America and the Caribbean area;

"(ii) Support the initiative of ILPES relating to the integration of the programming of the energy sector into macroeconomic planning and the incorporation of the environmental dimension into development planning;

"(iii) Draw attention to the importance attached to training activities in the past and think it advisable to strengthen them and to promote the exchange of planning technicians among national bodies under arrangements for horizontal co-operation;

"(iv) Join forces in support of ILPES with a view to stimulating the creation of new ideas and planning techniques among the countries of the region;

"(v) Give priority to future activities relating to the planning of the public sector, taking into consideration the new dimensions achieved by this sector and its linkages with the management of economic policy;

"(vi) Studies on articulation of short-term economic policy and medium-term plans should be strengthened and studies aimed at identifying common development strategies for the region should be embarked upon;

"(vii) Priority should be given to the quest for suitable mechanisms for expanding regional co-operation, with special attention given to the joint consideration by the countries of ways in which intra-Latin American trade might be expanded within a brief period of time;

"(viii) Communication mechanisms should be established between ILPES and the national staff trained in its programmes for purposes of achieving a fruitful exchange of experience to facilitate continual updating in planning;

"(ix) Action carried out by the planning bodies of the region in conjunction with ILPES in the execution of the programme of work should be intensified;

"(x) ILPES, in an effort to give continuity to its planning study on the Caribbean, should broaden and lengthen the analysis of the various experiences acquired in that subregion in the field of economic planning and guidance;

"(xi) Support should be given to the realization of studies on the short-term international economic situation and on the experience acquired in connection with renegotiating the external debt;

"(xii) Support should be given to the Planning Information System in the region with a view to its consolidating its work programmes and fulfilling the medium- and long-term objectives calling for the continual and speedy exchange of information on the planning experience of the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean;

"(xiii) Support should be given to the consolidation of the National Planning Information Networks (REDESNAPLAN) with a view to their co-ordinating the information on the topic generated in the countries and providing planners with an information service based on national and regional documentation;

"(xiv) The Conference wishes to extend its warm congratulations to the Government of Argentina for its great hospitality and the excellent way in which it organized this meeting".

Annex 1

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

A. MEMBER STATES

ARGENTINA

Representative: José Miret, Secretary of Planning, Planning Department

Alternate: Jorge Bonnesserre, Under-Secretary of Planning

Members of the delegation:

Luis Turcovich

Raquel Isabel Deas de Belén

Hugo Renato Breme

Jorge Alberto Presman

Antonio F. Moreno

Noemí Gómez de Abu-Hayatian

Roberto Juan García López

Silvia Olego de Campos

Armando Jorge Geretto

Miguel Mari

BOLIVIA

Arturo Núñez del Prado, Minister of Planning and Co-ordination, Ministry  
of Planning and Co-ordination

Members of the delegation:

Carlos Peñaranda

BRAZIL

Representative: José Flavio Pécora, Secretary-General of Planning,  
Office of Planning and General Co-ordination

Members of the delegation.

Sergio Silva do Amaral

Ronaldo Edgar Dunlop

COLOMBIA

Representative: Hernán Beltz, Head of National Planning,  
National Planning Department

Members of the delegation :

Nohra Bateman

Miguel Méndez

COSTA RICA

Representative: Claudio Soto Badilla, Vice-Minister of Planning and  
Economic Policy, National Planning and Economic  
Policy Office

CUBA

Representative: Herminio García Lazo, Vice-Chairman, Central Planning Board

Members of the delegation

José Fernández Santana

Waldo O'Farrill Angulo

CHILE

Representative: Sergio Pérez Hormazábal, Director, National Planning Office

Members of the delegation;

James Sinclair

Hugo Salas W.

ECUADOR

Representative: León Roldós A., Vice-President of the Republic,  
Chairman of the National Development Council

Alternate: Luis King Vanoni, Technical Director, National Development Council

EL SALVADOR

Representative: Fausto Adalberto Betancourt, Executive Director of Planning  
and Evaluation, Ministry of Planning and Co-ordination  
of Economic and Social Development

GRENADA

Representative: Edward Newman, Economist; Ministry of Finance, Trade,  
Industry and Planning

GUATEMALA

Representative: Leonel González, Secretary-General of Economic Planning,  
National Council of Economic Planning

Members of the delegation:

Luis Enrique Ocaña Corzo

HAITI

Representative: Claude Weil, Secretary of State, Planning Department

Alternate: Theophile Roche

HONDURAS

Representative: Carlos Villanueva Doblado, Ambassador in Argentina

MEXICO

Representative: Carlos Salinas de Gortari, Secretary of Programming and  
Budget, Department of Programming and Budget

Members of the delegation:

Bruno Kiehnle

Miguel Sandoval Lara

Ignacio Ovallo

PANAMA

Representative: Roberto Puello Araúz, Ambassador in Argentina

Members of the delegation:

Carlos Ycaza Vallarino

Alcibíades E. Simons R.

PARAGUAY

Representative: Fulvio José Gabriel Monges Ocampos, Programmer-General,  
Technical Planning Office

PERU

Representative: Juan León Polo, Director-General of Economic Planning,  
National Planning Institute

Members of the delegation:

Nilo Figueroa

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Representative: Héctor Pérez Tovar, Under-Secretary of State,  
Technical Secretariat of the Office of the  
President

SURINAME

Representative: René Henry Halhuid, Ambassador in Brazil

Alternate: Van Exel, Assistant Director, National Planning Department

URUGUAY

Representative: José María Michetti, Pro-Secretary, Office of Planning,  
Co-ordination and Dissemination

Members of the delegation:

Alejandro Ramos Carbajales

VENEZUELA

Representative: Fernando Hernández Rodríguez, Vice-Minister, Central  
Office for Co-ordination and Planning in the  
Office of the President of the Republic

B. UNITED NATIONS SECRETARIAT

Department of Technical Co-operation for Development (DTCD)

Luis María Gómez

United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)

Jorge Succar

Carlos Agustín Salazar

C. UNITED NATIONS BODIES

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

Eduardo Santiago Bustelo

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

Jaime Hurtubia-Urbina

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Hugo Navajas Mogro, Assistant Administrator and Regional Director for Latin  
America

Eduardo Gutiérrez, UNDP Resident Representative in Argentina

Gustavo R. González, Head of the UNDP Mission to Evaluate ILPES

Percy Rodríguez Noboa

Matilde Mazzini Soler

Jorge A. Martínez

United Nations University (UNU)

Carlos Alberto Mallmann



D. SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

World Bank

Carlos N. Quijano

International Labour Organisation (ILO)

Víctor Tokman

Perla Roqué de Marinelli

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)

Antonio Pérez García

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

Gustavo Malek

World Health Organization (WHO)

Italo Barragán Arenas

E. INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Board of the Cartagena Agreement (JUNAC)

Raúl Maldonado

Commission of the European Communities (CEC)

Peter Kalbe

Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)

Eudes Bezerra Galvao

Latin American Energy Organization (LADE)

Joao Pimentel

Latin American Integration Association (ALADI)

Franklin Buitron

Organization of American States(OAS)

José Luis Restrepo

Roberto C. Monti

Ernesto Cohen

Conrado Serrentino

F. NON-GOVERNMENTAL BODIES

Ibero-American Co-operation Institute (ICI)

Emilio de la Fuente Izarra

Inter-American Planning Society (IAPS)

Guillermo Geisse Grove

Inter-American Public Budget Association (ASIP)

Wilson Cepeda Digard

Bolívar Lupera

Latin American Council for the Social Sciences (CLACSO)

Alejandro Rofman

G. SPECIAL GUESTS

Dr. Raúl Prebisch, Former Executive Secretary of ECLA,  
Former Director-General of ILPES,  
Director of the CEPAL Review

Miguel Muñiz, Secretary-General of Economic Affairs and Planning of Spain

Pedro Pérez Fernández (ICI)

4. SECRETARIAT OF THE MEETING

Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES)

Alfredo Costa-Filho, Director-General

Rolando Sánchez

Jorge Israel

Eduardo García

Reynaldo Bajraj

Carlos de Mattos

5. ECLA SYSTEM

Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA)

Enrique Iglesias, Executive Secretary

Ricardo Cibotti

Adolfo Gurrieri (Member of the ILPES Technical Council)

ECLA Office in Buenos Aires

Eric Calcagno, Director

Alberto Fracchia

ECLA Office in Trinidad and Tobago

Trevor Harker

Joint ECLA/CTC Unit

Claudio Marinho, Director

Joint ECLA/UNEP Unit

Oswaldo Sunkel, Co-ordinator

Nicolo Gligo

Latin American Centre for Economic and Social Documentation (CLADES)

Claudionor Evangelista, Director

Latin American Demography Centre (CELADE)

Oscar J. Bardeci, Director

SPECIAL GUESTS OF THE HOST COUNTRY

Elsa A.L. de Accardi  
Amílcar Aguirre  
Alfredo Alejandro Allegri  
Lorenzo A. Blanco  
Rolando A. Boldt  
Juan Bautista Cincunegui  
Florencio Pedro Cuervo  
Domingo Díaz Terrado  
Orlando Alberto Ferrari  
Santos R. Ferreira  
José Manuel Ferro  
Nelly Azucena Flores  
Guido Frediani  
David Osvaldo Garramuño  
Ernesto Alfonso Golini  
Gustavo R. González  
Pedro A. Gortari  
La Cruz Delfina G. de Gutiérrez  
Gloria Alba Bertolina de Gómez  
Liliana S.D. Isler  
José Juan  
Orlando Williams Laciari  
Félix Roberto Loño  
Luis M. López Dantas  
Héctor Teodoro Martín  
Juan Montenero  
José I. Portela  
Diego O. Puga  
José Crecencia Quijano  
Arturo Ramón Quintas  
Hugo Oscar Ramos  
Jorge Rann  
Cosme A. Ribezzo  
Oscar F. Risso Patrón  
Enrique Pablo Schellhammer  
Alberto C. Taquini  
Aurelio Touriño  
Miguel Santiago Ussher

Annex 2

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

- |                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| E/CEPAL/ILPES/Conf.4/L.1 | IV Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning, V Meeting of ILPES Technical Committee: Bases of organization and proposal of agenda.               |
| E/CEPAL/ILPES/Conf.4/L.2 | ILPES: Twenty-one years of activity, 1962-1983.   |
| E/CEPAL/ILPES/Conf.4/L.3 | ILPES: Its role in the region and programme of work for 1983.   |
| E/CEPAL/ILPES/Conf.4/L.4 | Summary of the technical documents prepared by ILPES for the fourth Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America and the Caribbean. |
| E/CEPAL/ILPES/Conf.4/L.5 | Planning and economic and social policy in America and the Caribbean.   |
| E/CEPAL/ILPES/Conf.4/L.6 | Planning and development in the Caribbean area: Background and prospects.   |