

NACIONES UNIDAS



CEPAL

ILPES

INSTITUTO
LATINOAMERICANO DE
PLANIFICACION
ECONOMICA Y
SOCIAL

INST/106

Original: Spanish

May 1978

THIRD MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL SUB-COMMITTEE OF
THE LATIN AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMIC AND
SOCIAL PLANNING (ILPES)

Panama City, 21-22 April 1978

78-5-836

The Technical Sub-Committee of the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) met in Panama city on 21 and 22 April 1978. It was attended by the members of the Sub-Committee itself and the delegations of the members countries of the Technical Committee listed in Annex 1.

The meeting was opened by the Minister of Planning and Economic Policy of the Republic of Panama, Dr. Nicolás Ardito Barletta, who welcomed the participants and expressed his country's satisfaction at being able to welcome them at a moment of tremendous importance in the history of the Republic of Panama and Latin America, i.e., that of the adoption of the Treaties on the Panama Canal, which was largely due to the support and solidarity of the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. He went on to propose the agenda of the meeting, which appears in Annex 2.

Dr. Ardito Barletta then discussed the situation of transition through which ILPES had passed and said that the Institute could be of great help in serving as a catalytic centre for national experiences, since the countries had made great progress in development planning. The conditions were thus ripe, fifteen years after the creation of the Institute, for a change in the nature of its functions. He also noted that at the Meeting of Ministers and Heads of Planning in Caracas and at the CEPAL session in Guatemala city new mandates had been given to ILPES to support mutual co-operation among planning bodies.

Next, Mr. Enrique V. Iglesias, Executive Secretary of CEPAL, announced that he would present a general introduction to the ILPES Work Programme. Before doing so, however, he expressed his satisfaction at being in Panama, especially as his visit coincided with a historic week for the country, for Latin America and for hemisphere relations, and referred to the personal efforts of Dr. Ardito Barletta in connexion with the treaties, which

/merited the

merited the gratitude of all Latin Americans. Finally, he thanked all the Ministers and Heads of Planning, members of the Technical Committee of ILPES, and Mr. Gabriel Valdés for their presence at the meeting.

He said that ILPES was passing through a period of transition in order to implement the new ideas brought up in the Caracas meeting, which should be given more specific form at the present meeting so as to result in more precise instructions. The Work Programme presented for consideration by the meeting should be viewed as a basis for discussion. The meeting should also examine Phase Five of the UNDP Project for supporting ILPES' activities and consider the Second Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning to be held in Lima.

He recalled that in the past financial instability and the consequent reduction in staff had weighed against ILPES. However, what was important was the future and the need to face up to the new realities of Latin America. Planning had changed because of the accumulation of more experience, the more generalized acceptance of planning, and the way in which the growing importance of operational and pragmatic aspects was increasingly highlighted. The level of excellence which economic policy had reached in Latin America was very high, especially from the information point of view. He went on to say that the planning bodies had to face up to two major facts: one was instability as a dominating factor, and the other the multiplicity of objectives. The first of these made it necessary to improve the planning bodies and make them more flexible. Everything connected with the prevailing international economic situation would be of decisive importance. The fixed scenarios of the past had been replaced by changing and unpredictable circumstances. The multiplicity of objectives was manifested in the new topics and variables involved in planning, such as human settlements, technology, the environment and the problems of a better distribution of the benefits of development.

/Basically, the

Basically, the Work Programme attempted to give flexibility to ILPES' resources and was based on very considerable support from CEPAL, which in its turn had considerably expanded its activities. The most reasonable course was to use those resources jointly and place them at the service of governments through ILPES, which should maintain its own identity despite its close links with CEPAL.

Mr. Gabriel Valdés, Assistant Administrator of UNDP and Regional Director for Latin America, began by paying tribute to the Republic of Panama. UNDP considered that there was a growing need to integrate regional programmes, among which that of ILPES was the most important, with national programmes. It should be recalled that the resources assigned by the international community to Latin America had been reduced by half, in real terms, over the last four years, and this made it necessary to combine regional and national resources as far as possible. He considered that it had become essential to incorporate social aspects in economic policies, and it should not be forgotten that ILPES' objective was economic and social planning. The myth of pure economics should be left behind and concern should be for both development and social participation. The structure of the State and planning were also vital aspects of the problems. ILPES should contribute to the evaluation of State policies as a means of helping to improve the operational capacity of the State. The question of the State and public enterprises had acquired very special dimensions and was at the heart of planning problems.

Furthermore, new types of dependence were emerging for Latin America which were decisive in long-term planning, and it was indispensable to make a systematic study of the handling of international problems. He ended by saying that UNDP would continue to support ILPES, and that

/the increasingly

the increasingly close links with CEPAL constituted a very important advance. This was why CEPAL has been made the executing agency both of the project supporting ILPES and of other regional projects. In principle, it would be possible to increase the resources available to ILPES for programmes to which the governments gave high priority.

Following the introductory statements summarized above, discussion was opened on the Work Programme. All the delegations expressed their support of and satisfaction at the signing of the new Treaties on the Panama Canal.

All the delegations took part in the discussions on the Work Programme, thus given rise to a very valuable exchange of opinions full of suggestions and recommendations of great importance which are reproduced below in summary form, since it is impossible to do them justice individually in the present report.

The meeting arrived at conclusions and recommendations on the topics which ILPES should deal with and on the Institute's different activities, the general feeling being that an endeavour should be made to globalize all the activities, that there was a close relationship between them, and that new forms of linking them should be explored, with consequent redefinition of the structure of ILPES.

The meeting noted with satisfaction the statement by the Executive Secretary on the development of new activities by ILPES, and particularly stressed the need to bring the Work Programme into line with the following recommendations:

With regard to training:

It was recommended that national training activities should be strengthened and high priority should be given to the collaboration of ILPES with governments in preparing and delivering national courses. It was considered especially desirable:

/(a) To support

(a) To support national courses by taking part in their design and technical organization, in such aspects as curriculums and study plans;

(b) To provide teachers from ILPES and CEPAL;

(c) To prepare and distribute educational material for general use in the courses, including bibliographies, exercises and case studies;

(d) To encourage the presence of officials from other countries of the region on national courses, as a form of horizontal co-operation.

It was recommended that specialized courses should be organized on new topics of interest to the Ministries and Planning Bodies and that training activities should be carried out in new areas in which the Institute could carry out the task of innovative collaboration with the planning bodies. The following areas were mentioned in particular:

(a) New planning techniques;

(b) Social policies (critical poverty, agricultural policies and social development);

(c) The environment;

(d) Relations between agricultural and industrial development;

(e) Economic integration, and in particular the role of planning in the Caribbean region;

(f) Urban development and the effects of concentration on the quality of life;

(g) Energy development;

(h) Population problems and rural and urban migrations.

It was considered that these activities should take flexible forms and be carried out on the basis of course-seminars, encounters or round tables for highly qualified personnel occupying action posts within the planning bodies.

/As far

As far as the Institute's regular courses are concerned, it was recognized that it would be desirable to maintain them, but they should be designed to serve in particular countries without adequate national infrastructure. In this connexion it was agreed:

- (a) To recommend the widest possible renovation of topics in the courses both in terms of their approach and of the subjects covered;
- (b) To explore and promote the rotation of the courses in different countries of the region;
- (c) To provide the best possible support to the relatively less developed countries through these courses;
- (d) To increase the pragmatic orientation of the courses by introducing the comparative analysis of planning experiences of the countries and inviting persons with planning experience to present the different country cases.

As general observations, it was recommended that:

- (a) The greatest possible flexibility should be ensured in the organization and teaching of the courses in order to allow for their adaptation to the changing conditions of the countries;
- (b) The greatest possible harmonization with national interests should be sought, especially in areas coming within the competence of their governments;
- (c) The courses should be conducted at a high technical level and with strict scientific objectivity;
- (d) Co-ordination with national and international training institutions should be promoted, in order to avoid repetitions and duplications.

Finally, the governments were recommended to bring to the attention of the Institute their points of view on national training needs and priorities in the field of economic and social development and planning,

/in order

in order to enable the Institute to try to formulate a study laying down the needs and levels of human resources in the area under discussion.

Once the results of the study were known, ILPES would promote the formulation of a system of training centres and foster and co-ordinate co-operation among them.

With regard to advisory services:

(a) It was considered of fundamental importance to approach the advisory services as a whole integrated with the other sectors of the Institute's activities, since all of them can obviously have implications for each other. It was also considered that action should be concentrated on specific fields in which the Institute received demands from the countries on account of its wealth of experience;

(b) With regard to advisory services paid for by governments, it was considered that they should be financially projectable and should as far as possible constitute a source of financing for ILPES. This role, however, should be in keeping with the other specific functions as part of an overall flexible approach;

(c) As regards advisory services supplied from the Institute's own resources, it was emphasized that they should be concentrated in areas where the Institute had relative advantages, in particular as a result of past experience or the availability of suitably qualified personnel. In this context mention was made of the potential for co-operation arising out of the experience of ILPES in long-range economic and social development strategies and in regional and agricultural planning;

(d) In order to implement the above recommendations properly, it was considered necessary to hold consultations with the planning bodies of the region so that they could describe their supply of and demand for

/advisory services,

advisory services, specifying the respective fields, in order for ILPES to align them with its own technical and financial resources. Mention was made of the advantages of using horizontal co-operation for ILPES advisory services to governments.

(e) A special recommendation was made that a service should be set up to assist governments in organizing and contracting advisory services in planning;

(f) It was also recommended that, in using the resources which they had decided to allocate to planning within the indicative figure of UNDP, governments should consider the possibility of employing a larger percentage for financing activities of interest to them involving the use of ILPES services, since at the present time, out of the 24 per cent of the UNDP resources in the region allocated to planning, only a small proportion was channelled through the Institute;

(g) As part of the integrated concept described above, mention was made of:

(i) The need to incorporate new areas of activity in ILPES collaboration with governments which should include topics for which ILPES and CEPAL had intellectual installed capacity and which were connected with new or related issues which could thus reach the planning bodies;

(ii) The use of different types of operational methods for this purpose, such as continuing consultations with governments, or the selection of areas of activity by ILPES in consultation with them.

It was agreed that all activities involving advisory services should be channelled through and approved by the national planning bodies.

/With regard

With regard to co-operation and co-ordination among planning bodies it was recommended that:

(a) Discussion should be promoted among planning bodies on their specific experiences in both general and sectoral economic and social matters;

(b) Methodological discussions should be promoted on ways of dealing with new topics within planning bodies (human settlements, the environment, etc.);

(c) The greatest possible dissemination of new studies and research in planning should be promoted by disseminating documents or advance research results;

(d) Horizontal co-operation should continue to be promoted not only among the countries but also among groups of countries;

(e) The fullest information possible should be maintained on the results of the different planning experiences in fields of top priority for the planning bodies;

(f) Support should be given to the planning bodies in obtaining Latin American personnel with high qualifications or with the most advanced knowledge of planning matters, for their technical co-operation requirements in the field of planning;

(g) The concept of horizontal co-operation in planning should be enriched by taking into consideration existing recommendations and those which will emerge from the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Technical Co-operation among Developing Countries, to be held in Buenos Aires.

With regard to research it was recommended that:

(a) Activities in this field should have as their top priority objective the strengthening of the possibilities of innovation in training and advisory services;

/(b) The expansion

(b) The expansion of knowledge of the emerging problems which are beginning to affect the countries of the region and which have been listed in this report should be promoted;

(c) National experiences in planning and State policies should be reviewed and an attempt should be made to establish systematic comparisons in order to assist the planning bodies;

(d) Research should be oriented with a view to obtaining conclusions which will serve for policy recommendations in the planning process;

(e) The possibility of including local experts in the execution of research carried out under horizontal co-operation programmes should be considered.

PHASE FIVE

The Chairman of the Technical Committee invited the Executive Secretary of CEPAL to report on the steps taken in connexion with financing for the Institute following the meetings in Caracas and Guatemala city.

The Executive Secretary began by noting that, for the first time in the Institute's history, the United Nations had approved the financing of six international and ten local posts for ILPES. That was of great importance since it meant that a small permanent nucleus could be maintained.

With regard to UNDP backing, he said that a project providing for an annual contribution of 900.000 dollars had been and was being submitted to the consideration of the countries; Mr. Valdés would report on its present state of progress.

Government contributions had increased substantially, and more than one-third of the resources considered as possible contributions at the Caracas meeting were already available.

In addition to those sources of financing, CEPAL pledged the support of its technical staff in advisory, training and research activities. Furthermore, its regional offices would contribute substantially to better execution of ILPES activities.

He went on to mention the new bilateral resources, highlighting the contributions of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Netherlands and CEPAL's possibilities of obtaining resources from other countries, such as Canada. Briefly, the ILPES budget of around 2 million dollars annually would make it possible to maintain a professional staff of some 22 persons, and with the addition of CEPAL's contribution in expert/months, this could amount to 28 man/years. The local staff would number 20, since a considerable number had been absorbed by CEPAL. The foregoing bore witness to a

/diversification of

diversification of the sources of financing, which notably reduced the vulnerability of the ILPES budget.

The Executive Secretary ended his statement by saying that the unified administration of CEPAL and ILPES would help to make the recommendations of the government for better co-ordination of the activities of both institutions a reality during the present phase. CEPAL had substantial staff of experts and had recently incorporated new activities such as human settlements, the environment and transnational corporations. It would thus, through the operational arm of ILPES, be able to provide governments with contributions which would be useful in view of the new settings developing in planning.

Mr. Gabriel Valdés, Assistant Administrator of UNDP, began by reporting on the implementation of Phase Four. He explained that it was a three-year phase which should have been completed on 30 June 1977, but that in accordance with the mandates of the Caracas and Guatemala city meetings it had been extended to 31 December 1977 and then to 28 February 1978. He went on to say the Phase Four, following UNDP norms, was submitted to an evaluation mission which analysed its results and made important recommendations for planning future activities. In the light of these recommendations and the mandates of the governments expressed at Caracas and Guatemala city, a project was prepared and circulated by UNDP for the approval of the Governments.

To date, the approval of five countries (Bolivia, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Peru and Uruguay), had been received. From the point of view of UNDP procedure, he said, the signatures of three countries were sufficient, but since this was a project of some magnitude and of a regional nature, the backing of a larger number would be important and necessary. In view of the fact that there was support from several governments, UNDP had

/issued an

issued an advance authorization which terminated on 30 April. He said that this was a flexible project, and that during its implementation the governments could modify it, while there might possibly be additional resources to expand some activities in accordance with government requests. He said that it was particularly gratifying that CEPAL would be the Executing Agency of the Project.

Mr. Valdés went on to report that UNDP resources for planning had increased steadily within the indicative planning figures for the countries, and that greater co-ordination would be desirable in the utilization of the resources which UNDP contributed to ILPES as a regional project and to the countries in their national programmes. He explained that the countries could also utilize their national resources for horizontal co-operation.

Mr. Valdés ended by expressing his satisfaction at the effort made to finance ILPES, since during the period 1975-1976 UNDP support had provided 92 per cent of the financing. In the future, two or three-year programmes could be financed, with CEPAL continuing to be the Executing Agency.

Following these statements, a wide ranging exchange of opinions took place among the participants, in which the following points may be highlighted:

(a) Participants manifested their approval of the financing measures taken by the United Nations, UNDP, the member governments and other sources, as well as the activities of the secretariat directed towards the programming and organization of Phase Five;

(b) Gratitude was expressed to UNDP for its financial support to the Institute in this new phase, and it was noted with satisfaction that CEPAL would be the Executing Agency for the Project;

/(c) Participants reiterated

(c) Participants reiterated the advantages of close co-ordination between ILPES and CEPAL activities and noted that unified management would serve to facilitate the co-ordination of both institutions and ensure the necessary technical and substantive support by CEPAL for ILPES.

(d) The delegation of Colombia expressed its concern and hope that these new forms of financing and the new links between CEPAL and ILPES would not deprive the Institute's activities of flexibility. It went on to note that the resources available were not sufficient to cope with the growing demand by the countries for ILPES' services, and that the Director of the Institute should seek alternative sources of financing other than UNDP and CEPAL which would allow ILPES to carry out the larger-scale services requested by the countries and thus contribute to the process of institutionalization of ILPES.

SECOND CONFERENCE OF MINISTERS
AND HEADS OF PLANNING

The Chairman of the Technical Committee of ILPES invited General Jorge Chávez Quelopana, Minister of Planning of Peru, to speak. General Chávez gave a complete report of the work being done by his Government to organize the Second Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America, to be held in Lima, Peru, in the second half of October 1978, and submitted to the Executive Secretary a document prepared by the National Planning Institute (INP) containing the bases for the organization of the meeting.

He went on to submit to the consideration of the members of the Technical Committee of ILPES three alternative lists of topics, detailed below:

Alternative "A"

- Planning and integration
- Planning of human resources
- Planning and international economic crisis
- Technology and planning

Alternative "B"

- Linking-up of long-term, medium-term and operational budgets
- Planning and regional and sub-regional integration
- Facing the economic crisis in the short-term
- Concerting of production in development plans

Alternative "C"

- Linking-up of the long-term, medium-term and short-term implementation of plans
- Planning and integration
- Social development and planning

/- The environment

- The environment and planning
- The short-term

The Minister went on to suggest that the following aspects should also be considered in the organization of the Conference.

Seminar-Workshop on experiences in planning

Contribution of the countries in general and specific achievements.
Exchange of experience: selected statements on the most significant aspects.

Strengthening of ILPES

- Dimensioning of the activities of research, training, advisory services, and co-operation among planning bodies.
- Analysis of the countries' needs and the capacity of ILPES to deal with them.
- Preparation of a new institutional project.

After a wide-ranging exchange of ideas, the Ministers and Heads of Planning agreed that the statement made by the Minister of Planning of Peru represented a very valuable contribution for the organization of the forthcoming Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning and recommended that:

(a) There should be two levels for the exchange of experiences:

- for planning experts
- for Ministers and Heads of Planning;

(b) At the level of planning experts, specific experiences should be dealt with on the basis of documents which should be presented by each planning body as a means of making a continuing evaluation of the progress in and obstacles to planning.

These experiences should be considered fundamentally on the basis of the guidelines for the agenda suggested by the Minister of Planning of Peru, and the exchange should take place in the Seminar-Workshop proposed by the Minister.

/(c) At the

(c) At the ministerial level, the exchange of experiences should deal with the integration of social aspects in planning and the question of development plans vis-à-vis the international economic situation.

(d) The Chairman of the Technical Committee of ILPES and the Minister of Planning of Peru, with the support of CEPAL and ILPES, should hold consultations with the Ministers and Heads of Planning to define more closely the topics and scope of the studies to be prepared and the allocation of responsibilities in their preparation.

(e) At the level of Ministers and Heads of Planning, the Meeting of the Technical Committee of ILPES should be held in accordance with CEPAL resolution 371 (XVII).

At the final working meeting of the Sub-Committee, the Executive Secretary of CEPAL again thanked the Chairman of the Technical Committee of ILPES, Dr. Nicolás Ardito Barletta, for the hospitality and excellent facilities enjoyed in the course of the Meeting and requested him to convey participants' thanks to the officials of the Government of Panama who had co-operated with such dedication.

ANNEX 1

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

ARGENTINA

DUCLER, Luis.

Under-Secretary for Liaison and
Evaluation, Ministry of Planning

VILLAFANE, Alfredo

Adviser to the Under-Secretary

BARBADOS

REID, George

Permanent Secretary to the Ministry
of Planning

BOLIVIA

SANZ GUERRERO, Rolando

Director of General Programming,
Ministry of Planning and Co-ordination

BRAZIL

SOARES SEVERO, Cloraldino

Deputy Superintendent of IPLAN,
Ministry of Planning and General
Co-ordination

CHILE

ENTEICHE, Augusto

Assistant Director, National Planning
Office

COLOMBIA

GARCIA, Jorge

Assistant Chief of National Planning,
National Planning Department

COSTA RICA

SOTO, Claudio

Vice-Minister, Office of Planning
and Economic Policy

CUBA

PLASENCIA, Sergio

Director, Central Planning Board

O'FARRIL, Waldo

Head of Department, Office for
International Economic Affairs

/ECUADOR

ECUADOR

SWETT, Francisco

Chairman, National Board of Planning
and Economic Co-ordination

HONDURAS

GALEANO, Victor David

Director of Global and Regional Planning,
Higher Economic Planning Council

MEXICO

CEBREROS, Alfonso

Under-Secretary for Programming and
Budget, Secretariat for Programming
and Budget

CAMPILLO, Mauricio

Director, Secretariat for Programming
and Budget

RUIZ, Clemente

Adviser to the Secretariat for
Programming and Budget

NICARAGUA

PAIZ MOREIRA, José

Assistant Director, National Planning
Office

PANAMA

ARDITO BARLETTA, Nicolás

Minister of Planning and Economic Policy

GOODIN, Orville

Director of Economic and Social Planning

MORENO, Victoriano

Head of Economic Planning

UREÑA, Abdiel

Secretary for Economic and Social Planning

CANDANEDO, Gabriela

Co-ordinator for International Technical
Co-operation

PERU

CHAVEZ QUELOPANA, Jorge

Minister, National Planning Institute

URUGUAY

CICALESE ZIGNAGHO, Luis W.

Acting Secretary, Secretariat of
Planning, Co-ordination and Dissemination

VENEZUELA

AZPURUA M., Lorenzo

Minister, Central Office for Co-ordination
and Planning, Office of the President of
the Republic

UNITED NATIONS BODIES

UNDP

VALDES, Gabriel

Assistant Administrator and Regional
Director for Latin America

POKORNY, Ivo

Resident Representative in Panama

SECRETARIAT

CEPAL

IGLESIAS, Enrique V.

Executive Secretary of CEPAL and
Acting Director of ILPES

ILPES

DE ANDRADE, Jader

Director, Advisory Services Programme

SOLARI, Aldo

Co-ordinator, Research Programme

SANCHEZ, Rolando

Director, Training Programme

ISRAEL, Jorge

Co-ordinator, Programme of Co-operation
among Planning Bodies

ARBOLEDA, Alfonso

Chief, Administration and Finance
Services

PASCUAL, María Soledad

Principal Secretary, ILPES Administration

ANNEX 2

AGENDA

1. Information on the work carried out by ILPES and analysis of the Draft Work Programme 1978-1979 in the light of the principles laid down by the Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America.
2. Phase Five of support to ILPES.
3. Second Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning, Lima, Peru October 1978.
4. Proposals by members of the Committee.

WORKING DOCUMENTS

- Recommendations adopted at the Caracas meeting
- CEPAL resolution 371 (XVII), adopted at the Guatemala city session
- ILPES document INST/102
- ILPES document INST/105
- Phase Five Project Document

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125