



ILPES

Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social
NACIONES UNIDAS CEPAL PNUD GOBIERNOS DE AMÉRICA 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'AMÉRIQUE LATINE ET DES CARAÏBES

LC/1P/R.63

NTI/F.VII.4

ILPES: PROPOSED INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT 1987/1990

ILPES - 25 YEARS - 1962 / 1987

INDEX

	<u>Page</u>
PRESENTATION	1
I BACKGROUND TO THE "NEW INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT"	3
II THE NEW INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT AT THE BEGINNING OF 1987	7
A. The Institute: demand, organization, location and size	7
B. "Stabilizing the regular budget": lack of consensus?	14
C. Basis and characteristics of the 1987/1990 financial proposal	17
 TABLES:	
1. ILPES: SCHEDULE OF COLLECTIVE DELIBERATION BODIES	27
2. ILPES: SUMMARY OF MAIN SOURCES OF FINANCING	28
3. ILPES: SUMMARY OF ILPES PERSONNEL DATA AT HEADQUARTERS	29
4. ILPES: EVOLUTION OF CONTRIBUTIONS BY UNDP 1962-1986	30
5. ILPES: SOURCES AND USE OF FUNDS 1982-1987	31
6. ILPES: FINAL BALANCE OF CONTRIBUTIONS PHASE 1984-1986 / SUMMARY	32
7. ILPES: FINAL BALANCE OF CONTRIBUTIONS OF PHASE 1984-1986	33
8. ILPES: SOURCES OF FUNDS 1982-1986	34
9. ILPES: USE OF FUNDS 1982-1986	35
-- NOTES	36

PRESENTATION

The two main documents already submitted on this occasion fulfill different but interrelated objectives in so far as the national planning bodies are concerned. The document relating to the VI Conference (NTI/G.3), closed with a full list of tasks which the NPBs could assume, either in conjunction with each other or individually within each country thereby opening the way for joint co-operation with a large number of international bodies, including ILPES. The second document, which was prepared for this (the Seventh) meeting of the Technical Committee (NTI/F.VII.3) provides a new conceptual framework with regard to planning, on the basis of which other functions related more specifically to ILPES could be defined and then provides a list of tasks which the Institute might undertake in 1987.

This third document, is highly important from both points of view: in that the spectrum of functions to be carried out by the Institute in the future --from those which are highly general (in nature and arise out of the Sixth Conference), to those established at the seventh meeting of the Technical Committee-- and relate to more specific matters will be determined by the success of the Institute's own "project" as a permanent Institute and intergovernmental service agency. This document provides information on the state of this "project" and proposes concrete measures for its consolidation in the near future (1987-1990). There are proposals which must still be examined and accepted by the office of the Executive Secretary of ECLAC and the UNDP Bureau for Latin America, which will also be represented at this meeting.

The Institute takes this opportunity to convey its gratitude in advance to the member governments represented here for their understanding of the problems to be discussed, their support of the solutions suggested and for other contributions they may make to this proposal when it becomes the official project for the next four years. It also reiterates its gratitude to ECLAC and UNDP for their constant co-operation.

I. BACKGROUND TO THE "NEW INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT"

1. Since several members are attending this Meeting for the first time, this document briefly sets out part of the versions presented to governments in previous years. In keeping with this aim, members are reminded that since it was established (June 1962) the Institute has been conceived as an autonomous and permanent body, linked to the United Nations Regional System for Latin America and the Caribbean (known as the "ECLAC system"). As of that date, **the member governments determined to exert routine technical control over the Institute and to provide it with regular financial support.**^{1/} Later, with the approval of the Conferences of Ministers and Heads of Planning (Caracas, April 1977) ILPES was designated as the Technical Secretariat of this new System of Regional Co-operation.^{2/} With the creation of the Technical Committee (1974), the Ministers or Heads of National Planning Bodies ^{3/} became the supreme collegiate body of the Institute, as an intergovernmental agency.

^{1/} This was formalized by the Resolutions of the member countries of ECLAC: 199/IX of 30 May 1961, 219/AC.50 and 220/AC.52, both of 1962. This latter Resolution laid down the organization of ILPES, established a Governing Council and the post of Director-General. **The Governing Council was later replaced by a "Technical Committee" (resolution 340/AC.66, January 1974).**

^{2/} SCCOPALC: **System of Co-operation and Co-ordination among Planning Bodies of Latin America and the Caribbean.** (Ratified by Resolution 317, Seventeenth Session of ECLAC, May, 1977).

^{3/} Traditionally, **NPB or National Planning Body is used to designate the highest national body which is the representative of the member government in the Institute's collegiate organs,** regardless of its official name: Ministry, Secretariat, Council, Office, etc.

2. This intergovernmental agency assumed responsibility for providing the Institute with overall guidance and for approving its Programme of Work, which was to be reviewed every two years; in order to provide supervision during the interim period, the Technical Sub-committee was established (see **table 1**). Both of these collective bodies reinforced the Institutes dual nature: that of a permanent multilateral organism within the United Nations System and a **multilateral service agency, directly managed and controlled by the member Governments.**^{4/}
3. The "New Institutional Project" has been taking shape over a four-year period, and is marked by greater direct support from member Governments and the withdrawal of UNDP as a regular source of finance for the Institution.^{5/} An effort was made to begin a new stage in the history of ILPES' financing which had hitherto been marked by a certain incongruity which could be expressed as: "PERMANENT INSTITUTE - PROVISIONAL FUNDS".^{6/} In other words, ILPES had reached a critical stage in so far as it **depended on irregular funds, to maintain a regular activity,** (see table 2).

^{4/} It is possible to observe a growing conviction in the region that the terms "committee" and "technical subcommittee" signify little. In order to reflect the new nature of these bodies it would be desirable to rename them as "Regional Planning Council" and "Presiding Officers" of the Council (or some similar term); **the actual terms were adopted when the Institute had been set up as a finite project** (compare note 1 with table 1, line B).

^{5/} UNDP's collaboration remained and has continued to remain an essential factor in funding only specific projects, in which the Institute is involved as executing agency. Moreover, the network of Resident Representatives of UNDP provides ILPES with valuable and irreplaceable support; in Santiago UNDP's Liaison Office provides decisive support.

^{6/} In this respect, see, in particular, paragraph 76 (p.41), of document I-1, IV Conference, May 1983.

4. It should be remembered that the "New Institutional Project 1984-1986" was proposed and unanimously adopted in Buenos Aires (Fifth Technical Committee, May 1983), with as its basis three principles: "austerity", "a multi-annual limitation on government pledges" (which it was understood would be reviewed at the end of 1986), and the understanding that national contributions would be compensated by regular services of all kinds, provided to all governments, i.e.: **the contributions of a single country were not to be subject to the volume of the institutes bilateral activities** (in other words, those activities carried out therein as part of a relationship between the Institute and a member Government, with or without the collaboration of other bodies). It was also acknowledged that ILPES should maintain a stable technical staff, capable of providing coverage for the whole of the Region, and be financed on a regular basis (see **table 3**).

II. THE NEW INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT AT THE BEGINNING OF 1987

5. In accordance with past practice, each component of the "New Institutional Project" as presented has been updated. The layout is now divided into three parts: **first**, that relating to Demand, Organization, Location and Size; the **second**, concerns the stabilization plan for the Regular Budget; and the **third**, the Sources and Use of Funds.

A. The Institute: demand, organization, location and size

6. From the institutional viewpoint, the nature of ILPES as a permanent multilateral body, linked with the ECLAC system and directly managed by the NPBs of Latin America and the Caribbean is confirmed. Complete control over its administrative and financial management by the relevant United Nations bodies is also maintained. ILPES also continues to provide the Technical Secretariat for SCCOPALC (System of Co-operation and Co-ordination among Planning Bodies of Latin America and the Caribbean).
7. With regard to the demand for work by ILPES, a number of changes which have been observed in recent years became more pronounced. First of all, the persistence of the international economic crisis increased the need for technical co-operation in the region. Secondly, the reduction in the operating level of a number of major agencies in the field of technical co-

responsibilities borne by National Planning Bodies led to a continued expansion in the demands made on the Institutes services. Generally speaking, the volume of demand has grown more than threefold since 1982; this involves a level of operational expenditure in excess of that which the Institute is capable of meeting, unless the undertakings to stabilize its regular budget are carried out.

8. With regard to **administrative and technical organization**, it is proposed that the Institute continue to operate under a Director-General, and maintain its Advisory and Training activities, and that the remaining internal technical areas be reorganized in accordance with the new requirements of its activities (for further details, see Doc.NTI/F.VII.3, in particular, Section III A and B). As had been previously planned, the existing posts were reviewed in order to ensure greater management efficiency, and to individualize those functions which will exclusively correspond to the new Principal UNDP/ILPES project for 1987-1990 (see Doc. NTI/E.IX.5 and Section III.D.1 of Doc. NTI/F.VII.3). As far as personnel policy is concerned, these changes improve internal career prospects. Moreover, the "standard services" which are provided in three basic forms, are maintained: "regular generic", "regular on request" and "specific subject to agreement".^{7/}

^{7/} For a detailed presentation of the "standard services" and their "modes of access" by countries, see Document I-1/ILPES, May 1983 (Fourth Conference, Buenos Aires). As far as other management details are concerned, see the document NTI/F.VII.3, Chap. II.

9. As for the **location of its activities**, the majority of them are performed at Headquarters in Santiago, Chile, while, at the same time, the unit in Trinidad and Tobago has been in operation since September 1985. A decision is now being taken concerning the proposal to give more direct and intensive attention to the Central American Isthmus by establishing specific technical representation in that subregion.^{8/} On the other hand, the Institute's activities are now distributed more evenly among the country members, and **priority is given, in so far as possible, to the relatively less developed** countries. In this connection, consideration is being given both to the rotation of the site of some of the training activities (regional and national) and to the decentralization of some research work by articulating the activities with some reputable centres in the member countries.
10. As for the **general characteristics of the region** in which it operates, ILPES provides various types of service to 37 member governments with a total population of nearly 400 million inhabitants of various ethnic origin, distributed over 20.4 million square kilometers (27% of the area covered by the Third World). The product generated by the region comes close to US\$ 720 billion (in 1984), and its average per capita income is about US\$ 1 800 a year.

11. As for the decision concerning the Institute's size and performance capacity, consideration should also be given to the complexity and high degree of responsibility of the jobs performed by the national planning bodies (NPBs) in the region, which are the main direct beneficiaries of the Institute's work. In at least half of the 37 member governments, these bodies have ministerial rank, and a large number of them play significant roles in the design and implementation of development strategies.^{9/} The

diversity of topics included in the ILPES programme of work is due

primarily to the role played by the NPBs. In addition, the Institute's field of action is broader than its area of jurisdiction --the number of countries with which it works usually exceeds 50 (nearly one third of the Member Governments of the United Nations).^{10/}

12. Obviously the indicators concerning the Institute size depend on the criteria by which it is measured (its "product", its "inter-agency links" or its "inputs"); if it is measured on the basis of inputs) a distinction could be drawn between its material and human resources and its financial

^{9/} It should be noted that three main criteria usually determine whether an NPB is considered to have ministerial rank. First, the official heading must report to the President or Prime Minister of the country; second, he must have membership in the ministerial councils and in the highest interministerial bodies and, third, his duties must involve interministerial co-ordination, and he must have a say in decisive matters, including, at least, those relating to the national investment budget.

^{10/} Thus, the Institute is under the obligation of working in four languages in the following proportions (percentage of speakers in the total population): Spanish, 63%; Portuguese, 34%; English, 1.6% and French, 1.4%. At this meeting (the seventh meeting of the Technical Committee) it will be

resources. If it is measured on the basis of "production", it would be necessary to take into account the fact that in 1985/1986 the Institute provided advisory services directly to 16 countries in the region, organized some 34 events relating to training (in which it dealt with at least 1 200 senior professionals from 28 countries) and carried out continual research activities in connection with nine major topics, the findings of which are usually reported in the various series of publications issued by the

Institute (in 25 years, over 21 publications have been issued each year, on

average). These figures give a rough idea of the quantity of technical results shown by the Institute every year.

13. In second criterion of measurement, relating to the "inter-agency relations" maintained by ILPES, these relations must be viewed in two perspectives: first, from the point of view of the bodies making up its "clientele" (which purchase or receive the services offered by the Institute) and second, those bodies with which the Institute is associated for purposes of promoting or implementing joint activities. 11/ To give a rough idea of the extent of these relations, it may be noted that ILPES is in regular contact with 78 ministries in its member governments; close to 30 UNDP national offices; 26 universities and research centres and another 70 international or national institutions working in the fields of planning and development policy.
-

In addition, its work is co-ordinated with that of 20 substantive divisions and projects within ECLAC and that of 7 subregional offices. As has already been noted, it works with a number of departments in other technical or economic co-operation bodies with which it maintains co-operation agreements. All in all, ILPES maintains a diversified and full gamut of international relations, both in its capacity of provider of services and in fulfillment of its function of working in co-ordination with other bodies, so that it must be constantly engaged in the performance of its technical contact and management tasks, both of which are very intensive.

14. As for the size indicator based on inputs, it should be borne in mind that the Institute has always worked with a small staff. In order to describe its real working capacity, it must be borne in mind that it is required to co-ordinate a diversified set of technical resources of various origins, including the Institute's own small internationally and locally recruited technical staff (30, on average); experts and specialists taken on in the course of each year (about 50, on average); "senior" staff gathered from other international bodies (between 80 and 100, each year, most of them from ECLAC); a few experts at the highest level, who are mobilized through inter-agency agreements or agreements with non-member governments (approximately 10 a year); experts who may be associated with the Institute for variable periods of time (six months to three years) from international bodies, non-member governments or national bodies; and, finally,

counterpart staff recruited from national projects (for advisory services, training or research), who work with ILPES in the field.^{12/}

15. This diversified staff totals over 200 professionals a year, which is some indication of an impressive overall technical working capacity.^{13/} Nevertheless, the core technical staff at Headquarters is the most important factor. At recent intergovernmental meetings (Technical Committee and Technical Subcommittee meetings), it has been unanimously recognized that there is need to halt the outflow of technical resources which has affected the Institute in recent years and is reflected in the reduced size and lack of "seniority" of its technical staff (see table 3). The only way to do this, however, is by taking a decision as to the amount (sufficiently large) the regular resources needed to finance the Institute's current activities.

^{12/} In the case of training, the member governments usually provide between three and six local teachers for each professional assigned by the Institute, **thereby participating in a very effective and low-budget form of co-operation.**

^{13/} This number of professionals does not refer to man-years --three are people working under contract or recruited for the short term (one or two weeks) along with others who have longer contracts (two or three years or

16. This point concerns a final indicator of size: that relating to the **volume of financial resources** available to the Institute on a year-to-year basis. The "New Institutional Project", envisaged stabilizing it during the period between 1987 and 1990 at a level of US\$ 4.5 million per year, the minimum necessary to maintain the level that had originally been envisaged.14/

B. "Stabilizing the regular budget": lack of consensus?

17. It may be recalled that, from the outset, the financial bases of the "New Institutional Project", were established with a view to **stabilizing the regular budget of ILPES** (See table 4). This was to be achieved through two main sources of finance: the regular budget of the United Nations (items under the so-called "100 Series") and direct contributions from member governments.15/

14/ Various deflationary factors determined this level of US\$ 4.5 million annually over the next four-year period, although it may be slightly less --in real terms-- than the original level set in May 1983. The annual levels from 1987 onwards were unanimously approved in previous meetings (see, in particular, document ST-VIII/4, VIII Technical Subcommittee, Bogota, January 1986, paragraph 23, p. 13 and Doc. E.IX.6, Lima/December 1986, paragraph 16). In fact, **the principal limit refers to the "regular budget"** as indicated below.

15/ Since January 1987, **UNDP contributions have been directed to the financing of special projects** (see the documents referred to in footnote 14/ above). The new Principal Project (document NTI/F.3, Section D.1)

18. The total budget level, unanimously adopted in the "New Institutional Project" (US\$ 4.5 million annually for the three-year period 1987-1990), requires considerable effort by the Institute to procure additional resources by its own means in order to make up the necessary financing. However, although it had been fully and unanimously agreed as far back as May 1983 (V Technical Committee, Buenos Aires) **that regular expenditure should not remain dependent on non-regular resources;^{16/}** and that it was therefore "necessary to reduce the dependency of the basic functioning of ILPES on resources obtained from special and occasional services", this has not been put into effect. The Institute's accounting still has some very curious features: the expenditure column has a strong stable component while the receipts column is largely characterized by constantly changing figures. This affects the proper organization of its own internal activities: in fact, expenditure is reprogrammed upon receipt of each new inflow of income.
19. In this regard two principal arguments were advanced to justify an adequate regular budget:

^{16/} The natural limitation of the Institute to generate its own resources was also recognized; this is due in part to the many restrictions on the use of resources provided by the United Nations system (permanent staff or UNDP) or under special agreements and projects. **Government contributions were considered to be irreplaceable (together with the reconstitution of its own minimum reserves).** These two sources are currently still the only ones available to meet various types of expenditure, (including expenditure incurred in recruiting personnel whose salaries are met from other United Nations sources) and to undertake most operational activities. On the other hand, such deficiencies, which could probably be rectified by short-term

- firstly, that the duration of the contracts and the technical skills of the professional staff assigned to such "special project" as are undertaken (arrangements between the Institute and member governments) **are inappropriate to the needs of the permanent central staff; and**
- secondly, that the resources generated from "special projects" are **always insufficient to finance the central staff.**^{17/}

20. It was therefore with a view to regularizing the budgeted income of the Institute that this very Forum **unanimously provided for a larger fixed contribution from member governments, jointly distributed among all governments without disproportionate contributions from a few.** In no case-- however acute the external or internal resource crisis of the country-- is this small payment to the Institute such as to have any significance in macroeconomic or macrofinancial terms, neither as a percentage of contributions to international organizations nor even less so as a percentage of aggregate public expenditure.

^{17/} In fact, out of the 13% of the maximum overhead covered by the United Nations, the Institute receives 66%, 34%, or nothing at all, as the case may be, since it must be transferred to the ECLAC system. **The remaining resources procured by the Institute are usually much lower than the real cost of technical or administrative backstopping,** which each project requires from its headquarters in Santiago. In fact, in the "Conceptual Dictionary" of financial flows, "overhead" does not have the same meaning as "grant"; at best it would be similar to a "credit supplier"; it is commonly used with the same meaning as "reimbursement". On the other hand, in the United Nations, "overheads" are only credited subsequent to the effecting of the expenditure to which it corresponds in theory (in other words, although

21. There is no simple answer to the question that serves as the title: **"Regularizing the budget: lack of consensus?"**. While we welcome the increase in direct government contributions (which approached one million dollars in 1986, see table 5), we must at the same time note that only a small number of countries have ratified the agreement adopted in May 1983 (V Technical Committee) and have fully implemented it (see tables 6 and 7). The Institute is very grateful to all those countries and is forced to renew its appeal to the other countries to re-evaluate their financial situation on the basis of the information presented hereafter, and to adopt positions that are more favourable than those hitherto adopted.

C. Basis and characteristics of the 1987/1990 financial proposal

22. As is well-known, 1982 was adopted as the base year in redefining the "size" of ILPES as far as the uses and sources of funds are concerned; the overall budget was then US\$ 4 483 300 and the "regular" budget US\$ 2 032 900; consequently, they were similar in nominal terms to those proposed for 1987. **Any increase in "size" would be unsuited to the period of austerity which the region is living through and any smaller size would require increased direct support from the governments.** In other words, the Institute would be so limited in size that it would be unable to obtain, by its own means, sufficient additional resources for its upkeep. Whatever the case, in order to maintain the regular budget at this level (1982) a new source of funding was necessary, since UNDP was to withdraw its direct institutional support

23. As part of the New Institutional Project, the number of "basic technical staff" was set at approximately 30 professionals (a minimum of 25 international personnel and the remainder local staff); the number finally adopted was 34, including a small quota of "non-permanent contracts" which were nonetheless continuous, at headquarters. Together with the administrative staff, the total number would be approximately 50 (see table 3).

24. During the 1984-1986 period —despite the fact that a certain amount of "regular" funding was still available from UNDP, (see table 4)— the Institute was obliged to operate with a 31% lower average annual level of resources for the regular budget; it also possessed 25% fewer technical staff and spent 38% less on operating expenditure. These circumstances are in clear contrast with the Institute's technical achievements (see document NTI/F.VII.3/A); however, this possibility has been exhausted: it was based on the "consumption" of reserves and brutal cutbacks in essential expenditure.

25. The following minimum guidelines for the coming four-year period have been established (Ninth Technical Subcommittee, Lima, Peru, November 1986):

- i) To maintain the principles underlying the NIP (see paragraph 4);
- ii) To adopt the period 1987-1990 as the basis for the new programme;
- iii) To stabilize within the previously adopted limits (NIP/1984-1986) the size of the basic technical staff and the budgetary

- iv) To re-define the internal relationship between ILPES and ECLAC, and request that the latter maintain its policy of refunding to the Institute the "overheads" charged on the direct government contributions;
- v) To enter contributions from the Principal Project or from other agreements with UNDP as items under "specific projects" which are consequently outside the regular budget;
- vi) Recommend that expenditure on the Principal UNDP/ILPES Project (within the provisions of the relevant budget) would only concern institutional operations whose total cost did not exceed ILPES' own maximum contribution to the project, in the form of costs shared in cash.

In accordance with the mandates then given, the Institute examined these guidelines one by one and drew up the set of proposals presented below.

26. **Maintenance of the principles of the MIP** (paragraph 25, item 1). These guidelines should be interpreted in two ways: firstly they confirm the three "principles" mentioned above (paragraph 4); secondly, they update the tripartite "agreement" implicit in the financial proposal; i.e., the combination of funds from the United Nations, from member Governments and others carried by the Institute itself.

1. "Austerity" - Maintenance of the policy pursued since 1982.¹⁸ In line with this a Regular Budget 15% lower than at the time is being proposed; consequently, it is 15% lower than that in the first version of the New Institutional Project (May 1983); US\$ 2 050 000 per year during 1987/1990 (table 5, line A, Column I).
2. "Tripartite funding" - The proposal provides for a contribution of 11% by the United Nations¹⁹, 33% by governments and 56% in the form of other funds obtained by the Institute outside the regular budget (percentages in respect of the Overall Budget). The first version of the NIP provided for 20%, 40% and 40% respectively. The overall government contribution --maintained in nominal terms at the level of US\$ 1 500 000 per year (see table 6, Column I)-- would provide the Institute with lower gross income (see table 7, Column I) 11% in real terms, than the figure given in the initial version of the NIP (May, 1983).
3. "Counterpart contributions". A further principle involves acknowledging that the contributions by member governments (while they are officially considered to be "voluntary"), constitute a regular source of financing for the Institute's "multilateral activities" (see paragraph 4). In this respect, the following propositions are put forward:

¹⁸ Some examples of austerity follow: the Institute occupies modest premises, the area of which has been reduced by half over the last 15 years in the ECLAC building; its lecture rooms are not in keeping with the status of its alumni; it possesses only one vehicle for transport and has never received "representation expenses". The reduction in the duration of the Forums (the conference has been shortened from 15 days to 3 or 4 the sub-committee from 6 days to 2) also represented an austerity measure. The same austerity policy has in recent year led to the adoption of more economical means of recruiting personnel, and has even involved the replacement of "fixed-term" contracts by tightly controlled "special services", although this measure does not contribute to the maintenance of a reliable and stable technical staff. Similarly, over the coming four years, sub-contracting of specific tasks with governmental or non-governmental bodies should be adopted, within the norms allowed by the United Nations. Steps forward in this field would make it possible to advance in the use of "centres of excellence" which exist in the countries themselves.

- 3.1. To establish a **new inter-governmental agreement** based on the proposed distribution (table 7, Column I);
- 3.2. To retain **31 March and 30 June as the two deadlines for payment each year**; (in accordance with the unanimous agreement reached at the last two meetings);²⁰
- 3.3. The contributing member Governments should make an effort to **"regularize" from a legal and procedural angle, the formalities for the payment of its contribution to the Institute;**²¹
- 3.4. To maintain the **possibility of one payment or the other being made in national currency**, but to abolish part-payments of each annual contribution; in other words, each contribution should be made once a year (as far as exchange losses are concerned, see table 6, Column H);
- 3.5. To agree, on a **case-by-case basis, the most suitable means for countries to make their payments**, endeavouring to ensure that the Institute actually receives the contribution as rapidly as possible.²²

²⁰ Within the ILPES Institutional Project for 1987/1990, **government contributions are linked to expenditure in the year itself**; should contributions be made in the second semester or even later, this in particular upsets the hiring of personnel (see table 3, Column J). Moreover, it is well-known that a new procedure has been introduced to United Nations: "expenditure can only be made once the relevant funds have been received as cash in hand".

²¹ On average 9 formal bills were issued for each contribution made in 1986 (although it is true that some contributions were made without it having been necessary to request them). This is a disquieting feature for both sides in the relations between the Institute and its member Governments; moreover, it consumes a considerable amount of the time of authorities or professionals who are involved in these steps on both sides.

²² In 1986 delays of up to 90 days were recorded between the moment when the contribution was paid by a national body (the NPB, Ministry of Foreign Relations or Ministry of the Budget) and its actual payment to the

27. **Four-year programming** (paragraph 25, item ii). This in fact represents one of the initial "principles" of the New Institutional Project (paragraph 4), drawn up in 1983. As the project is now being renewed, this implies the following:

4. The development of the New Institutional Plan for the 1987-1990 period, in accordance with the terms set out above and stabilize at an annual figure of approximately US\$ 4 500.000. ²³ This proposal involves:

4.1. Updating the schedule of the project's dates in accordance with the timetable of the Institute's supervisory Forums (Technical Committee and Sub-committee), held during the four-year period;

4.2. Revise the inter-governmental agreement relating to the Project up to 1990, with a view to the 1991-1994 four-year period.

5. Repercussions of this programming for member Governments. The commitments in respect of funding agreed upon as part of this proposal would need to be established, by each member government, on the basis of a **minimum deadline corresponding to the same four-year period.**

28. **Maintenance of limits on size** (paragraph 25, item ii). In this respect, the characteristics of this proposal have already been set out. To sum up, their implications are twofold:

6. Confirmation of the consensus as to the need for a stable minimum basic staff, with implications of a quantitative nature and for "professional seniority" (see Columns D, H and J and lines L6/D1, L5/P5 and L4/P4, in table 3, which compare 1982 with the present);²⁴
 7. Stabilize the size of the Institution on the basis of its regular budget, since the overall budget may vary (favourably or not) depending on the existence of contracts for new services or the establishment of agreements with non-member countries, without there being in either case any change in the commitments to contributions by member Governments.
29. **Relations between ILPES and ECLAC** (paragraph 25, item iv). In addition to the point mentioned at the previous Forum (Lima, December 1986), subsequent events linked to the United Nations financial position in 1987 (and to its prospects for 1988) make it advisable to consider the following further suggestions:
8. Refund of "overheads" on contributions. In addition to renewing the commitments to **refund 13% of government contributions received by the Institute** under the heading of "overhead" for the coming four-year period, it would be highly desirable to review the system of refunding, as the present system has an unfavourable impact upon the Institute's liquidity (see the end of note 17).
 9. Restore the quota of funds associated with permanent posts. For more than 10 years, since the General Assembly approved the creation of 16 permanent United Nations posts for ILPES (including the "frozen" post), the small quota of funds linked to these posts for "expenditure by experts" (travel, per-diem expenses, etc.), has never been paid to the Institute, and has been to the direct benefit of other units within the System. Although the sums involved are not large, it would be desirable if, in the future, **the Institute could be guaranteed access to them funds;**

24 This will depend on how the internal affairs of the United Nations

10. Complement the support provided by the Executive Secretariat with regard to personnel. In view of the internal crisis affecting the United Nations, the highly significant support received by ILPES from the Executive Secretary of ECLAC could be complemented in several ways with regard to: i) the improvement of internal conditions to allow the Institute to carry out its role as "executing body" for those projects in which it has been so designated; ii) more expeditious treatment of internal administrative matters, in particular in so far as personnel are concerned; iii) due consideration should be given by the administrative sectors of ECLAC to the specific nature of the Institute as an inter-governmental agency, directly and regularly maintained by member Governments; iv) the provision of facilities to strengthen the Institute's technical and administrative staff by means of "reassignments".

30. **Relations between ILPES and UNDP** (paragraph 25, items v and vi). Finally, this is a suitable point to stress the quality of the support provided by the UNDP Liaison Unit with ECLAC/ILPES (which to a large part involves direct collaboration by the Operations Division). It will be vital to maintain these contacts on a continuous and flexible basis in order to implement this proposal, in so far as UNDP is concerned. The following propositions are made in this respect:

11. Consider the financial support from UNDP to be exclusively for the purpose of "specific projects"; and, as a temporary measure, to only support any institutional expenditure up to a maximum of the Institute's financial contribution to joint projects (transferred to UNDP in the form of "cost sharing" in cash). These propositions were already approved in Lima;

12. Encourage UNDP to envisage other projects with the Institute, of

31. **Relations between ILPES and other International Organizations and between ILPES and non-member Governments.** Further to the principles laid down in Lima (December 1983, summarized in paragraph 25) it would be necessary to add two further proposals, which to a certain extent reflect previous Resolutions taken by both ILPES's Forums:

13. Support from International Organizations, particularly in the financial field: **if medium-term agreements** (three to four years) relating to joint inter-institutional and multilateral co-operation were signed with ILPES this would have a strong stabilizing effect, with regard to the budgetary problem which is the subject of this document. These would make it possible to mobilize technical personnel to strengthen the Institute's basic staff, either at its headquarters or in decentralized units.
 14. Moreover, the progress made in co-operation with non-member Governments, depends almost exclusively on initiatives taken by the Institute itself: in this respect too, it is suggested that this Forum provide greater support, **by encouraging other governments to sign pluri-annual agreements making it possible to strengthen ILPES' capacity to provide services** in areas of multilateral interest in Latin America and the Caribbean.
32. On the basis of these principles, this proposed financial programme, a summary of which is provided in table 5 (with greater details in tables 8 and 9) has been drawn up. As is now traditional, the presentation made by the Director General of the Institute before the Seventh Technical Committee will provide details of these suggestions, in response to any request for further information made by member Governments.

Table 1
 ILPES: SCHEDULE OF COLLECTIVE DELIBERATION BODIES
 A. SCOOPALC / Conferences of Ministers and Heads of Planning

City	Country	Date	Chairmanship
ce - Caracas	- VENEZUELA	13-16 April 1977	- Venezuela 1977-1978
ce - Lima	- PERU	15-18 November 1978	- Peru 1978-1980
ce - Guatemala	- GUATEMALA	26-29 November 1980	- Guatemala 1980-1983
ce - Buenos Aires	- ARGENTINA	9-10 May 1983	- Argentina 1983-1985
ce - Mexico City	- MEXICO	15-17 April 1985	- México 1985-1987
ce - Havana	- CUBA	23-26 March 1987	- (Ad-hoc) 1987-1989
ce - (To be defined on 1987)	- (Idem)	(1º trimestre) 1989 <u>a/</u>	- (Ad-hoc) 1989-1991

B. ILPES / Technical Committee and Subcommittee

City	Country	Date	Committee	City	Country	Date
-	-	-	I	-Port of Spain	-TRINIDAD & TOBAGO	7 May 1975
-Contadora Island	-PANAMA	2 November 1975	-	-	-	-
-Bogota	-COLOMBIA	12 September 1976	II	-Caracas	-VENEZUELA	15 April 1977
-Panama	-PANAMA	21-22 April 1978	III	-Lima	-PERU	16 Nov. 1978
-Santiago	-CHILE	14-15 February 1980	IV	-Guatemala	-GUATEMALA	29 Nov. 1980
-San Jose	-COSTA RICA	29-30 November 1982	V	-Buenos Aires	-ARGENTINA	10 May 1983
-Mexico City	-MEXICO	28-29 November 1983	VI	-Mexico City	-MEXICO	16 April 1985
-Brasilia	-BRAZIL	3-4 November 1984	VII	-Havana	-CUBA	24 March 1987
-Bogota	-COLOMBIA	20-21 January 1986	VIII	-(to define)	-(to define)	(I Trim) 1989 <u>a/</u>
-Lima	-PERU	1-2 December 1986	-	-	-	-
-Caracas	-VENEZUELA	March 1988 <u>a/</u>				

to be confirmed. Some suggestions have been registered in order to change Conferences to a regime of ordinary sessions every 4
 ling to 9 the number of countries in the Technical Subcommittee and creating in it an stable subregional representation.

Table 2

ILPES: SUMMARY OF MAIN SOURCES OF FINANCING

Order	Period	Main sources of regular financing	Percentage share in total (average)
A	1962-1973 <u>a/</u>	United Nations Special Fund, UNDP and IDB <u>b/</u>	97
B	1974-1976	UNDP <u>c/</u>	96
C	1977-1983	UNDP and the United Nations <u>d/</u>	90
D	1984-1986 <u>e/</u>	Member Governments <u>f/</u> , UNDP and the United Nations	51 <u>g/</u>
E	1987-1990	Member Governments and the United Nations (permanent budget)	44 (proposed)

a/ In the first five years direct contributions from member governments were recorded (less than 3% of the total); these contributions were resumed in 1978 (less than 10% of the total).

b/ The IDB contribution grew in absolute terms between 1962 and 1968 (amounting to between 20% and 25% of the total), falling later until in 1973 it amounted to 7% of the total and ceasing to be a regular component of the Institute's budget in 1974.

c/ During this short period, the Institute was virtually a UNDP project. The technical structure it is proposed to change in 1987 dates from this period.

d/ The General Assembly earmarks 16 permanent ordinary budget posts for ILPES (six of which are intended for technical staff and the rest for administrative staff). The share of these posts in the total ordinary budget of the Institute fluctuated between 25% and 35% in the period under review (representing 28.5% in the period 1984-1986). One professional post (whose costs represents 16.6% of the cost of the permanent staff) has been empty and frozen since 1985.

e/ In April 1983 there was a 33% reduction in the UNDP's budget in respect of ILPES; thus, 1984 began with the new system of financing mentioned in this report.

f/ In May 1983 the New Institutional Project was unanimously adopted at the fifth meeting of the Technical Committee held in Buenos Aires and went into effect the following year thereby strengthening the intergovernmental aspects of the Institutes. The share of government contributions to the total budget was close to 30% in 1985 and 22.5% in 1986.

g/ This is a critical figure and will be difficult to sustain unless the contributions it

Table 3
ILPES: SUMMARY OF ILPES PERSONNEL DATA AT HEADQUARTERS

Category	1982 (January)				Approved "N.I.P."a/			Situation at 28/2/87			
	U.N. (A)	UNDP (B)	Others (C)	Total (D)	U.N. (E)	O.Rs. (F)	Total (G)	U.N. (H)	UNDP (I)	O.Rs. (J)	Total (K)
Professional Staff	6	7	17	30	6	19	25	5	9	19	33
L.7/D.2	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
L.6/D.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
L.5/P.5	-	5	4	9	-	-	-	2	2	2	6
L.4/P.4	5	-	4	9	-	-	-	3	1	2	6
L.3/P.3	1	2	2	5	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
L.2/P.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	3
L.1/P.1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
S.E.	-	-	5	5	(0)	(0)	(0)	-	5	11	16
Local Technicians	1	3	-	4	1	3	1	1	3	1	5
G.8	1	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	2	-	3
G.7	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	2
G.6	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
S.E. b/	-	-	-	-	(0)	(0)	(0)	-	-	-	-
Technic Personnel	7	10	17	34	6	12	20	6	12	20	38
Administrative Personnel	9	8	1	18	10	9	19	9	2	8	19
G.8	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
G.7	2	-	1	3	-	-	-	2	-	-	2
G.6	6	2	-	8	-	-	-	5	1	1	7
G.5	-	5	-	5	-	-	-	1	1	3	5
G.3	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
S.E. b/	-	-	-	-	(0)	(0)	(0)	-	-	3	3
Total	16	18	17	52	-	-	-	15	14	28	57
Ad-hoc personnel	-	-	-5	-5	-	-	-	-	-1	-20	-21
Central Equipment	16	18	12	47	20c/	24c/	44	15	13	8	36

"New Institutional Project."

S.S. corresponds to two different special situations: contracts "per product" ("special service agreement" in U.N. terminology) or contracts "per projects" ("Short term" or "Special Service") linked to field occasional and activities of personnel acting occasionally and provisionally at Headquarters.

Includes in "E" and excludes in "F" a proposal of extension of U.N. chart, already presented, based on paragraph 10. Resolution 467 (XX) of April 1984 (4 posts).

Obs. Column I includes technicians of a specific project (therefore "non regular").

Table 4

ILPES: EVOLUTION OF CONTRIBUTIONS BY UNDP a/
1962 - 1986

Phase	Period	Estimated (A)	Actual (B)	% of estimate actually received (C =B/A)
I	June 1962/January 1967	3 154.1	2 862.9	90.8
II	June 1967/January 1971	4 537.1	4 315.9	95.1
III	July 1971/June 1974	4 272.7	4 036.3	94.5
IV	July 1974/February 1978	5 072.1	4 211.8	83.0
V	March 1978/December 1979	1 956.0	1 834.3	93.8
VI	January 1980/December 1981	2 536.2	2 425.8	95.6
VII	January 1982/December 1986	<u>3 547.9</u> <u>b/</u>	<u>3 161.7</u>	<u>89.1</u>
	1982	1 032.6	1 049.9	101.7
	1983	926.0	784.5	84.7
	1984	860.8	646.9	75.2
	1985	728.5	360.4	49.5
	1986	-	320.0	100.0

a/ The figures shown for percentages actually received were higher than they should be because, generally speaking the US dollars shown in column B are received when their purchasing power has already dropped from the values shown in column A. The table does not show data for individual country projects which the Institute has carried out in conjunction with the UNDP Division for Country Programmes.

b/ Amount corresponds to original figures shown for project RLA/81/013. In April 1983, UNDP rescheduled its budget for that year and the following two years in the amounts of US\$ 960 000, US\$ 450 000 and US\$ 450 000, respectively. In 1984, it allocated an additional US\$ 200 000, half of which was taken from the 1985 contribution. In 1986, UNDP allocated US\$ 320 000, which represented a substantial reestablishment of resources, still within Phase VII of its support to ILPES. The final figure shown in line VII (89.1%) represents the final balance for the five year period which constitutes phase VII (excluding preparatory assistance project RLA/86/013 which does not belong to phase VII).

Table 5

ILPES: SOURCES AND USE OF FUNDS 1982-1987

(In thousands US\$)

Ref.	Item	1982 Actual (A)	1983 Actual (B)	1984 Actual (C)	1985 Actual (D)	1986 Planned (E)	1986 Actual (F)	NIF/ 1984-1986		1987 Proposal (I)
								Actual (G=C+D+F)	Planned (H)	
I.	TOTAL SOURCES	4,483.3	3,391.1	3,310.8	3,152.9	3,823.6	3,485.4	9,949.1	11,820.0	4,500.0
	A. REGULAR BUDGET	2,032.9	1,571.5	1,970.1	1,765.0	2,350.6	1,569.7	5,304.8	7,653.0	2,050.0
	B. NON REGULAR SOURCES	1,709.6	1,380.0	887.5	954.9	1,152.0	1,485.7	3,328.1	3,278.0	2,000.0
	C. OTHER FUNDS	740.8	439.6	453.2	433.0	321.0	430.0	1,316.2	889.0	450.0
II.	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	4,483.3	3,391.1	3,310.8	3,152.9	3,823.6	3,485.4	9,949.1	11,820.0	4,500.0
	D. REGULAR OPERATIONAL EXPENDITURE	2,976.5	1,790.4	2,018.1	1,720.0	2,100.0	1,772.0	5,510.1	8,538.0	1,750.0
	E. RELATED EXPENDITURES	157.6	125.3	197.4	259.5	225.0	448.1	905.0	426.0	480.0
	F. SPECIFIC PROJECTS	657.1	779.2	578.6	345.0	632.0	705.3	1,628.9	1,472.0	1,300.0
	G. EQUIPMENT	38.6	4.7	32.2	32.1	40.0	36.7	101.0	96.0	50.0
	H. OBLIGATED FUNDS	206.5	130.0	78.1	354.3	654.0	102.7	535.1	832.0	600.0
	I. OTHER EXPENDITURES AND/OR COMMITMENTS	157.4	264.9	130.0	228.0	160.0	217.2	575.2	-	120.0
	J. TRANSFER TO FOLLOWING YEAR	289.6	296.6	276.4	214.0	12.6	203.4	693.8	456.0	200.0

COLUMNS

TABLE 6

ILPES: FINAL BALANCE OF CONTRIBUTIONS PHASE 1984-1986

(In thousands US\$)

COB.	RELATIVE POSITIONS (%)			CONTRIBUTIONS: ABSOLUTE/RELATIVE			NET	ESTIMATED 1987
	Accorded	Adopted	Payments	Adopted	Payments	Percentage	INCOMES TO ILPES Triennium	
(A)	(B)	(C)	(D)	(E)	(F)	(G)=(F)/(E)	(H)	(I)
(7)	22.16	22.41	25.8	855.0	640.0	74.9	558.9	285.0
(3)	5.71	6.58	5.7	240.0	140.0	58.3	128.7	80.0
(17)	8.94	11.31	0.07	810.0	1.8	0.2	1.6	270.0 (a)
(10)	63.19	59.70	68.4	2595.0	1695.4	65.3	1371.7	865.0
(37)	100.00	100.00	100.00	4500.0	2477.2	55.0 (b)	2060.9	1500.0

(E)- According to the original version of the New Institutional Plan (Buenos Aires, May 1983).

(F)- As of 28 February 1987 (includes a contribution under negotiation).

(H)- Represents the figure in column (F) minus exchange rate losses and overhead.

(I)- Treble the amount shown in (E). For the figure for the for year period 1987-1990, multiply by four.

(a)- Should be replaced by direct support from some economic co-operation body generating a regular income in an equivalent amount.

(b)- Falls to 45.8% in terms of net income.

(I/EWUCE)

Table 7

ILPES: FINAL BALANCE OF CONTRIBUTIONS OF PHASE 1984-1986

(In thousands of US\$)

COD.	RELATIVE POSITIONS (%)			CONTRIBUTIONS: RELATIVES & ABS.			NET	PLANNED
	Accorded (B)	Adopted (C)	Payments (D)	Adopted (E)	Payments (F)	Percentage (G)=(F)/(E)	Triennium (H)	1987 (I)
A01	12.87	14.80	21.0	540.0	540.0	100.0	470.4	180.0
A02	1.79	2.06	1.2	75.0	30.0	40.0	26.5	25.0
A03	1.07	0.62	0.6	30.0	15.0	50.0	13.3	10.0
A04	1.07	0.41	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
A05	1.07	0.41	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
A06	1.43	0.82	0.4	30.0	10.0	33.3	8.9	10.0
A07	2.86	3.29	1.8	120.0	45.0	37.5	39.8	40.0
B08	2.50	2.88	4.2	105.0	105.0	100.0	96.4	35.0
B09	0.71	0.82	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
B10	2.50	2.88	1.4	105.0	35.0	33.3	32.3	35.0
C11	0.36	0.41	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
C12	0.36	0.41	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
C13	0.36	0.41	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
C14	0.71	0.82	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
C15	0.36	0.41	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
C16	0.36	0.62	0.1	30.0	1.8	6.0	1.6	10.0
C17	0.71	0.82	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
C18	1.07	1.23	0.0	90.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.0
C19	0.36	0.41	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
C20	0.36	0.41	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
C21	0.36	0.41	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
C22	0.71	0.82	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
C23	2.14	2.47	0.0	180.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0
C24	0.36	0.42	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
C25	-	0.42	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
C26	-	0.41	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
C27	0.36	0.41	0.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0
D28	10.71	10.28	13.5	450.0	333.3	74.1	295.0	150.0
D29	5.71	4.19	3.5	240.0	87.1	36.3	74.2	80.0
D30	2.50	2.88	4.2	105.0	105.0	100.0	77.1	35.0
D31	4.29	2.47	0.0	180.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	60.0
D32	1.42	1.64	0.0	120.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0
D33	5.71	4.93	4.8	240.0	120.0	50.0	106.2	80.0
D34	10.71	12.34	15.7	450.0	390.0	86.7	240.0	150.0
D35	2.86	3.29	2.0	120.0	50.0	41.7	44.2	40.0
D36	2.14	1.23	0.2	90.0	6.1	6.8	5.4	30.0

Table B

ILPES: SOURCES OF FUNDS 1982-1986 (a)

(In thousands of US\$)

Cod.	Ref/Item	1982 Actual (A)	1983 Actual (B)	1984 Actual (C)	1985 Actual (D)	1986 Budget (E)	1986 Actual (F)	1984-1986 Actual (G=C+D+F)
	A. REGULAR BUDGET	2,032.9	1,571.5	1,970.1	1,765.0	2,350.6	1,569.7	5,304.8
15100	A.1 Permanent Posts U.N.	729.2	569.2	585.0	465.9	530.6	463.7	1,514.6
16100	A.2 VII Phase Income/UNDP	1,130.4	800.0	646.9	361.1	320.0	320.0	1,328.0
15200	A.3 Contributions from member countries	173.3	202.3	738.2	938.0	1,500.0	786.0 (b)	2,462.2
	B. NON REGULAR SOURCES	1,709.6	1,380.0	887.5	954.9	1,152.0	1,485.7	3,328.1
16200	B.1 UNDP Support to ILPES Project	-	-	15.7	37.6	50.0	125.5 (c)	178.8
16300	B.2 Financing other projects	1,251.4	1,151.5	467.2	575.3	630.0	1,136.6 (d)	2,179.1
16400								
16600	B.3 Bilateral Agreements	276.3	68.5	226.6	175.1	180.0	0.0 (e)	401.7
16500	B.4 Agreements with non-member countries	181.9	160.0	178.0	166.9	150.0	208.6 (f)	553.5
17320	B.5 Differed Incomes (g)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	142.0	15.0	15.0
	C. OTHER RESOURCES	740.8	439.6	453.2	433.0	321.0	430.0 (h)	1,316.2
17100	C.1 Own resources in the year	198.9	150.0	156.6	156.6	170.0	216.0	529.2
17200								
19100	C.2 Balance from previous year	541.9	289.6	296.6	276.4	151.0	214.0	787.0
I.	TOTAL FUNDS (GENERAL=A+B+C)	4,483.3	3,391.1	3,310.8	3,152.9	3,823.6	3,485.4	9,949.1
	- B.2 Financing other projects	(1,251.4)	(1,151.5)	(467.2)	(575.3)	(630.0)	(1,136.6)	(2,179.1)

Table 9

ILPES: USE OF FUNDS 1982-1986

(In thousands of US\$)

Cod.	Ref/Item	1982 Actual (A)	1983 Actual (B)	1984 Actual (C)	1985 Actual (D)	1986 Planned (E)	1986 Actual (F)	1984-1986 Actual (G=C+D+F)
	D. REGULAR OPERATING EXPENDITURE	2,976.5	1,790.4	2,018.1	1,720.0	2,100.0	1,772.0	5,510.1
1100	D.1 Staff	2,312.6	1,323.9	1,532.0	1,283.0	1,450.0	1,304.2	4,119.2
1200	D.2 Fellowships	327.5	117.1	238.5	125.4	260.0	192.7	556.6
1300	D.3 Travel	169.0	243.6	149.8	142.9	180.0	152.0	444.7
1400	D.4 Miscellaneous	167.4	105.8	97.8	168.7	170.0	85.5 (i)	352.0
1700	D.5 Publications	-	-	0.0	0.0	40.0	3.9	3.9
1800	D.6 Meetings and Seminars	-	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.7	33.7
	E. RELATED EXPENDITURES	157.6	125.3	197.4	259.5	225.0	448.1	905.0
13200	E.1 Obligatory transfers	157.6	125.3	182.1	179.1	200.0	395.4 (j)	756.6
13300								
1620	E.2 Foreign exchange losses from contributions	-	-	15.3	80.4	25.0	52.7 (k)	148.4
	F. SPECIFIC PROJECTS	657.1	779.2	578.6	345.0	632.0	705.3 (l)	1,628.9
2100	G. EQUIPMENT	38.6	4.7	32.2	32.1	40.0	36.7	101.0
2200								
2300								
	H. OBLIGATED FUNDS	206.5	130.0	78.1	354.3	654.0	102.7	535.1
4300	H.1 Project commitments	206.5	130.0	29.2	53.3	130.0	20.0	102.5
	H.2 Other commitments	-	-	48.9	178.0	226.0	70.8 (m)	297.7
4100	H.3 Reserves and contingencies	-	-	0.0	123.0	298.0	11.9 (n)	134.9
	I. OTHER EXPENDITURES AND/OR COMMITMENTS	157.4	264.9	130.0	228.0	160.0	217.2 (o)	575.2
4400	J. TRANSFER TO FOLLOWING YEAR	289.6	296.6	276.4	214.0	12.6	203.4 (p)	693.8
	II. TOTAL USES (GENERAL=D+...+J)	4,483.3	3,391.1	3,310.8	3,152.9	3,823.6	3,485.4	9,949.1
	- F. SPECIFIC PROJECTS	(657.1)	(779.2)	(578.6)	(345.0)	(632.0)	(705.3)	(1,628.9)
	III. TOTAL USES (ADJUSTED)	3,826.2	2,611.9	2,732.2	2,807.9	3,191.6	2,780.1	8,320.2

CONTINUATION OF NOTES RELATING TO TABLES 8 AND 9

- a/ See last entry in table 8.
- b/ These figures correspond to the situation on 28 February 1987 and also include a contribution in the amount of US\$ 150 000 which has still not been received by ILPES. The figures for 1984 were corrected to include contributions received as of 31 December 1985, and the figures for 1985 include the contributions received during 1986.
- c/ Includes US\$ 100 600 relating to Project RLA/86/013/A/01/52 carried out at ILPES headquarters.
- d/ Includes US\$ 88 700 relating to projects conducted in conjunction with the Department of Technical Cooperation for Development, most of which are supported by the Division for Country Programmes of the UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean.
- e/ In 1986 the Institute received no assistance from associate experts; contributions in kind from other institutions are not itemized in this table of financial sources.
- f/ Includes agreements with France and the Netherlands.
- g/ Corresponds to balances of US\$ 15 000 for 1984 entered in 1986.
- h/ Represent a reduction of US\$ 300 000 in four years; also caused by the non-realization of some of the regular contributions envisaged.
- i/ Up to 1985 this line included the information entered in lines D.5 and D.6 (publications, meetings and seminars).
- j/ This amount includes US\$ 225 000 transferred to CEPAL as overhead, US\$ 21,300 transferred to CLADES (in the form of staff seconded to INFOPLAN) and US\$ 143 500 representing an ILPES contribution to project RLA/86/029/A/01/52.
- k/ Due to payments in local currency of portions of government contributions set in US dollars; the Institute covers differences due to the cost of reconversion (see tables 6 and 7).
- l/ This amount exceeds the previous estimates reflected in column E due to the effort made by ILPES to attract more resources as specific financing (see lines B.1, B.2 and B.4 in "sources"; or compare columns E and F in table 8). On the whole, these "sources" exceed the initial estimate for 1986 by over 80%. Please note that some of the expenditure noted in column F relates to entries made in line D (table 9).
- m/ Corresponds to overhead in own resources still not spent (see note 17).
- n/ The financial reserves, with the exception of the amount noted in column J of table 9 have virtually been depleted. This figure relates to a mandatory reserve in connection with labour liabilities.
- o/ Left over from various project accounts; represent payments due to be made in the future.
- p/ This figure actually represents the liquid balance transferred on 31 December 1986. In 1982 it amounted to 7% of the total used; at the end of 1986 it dropped to 5.8% of that total; thus it may be considered to be another critical figure relating to the present financial situation in that, ideally, it should amount to about 15% of the total spent.