



Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social
NACIONES UNIDAS-CEPAL-PNUD GOBIERNOS DE AMERICA LATINA Y EL CARIBE

Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning
UNITED NATIONS-ECLAC-UNDP LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN GOVERNMENTS

Institut Latino-Américain et des Caraïbes de Planification Economique et Sociale
NATIONS UNIES-CEPALC-PNUD GOUVERNEMENTS DE L'AMERIQUE LATINE ET DES CARAIBES

Distr.
RESTRICTED

LC/IP/L.17
LC/IP/R.53(CT 6/6)/Rev.1
February 28 1986

ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH



REPORT SUBMITTED BY THE RAPPORTEUR
SIXTH MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE OF ILPES

(Mexico City, 16 April 1985)

INDEX

	<u>Page</u>
I. ATTENDANCE AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK	1
A. Place and date	1
B. Attendance	
C. Officers of the Committee	1
D. Agenda and Documentation	1
E. Organization of Work	2
II. PROPOSED PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR 1985 AND REPORT ON ACTIVITIES 1984	2
III. NEW INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT 1984-1986	5
IV. PARTICIPATION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE AND SPECIAL GUESTS	7
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	24
VI. DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE	24
VII. CLOSING MEETING	24
VIII. RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE OF THE LATIN AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PLANNING	25
 <u>ANNEXES</u>	
ANNEX I LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	28
ANNEX II DRAFT AGENDA	34
ANNEX III LIST OF DOCUMENTS	35

I. ATTENDANCE AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

A. Place and date

1. The meeting of the Technical Committee of ILPES was held in Mexico City on 16 April 1985 on the occasion of the Fifth Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America and The Caribbean.

B. Attendance

2. The Sixth Meeting of the Technical Committee of ILPES was attended by the representatives of 22 member countries, including Ministers and Heads of Planning and other representatives of Argentina, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Dominican Republic, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela.

Participants also included the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), the Deputy Executive Secretary for Economic and Social Development of ECLAC, the Director of the ECLAC Mexico Office, the Deputy Director of the ECLAC Subregional Office for the Caribbean, the Assistant Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Assistant Secretary-General for Technical Cooperation for Development. (See list of participants in Annex I).

C. Officers of the Committee

3. In accordance with the guidelines set for their appointment, the officers of the Committee included:

- | | |
|-------------------------|------------|
| - Chairman: | Mexico |
| - First Vice-Chairman: | Brazil |
| - Second Vice-Chairman: | Costa Rica |
| - Rapporteur: | Guatemala |

D. Agenda and documentation

4. The deliberations were conducted on the basis of the proposed agenda, which was unanimously adopted by the Committee and appears as Annex II to this document. The directorate of ILPES submitted a set of documents to provide a basis for the discussion, and a list of them appears as Annex III to this document.

(6/0217)

Jl/ma

E. Organization of work

5. First of all the Technical Committee dealt with the Proposed Programme of Work for ILPES for 1985, the Report on Activities for 1984 and the New Institutional Project 1984-1986. Subsequently it considered a number of draft resolutions relating to the orientation of the Institute's work in the future.

II. PROPOSED PROGRAMME OF WORK FOR 1985 AND REPORT ON ACTIVITIES 1984

6. The Director of ILPES open his statement by giving a brief description of the activities carried out by the Institute in 1984, which had been examined in detail in Brasilia at the Seventh Meeting of the Technical Subcommittee of ILPES (3 and 4 December 1984). He focussed on three basic documents: Programme of Work for 1985 (CT 6/3), the New Institutional Project 1984-1986 (CT 6/4) and the document relating to the government inputs in 1984 and proposed inputs for 1985 (CT 6/4 Add.1).

7. As regards the Programme of Work for 1985, the Director of ILPES drew attention to the significant financial and technical contribution of UNDP and the strengthening of activities conducted jointly with DTCB. He also referred to the substantial portfolio of projects administered with support from the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and the new activities being carried out in conjunction with the Economic Development Institute of the World Bank (EDI), with special emphasis on the Caribbean area.

8. He also mentioned the existing imbalance between the size of the ILPES technical staff and the large number of activities assigned to the Institute. The volume of work carried out is explained by the great capacity shown by ILPES to mobilize new technical resources, and, in that connection, he drew attention to the large contribution made by ECLAC. Moreover, while the demand for ILPES studies had trebled, the Institute's capacity had shown a 30% reduction. Since this situation was characterized by serious aspects, it would have to be examined within the Committee; otherwise the Institution's impact in the region might diminish.

9. With regard to its activities, ILPES would remain as pluralistic as possible in terms of operational approach in order to take into account the various approaches to planning taken in the 37 member countries. Recognition

could be given in a very simplified way to various views of planning in the region: greater centralization in the management of the economic process by the State; strategical planning for market economies; standardized or indicative planning associated with the decentralization of decisions and, where greater importance was given to private initiatives, the "management or administration" of public policies.

10. With regard to the Institute's areas of specialization or concentration, the Director noted that it should continue to focus its activities on four fields: Economic planning and policies; Programming of the public sector and public policies (including the decentralized sector and pre-investment); Social programmes and policies and Regional planning policies. He also thought it necessary for the Institute to maintain its four priority subject areas as guidelines for establishing priorities among its different activities and articulating them (harmonization of the short-, medium- and long-term decision-making process; impact of the new international role of the regional economies on planning during and after the present crisis; the impact of the crisis both on the society and the internal space of countries and the role of the State in Latin America and the Caribbean in the near future, viewed from the perspective of the planning or or the co-ordination of public policies.

11. The Director of ILPES went on to refer to various activities of the Institute, touching first on those relating on the provision of advisory services to governments of member countries. Generally speaking, the Programme of Work of the Office of the Director of the Advisory Services Programme continued to concentrate on the fields of activity already established: Planning and economic policy; Public sector programmes and projects; Social programmes and policies and Regional planning. During 1985 this Office was concentrating on the following member countries: Belize, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Panama, Paraguay and the Dominican Republic. He noted the sources of financing, referring in particular to the activities carried out in conjunction with UNDP, DTCD, and IDB.

12. With regard to training, the Director drew attention to the large number of activities with the Institute had been asked to perform. He referred first to the Twenty-sixth International Course on Development, Planning and Public Policies, which was of irreplaceable value in the countries of the region in that was the only Post-graduate course which provided and integrated view of the development of the region and its participants included nationals of nearly all the Latin American and Caribbean countries and its teaching staff was equally diversified geographically. He gave the members of the Committee to understand that this course could be suspended although, after 26 years, it had become a tradition, if resources were not obtained to finance it for 1986. The financial support provided by UNDP was still essential to the continuation of the Course. So far the course was still being offered thanks to a generous contribution from the government of the Netherlands.

13. As for the other training activities, the Director mentioned only the most relevant. He referred to the Second Course-Workshop on Current Problems and Development Strategies (ECLAC/ILPES/CIDE) which would be held in Mexico for participants from Mexico and the Central American and Spanish-speaking Caribbean countries; it would concentrate on analysis of the main problems affecting the countries of the area and would provide for thought and discussion concerning the alternatives which had been suggested in those countries for lessening the impact of the international economic crisis. He mentioned the Course-Seminars on Foreign Trade Policies which would be conducted as joint ECLAC/ILPES/OAS/UNCTAD activities, and the Course-Seminar on Latin American Integration, which would be organized by ALADI, ECLAC, and ILPES. He also referred to programmes in new areas, such as science and technology, and the new stress which would be laid on activities relating to social and regional planning. He drew particular attention to the Seminar on Higher Education in the field of Planning in Latin America and the Caribbean, which would be organized jointly by ILPES and the Planning Institute of Venezuela (IVEPLAN). He stressed the importance of activities to be carried out in the Caribbean in the field of policy co-ordination, in conjunction with the World Bank (EDI) and the Caribbean Development Bank.

14. With regard to research activities, the Director of ILPES noted that work would continue on the development of the mainstreams of study proposed in the Technical Committee and Subcommittee of ILPES. He added that a study would be carried out on the nature and content of strategic planning and another on technical innovations in respect of centralized planning. At the same time work would continue on instrumental studies relating to planning methodologies and techniques, on the analysis of the major institutional models now available and on the study of experiences in co-ordination and management of public policies. With regard to research on the social field, some of the new subjects to be tackled included participation; financing of social policies; existing links between health and the other social sectors; education; financing and expenditure and decentralization policies. Particular importance would also be attached to methodologies for preparing and evaluating social projects. Finally, in connection with research into regional economics and planning, the Institute would continue with the study on instrumental policies and regional development and was intending to do comparative research in mechanisms for the transfer of central government resources to governments at subnational level.

15. With regard to horizontal co-operation activities he announced the resignation of the Programme Director and said that consideration was being given to the reallocation of duties within the Institute in an attempt to deal with this problem. He added that the programme had been performing very efficiently and had completed the study of a horizontal co-operation financing system based on national currencies.

III. NEW INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT 1984 - 1986

16. The Director of ILPES opened his statement in this respect by noting that since its creation in June 1962, the Institute had been regarded as an autonomous body with permanent ties to the ECLAC system. He added that when the technical committee had been established, in May 1975, the Ministers and Heads of National Planning Bodies had become the key body of the Institute, in its capacity as an intergovernmental agency. In its early days, ILPES had been financed by the United Nations Special Fund, which had been transformed into the UNDP of today, and by IDB; even then thought had been given to financing the Institute by the governments of the region. The seventh Phase of financing by UNDP would be the last in which this kind of institutional support would be given, and substantial curtailments had been effected in this type of support. The new institutional project had been designed to fulfil the commitment taken on by the governments in 1962 to contribute to the financing of ILPES. The project had been proposed and unanimously adopted at the fifth session of the Technical Committee held in Buenos Aires in May 1983 and was based on three fundamental principles: austeriry, a three year limitation on governmental commitments and national contributions as counterparts of the regular and special services provided.

17. He went on to give a brief description of the new institutional project, noting that ILPES played a dual role: that of a regional body in the United Nations system and that of an intergovernmental entity under the authority of the national planning ministries and bodies of Latin American and the Caribbean. In its role of intergovernmental agency, it enjoyed permanent access to both of its collective orientation bodies (the Technical Committee and Subcommittee) and to the officers of the System for Co-operation and Co-ordination among Planning Bodies of Latin America and the Caribbean (SCCOPALC). With regard to the demand for ILPES services by member countries, he noted changes which had recently occurred in various connections: the increase in the needs of all governments for international technical co-operation as a result of the worsening in the internacional economic crisis; the increase in applications for co-operation submitted to regional bodies, including ILPES, due to the reduction in traditional sources of technical co-operation; the new responsibilities of the public sector and in particular of national planning bodies, and the changes made in the Institute in terms of orientation and technical organization. These changes had stepped up applications for co-operation submitted directly to the Institute.

18. With regard to the administrative and technical organization of the Institute, the Director noted that it would continue to operate with a general directorate, a technical secretariat for SCCOPALC and programme directors in the fields of advisory services, training and research. He added that it was also advisable for ILPES to maintain its three stresses of services regular and special services, regular services on request and special services by agreement.

19. With regard to the location of the Institute's activities, he suggested that the practice of concentrating them at Institute headquarters should be continued, recognizing, however, the need to operate more directly and intensively in the Caribbean and the Central American Isthmus, which for the time being meant assigning special representatives to those regions. He also drew attention to the advisability of adopting systematic criteria for assigning the activities of the Institute to specific areas in such a way that they would be more evenly distributed throughout the member countries, while at the same time favouring the relatively less developed countries. In that same connection, he said he considered it to be advisable to rotate some of the Institute's training activities (regional or national) and for diverse research activities to be provided with greater support in the studies done by reputable centres existing in the region.

20. He reminded the meeting that the size of the Institute had changed with time; in one period, UNDP was responsible for 97% of the Institute's financing since it was not capable of generating its own resources. The new institutional project adopted in Buenos Aires had been designed on the basis of a small-sized body which would make it possible to keep governmental contributions down to a minimum. Such a small body, which would not require large government contributions, would need a technical team of 25 experts. In that respect, he drew the attention of the members of the Committee to the fact that while all indicators, such as the region's real GDP, the population and the number of countries members of ILPES, had increased, the budget and staff of ILPES had diminished dramatically. It was indispensable to support the Institute's basic team out of regular budget resources and to put a stop to the reduction in technical assets which had beset ILPES in recent years.

21. With regard to costs and use of resources, he began by referring to the severe problem which seemed to confront the staff of the Institute, which in January 1986 would be reduced to include only those post which are supported by United Nations regular budget unless commitments to contribute to the Institute's budget were fulfilled. He then referred to the structure of the new institutional project in both its original and revised versions. He referred to the composition of the resources and use of funds, explaining that the figures for 1985 did not reflect growth in the Institute's budget. By analysing them, it was possible to see that there was a difference of nearly US\$1 million between the estimates made in the regular budget for 1984 and the amount actually received, a difference which is due to the fact that governments contributed less than anticipated. Nevertheless, by comparison with previous period those contributions had risen considerably; and he thanked those governments which had made contributions to ILPES. In 1984 there had been a drop in staff, a trend which had to be discouraged. In that connection, the new institutional project called for the stabilization of the regular ILPES budget since it was impossible to maintain a technical team of a size which met minimum requirements out of any but regular sources. This same principle had been unanimously endorsed at the

fifth meeting of the Technical Committee in Buenos Aires. Sources of resources from overhead were too limited that they could not be considered for financing regular staff. With regard to extrabudgetary resources, he said that UNDP contributions would no longer support the regular ILPES budget and would be applied to special projects.

22. Continuing his financial analysis, the Director of ILPES looked at the figures contained in the regular budget and at the sources of funds outside the regular budget. He noted that ILPES had needed to use its reserves beyond acceptable limits. With regards to the use of the funds, he considered a number of items, such as regular operating expenses, expenses relating to special projects, equipment, liability funds, other expenditure and liabilities and transfers of funds for the following year. There was the need for the Institute to have a reserve of capital both for covering the initial expenses of financed projects and for purposes of the new budget item it had been necessary to create to compensate staff who had had to leave the Institute because of lack of funds to pay them. Ready cash would be needed for staff contracts, and if the resources required for that purpose were not available in January 1986, it would be impossible to renew contracts.

23. Finally, he referred to the situation with regard to government contributions, the 1984 balance and the proposal for 1985. He began by describing the general situation with regard to government contributions by subregion. The contributions suggested for governments included only amounts already agreed to and of no macroeconomic significance for the countries. In 1984, US\$ 734 000 had been received out of an estimated contribution of US\$ 1 340 000, leaving US\$ 198 000 still to come. He asked the member countries to reinstate the commitment of US\$ 1 500 for 1985, explaining that amount covered technical support for ILPES units for the Central American Isthmus and the Caribbean. Finally, he again expressed his gratitude to the governments for their large financial contribution in support of the Institute.

IV. PARTICIPATION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

AND SPECIAL GUESTS

24. The representative of the Dominican Republic opened his statement by noting that his country had always supported ILPES, which, together with ECLAC, had co-operated effectively in the strengthening of his country's planning system. Because he held the institute in high esteem, he would comment on its activities frankly and informally and would make suggestions for their improvement. In this connection he noted that the Ministers and Heads of Planning were requesting a large number of services from ILPES but that not enough attention was being paid to the resources actually needed for the performance of those activities. It would be necessary to

adjust the number of activities provided by the Institute and to consider what resources were needed to make its programme of work viable.

25. With respect to the Institute's activities, he said he agreed that priority should be given to the advisory services and training programmes but not to horizontal co-operation. The research work done by ILPES should be based more on ECLAC studies and on the experiences of the countries so as to rationalize the use of the technical resources available. With regard to social policy, he recommended that a careful selection be made of the areas of study, giving education as an example.

26. He recommended that ILPES should review the terms of its relations with the member countries so as to make its link with them more continuous and direct. Political changes occurred in countries which made sustained co-ordination with planning authorities vital. The initiation of the new decentralization policies (in the Caribbean and Central America) suggested by the Directors of ILPES would undoubtedly help in meeting the needs of the member countries. He drew attention, however, to the need to obtain the resources necessary for bringing that decentralization about.

27. He reiterated his support for the recommendations made by the Technical Committee in Buenos Aires and to the need for countries to help in financing ILPES. His country was obtaining resources from other bodies, such as IDB, the World Bank and UNDP, to finance activities to be carried out with support from ILPES. This practice of obtaining assistance from other sources could help to strengthen the activities of ILPES, which all the countries held in high esteem.

28. The Director of ILPES thanked the representative of the Dominican Republic for his statement and noted that he agreed with the suggestion made by that representative regarding the advisability of assigning lower priority within ILPES to horizontal co-operation activities. In that respect, he said that owing to the resignation of the Programme Director responsible in that area were being reallocated.

29. With regard to the comments made concerning the attention paid to the countries, he noted that that was being done as extensively as possible within the limitations imposed by the amount of resources available; he personally had taken part in a mission to the Dominican Republic and a number of other countries, in which the Director of the Advisory Services Programme had also participated. In order to perform activities which met the requirements of each individual country, special financing would be needed and the process for obtaining it was complicated and slow given the way in which the financial institutions operated and because of the administrative and financial procedures of the United Nations itself.

30. The representative of Ecuador opened his statement by saying he agreed with the thematic nuclei set forth in the programme of work. He drew attention, however to the large number of activities to be tackled by the Institute and suggested that they should be examined in greater detail in order to establish priorities. As an example, he cited the field of science and technology, which was under study in many institutions, and asked to what point the Institute could contribute. Another case was that of public policy co-ordination, which was being considered in such institutions as the World Bank, IDB, AID and UNDP. Here the Institute should try to establish closer relations with those bodies and seek sources of financing for activities in which it was best equipped to operate and which lay within the priorities of its programme of work. Co-ordination with those bodies would also make it possible to at expenses incurred by international agencies. With regard to the geographical distribution of the Institute's activities, he said he fully endorsed decentralization in the Caribbean and Central America and offered his country's support in obtaining financial resources.

31. The representative of Colombia opened his statement by noting that he agreed with what the representatives of the Dominican Republic and Ecuador had said in respect of the need for ILPES to concentrate its efforts in a few areas of activity.

32. He referred to the need to study an approach based on the identification by ILPES of projects really useful to a country or a group of countries in an attempt to seek sources of financing which would be more readily available in such an approach were adopted.

33. If a project of mutual interest to Ecuador, Colombia and Venezuela (in connection with border policies, for example) were submitted, adequate financing might be found and, in addition, use could be made of the specialized technical resources of those countries who could work together with the ILPES staff.

34. The representative of Argentina stressed the serious short-term, emergency problems which the countries of the region were facing. There was need to use planning to rationalize measures taken at the political level, giving special consideration to the emergency situations which were damaging the economies of the region. This familiarity with the more immediate crisis and with the real aims of political action and planning was what international bodies needed if they were to assist countries effectively. In this connection he said that long- and medium-term planning which did not take account of the problems standing in the way of countries was neither useful nor meaningful.

35. He suggested that in that context ILPES should be prepared to help countries to solve their more pressing problems rather than putting so much effort into the forecasting of long-term economic trends. This was particularly relevant in the case of his country which had recently returned to democracy.

36. The representative of Suriname opened his statement by noting that although his country was regarded as English-speaking, in the historical sense it was part of the Latin American continent and community. Nevertheless, it had no great practical experience in working together with ILPES, and its participation had been limited to attendance of a few conferences. In his country great importance was attached to the relationship between the countries of the Caribbean and those of Latin America, and ILPES could play a very relevant role in such a rapprochement. The Institute might also co-operate in strengthening the links between the countries of the Caribbean and those of the Central American Isthmus; in that connection he endorsed the initiative taken by the Institute to decentralize its activities in those subregions, which would certainly help to integrate Suriname in the activities of ILPES.

37. Since his country had not taken an active part in the work of ILPES, he had a few questions to ask. First, he said he would like ILPES to explain what was meant by "Caribbean" for purposes of ILPES representation in that subregion. Secondly, with regard to the statement made by Mr. Clyde Applewhite at the Seventh Meeting of the Technical Subcommittee of ILPES, he asked what role subregional bodies such as CDB, CARICOM, the University of the West Indies and the organization of the Eastern Caribbean States, whose work was focused on English-speaking countries, would play in the tasks of the new ILPES entity and noted that Suriname did not belong to those organizations. Thirdly, he requested more information concerning future relations between Suriname and that part of the Caribbean which would be served by ILPES and between Suriname and the other countries of Latin America.

38. The representative of Venezuela referred to areas of interest to his government in so far as co-operation with ILPES was concerned. After the oil crisis, political support for planning had increased in his country, and this had provided a great opportunity to demonstrate the validity of planning in decision-taking. He then referred to the reforms being carried out in the planning system in his country in order to allow politicians to take timely decisions based on a good grasp of future trends.

39. An activity which might be conducted jointly with ILPES was that of making the results of studies carried out in Venezuela available to other countries so as to promote the exchange of experience. In that connection, it would be important to stress two basic factors: information and the

training of manpower for managerial posts in the government. CORDIPLAN and IVEPLAN had begun to give a course on science and technology in government, which had received wide support both from politicians and from other sectors of national life. He mentioned the progress which had been made in Venezuela in seeing that information reached the political level in good time so that it could be used effectively. He told how the planning body had been structured to permit both the monitoring of the short-term situation and the forecasting of the long-term situation in the country. He said would also be good idea to publicize that experience in the countries of the region in co-operation with ILPES, thereby making it possible to exchange views concerning the matter.

40. The representative of Uruguay said he agreed with the views expressed by the representative of Argentina as to the need to lay stress on the short-term problems faced by the countries of the region and with his suggestions concerning the ILPES co-operation programme.

41. His country was faced with a tremendous challenge. First it was necessary to strengthen the new political position by resolving the most pressing of the current economic problems. A prerequisite for successful planning was a certain amount of institutional stability, which could be maintained only if an acceptable balance were struck among the main economic variables. In that connection he noted that action taken by ILPES made no sense if it consisted only in medium-term studies while serious problems, such as the negotiation of the external debt and matters relating to foreign trade, were present.

42. He ended his statement by saying he was looking forward to a flexible relationship with the Institute and promised that his government would support it financially.

43. The representative of Panama referred to the urgent problems faced by his country and to the measures which were being taken to solve them. With regard to action by ILPES, he noted that relations should be intensified and better communications maintained since there was need to work with the new government, which was beset by social demands and serious economic problems. He referred to the experience of Venezuela in its attempts to increase the political credibility of planning, pointing out that this was a major problem for his country. With regard to technical co-operation, he drew attention to the need for better co-ordination among international bodies in order to avoid duplication and overlapping. He referred to efforts in science and technology, where a number of bodies were working together. Panama was making radical changes in its technical co-operation programme and its contribution to the various international agencies. He suggested that it would be highly recommendable for international bodies to seek ways of co-ordinating their action more effectively.

44. He went on to refer to various aspects of the ILPES programme of work, saying he agreed with other representatives as to the need to re-establish priorities to bring them closer in line with the real requirements of the countries. He referred in particular to the importance of social projects and information systems. With regard to the latter, he noted that in view of the important role played by private enterprise in his country, timely information on investment possibilities was needed.

45. He referred to the need to give priority to improving administrative efficiency in the tasks of government, saying that in that context planning should be made more flexible. With regard to contributions to ILPES, he said his government was seeking how best to meet the needs of the Institute. With regard to the projected ILPES office for the Central American Isthmus, he said there would seem to be great need for such an office since it would strengthen relations among the countries.

46. Finally, he announced that his country would request technical co-operation from ILPES for its development planning tasks and for the formulation of short-term indicators.

47. The representative of Bolivia said that although particular importance should be attached to short-term problems, consideration should also be given to the medium and long term, especially with respect to projects of multinational scope. As for projects at national level, ILPES would have to accommodate itself to the requests made by governments.

48. The representative of Costa Rica expressed his government's gratitude for the support which had been coming from ILPES. In spite of limited resources, the work being done had been highly useful and beneficial, and he said he felt that ILPES was an institution of great value to the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean.

49. With regard to the programme of work for 1985, he agreed with the representative of Ecuador, that in the revised version provision continued to be made for services of high quality, although the number of activities was reduced.

50. With regard to sources of financing for ILPES, he noted the approach being adopted in the Dominican Republic and other countries of obtaining financing from bodies such as IDB. He suggested that this approach might be made generally known so that countries could adopt it when they required the technical services of ILPES.

51. With regard to the Subregional Office for the Central American Isthmus, he said he endorsed it wholeheartedly, noting that planning should provide the basic tool for dealing with the severe structural and conjunctural problems troubling the Subregion.

52. The representative of Guatemala pointed out that in his country great importance had been attached to planning. The foundations were now being laid for submitting proposals to the new government regarding improvements to the National Planning Systems, which included the central, sectoral and regional subsystems. Since the country was in the process of democratization, there was need for a planning instrument to enable it to take action much more effectively. He referred to the co-operation under way with ILPES within the framework of the priority needs of Guatemala.

53. With regard to the decentralization of ILPES activities in the Central American Isthmus, he endorsed the statement made by the representative of Costa Rica in connection with the need to support this initiative and noted that consideration would be given to financial support for ILPES in its activities in the Subregion. With regard to the programme of work, he said he agreed that priority should be set for the activities so as to improve their quality and cut costs and proposed that the ILPES contribution should include innovative approaches to the strengthening of planning in the region. He ended his statement by commending ILPES for the support it had given his country.

54. The representative of Brazil referred to the ILPES programme of work and to the variety of requests for co-operation from the countries. He felt it necessary to warn against the assignment to the Institute of activities which lay outside its purview and its capacity to provide services.

55. The representative of Paraguay referred first to the large amount of technical co-operation which was being received from ILPES in connection with medium- and short-term planning and the strengthening of planning institutions. He went on to refer to the three-year programme whose implementation in conjunction with ILPES and with IDB financing was under consideration. The following areas would be tackled under the programme: financial and budgetary planning; modernization of the tax structure; short-term planning; macroeconomic models; inventories of technical co-operation projects and manpower training.

56. He referred to the arrangement whereby local technical resources were used for technical co-operation programmes and, by way of example, mentioned the Paraguayan Centre for Economic and Social Development Studies (CEPADES), which, together with ILPES, which has participated in the strengthening of planning and the co-ordination of public policies.

57. He referred to this country's contribution to ILPES and said his government was considering the modality for the transfer of resources. Finally he said he supported the proposal to decentralize ILPES activities relating to the Caribbean and Central America.

58. The representative of Honduras first thanked both ILPES and UNDP for the close co-operation being received from them. He went on to refer to the issue of the short-term versus the medium-and long-term approach. If planning had been carried out more effectively, a crisis as severe as the one now being experienced would never have arisen. It was necessary for the Institute to go on making efforts to ensure that the interest and importance attaching to the medium-and long-term dimension, which was, of course, entirely bound up in the analysis of the immediate situation, were not lost in the struggle. He then turned to the topic of social planning, noting that at the present time of crisis, attempts had frequently been made to solve problems from the economic point of view, it being forgotten that the ultimate goal of development was human welfare. In that connection he proposed that, in view of the limited resources of ILPES, priority should be given to social concerns.

59. Mr. Wilfred Wittingham, Deputy Director of the ECLAC Office for the Caribbean, said he would speak on various items which he felt might be of interest to the countries of the Subregion given the close contacts maintained with them through the Subregional Office.

60. First he explained that the Caribbean Development and Co-operation Committee was an advisory body of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean and that it had been created in 1975. Its membership included all the island countries plus Suriname, Guyana and Belize.

61. The basic objective of this ministerial-level committee was to promote co-operation and the co-ordination of activities among its member countries in respect of the implementation of development programmes. Planning was therefore a priority in so far as the activities of the Committee were concerned, and the participation of ILPES had been important to its work. Some of the planning activities were concentrated in working groups in the fields of transport, energy, agriculture, human resources and employment, physical and regional planning, and training. Substantial results had so far been obtained by the small number of experts who participated in those groups.

62. CDCC was structured in concentric circles. The smallest circle consisted in the countries belonging to the Organization of Eastern-Caribbean States. The English-speaking countries within CARICOM or the Caribbean Community formed a larger circle. Finally, the largest circle

consisted in the CDCC itself. This kind of structuring provided various opportunities in terms of co-operation activities in conjunction with different agencies and at bilateral level.

63. He went on to refer to the contributions made by the CDCC countries to ILPES and to the difficulties experienced by many of them in financing the Institute because of the scarcity of resources they were confronting.

64. If more Caribbean countries had been represented in the Committee, they would have certainly drawn attention to the importance of planning and training in achieving higher levels of development. ILPES had already been providing support in the area of training, and training would be given priority in the ILPES Unit for the Caribbean. This was because there was a great shortage of trained manpower which had been aggravated by the migration of professional and technical staff to developed countries. He ended his statement by commending ILPES on the establishment of a Unit in the Caribbean.

65. The Director of ILPES asked the Chairman to offer the floor to the Director of the Advisory Services Programme and to the Secretary of SCCOPALC so that he could comment on the consultations held in connection with advisory services and action in the Caribbean.

66. The Director of the Advisory Services Programme referred to the different activities carried out in the Caribbean countries, pointing out that in many of those activities the problem of the short-term and conjunctural dimension had been tackled. People had been aware that the priorities had been dictated by the emergency and that it had become necessary to support the planning bodies so that they could deal with it. ILPES had amassed considerable experience in terms of research on medium and long-term planning techniques, and this experience had been vital in tackling short-term problems. He therefore felt there was need for an ongoing research activity in which ILPES worked in close contact with ECLAC and with the governments to support the work done in the field.

67. As for the presence of ILPES in the countries of the region at this time of pressing economic need, he noted that the Institute had always wanted this kind of presence but that resources had been very limited in that the Advisory Services Programme consisted in only three international professionals and two local staff members to attend to the needs of the various countries. This small team had been able to increase its activity thanks to the projects mechanism which had been mentioned and to financing by IDB. The mechanism did not make it possible to increase the basic support team of technicians, and for that reason it was necessary to provide ILPES with additional resources in order to provide the countries with more extensive services.

68. With respect to horizontal co-operation he pointed out that, as the Director of ILPES had stated, ILPES had curtailed that activity in order to be able to concentrate on other areas. He felt, however, that at very small cost ILPES could act as a catalyst since its contacts with the countries enabled it to gauge supply and demand in the field of co-operation.

69. The Secretary of SCCOPALC referred to the questions posed by the representative of Suriname. Many of those questions had been answered in the statement made by Mr. Wilfred Wittingham. With regard to CDCC, he said that, as Mr. Wittingham had explained, it was an advisory body of the Secretariat made up of English-, French - and Spanish-speaking countries. ILPES, which participated in all the meetings of that body, took part, in association with ECLAC, in the System of Co-operation and Co-ordination among the Caribbean Planning Bodies, which had been established as a result of the CDCC meeting held in the Dominican Republic. The planners had met succesively in Cuba, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago. With regard to the working groups mentioned by Mr. Wittingham, he said they were accomplishing results in the intervals between the sessions of CDCC, which was providing some continuity for co-operation. In that connection, the presence of Suriname in CDCC and its machinery for planners ensured that it was that tied in with the entire Caribbean area. On the other hand, Suriname, as a member of SCCOPALC, was brought into association with all the countries of the region. Under the mandates received from the governments, ILPES was expected to support the strengthening of co-operation among countries, and for that reason it would participate in the attempts at joint action among the various subregions of Latin America and the Caribbean. As for the relationship between Suriname and bodies such as CARICOM, the Caribbean Development Bank and the University of the West Indies, he said that ILPES was working in conjunction with some of them in training projects carried out in co-operation with the World Bank and that there were plans for it to deepen its working relations with those subregional bodies. ILPES would keep Suriname informed of such activities to help Suriname in considering its incorporation in areas it regarded as being of priority.

70. With regard to the area which ILPES would cover through the Caribbean Unit, which would be located next door to the ECLAC Office in Port of Spain, he said it was the same as the area covered by CDCC. He expressed the gratification of ILPES at its increased participation in the problems and areas of concern of the Caribbean and at the significant progress which had been made, particularly in recent years, in the performance of activities in that important area.

71. The Director of ILPES opened his statement by thanking all the representatives for their valuable suggestions regarding the ILPES Programme of Work and the New Institutional Project.

72. With regard to the Programme of Work, he said he agreed with the representatives that it should be revised in such a way that priorities were brought into line with resources. He reminded the participants that his Office had submitted a suggestion which had been formulated on the basis of petitions made by the various planning bodies and other institutions related to the work of ILPES and that what was called for at the current session was, in fact, guidelines for the establishment of an order of priorities. The Institute was in contact with 37 member countries and 12 non-member countries, and requests had been received from over 90 institutions. All that was shown in the Programme of Work. To meet all those requests, the Institute had a staff of 25 experts, some of whom were on contracts of very short duration. Much less had been spent than in 1982, and the work had been growing, thereby reflecting a substantial increase in productivity. However, the danger lay in the fact that it was no longer possible to go on expanding the range of services without increasing the resources accordingly.

73. He drew attention to the role of the Institute as a catalyst and reminded the participants that it had come into being over 20 years ago as an operational branch of ECLAC, a body with a substantial technical team. Working with ECLAC, it had performed a large number of activities and on occasion it had been ILPES which had promoted the performance of work in conjunction with governments. An example of that was the Foreign Policy Course. With regard to Science and Technology, he informed the meeting that ILPES was not contracting technical resources in that connection nor was it scheduled to do so but that instead it acted as an articulator. The same was true in the co-ordination of public policies, an activity it performed in conjunction with the World Bank.

74. With regard to the suggestion that ILPES should attract resources by means of projects to finance its activities in the countries, he said he agreed with the participants that was a highly workable approach and one which the Institute was resorting to increasingly.

75. At the session of the Technical Committee held in Buenos Aires, a formula for financing ILPES activities had been laid down with the support of all governments; the United Nations was to supply 20% of the resources; the governments, about 40%, and the Institute was to seek its own ways of working with governments to attract resources through projects and bilateral arrangements. In that connection, he said the Institute had fully lived up to its commitment. Although it was important to continue to tap those sources, government support was an indispensable prerequisite for meeting the minimum requirements in terms of size of technical staff since, as the Director of the Advisory Services Programme had pointed out, projects were not producing resources for ILPES. He was very interested in the suggestion made by some governments that ILPES should support them in tasks relating to the short-term situation while also co-operating in the formulation of medium- and long-term objectives.

76. With regard to the work of ILPES in the Caribbean, he said that the statements made so far cleared up some of the doubts in that respect. He agreed that priority should be given to government training in science and technology and promised full support of the Institute to efforts made in that connection.

77. He said he agreed with those representatives who had suggested strengthening co-ordination among international agencies in order to avoid overlapping and duplication and said that ILPES was giving high priority to relations with bodies work in its field of action, with a view to the implementation of joint activities.

78. He referred to the INFOPLAN project which was being carried out in conjunction with ECLAC and said that it would continue to receive support. With regard to the suggestion that more shall be done in the field of short-term planning, he said that an agreement had been signed with France, a country with a vast experience in that field. The programme of basic courses which were given at headquarters had been extended through the addition of two subjects, one relating to short-term indicators and the other to short-term programming, and both of them making use of French experience.

79. With regard to the remark made by one representative as to the large number of training activities, he said that while he agreed there was a need to set priorities, many of those activities consisted in small-scale support or activities carried out in co-ordination with other bodies.

80. With regard to the rationalization of the expenditure of ILPES, he said this was a priority task and that a computer system for daily monitoring of expenditure and cost was already in operation within the Institute.

81. He drew attention to the support being provided to a number of countries in association with DTCD, which marked a turning point in the technical co-operation efforts of ILPES.

82. He said he agreed with those representatives who had argued the importance for ILPES of continuing to need the long-and medium-term-dimension and strengthening its research function. With regard to research, he noted that the action taken by ILPES was not exclusively academic but that, on the contrary, research was, in every aspect, associated with training and advisory services and hence with the real needs of countries. He cited, as an example, the application of an econometric model in a country where the foundations for its use had been laid by the research

programme. ILPES research in medium-and long-term planning had enabled it to make a number of predictions concerning the crisis situation through which the region was passing.

83. With regard to the statement made by the representative of the ECLAC Subregional Office for the Caribbean, he said he acknowledge that in the past ILPES had not developed significant activities in that subregion, but he said that the shortcoming was being remedied, and in recent years an effort had been made which had already shown results. He expressed reservations as to the speed and intensity of the action taken in the Caribbean since activities there had really begun only very recently.

84. Finally, he referred to the support which UNDP was providing for ILPES. The new institutional project of ILPES provided that beginning in 1986, UNDP would change the formula of its support to the Institute. From that time on support would be provided through the financing of special projects in activities to which the governments attached priority. In that respect, he said that UNDP's contribution for 1986 had been programmed, in accordance with the mandates received from the governments, at a level compatible with the support received in 1984. He ended his presentation by reiterating his recognition of the important interventions made by the members of the Committee.

85. Mr. Hugo Navajas-Mogro, UNDP Regional Director for Latin America and the Caribbean, opened his statement by pointing out that it was a privilege for the body he represented to be participating in a technical committee made up of Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America and the Caribbean. The large majority of the representatives were familiar with UNDP, its mechanics and possibilities and its country and regional programmes. They were also familiar with its financial problems. UNDP was also asking for more resources in order to be able to meet the growing needs of the 250 countries benefiting from its co-operation.

86. He referred to the situation in Latin America and the Caribbean and to the change of attitude on the part of the main donor countries which were abandoning multilateral co-operation in favour of bilateral co-operation. In addition, even within the multilateral co-operation approach, they were turning away from programmes, such as those of UNDP, which were based on initiatives taken by countries. Within this scenario, which was an unfavourable one for all countries, the region was encountering its own very special difficulties which were related to a new way of looking at the international situation.

87. Seven countries of Latin America and the Caribbean represented the region on the UNDP Governing Council, and it was important that they should be careful to see that Latin America and the Caribbean was not depicted as a low priority area in so far as the distribution of international resources

was concerned. The Governing Council would meet in June 1985 to lay the foundations for the fourth programming cycle, which would begin in January 1987. The climate was not propitious for multilateral co-operation of the kind extended by UNDP, but the Programme was in close contact with the countries so as to ensure that what they received was consistent with their national growth.

88. With regard to the new UNDP approach to its ILPES contributions, he noted that in 1980 the UNDP Regional Programme had had close to US\$ 20 million available to it. In 1985 the programme funds amounted to US\$ 4.9 million; hence the reduction was very great. It was expected that for 1986 slightly more than US\$ 5 million would be available, but this still represented a severe curtailment.

89. UNDP had been contributing to ILPES since its foundation. Between 1961 and 1985 it had contributed over US\$ 23 million. The figure budgeted for the seventh phase of UNDP co-operation was US\$ 3.6 million, but, as everybody knew, the Institute was compelled to reduce all its programmes to 55% of what had been envisaged. This was because of a drop in contributions due to the rise in value of the dollar in terms of the voluntary contributions, all of which were made in local currency, in addition to other factors. This had come as a very hard knock, in particular, where country programmes were concerned. It had been necessary to reset priorities, and some of the resources had been replaced by national contribution, which represented a demonstration of the government's confidence in UNDP.

90. He then gave more detailed information concerning the resources which had been assigned to ILPES and reminded the participants of the request made at the seventh meeting of the Technical Subcommittee held at Brasilia, at which UNDP had been asked to maintain a figure equal to that of the contribution granted in 1984, i.e., US\$ 450 000. In that connection, he said that every possible effort would be made to see that the resources allocated were sufficient to meet the needs of the new approach to UNDP/ILPES co-operation. After 1986, i.e., in the fourth programming cycle, it would be advisable, within this new approach to ILPES/UNDP co-operation, to go on examining how to maintain an association which had so far proved very beneficial, both to the countries and to UNDP.

91. It was still too early to set final figures, but he was sure that efforts would be made to ensure that UNDP could provide at least basic support for the activities scheduled. This represented a duty more than a promise since UNDP regarded ILPES as a link with the planning activities of the countries in the region. In present circumstances, in which the governments themselves had expressed new needs while at the same time continuing to stress the needs which had traditionally been covered through ILPES co-operation, there was need for UNDP to lend its support, within the possibilities available in the Regional Programme, in those areas which fell within its scope.

92. He went on to refer to the UNDP country programmes and to the fact that some of the ILPES activities were totally or partially financed under those programmes and drew attention to the relationship between ILPES and DTCD in respect of a number of projects, noting the advisability of intensifying that relationship. With respect to the Basic Course given by ILPES, he regarded it as being of major importance and said he would not like to see UNDP blamed if it became necessary to study ways of financing it. He also suggested that governments might give consideration to the possibility of financing scholarships out of their UNDP country programmes, to which recourse had been had in connection with other ILPES activities. This solution could be applied without difficulty since the cost of the scholarships was not very high. He said that UNDP was keeping closely abreast of the needs of the countries and drew attention to projects which had been implemented in many countries under their country programme in so far as support to planning systems was concerned.

93. He ended his statement by re-emphasizing that UNDP's relationships with ILPES and with the countries in their planning needs was not only that of a donor but was one of co-partnership in the fulfilment of the will of the governments in the area of international co-operation.

94. Miss Margaret Anstee, Assistant Secretary-General for Technical Co-operation for Development opened her statement by noting that the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development (DTCD) carried out its activities at world level, working in some 150 countries, in many of which it supported the strengthening of economic and social development planning. The department had been working very closely with countries in the Latin America and the Caribbean region in conjunction with ILPES, and this action was expected to show continued growth in the future. She said that from the professional point of view, her department had, since its creation, been closely linked to ILPES since it had had occasion to work in one of the countries in which the advisory service activities of the Institute had been initiated.

95. With respect to current activities with ILPES, she noted the importance of joint action in national projects, mentioning Belize and Paraguay in that connection.

96. With regard to the financial problem of ILPES, she agreed that it was absolutely essential to strengthen it by providing it with a firm financial base. The United Nations was also suffering from a shortage of resources, and everybody was seeking ways of obtaining resources, not only to initiate activities but also to salvage worthwhile projects begun in the past which were now in danger of being eliminated. She agreed with the Committee members that the countries should be served in the best manner and in close co-ordination with other bodies in order to ensure that the work was carried out efficiently and with a true division of labour. When missions were

carried out in connection with urgent problems, ILPES could provide rapid help, and DTCD could co-operate in so far as it was able.

97. She went on to refer to the research activities, noting that they provided a very important support for the operations as well as being one of their end products. She proposed combining the research capacity of ILPES with the operational capacity of DTCD to supplement the efforts already being made. She also stressed the need of making the best use of the resources available for co-operation, with the governments working in close participation. Finally, she reiterated the commitment of United Nations Headquarters and DTCD to continue co-operating with the region in matters relating to planning, working very closely with ILPES and ECLAC in that regard.

98. The Director of ILPES said he wished first to thank Mr. Navajas-Mogro for his participation, stressing the major contribution to ILPES of the network of Resident Representatives in Latin America and the Caribbean. He also thanked Miss Anstee for her statement, noting that it was the first time that DTCD had been represented by such a senior official.

99. The Executive Secretary of ECLAC began his statement by reminding the Committee that ILPES had been designed as an autonomous institution - a role which had major advantages. It had also been designed as part of a system made up of ILPES, CELADE and the ECLAC Secretariat, in such a way that each of them derived strength by belonging to the system and taking advantage of its close connection with the others.

100. The course of action followed by the Secretariat was to seek the integration of the institutions within the system while of the same time ensuring that the distinctive features of each of them were retained. The link between ECLAC and ILPES gave the Secretariat an opportunity to be closer to the action by participating in the training and advisory services activities. As an example of such co-operation, he cited the course on trade policy and the use made of ECLAC's experience in the preparation of the course and in the presentation of the subjects covered.

101. He referred to the deterioration of multilateralism and to the need to rethink the responsibilities of the Institute in the circumstances to which that deterioration gave rise. It was necessary to work as hard as possible to achieve the greatest efficiency in the provision of services to governments. Such an effort would strengthen multilateralism and would thereby strengthen the United Nations system itself.

102. He went on to refer to the need for closer links with the actors of the development process, i.e., with those who took decisions in the public and private sectors. In that connection too, co-operation with ILPES would play

102. He went on to refer to the need for closer links with the actors of the development process, i.e., with those who took decisions in the public and private sectors. In that connection too, co-operation with ILPES would play a very important role. He closed his statement by noting that activities with ILPES would be increased not only because it was ECLAC's duty to see that they were but also in order to give the Institute an opportunity to play its role more effectively.

103. The Director of ILPES referred to the strengthening of activities in Central America and the Caribbean, noting that their basic financing had been provided for in the new institutional project.

104. The representative of Paraguay drew attention to the valuable contribution made by DTCD and ILPES to the strengthening of national and regional planning and to the support provided by UNDP in that connection.

105. The Secretary of the Committee noted that in accordance with a recommendation made at the seventh meeting of the Technical Sub-Committee held at Brasilia in December 1984, the Committee had to take a decision concerning the change in the name of the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning. He read out the background information and the Sub-Committee's proposal in that respect:

a) The proposal to change the name of the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning to: Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning.

b) The proposal to retain the acronym "ILPES" for the abbreviated denomination of the Institute, considering its generalized use in all languages and its recognition throughout the region.

106. The Technical Committee adopted these proposals, which were included in the text of the final resolution.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

107. The rapporteur read out the draft resolutions which had been prepared on the basis of suggestions made by the members of the Committee. The drafts were discussed by the members of the Committee and by the representatives of UNDP, DTCO and ECLAC. After introducing a few changes, the Technical Committee adopted them unanimously. The text of the resolution appears at the end of this report.

108. All the delegations expressed their gratitude for the hospitality of the Government of Mexico and for the facilities and services made available to them during the meeting.

VI. DATE AND PLACE OF THE NEXT MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

109. The seventh meeting of the Technical Committee will be held in 1987 on the occasion of the Sixth Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America and the Caribbean, which, as a result of the kind offer by the Government of Cuba, will be held at Havana.

VII. CLOSING MEETING

110. The representative of Mexico and Chairman of the Technical Committee expressed great satisfaction with the excellent participation by the members and special guests and the significant conclusions reached in the exchange of ideas. He then declared the sixth meeting of the Technical Committee closed.

VIII. RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE SIXTH MEETING OF THE
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE OF THE LATIN AMERICAN INSTITUTE
FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PLANNING

(Mexico City, 16 April 1985)

The Technical Committee of the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning, taking into account the deliberations of its members and the results of the Seventh Meeting of the Technical Sub-Committee of the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning unanimously adopts the following resolution.

The Technical Committee

1. Notes with approval the report on activities 1984 and requests ILPES to revise the programme of work for 1985, taking into account the suggestions made by delegations as contained in the report of its sixth meeting.
2. Take note of the revised version of the new institutional project for 1984-1986, updated for the biennium 1985-1986, and in this respect:
 - a) Approves the bases on which the project was updated;
 - b) Also approves the suggestions regarding resource derivation and use estimates for 1986;
 - c) Endorses the resolutions adopted at the seventh session of the Technical Sub-Committee of ILPES, in that the Technical Committee:
 - i) Reiterate its satisfaction concerning the fulfilment by the Executive Secretary of ECLAC of the recommendation to propose to the United Nations an increase in the resources of ILPES in the regular budget of the United Nations;
 - ii) Requests the member governments of ILPES to support, in the appropriate organs of the United Nations, the approval of this increase in posts which is crucial for the expansion of the professional critical mass of the Institution in 1986.

- iii) Reiterates its gratitude to the United Nations Development Programme for its continued support of ILPES since its creation;
- iv) Recommends to the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean of the United Nations Development Programme that if possible it grant resources to the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning from 1986 onwards which are not less than the figure granted in 1984. These resources would be used to finance activities in priority areas of mutual concern to governments;
- v) Thanks the member governments for their contributions to the New Institutional Project of ILPES and requests those member governments which have not yet contributed to the New Institutional Project to give their most urgent consideration to bringing their regular contributions to the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning up to date in order to establish a minimum technical capacity which can respond to the requirements of the governments;
- vi) Expresses its satisfaction concerning the working relationships between ILPES and the Department of Technical Co-operation for Development (DTCD) and international bodies such as the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and the World Bank.

3. With regard to the decentralization of ILPES activities:

- 1) Expresses its satisfaction concerning the progress made in the establishment of the ILPES Unit for the Caribbean at the ECLAC Subregional Office in Trinidad and Tobago. Also recognizes the estimable participation of ILPES, together with ECLAC, in the activities of the Technical Secretariat of the mechanism grouping planners of the Caribbean.
- ii) Recommends that consideration be given as soon as possible to the measures needed to establish an ILPES Unit in Central America.
- iii) Recommends that ILPES, in its capacity as Technical Secretariat of SCCOPALC and with support from ECLAC, co-operate with the mechanism grouping planners from the Central American Isthmus.

4. With respect to the name of the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning, endorses the resolution adopted at the seventh session of the Technical Sub-Committee of ILPES and agrees:
 - i) To change the name of the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning to "Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning".
 - ii) To retain the acronym "ILPES" for the abbreviated denomination of the Institute, considering its generalized use in all languages and its recognition throughout the region.
5. Notes with satisfaction and expresses its gratitude for the offer of Colombia to host the Eight meeting of the Technical Sub-Committee of ILPES, which is expected to be held at the end of 1985 or beginning of 1986.
6. Recommends to the member governments that, in so far as they are able and within the framework of their national priorities, they consider the use of sources of co-operation, whether multilateral, bilateral, public, private or of any other description, in support of specific activities which might be requested from ILPES.
7. Commends the Department of Planning and Budget of Mexico on the excellent way in which it organized the meeting and thanks the Department of Foreign Relations for its contribution to the success of the Sixth Meeting of the Technical Committee of ILPES.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ANNEX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

A. Member States

ARGENTINA

Representatives:

Bernardo Grispun, Secretary of Planning,
Department of Planning.

Members of the Delegation:

Alberto Ezequiel Volpi, Under-Secretary for
Long-Term Analysis, Department of Planning.

Oscar Yujnovsky, Under-Secretary for Interna-
tional Co-operation, Ministry for Foreign
Relations and Culture.

Lila Roldán Vázquez.

BELIZE

Representative:

Robert Leslie, Permanent Secretary, Ministry
of Foreign Affairs and Economic Development.

BOLIVIA

Representative:

Iván Finot, Under-Secretary of Planning,
Ministry of Planning and Co-ordination.

Members of the Delegation:

Alfredo Harvey.

BRAZIL

Representative:

Francisco Vidal Luna, Head of the Planning
Institute, Department of Planning.

COLOMBIA

Representative: Jorge Ospina Sardi, Director of the National Planning Department.

Members of the Delegation: Rodrigo Villamizar

COSTA RICA

Representative: Juan Manuel Villasuso, Minister of National Planning and Economic Policy.

Members of the Delegation: Armando Bolaños.

CUBA

Representative: Humberto Pérez, Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Chairman of the Central Planning Board.

Members of the Delegation: Herminio García Lazo, Vice-Chairman of the Central Planning Board.

Jorge Reyes
Martín González
Waldo O`Farrill

CHILE

Representative: Jorge Aliro Valenzuela, Chargé d`Affaires of the Embassy of Chile in the United States of America.

ECUADOR

Representative: Oswaldo Dávila, Secretary-General of Planning, National Development Council (CONADE)

Members of the Delegation: Gustavo Bucheli.

EL SALVADOR

Representative: Ernesto Alwood, Vice-Minister, Ministry of Planning and Co-ordination of Economic and Social Development.

GUATEMALA

Representative: Mario Funes Cuéllar, Acting Secretary-General, National Economic Planning Council.

Members of the Delegation: Carlos Secaira

HAITI

Representative: Ives Blanchar, Minister of Planning

HONDURAS

Representative: Daniel Meza Palma, Executive Secretary, Consejo Superior de Planificación (CONSUPLANE)

MEXICO

Representative: Carlos Salinas de Gortari, Secretary of Planning and Budget.

Members of the Delegation: Rogelio Montemayor, Under-Secretary of Planning and Development, Department of Planning and Budget

Miguel Sandoval Lara
Santiago Meyer Picón
Tomás Yarrington

NICARAGUA

Representative: Luis Enrique Figueroa, Secretary of Planning and Budget.

Members of the Delegation: Carlos Canales

PANAMA

Representative: Abdiel Ureña, Vice-Minister, Ministry of Planning and Economic Policy.

PARAGUAY

Representative: Raúl Gómez Nuñez, Ambassador of Paraguay in Mexico.

Members of the Delegation: Darío Zárate Arellano and Fulvio Monges.

PERU

Representative Manuel Forno Henríquez, Technical Director of the National Planning Institute.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Representative: Fernando Mangual, Under-Secretary, Technical Secretariat of the Office of the President.

SURINAME

Representative: Percy Van Kantén, Director, National Planning Office (Ministry of Finance and Planning)

URUGUAY

Representative: Carlos Stenery, Head of Planning, Office and Planning and Budget, Office of the President.

VENEZUELA

Representative: Ana Luisa Jatar, Sectoral Director-General of Medium-Term Planning (CORDIPLAN).

ANNEX II

DRAFT AGENDA

ANNEX II

DRAFT AGENDA

SIXTH MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE OF ILPES
Mexico City, 16 April 1985

<u>Time</u>		<u>Event</u>	
9:a.m.	-	AGENDA	- Discussion and adoption (Doc. CT 6/2)
9.30 a.m.	-	OPENING	- Statement by the Chairman of the Technical Committee. - Report of the Director of ILPES. General Presentation. - Report on Activities, 1984 and Programme of Work for 1985 (Doc.6/3) - ILPES: The new institutional project 1984-1986 (Doc. 6/4).
10.30 a.m.	-	RECESS	
10.45 a.m.			- Statements by representatives and discussion.
12.45 p.m.	-	RECESS	
1. p.m.			- Other draft resolutions (Doc. CT 6/5 and Ad-hoc Doc.)
2. p.m.	-	CLOSING	- Statements: - Director, Regional Bureau for Latin America/UNDP. - Executive Secretary, ECLAC. - Director of ILPES. - Chairman of the Technical Committee.

ANNEX III

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

ANNEX III

LIST OF DOCUMENTS

- LC/IP/R.49 (CT 6/2) - Organization of work and proposed agenda
- LC/IP/R.50 (CT 6/3) - ILPES: Proposed Programme of Work for 1985 and Report on Activities, 1984
- LC/IP/R.51 (CT 6/4) - ILPES: The New Institutional Project 1984-1986
- LC/IP/R.52 (CT 6/5) - Resolution of the Seventh Technical Sub-Committee (December 1984)
- LC/IP/R.53 (CT 6/6) - Draft Report (To be prepared in due course)

