



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

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

**ILPES**

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

---

**E/CEPAL/ILPES/L.11**

REPORT SUBMITTED BY THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE

FIFTH MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE OF ILPES

Buenos Aires, 10 May 1983

83-12-2234



1. The Fifth Meeting of the Technical Committee of ILPES was held in Buenos Aires on 10 May 1983 on the occasion of the Fourth Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America and the Caribbean.
2. The Meeting of the Technical Committee of ILPES was attended by the representatives of 21 member countries, including Ministers and Heads of Planning and other representatives from Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Dominican Republic, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela (see list of participants in annex I). Participants also included the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Assistant Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme.
3. In accordance with the first item on the agenda, the participants elected the new officers of the Technical Committee and the members of the Technical Subcommittee, as follows:

Officers of the Technical Committee

Chairman:	Mexico
First Vice-Chairman:	Brazil
Second Vice-Chairman:	Costa Rica
Rapporteur:	Guatemala
Directors:	Colombia, Cuba and Venezuela

Members of the Technical Subcommittee

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

4. Mr. Carlos Salinas de Gortari, the new Chairman, expressed gratitude for the recognition given to Mexico and then gave the floor to the Director of ILPES.
5. The Director of ILPES began his statement by thanking Mr. Luis King Vanoni, Technical Secretary of the National Development Council

of Ecuador and formerly Vice-Chairman of the Committee and the TEchnical Subcommittee, for the valuable services he performed for ILPES in the accomplishment of his responsibilities.

6. The Director pointed out that after 21 years as an institution, ILPES was encountering serious financial difficulties which threw into jeopardy the maintenance of the technical structure put at the service of governments. He would refer only very briefly to the programme of work since in his statement in the fourth Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning, reference had already been made to the new role of ILPES and to the adjustments which had been made for enabling it to meet every new requirement of all the member countries. His presentation would refer primarily to document I-3 "ILPES: New Institutional Project 1983 and 1984-1986" (see annex II).

7. He pointed out that under its new arrangements ILPES could act in all the member countries no matter what their systems of government might be. He referred to the dual role of ILPES as a regional body of the United Nations within the ECLA system and one in which the United Nations Development Programme played a major role and as an intergovernmental body, which was a government-supported organ dedicated to multilateral co-operation. In referring to the programme of work, he reminded the participants of the main functional areas: economic policy in planning, programming of the public sector, regional and sectoral planning and pre-investment and projects. He pointed out that the various activities carried out in each of these areas and in each of the Institute's basic programmes (advisory services, research and training) would be required to coverge upon a series of subject-matter nuclei to be adjusted to the evolution of the problems encountered in the economic policy and planning of each country. Those nuclei included: planning and co-ordination of economic policy, the region within the world economy of the near future, territorial effects of the economic global and sectoral policies and promotion of social development and social development policies.

8. He referred to the location of the activities of ILPES, pointing out that they should be concentrated at headquarters in Santiago, Chile, but that the activities should be zoned and that in an effort to achieve better spatial distribution, the headquarters for some activities, including those in certain training programmes, could be rotated. In any case an effort would be made to establish an ILPES unit in the Caribbean.

9. He also referred to the size of the Institute and said that the basic operational areas for the work of ILPES, to which reference had been made at the fifth Meeting of the Technical Subcommittee at San José, Costa Rica, in November 1982, were to a large extent being maintained. Actually, the programme of work contained only two new additions, one of which referred to the duties of the planning bodies and another one in which the activities for each country and the way in which the Institute's activities were articulated among institutions and governments were presented.

10. Thus, he drew attention to the basic principles established at San José for orienting the new institutional project. The first of those principles was the principle of austerity in that it was impossible to think of expanding ILPES in the existing circumstances of economic crisis in the region. The second principle related to the fact that although there was need for an actual commitment to ILPES on the part of the governments, it was not appropriate to ask the member countries to commit themselves permanently to it; they had to conduct a periodic review, with those of their bodies which were represented in the Committee and with the Technical Subcommittee, of the results of the Institute's activities. For that reason, a three-year programme covering the period 1984-1986, was being presented. The last principle related to the fact that government contributions could not be considered to be a donation but must constitute a counterpart to the generic services which ILPES must provide on a regular basis. In that respect, he reminded the participants of the various ways of gearing success to the services provided by ILPES

and pointed out that the contributions made by the member countries would be used to finance both, the regular services as such and the regular services provided on request.

11. He touched on the subject of the contributions made by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), explaining that they had been cut down because of the need to channel resources to other continents and owing to difficulties within the region itself. He reminded the Committee that the former leadership of UNDP for Latin America had approved the financing for the project but that at the end of April, because of serious financial problems UNDP had announced a further cut back on the order of US\$830 000 for the three-year period 1983-1985. Of that amount, US\$145 000 pertained to 1983, US\$400 000 to 1984 and the rest to 1985; furthermore, those reductions had come after the fifth Meeting of the Technical Subcommittee held at San José, Costa Rica, in November 1982. In spite of the drastic reduction in resources, there had been a significant increase in the demand for the Institute's services. That might be due first to the fact that there had been a reduction in the supply of technical co-operation provided by national bodies and also to the fact that the worsening of the crisis which affected the majority of the countries had caused a number of them to ask for new emergency support. Finally, the updating and greater transparency of the new programme of work had provided the member countries with more systematic knowledge concerning the various service types provided by ILPES and enabled them to make their requests for assistance more dynamic.

12. He pointed out that in spite of the sharp reduction in resources and the substantial increase in the demand for services, there had been no change in the amount of the contribution suggested to the governments at the fifth Meeting of the Technical Subcommittee at San José. This was because another sacrifice had been in terms of a staff reduction (and hence a reduction in the technical capacity itself) and a reduction in fellowship and travel expenses.

13. At this point in his statement , the Director returned to the subject of the size of ILPES. He said thought was being given to a body of some 25 technicians and 15 professionals as the minimum critical mass needed first to improve the Institute's work and second to make it capable of generating its own resources. He referred to the need to achieve financing and remarked that whenever there had been a reduction in the financing from UNDP, it had been necessary to increase the Institute's own resources without warning, with the result that its impact had been dispersed and its technical facilities had been reduced. It was no longer possible to reduce its technical resources because the very existence of the Institution was being thrown into jeopardy. In that connection he referred to the very unstable situation of much of the technical staff, some of whose members had been with the Institute for many years, who had been given very short-term contracts because of the severe shortage of resources.

14. The conclusion which the Director drew from the remarks he had made was that in the present situation it was becoming crucial for the governments to crystallize their contributions so as to guarantee that ILPES would continue to exist as an institution. He then, by way of suggestion, gave the members of the Committee an exercise relating to the distribution of quotas by country in convertible currencies (see annex III). In that connection he pointed out that it had been thought that in some cases part of the contributions could be made in national currency. He said that the formal proposal submitted by ILPES was contained in document I-3 and that the suggested contributions were merely guidelines for the consideration of the governments. He ended his statement by saying that he was available to the members of the Committee for any additional information or explanations they might need.

15. The Chairman of the TEchnical Committee and representative of Mexico said that before giving the floor to the members of the Committee he wished to state that the Director of ILPES had presented a straightforward and direct report and had shown how the best use could be made of the limited resources which might become available.

He added that ILPES was adjusting to the present economic situation of the various countries by submitting a full work programme on very limited resources. He pointed out that in its 21 years of existence ILPES had provided very valuable services to the member countries, which had benefited by those services, and said that the time had come to give the Institute their full support at a time when it was experiencing severe financial problems and a reduction in its technical resources. He suggested that the proposals for financing should be submitted to each government and said he was sure that in spite of the difficult situation, ILPES would be given the support it deserved by virtue of its professionalism and the seriousness of its work.

16. With regard to the programme of work of the Institute, he pointed out that at present the countries were giving priority to the real link between planning and short-term policies for coping with the crisis but said it was necessary not to lose sight of the medium and long terms by meeting the more far-reaching objectives of economic and social development.

17. There was an exchange of ideas among the members of the Committee concerning the statement by the Director of ILPES. Because the Chairman of the fifth Meeting of the Technical Committee had an engagement with the Government of Argentina, part of the meeting was presided over by Mr. José Flavio Pécora, Secretary-General of the Department of Planning of Brazil and First Vice-Chairman of the meeting. A summary of the interventions is given below.

18. The representative of Guatemala opened his statement by remarking on the very full statement made by the Director of ILPES concerning financial matters and the role which the Institution would be called upon to play in future. The representative of Guatemala pointed out that the countries made a very great contribution, not in the sense of a donation but in terms of a national input. In this way the countries could ask for regular and special services and would be entitled to demand that they be carried out and that they be of high quality. Guatemala, aware that a contribution was necessary, would consent to the regular contribution and urge the other countries to decide to make a contribution



as soon as possible so that ILPES could continue to function with the efficiency and effectiveness which had always characterized it.

19. The representative of Uruguay made an inquiry concerning the amount of the contributions by the countries and the distribution of that amount in convertible and national currency and was told by ILPES officials that the figures proposed were merely suggestions as to the distribution of the contributions received which had been prepared for the fifth Meeting of the Technical Subcommittee (Costa Rica, November 1982) and that the contributions were a matter to be decided upon by each country. The same representative said his country was willing to consider making a financial contribution to ILPES but that he wished to make known its position with regard to the seriousness of the decline in United Nations contributions to national and regional programmes. He added that other international bodies had also reduced their contributions to the region and said that the industrialized nations should be asked to consider increasing their contributions to the most needy countries in Latin America and the Caribbean so that higher levels of trade and development could be obtained. He pointed out that this was a fundamental problem on which a position had to be adopted.

20. The representative of Chile referred first to the statement on the financial situation by the Director of ILPES, calling it very objective. He added that the figures clearly showed that the very existence of ILPES was threatened. He said that Chile, as host country of ILPES and one of its founders, had a moral responsibility vis-à-vis the Institute. He repeated that his country had been one of the founders of the Institute 20 years ago and had given the Institute its full support, in terms both of the tasks carried out by the Institute and of its potential in the region. Finally, he suggested that a motion should be adopted calling for generalized practical support of the body without prejudice to the individual action which each government would take to ensure the financing of the Institute.

21. The representative of Argentina referred to the detailed report by the Director of ILPES and pointed out that the Institute was very necessary and should go on operating for the good of the region. With regard to the question of the reduction of the resources channelled by the international bodies to Latin America and the Caribbean, he said it was necessary to join forces to increase the pressure exerted by the region on multilateral bodies. He also referred to the dual role of ILPES as a United Nations entity and as an intergovernmental body and said it was necessary to be clear as to the channels needed for it to function better.

22. With regard to the serious financial problems faced by ILPES, he said that its technical structure could not be subject to the vagueries of an international source and that the cuts in its budget were seriously eroding its specialized staff. It was necessary to give the Institution some stability with regular funds obtained from the countries in the form of voluntary contributions and not subsidies. He added that these contributions should be made as from 1984 to give the governments time to include them in their budgets. Finally, he suggested that a meeting be held of the governmental body which provided ILPES with its orientation before the end of the year so as to strengthen out the matter of the financial support provided by the governments. He informed the participants that his Government was carrying out a review of its contributions to international bodies so as to avoid duplication in the services to be received from those bodies.

23. The delegation of Cuba said it was grateful for the very clear statement made by the Director of ILPES on the financial and institutional situation of the organization. The large majority of countries represented on the Committee had been heavily burdened by external indebtedness and had been affected by the protectionism practised by the industrialized countries. It was those very developed countries which were now decreasing their contributions to the region's co-operation institutions.

In its view, the international bodies should guarantee that a minimum amount was given so that ILPES could operate, while the contributions from the countries should be used to enhance and extend its work. However if it was not possible to activate the contributions from the developed countries, the Latin American and Caribbean governments should be called upon to assume responsibility for ILPES.

24. The delegation of Costa Rica, the country which have provided the site for the fifth meeting of the Technical Subcommittee of ILPES, drew attention to the very important role of the Institute in the creation and consolidation of the region's planning ministries and bodies. It referred to the new orientation of the ILPES programme of work, especially where pre-investment and special projects were concerned. It indicated that the Government of Costa Rica had already taken steps with regard to its contribution to ILPES and that an effort would be made to supplement the contribution which had been suggested. Finally, it referred to the technical co-operation services which ILPES was providing in respect of the formulation of the national development plan by the new government.

25. The representative of Bolivia referred to the proposal made by the Director of ILPES with regard to the financing of the Institute and pointed out that it was very modest and on the whole very adequate for the countries of the region in present circumstances. He said there was a great challenge to revitalize planning in the countries and that ILPES should be associated with that effort in view of its broad experience and comprehensive approach. He said he agreed that a regional effort should be made to finance ILPES and that his government would support such an effort since it had adopted planning as an instrument of governmental management.

26. The representative of Peru emphasized the very clear way in which the Director of ILPES had described the situation of the Institute and had presented the proposal for its financing.

27. With regard to ILPES, he said he was very gratified by the new approach which the Director had described which seemed to him to be a very pragmatic way of looking at planning. He added that with its new approach, ILPES was in a better position to help countries deal with the problems of today. In the new programme of work, consideration would be given to the technical capacity of ECLA and to the great experience acquired by the countries of the region where planning was concerned. He therefore recommended that the mechanisms of horizontal co-operation should be used more intensively. As for the financing of ILPES, he said he agreed that the fifth meeting of the Technical Committee should express willingness to support the continuation of the institution and to co-operate in that regard and that where his own country was concerned, he would consult with the appropriate government organs to ensure that such support was forthcoming.

28. The representative of Ecuador acknowledged the important contribution which ILPES had made to the region and said that at present, when countries were up against severe problems, the institution was even more necessary. He added that it was essential for the Institute to remain with a minimum staff and budget, which could be financed by the international bodies. He also drew attention to the importance of a contribution from the governments to supplement that basic minimum and suggested that the region's co-operation and financial bodies might be approached to obtain a permanent financial base.

29. The representative of Honduras, who was attending the meeting in the absence of the Minister and Head of Planning, said he was very well aware of the problems described by the Director of ILPES and would

convey to his government the proposals made for the financing of ILPES since he was not authorized to make commitments.

30. The representative of the Dominican Republic said his country was closely tied to ILPES which had provided it with valuable services and that it viewed the predicament of the Institute with great concern. At that very moment an ILPES mission was helping his country's central planning body. In spite of the difficult financial situation in which the new government found itself, he promised to convey the proposals concerning contributions to the appropriate forums and to support them vehemently so that the outcome would be a contribution in line with the requirements stipulated by the Institute.

31. The representative of El Salvador said he was grateful for the statement by the Director of ILPES and congratulated him on the high quality of the documentation prepared. He said he was very concerned about the situation of ILPES, which had also provided the planning body he represented with valuable services, but he added that it was impossible to announce his country's contribution at the meeting since it was at that time in the process of reviewing its contributions to international bodies. He referred to the need to strengthen co-operation among the planning bodies of the region through horizontal co-operation activities and he said he was concerned about the dispersion of effort which could be seen in those international bodies which provided countries with technical assistance. He said he supported the proposal for a joint effort to support ILPES within other international bodies.

32. The representative of Paraguay congratulated the Director of the Institute on his clear explanation concerning the difficult situation in which ILPES, which belonged to all the countries of the region, now found itself. His own country had benefited for 20 years from the Institution's support, and consideration was being given to a new request for ILPES assistance in strengthening medium-and short-term planning. As he interpreted it, the meeting was unanimous in its view that ILPES should continue since its action had been very important for the region. He proposed that each representative should approach

his own government to make its financial contribution concrete so that ILPES could continue with its work.

33. The representative of Suriname said his country felt that the work done by ILPES was important and would always be needed and expressed satisfaction with regard to the statement by the Director. As for the financing of the Institute, he said he was in no position to promise resources but that he would submit the matter of the contribution to the appropriate levels of his government.

34. The representative of Brazil paid a tribute to the statement made by the Director of ILPES and congratulated him on the high quality of the documents submitted. He said the position of his government was to go on supporting ILPES, an entity which had become a mainstay for all Latin America and the Caribbean. With regard to the financial problem of the Institution, he said he agreed that its work should be based on the principles of austerity and efficiency. The new programme should be properly evaluated, and an effort should be made to avoid dispersion and duplication of effort.

As much profit as possible should be derived from the countries' various experiences in planning, which should be transferred when appropriate. ILPES should centre its activity in those fields where there was a sure demand for it since, in addition to everything else, that would ensure its financing.

35. He said that in addition to contributions from each country (which should be considered by the appropriate bodies in the respective governments), efforts should be made to extend the Institute's activities. He said he agree with the suggestion of approaching the region's co-operation bodies unitedly with a view to getting them to increase their contributions to the Institute. He also referred to the important source constituted by each country's technical capacity, which could be drawn upon without cost by ILPES itself or by other countries interested in obtaining specialized services. In that respect, he told the governments that the experience, research and technical staff of IPEA was available to them. Finally he said he agreed that a special meeting of the Technical Subcommittee should

be called in the near future to evaluate the progress made in respect of the financing of ILPES.

36. The representative of Colombia emphasized that his country was grateful for the work carried out by ILPES and was very hopeful that the continuation of its work would be of great help to all of Latin America and the countries of the Caribbean. He said those two areas had to bring their weight to bear and suggested that that could be done in part through planning and relying on ILPES to make their voice heard in the exchange of experience. ILPES should be a sounding board for the views of the region. He informed the meeting that his government was willing to go on supporting ILPES and providing it with economic assistance and that although he could make no commitment as to a figure, it would be no lower than the contribution which his country was now making. He reaffirmed that Colombia was willing to give its full support to ILPES as an entity through which the views of countries and the thinking of Latin America and the Caribbean on planning were made known.

37. The representative of Venezuela congratulated the Director of ILPES on the austerity campaign it had embarked upon by drawing up a new institutional project which responded to the region's current need for greater rationality in the use of its resources. He drew attention to the fact that ILPES was, in addition to performing its traditional advisory services, training and research functions, acting as technical secretariat of the system of co-operation among Latin American planners. He said that this new function was very important in that it gave the Institute an opportunity to become a real sounding board for the planning problems of Latin America so that joint action which benefitted the whole region resulted.

38. With regard to the financing of ILPES, he said he agreed that it was necessary to support the Institute and said that after the meeting the contribution of each country should be established at the appropriate governmental levels. He agreed that it was necessary to go before UNDP again with the technical co-operation requirements

of the countries and of regional bodies such as ILPES. He also agreed there was a need to review the co-operation in planning extended by different bodies with a view to avoiding duplication. He referred to the priority issues of the countries and said that they should be taken into account in the activities of ILPES. He made special mention of the need to co-operate in tackling short-term problems. He referred to the external debt of the countries of the region and suggested that ILPES, in conjunction with the planning bodies, should consider how those levels of indebtedness had been reached and how the renegotiations were being proceeding. He reiterated his Government's support for the work of ILPES.

39. The representative of Grenada said he had noted with great interest the very clear presentation by the Director of ILPES and in particular, the difficult financial situation which the Institute was experiencing. He said that the countries of the English-speaking Caribbean, had, for various reasons, not participated in the activities of ILPES as they should. He wondered whether the Caribbean countries would in the near future be able to benefit from the services of ILPES and asked what possibility there was of installing an ILPES unit in the Caribbean subregion. The Director of ILPES answered that question, saying that a project was in the pipeline and that the contributions suggested for the Caribbean countries could be channelled directly toward those new activities in the subregion.

40. The representative of Haiti began by thanking the Director of ILPES for his very clear statement with regard to the situation of the Institute and its financial needs for the next few years. He then assured the participants of the interest of the Government of Haiti in continuing to co-operate in the activities of ILPES. He said he was unable to take a position concerning his Government's contribution but that when he returned he would submit the suggested contribution to the appropriate bodies. He said he agreed that the contribution should be partly in convertible and partly in national currency, a solution which seemed very suitable for his country.



With regard to a future ILPES office for the Caribbean, he said the idea was a very timely one and should include all the countries of the Caribbean and not only the English-speaking countries. As for subjects to be dealt with by ILPES, he said that in his view attention should be paid to the small countries with a low income level. Attention should also be paid to the development of techniques for following up on the execution of integrated development projects and to the training of technical administrative and managerial staff for that kind of project.

41. Following the statements by the members of the Committee, the Chairman gave the floor to the delegation of Argentina, which submitted a draft resolution. That resolution gave rise to a number of comments and suggestions from various delegations. The representative of Guatemala said that in view of the important role played by ILPES and the demand for its services by the Latin American countries, he considered it advisable to open a subregional office for Central America and the Caribbean and had submitted a motion in that respect to the Technical Committee. He was told in reply that note had been taken of his request and that in due course the decision concerning it would be conveyed to the countries of the Central American and Caribbean area.

42. An exchange of views took place in which Mr. Hugo Navajas-Mogro, Regional Administrator of UNDP and Mr. Enrique Iglesias, Executive Secretary of ECLA, took part.

43. Mr. Navajas-Mogro, speaking on behalf of UNDP, said he was happy to be present at the meeting of the Technical Committee and explained that ILPES's financing had not been cut as the result of a sudden administrative decision. He added that the UNDP Governing Council made up of government representatives, including representatives of a number of countries from the region to whom all the countries had access, had decided in 1980 that 80% of the voluntary contributions should go towards those countries with an income of less than US\$500 and the remaining 20% to those with a higher income on a sliding scale

based on the income levels of the countries. In those circumstances, Latin America was at a disadvantage.

44. He also pointed out that the distribution of resources for the region was made in 1980 for the period 1982-1986 on the assumption that a certain amount would be received in contributions which unfortunately had not been the case. Because of the drop in voluntary contributions, the UNDP Governing Council had called for a sharp cut amounting to 55% in the projects of the region. At that time, in view of the important role played by ILPES in the region, its financing had been cut by only 24%. He said it was appropriate to bear in mind the important role which UNDP had played throughout the existence of ILPES as an institution.

45. Moreover, he pointed out that there were recommendations for the gradual withdrawal of UNDP as an important source of ILPES financing. There were no plans for putting a complete halt to relations with the Institute, which was supported by the governments and played a role adjudged as valuable by the last UNDP evaluation mission. He said he regretted the situation and that the channels of the UNDP Governing Council the SEcond Committee of the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly itself were open to the governments. He ended his statement by saying that he was very happy that the governments were asking for UNDP support for national and regional programmes.

46. Mr. Enrique Iglesias, Executive Secretary of ECLA, said that the results of the meeting were very satisfactory for ILPES in that they included explicit support for the Institution in defending its intellectual capital and technical resources. The governments were supporting a body which among other things, provided a point of contact for the planners of the region. The modernization proposed by the Director, which to a large extent coincided with the recommendations made by the UNDP evaluation mission, was essential as things new stood. He said that in his view great emphasis should be placed on the use of the existing capacity to promote co-operation among planning bodies.

He also drew attention to ILPES's austerity budget, which was in complete harmony with the present economic situation, and he pleaded for the stability of the Institution as a key to its performing its role in the region. He ended his statement by saying that in his view the fifth Meeting of the TEchnical Committee was the most important meeting ever held by the governments of the region in so far as the work of ILPES was concerned.

47. The draft resolution submitted by Argentina elicited very favourable comments on the part of the members of the Committee, who adopted it after making a few amendments.

48. The delegation of Mexico offered its country as the site of the next meeting of the Technical Subcommittee, at which the results of the implementation of the resolution would be noted.

49. Finally, the Director of ILPES addressed the members of the Technical Committee, thanking them for the decisive way in which they had supported the Institute.

50. The final text of the resolution unanimously adopted by the Committee is as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE OF  
ILPES AT ITS FIFTH MEETING HELD IN BUENOS AIRES,  
ARGENTINA

10 May 1983

Considering:

That in June 1983 the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning will have completed 21 years in the service of the planning bodies of the region, which it has greatly helped to strengthen.

That although the Institute is a permanent body of the United Nations, the United Nations has not guaranteed that it will provide the regular financial support necessary for the performance of the Institute's activities,

That the new programme of work adopted at the fifth Meeting of the Technical Subcommittee (November 1982) and endorsed at the present meeting reflects the priorities established by the governments, including the priority put on expanding and strengthening the work in Central America and the Caribbean,

That there has been a substantial reduction in the financing from the main source, i.e., the United Nations Development Programme,

The Technical Committee of the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning agrees to the text of this resolution.

1. Recognizes that the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning is a body which is needed for planning and co-ordinating the economic and social policies in the region by means of the technical contributions it makes it terms of advisory services, research and training,

2. Exhorts the governments of the region to give the highest priority to defending the financing of the Latin American Institute for Economic and Social Planning in the forums of international bodies,

3. Considering that it is becoming necessary to establish a regular system of supplementary financing so that the Institute can be consolidated once and for all,

4. Decides that this system will be based on, inter alia, voluntary contributions as determined by each country and that these contributions will be in convertible currency but can include national currency,

5. Decides that the countries will confirm the amount of their contributions no later than the end of October 1983, since those contributions must be taken into account in calculating the resources for the 1984 budget of the Institute.

6. Directs the Institute to keep the Technical Subcommittee informed of the implementation of these agreements.

It is agreed that the site of the next meeting of the Technical Subcommittee will be Mexico City.

Annex 1

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

MEMBER COUNTRIES OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Argentina

Alternate Head of Delegation: Vice-Commodore (Ret.) Jorge Bonnesserre,  
Under-Secretary of Planning

Bolivia

Head of Delegation: Arturo Núñez del Prado, Minister of Planning and  
Co-ordination

Brazil

Head of Delegation: José Flavio Pécora, Secretary-General of Planning

Colombia

Head of Delegation: Hernán Beltz, Head of National Planning

Costa Rica

Head of Delegation: Claudio Soto Badilla, Vice-Minister of Planning

Cuba

Head of Delegation: Herminio García Lazo, Vice-Chairman of JUCEPLAN

Chile

Head of Delegation: Sergio Pérez Hormazábal, Director (Minister) of the  
National Planning Office

Ecuador

Alternate Head of Delegation: Luis King Vanoni, Technical Director,  
Planning Department, CONADE

El Salvador

Head of Delegation: Fausto Adalberto Betancourt, Executive Director of  
Planning and Evaluation

Grenada

Head of Delegation: Edward Newman, Economist

Guatemala

Head of Delegation: Leonel González, Secretary-General of Economic Planning

Haití

Head of Delegation: Claude Weil, Secretary of State

Alternate Head of Delegation: Théophile Roche

Honduras

Head of Delegation: Carlos Villanueva Doblado, Ambassador in Argentina

Mexico

Head of Delegation: Carlos Salinas de Gortari, Secretary of Programming and Budget

Panama

Head of Delegation: Roberto Puello Araúz, Ambassador in Argentina

Paraguay

Head of Delegation: Fulvio José Gabriel Monges Ocampos, Programmer-General

Peru

Head of Delegation: Juan León Polo, Director-General of Economic Planning

Dominican Republic

Head of Delegation: Héctor Pérez Tovar, Technical Under-Secretary of the Office of the President

Suriname

Head of Delegation: René Henry Halfhuid, Ambassador in Brazil

Alternate Head of Delegation: Van Exel, Assistant Director of the National Planning Department

Uruguay

Head of Delegation: José María Michetti, Pro-Secretary, Planning Department, Co-ordination and Dissemination

Venezuela

Head of Delegation: Fernando Hernández Rodríguez, Vice-Minister of the Central Planning Office in the Office of the President of the Republic

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

Hugo Navajas-Mogro, Director of the Latin American Bureau

Percy Rodríguez Noboa

Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA)

Enrique Iglesias, Executive Secretary

Ricardo Cibotti

Latin American Institute of Economic and Social Planning (ILPES)

Alfredo Costa-Filho, Director General

Rolando Sánchez

Jorge Israel

Reynaldo Bajraj