



**XXVII**

Meeting of the Presiding Officers  
of the Regional Council for Planning  
of the Latin American and  
Caribbean Institute for Economic  
and Social Planning (ILPES)

Santo Domingo, 30 August 2018

Distr.  
LIMITED  
LC/MDCRP.27/7  
21 January 2019  
ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: SPANISH  
19-00041

**REPORT OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH MEETING OF THE PRESIDING OFFICERS  
OF THE REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR PLANNING OF THE LATIN AMERICAN AND  
CARIBBEAN INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PLANNING (ILPES)**

Santo Domingo, 30 August 2018



## CONTENTS

		<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Page</i>
A.	ATTENDANCE AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK .....	1-3	3
	Place and date of the meeting .....	1	3
	Attendance .....	2	3
	Organization of work .....	3	3
B.	AGENDA .....	4	3
C.	PROCEEDINGS .....	5-32	4
Annex 1	Agreements .....	-	9
Annex 2	International seminar “Territorialization of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in Latin America and the Caribbean: policy challenges” .....	-	10
Annex 3	List of participants .....	-	15

## **A. ATTENDANCE AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK**

### **Place and date of the meeting**

1. The Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) held their twenty-seventh meeting on 30 August 2018 in Santo Domingo.

### **Attendance<sup>1</sup>**

2. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following member countries in their capacity as Presiding Officers: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Jamaica, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, Peru and Uruguay.

### **Organization of work**

3. The international seminar “Territorialization of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in Latin America and the Caribbean: policy challenges” was held prior to the meeting of the Presiding Officers. The seminar provided an opportunity for different countries of the region to share their experiences with respect to territorial inequalities and to discuss the policies and instruments they were using to solve the problem.<sup>2</sup>

## **B. AGENDA**

4. The Presiding Officers adopted the following agenda:
1. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
  2. Review of progress with respect to the resolutions adopted at the sixteenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), held in Lima in 2017.
  3. Review of the ILPES report on activities, 2017-2018.
  4. Preparations for the seventeenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES).
  5. Consideration and adoption of agreements.

---

<sup>1</sup> See the complete list of participants in annex 3.

<sup>2</sup> See annex 2.

## C. PROCEEDINGS

### Opening session

5. Javier Abugattás, Chair of the Board of Directors of the Centre for Strategic Planning (CEPLAN) of Peru, in his capacity as Chair of the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning, welcomed participants and highlighted the need to facilitate planning processes. Common indicators and elements were required to optimize processes, which would result in a better quality of life for the population. Policies and plans had to be aligned in the long term to ensure that they were useful for the region.

Review of progress with respect to the resolutions adopted at the sixteenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), held in Lima in 2017 (agenda item 2)

6. Alicia Williner, Senior Research Assistant of ILPES, spoke of the progress made on the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development, which had been launched in October 2017 with a view to analysing national planning systems in Latin America and the Caribbean. Of the 33 countries in the region, 13 had long-term planning programmes and 6 were in the process of developing plans. The Observatory now also included information on open government and matrix analyses had been carried out on urban planning instruments and on the link between planning and budgeting. Mechanisms to implement the 2030 Agenda at the territorial level were also being developed. Although the countries had made progress, institutions still needed to be strengthened and planning and budgeting had to be harmonized.

7. Carlos Sandoval, Senior Research Assistant of ILPES, referred to the progress made in activities relating to the PlanBarometer, an instrument created pursuant to resolution CRP/XV/01 and adopted at the fifteenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning, to coordinate countries' knowledge and operationalize their experiences in improvement processes. To that end, five dimensions of analysis were considered: institutional aspects, instrument design, implementation, outcomes and coordination of global and regional commitments. Progress had been made in the configuration of prospective alerts and work had been done with several countries at different levels of government. Those efforts had revealed the following: planning systems had become more focused on instruments and implementation, difficulties had arisen in interinstitutional coordination, public servants' knowledge of planning differed, and criteria were highly variable. Planning system development and community involvement were weaker at the subnational level. In order to be able to identify limitations more accurately, it was necessary to improve assessment, form working groups, review criteria, adapt the model to the needs of the Caribbean, improve the instrument with prospective and sectoral models, improve the interpretation of results and the assignment of responsibilities, work harder to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals and create a PlanBarometer user network.

8. Daniel Titelman, Chief of the Economic Development Division of ECLAC, spoke of the elements linking the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development with national planning processes. That Agenda addressed substantive themes such as the mobilization of international and domestic resources and attracting private investment, placing emphasis on financing mechanisms. In Latin America and the Caribbean, where countries were classified as middle-income, official development assistance was declining considerably, and as a result the region was increasingly dependent on private sources of financing, including on unstable foreign direct investment (FDI), which was concentrated on specific geographical areas and sectors. FDI was linked to financial outflows from the repatriation of earnings and was insufficient in areas crucial to sustainable

development. A solid institutional framework was needed to regulate those resources. ECLAC had developed a structural gap approach which could be used as a guide to define investment and financing priorities. Aligning public and private incentives to achieve the 2030 Agenda required stronger planning mechanisms. Social return criteria had to be included to enable public resources to leverage private resources, and a territorial approach had to be incorporated, while bearing in mind that some areas would not be profitable. The Addis Ababa Action Agenda stressed the importance of mobilizing domestic resources, which required fiscal policy efforts. The region had to move towards more progressive tax structures, mainly direct taxes, while addressing tax evasion and avoidance. Development banks also needed to play a greater role in mobilizing and allocating resources.

9. Luis Riffo, Senior Research Assistant of ILPES, presented the draft annotated index of the position document to be examined at the seventeenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning in 2019. The document covered the following topics: the current situation and recent trends in territorial inequalities in Latin America and the Caribbean; territorial development policies and strategies in the region's countries; and the financing of those policies. He said that the region had the largest territorial inequalities in the world, with population and wealth concentrated in urban centres. The population of urban agglomerations had increased in many countries, but the gaps between the most underdeveloped and most advanced territories had not changed. With regard to per capita GDP, another indicator of territorial disparity, the process of convergence had stalled in recent years. The main approaches of territorial policies were decentralization, land-use planning and local-level development, although other issues had come to the fore, such as climate change, risk management, multilevel planning and implementation of the 2030 Agenda. Financing was provided through regional development funds and royalty systems, the territorialization of national public investment and agreements between different levels of government. It was proposed that work for the position paper should focus on three areas: (i) analysing territorial inequalities; (ii) conducting a comparative analysis of national territorial policies; and (iii) identifying of links with the 2030 Agenda, to create typologies of policies that included existing gaps in that area, the policies and strategies implemented, and financing and budgetary frameworks.

10. The Chief of ILPES said that the document must include a chapter on resilience planning, focused on the Caribbean, in which difficulties and progress in the subregion would be highlighted.

11. In the ensuing discussion, the representative of the Dominican Republic said that macroeconomic policies were key to preventing the concentration of activities in certain areas and described the experience of his country in that respect.

12. The representative of Jamaica said that, in her country, projects and programmes had been aligned with Sustainable Development Goals and that, in terms of financing, partnerships had been established with the international community for development. The current development plan was fully aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals and she asked for that to be reflected in the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development.

13. The representative of Colombia said that the ILPES analysis of the spatial concentration of wealth was useful, but suggested that the study should be deepened at the national level to help improve policy decisions. He also called for support from ILPES to evaluate how decentralization was measured, as there were no guiding indicators to show how it had evolved over time.

14. The representative of Dominica asked that the data relating to her country be updated in the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development.

15. The representative of Uruguay thanked ILPES for its report and said that it would be very useful to have comparative information and to learn about other financing experiences, particularly in light of the manifest contradiction between the proposal to increase local governments' autonomy and the dependence of those governments on transfers from the national government.

16. The Chair of the Board of Directors of CEPLAN of Peru said that financing was inherently unstable and that it was important to know what means each country had at its disposal to face economic fluctuations. Much remained to be done at the territorial level, for example identifying gaps in areas where progress had been made with regard to well-being and linking that information to the 2030 Agenda.

17. The representative of Ecuador focused on the problem of tax evasion and avoidance, and raised the question of how to address corruption in general. He added that, in that respect, culture also had to be taken into account.

18. In response to the issue raised by the representative of Uruguay, the Chief of ILPES explained that the difference between the PlanBarometer and the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development was that the PlanBarometer was a tool that could be used at the national or subnational level to characterize planning processes in each dimension covered therein. The Observatory was a platform that enabled analysis of planning trends in the countries of the region.

19. With regard to measuring decentralization, the Senior Research Assistant of ILPES recalled the work of the European Union on structural indicators and added that a set of user-friendly and useful indicators on territorial inequalities should be developed, an area in which ILPES had experience.

#### Review of the ILPES report on activities, 2017-2018 (agenda item 3)

20. The review of the ILPES report on activities, 2017-2018, was conducted by Cielo Morales, Chief of ILPES, who presented a summary of the activities carried out in that period, drawing particular attention to training, technical assistance and the publication of documents, as well as the consolidation of the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development in Latin America and the Caribbean and the PlanBarometer.

21. The activities had focused on public leadership, territorial development, open government, evaluation, participatory planning and foresight. Emerging issues included the development of national and regional capacities for territorial planning, particularly in rural areas and small cities, and the regional strategy to link the Addis Ababa Action Agenda with national planning processes. With regard to technical assistance, strategic partnerships had been formed with different multilateral institutions and agencies.

22. Lastly, she referred to the challenges arising from the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development with respect to ensuring the coherence of public policies and the coordination of the different government plans. Planning for development was therefore an ideal element to link objectives. She said that the challenge for ILPES was maintaining and increasing the capacity to respond to countries' requests. Financing must therefore be strengthened through the Regular System of Government Financing (RSGF).

23. Raúl García-Buchaca, Deputy Executive Secretary for Management and Programme Analysis of ECLAC, spoke about the RSGF for ILPES. He explained that financing for ILPES came from three sources: the regular budget, approved by the United Nations General Assembly, for fixed costs; the RSGF, consisting of voluntary contributions; and extrabudgetary resources provided by strategic partners, mobilized through programmes and projects for very specific activities. He said that the resources received by ILPES were not

enough to maintain its operations and that RSGF contributions had been very irregular. As a result, ILPES financing must be strengthened, which did not mean increasing contributions, but systematizing them and improving their timeliness.

24. The representatives of the Dominican Republic and Guatemala noted the important role played by ILPES in the region and called for support to maintain and strengthen the Institute.

25. The representative of Jamaica urged ILPES to be more active in the English-speaking Caribbean, given that the subregion needed its valuable contributions.

26. The representative of Panama said that the Caribbean countries had very disparate planning experiences and that the meeting had allowed them to share ideas and lessons learned.

27. The representative of Colombia congratulated the Chief of ILPES on her presentation and said that the Institute's work was useful. He also called for the services provided by ILPES to be promoted within the countries, as was the newly created office for strengthening territorial institutions did in Colombia.

28. The representative of Chile thanked ILPES for its work and the presentations given at the meeting, which had produced very interesting ideas.

29. The representative of Uruguay said that the countries did not lack commitment, but their efforts were sometimes diluted by bureaucracy, and he urged the authorities to address that issue to ensure that contributions were effective.

#### Preparations for the seventeenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) (agenda item 4)

30. The representative of Uruguay conveyed his country's offer to host the seventeenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning, to be held in the second half of 2019. The offer was welcomed by the delegations present.

#### Consideration and adoption of agreements (agenda item 5)

31. The Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning of ILPES, at their twenty-seventh meeting, adopted the agreements contained in annex 1 of this report.

32. There being no other matters to discuss, the meeting was brought to a close.





## Annex 1

**AGREEMENTS**

*At their twenty-seventh meeting, the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning agreed to:*

1. *Take note* of the Report on the activities carried out by the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), 2017-2018,<sup>1</sup> which includes the Institute's training activities;
2. *Recognize* the consolidation of the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development in Latin America and the Caribbean;
3. *Take note* of the Report on the activities relating to the PlanBarometer,<sup>2</sup> which sets forth the adjustments made to this tool and its new applications, through practical cases;
4. *Also take note* of the report presented by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean on linking the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development with national planning processes;
5. *Further take note* of the draft annotated index of the position document<sup>3</sup> that will be presented at the seventeenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning in 2019, and request the Institute, in conformity with resolution CRP/XVI/01, to continue progressing with the preparation of that document, taking into consideration the contributions made by the delegations at the present meeting;
6. *Request* the Institute to continue encouraging the countries to keep their voluntary contributions up-to-date to facilitate the resource flow with a view to supporting delivery of an efficient and effective service;
7. *Thank* the Government of Uruguay for its offer to host the seventeenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning;
8. *Also thank* the Government and people of the Dominican Republic for the excellent organization of the present meeting and their kind hospitality;
9. *Request* the secretariat of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean to convene the seventeenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning and the sixteenth Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America and the Caribbean in Uruguay in the second half of 2019.

---

<sup>1</sup> LC/MDCRP.27/5.

<sup>2</sup> LC/MDCRP.27/4.

<sup>3</sup> "Territorial development in Latin America and the Caribbean: challenges for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Draft annotated index" (LC/MDCRP.27/3).

## Annex 2

**INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR “TERRITORIALIZATION OF THE 2030 AGENDA FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN: POLICY CHALLENGES”**

The international seminar “Territorialization of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in Latin America and the Caribbean: policy challenges”, was held in Santo Domingo on 29 and 30 August 2018, within the framework of the twenty-seventh meeting of the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES).

At the opening of the seminar, statements were made by Isidoro Santana, Minister of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic; Javier Abugattás, Chair of the Board of Directors of the Centre for Strategic Planning (CEPLAN) of Peru; and Raúl García-Buchaca, Deputy Executive Secretary for Management and Programme Analysis of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC). They underscored the importance of incorporating a territorial vision into public policies and of initiating decentralization processes that promoted the development of the poorest areas. They emphasized the need for a stronger State with the capacity to act, promote dialogue and forge agreements between different levels of government.

The seminar was divided into four modules. Module I, the territorial aspect of development in the Caribbean, was moderated by Diane Quarless, Chief of the ECLAC subregional headquarters for the Caribbean, who referred to the "Caribbean first" policy established by ECLAC, taking into account the challenges facing the subregion with respect to achieving sustainable development. Those challenges included considerable vulnerability to climate change, a heavy debt burden and categorization as middle-income countries, which made it more difficult to receive official development assistance. She said that planning was a means to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals and that governments, businesses and communities must have the knowledge and capacity to anticipate natural disasters and respond to their effects. Resilience to disaster risks was one of the biggest hurdles facing the subregion on the path to sustainable development. Although all countries around the world were vulnerable to extreme natural phenomena, resilience made a big difference. For example, in developed countries, resilient infrastructure reduced vulnerability to such events. In addition, of the countries most vulnerable to disasters, six were in the Caribbean. Many small island States also had structural vulnerabilities that hampered their resilience, such as complex fiscal situations, diseconomies of scale, crumbling public and private infrastructure, and geographic dispersion. In light of those conditions, it was imperative to mainstream disaster risk management and resilient public infrastructure into planning.

Elizabeth Emanuel, Programme Director of the Planning Institute of Jamaica, and Gloria Joseph, Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Planning and Economic Development of Dominica, took the floor and both underscored the vulnerability of their countries to natural disasters, which were the cause of drastic reductions in GDP, greater poverty and destitution, job and infrastructure losses and damage to agriculture.

The Programme Director of the Planning Institute of Jamaica said that the economy’s reliance on activities such as tourism had resulted in the population concentrating in areas near the coast and therefore more exposed to damage. The country was in the process of aligning its long-term national development plan (Vision 2030) with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The plan sought to achieve urban and rural sustainable development in order to improve citizens’ quality of life. Hence, the State had a crucial

role to play in guiding the planning process. Thanks to the political consensus reached, the national development plan had been mainstreamed into different policy areas and would be implemented through a medium-term strategic framework that could be adjusted as necessary. In its pursuit of a new development paradigm, Jamaica had adopted new approaches to capital formation in an effort to achieve prosperity.

The Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Planning and Economic Development of Dominica said that her island was exposed to a high risk of natural events and was not prepared to face major phenomena such as category 5 hurricanes. Fragile and small economies, such as Dominica, had no choice but to build resilient infrastructure, but small island States could not develop resilience on their own; they needed support from a global alliance, and at the domestic level, partnerships with the private sector. Strong public leadership was needed to empower the public sector to face disaster risks and to commit to rebuilding under better conditions. To address those and other challenges, the country had launched a national resilience strategy and begun formulating a national development plan to achieve fair, efficient and effective outcomes by 2030. For the Caribbean, mainstreaming disaster risk management and resilience into planning was not optional, it was imperative.

Module II, territorial inequalities in Latin America, was moderated by Javier Abugattás, Chair of the Board of Directors of CEPLAN of Peru. The introduction was made by Luis Riffo, Senior Research Assistant of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), who noted the high level of spatial concentration in Latin America and the Caribbean and the considerable disparities between territories. He said that those inequalities followed the general development trend, whereby peripheral economies followed specialized participation patterns and had high per capita GDP that was not reflected in living standards. Structural heterogeneity gave rise to a large concentration of wealth, especially in metropolitan areas. Possible solutions to those problems included the geographical transfer of value or income and cohesion funds. Institutions must be involved in order to improve indicators and formulate territorial development policies and long-term plans.

Presentations were given by Fernando Álvarez de Celis, Secretary for Territorial Planning and Coordination of Public Works of the Ministry of the Interior, Public Works and Housing of Argentina; Dorotea Blos, Social Policy Analyst of the Secretariat of Planning and Economic Affairs of the Ministry of Planning, Development and Management of Brazil; and Miguel Hernández, Director General for Public Investment of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic.

The Secretary for Territorial Planning and Coordination of Public Works of the Ministry of the Interior, Public Works and Housing of Argentina said that the north of the country had the largest territorial inequalities and underscored the role of planning to address that situation. He said that the major planning challenge was how it was implemented, how the decision-making process could be made more efficient and how planning was coordinated at the local, provincial and national levels. He referred to the Territorial Strategic Plan, considered a State policy, which had been updated in 2018 on the basis of agreements with the provinces, and to the Belgrano Plan, under which 40% of public investment was allocated to the northern provinces. Lastly, he highlighted the usefulness of the web portal, Plataformas de Gestión de Proyectos y Obras, which contained 17,000 projects and sought to increase the transparency and efficiency of public investments and the capacity of local governments.

The Social Policy Analyst of the Secretariat of Planning and Economic Affairs of the Ministry of Planning, Development and Management of Brazil underscored the reduction in territorial inequalities in her country between 2000 and 2010, although relative gaps persisted between the northern and north-eastern areas of the country and the south, and there were important intraregional differences. In that connection, Brazil was preparing the second phase of the national regional development policy (PNDR),

which had been established in 2007, to align it with the Goals of the 2030 Agenda. The target of convergence between development and quality of life had been carried over into the second phase, and two additional objectives had been included, namely: (i) strengthening the network of medium-sized cities, which underpinned development in inland areas of the country, by fostering links between medium-sized and small cities; and (ii) making production chains more competitive. Three bodies were responsible for overseeing phase two of PNDR: the national integration and regional development commission, which was in charge of the operational guidelines; the executive committee, which was tasked with coordinating the federal programmes; and thematic groups, which were responsible for coordinating the sectoral ministries' programmes with the 2020-2023 plan in order to expand the territorial vision. She also drew attention to the key role of information, noting that a regional intelligence centre and a regional development observatory had been set up.

Lastly, the Director General for Public Investment of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic said that his country was more vulnerable because of its position in a hurricane-prone area and, therefore, the shortcomings of territorial institutions with regard to creating development plans and strategies was worrying. In that respect, the Planning and Public Investment Act of 2006 had marked the beginning of a new phase. Great importance was attached to the development of a vision for the country, as expressed in the 2030 National Development Strategy, which was broadly aligned with the 2030 Agenda and addressed four issues: (i) strengthening institutional frameworks; (ii) social cohesion, through a territorial cohesion fund; (iii) productive development and competitiveness; and (iv) sustainability. In that connection, he drew attention to the role of public investment and its positive impacts not only in the short term, but also in the medium and long term. The two issues with the largest share of public investment were social cohesion and productive development and competitiveness, which were closely linked to the country's territorial development.

The speakers said that territorial disparities in their countries remained considerable and posed significant institutional challenges. In particular, they drew attention to the need to generate data for territorial planning based on information systems that supported the design and monitoring of plans and policies, which required training of local government staff. They said that coordinating planning with the demands of the various national entities and sectors was crucial and that it was important to make development levels converge with quality of life and to create a new spatial data infrastructure in the region. The territorial perspective must also be mainstreamed into the follow-up of the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals, in particular into information systems.

Module III, national plans, strategies and policies for territorial development, was moderated by Martha V. Doblado, Secretary of State General Coordinator of the Government of Honduras. Introducing the module, Luis Mauricio Cuervo, Economic Affairs Officer of ILPES, said that the region had a wide range of territorial development policies, the result of a decades-long process, which could be classified as either consolidated or emerging. Consolidated policies included decentralization policies, a long-term exercise that involved a redistribution of responsibilities among different levels of government; territorial organization policies, which regulated the use of land and natural resources; and territorial competitiveness policies, which focused on promoting endogenous development and coordination with the global market. Emerging policies addressed the challenges of the twenty-first century and covered issues such as resilience, risk management and disaster prevention, social policies with a territorial approach, multilevel planning and localizing the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals. Each country had a unique combination of emerging policies and the intersectoral and multilevel coordination of those policies was a strategic challenge for all countries.

Cases were presented by Juan Pablo Remolina, Director of the Decentralization and Regional Development Office of the National Planning Department of Colombia; Mildrey Granadillo de la Torre, Vice-Minister of the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Planning of Cuba; and Álvaro García, Director of the Planning and Budget Office of the Office of the President of Uruguay.

The Director of the Decentralization and Regional Development Office of the National Planning Department of Colombia spoke about the territorialization of the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals in his country, from the promulgation of the 2014–2018 National Development Plan to the adoption in 2018 of the Strategy for the Implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals in Colombia. Sixteen monitoring targets had been selected and regionalized and territorial management plans had been updated. A toolbox had also been developed to improve the quality of processes and to promote their alignment with the Sustainable Development Goals. Current challenges included providing training for local authorities, coordinating investments, and implementing a system to strengthen local and intermediate government institutions.

The Vice-Minister of the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Planning of Cuba reported on the preparation of an economic and social development plan until 2030, the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals as a State commitment and the role of the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Planning in driving that process. The objective of the plan was to address structural imbalances through short-, medium- and long-term strategies in six areas which all included a territorial approach: government and social integration; production; infrastructure; science, technology and innovation; natural resources and the environment; and human development, equity and social justice. The foundations of the plan had been approved and were being submitted for public consultation. A document had been prepared that defined the indicators and linked them to the Sustainable Development Goals, with the aim of mitigating territorial inequalities, providing territories with development tools and promoting mutual cooperation. Moreover, with the support of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), municipal development initiatives were being carried out through the Coordinated Platform for Comprehensive Territorial Development (PADIT), which was expected to be expanded to cover more areas.

The Director of the Planning and Budget Office of the Office of the President of Uruguay referred to the process of devising the Uruguay 2050 national development strategy, which sought to reduce inequality and substantially increase per capita income in the country, building on the cornerstones of democratic change and productive transformation that, in turn, presented cross-cutting challenges in terms of gender, culture and territory. Demographic change, sluggish population growth and the impacts of population ageing must be taken into account. With regard to production, boosting the digital economy and the bioeconomy was fundamental. At the territorial level, Uruguay had 112 municipal strategic plans that varied in quality, but which were being improved. He drew particular attention to the work carried out in Tacuarembó, where a long-term view of territorial dimension was taken, and to the experiences in Juan Lacaze, Salto and Paysandú, as well as to the localization of the Sustainable Development Goals in Flores.

In the question-and-answer session that followed, participants raised the following issues: constitutional changes relating to forms of ownership in Cuba; the decentralization process in Colombia, which was described as asymmetrical; sustainability challenges in rural areas of Uruguay; indigenous populations' relationship with the Sustainable Development Goals; and the private sector's involvement in planning processes.

Module IV, territorial development policies, instruments, financing and budgets, was moderated by Alicia Williner, Senior Research Assistant of ILPES. In his introduction to the topic, Daniel Titelman, Chief of the Economic Development Division of ECLAC, and Carlos Sandoval, Senior Research Assistant of ILPES, said that there was considerable heterogeneity within countries, as evidenced by the concentration of

poverty in specific territories. With regard to financing sources, vertical and horizontal equity could be achieved by generating direct taxes and implementing transfers from central governments to territories. An important factor in that regard was the increasing subnational debt levels, which suggested fiscal deficit challenges. The financing mechanisms of territorial policies must therefore be improved. They also stressed that the impacts and sustainability of and compliance with territorial policies and programmes over time must be measured. The 2030 Agenda represented a global approach to the implementation of values, principles and objectives that should be used to achieve local objectives in a more egalitarian manner.

Presentations were given by Patricio Proaño, Undersecretary General for Planning and Development of Ecuador; Miguel Ángel Moir, Secretary of Planning and Programming of the Office of the President of Guatemala; and Javier Abugattás, Chair of the Board of Directors of CEPLAN of Peru.

The Undersecretary General for Planning and Development of Ecuador said that his country had presented its voluntary national review at the high-level political forum on sustainable development in July 2018. The review drew attention to the alignment of the National Development Plan 2017-2021 with the Sustainable Development Goals and the adoption of the 2030 Agenda as official public policy of the country. He also stressed the need for closer links between people and planning processes, with a view to strengthening the role of those responsible for implementing policies and plans in the formulation of objectives and strategies.

The Secretary of Planning and Programming of the Office of the President of Guatemala drew attention to the work carried out by the Secretariat for Planning and Programming of the Office of the President (SEGEPLAN) to link the Sustainable Development Goals to national development priorities, a process that allowed those long-term guidelines to be internalized by the public institutions responsible for their execution and critical areas and virtuous circles of development to be identified. That work had helped to reinforce institutional coordination to address highly complex problems, such as urban segregation and strengthening planning capacity at the local level.

The Chair of the Board of Directors of CEPLAN of Peru highlighted the CEPLAN initiative to develop a vision of the country for 2030 and to update State policies with a long-term view through to 2040. As part of that initiative, spatial data systems would have to be created to enable territorial analysis and decision-making based on more precise information.

The speakers gave a broad overview of the links between the respective national development plans and the Sustainable Development Goals. They spoke of the challenges of regulating land use in order to achieve an equitable distribution of basic services and of creating territorial indicators to identify gaps between urban and rural areas. They said that coordination between institutions should be improved, citizen participation increased, and decentralization processes deepened. Lastly, they called for reflection on appropriate mechanisms to foster cooperation among countries and institutions with regard to territorial data and information, which would give insight into spatial dynamics and generate early warnings with a view to designing better policies and plans.

In the ensuing discussion, participants said that steps must be taken towards decentralization and to increase territories' capacity to improve tax collection, primarily through direct taxes. Help should be given to local and intermediate governments so that they could take on the responsibilities that would be decentralized. Thus, their proximity to the community and knowledge of local realities could be capitalized on. They discussed training programmes for planners, particularly specialists, and the production of local data. Efforts were being made to strengthen planning for development that involved different actors. It would therefore be useful to create systems in which each institution played a role and participated in instrument-building.

Annex 3

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

**A. Estados miembros de la Comisión  
States members of the Commission**

**ARGENTINA**

Representante/Representative:

- Fernando Álvarez de Celis, Secretario de Planificación Territorial y Coordinación de la Obra Pública, email: falvarezdecelis@mininterior.gob.ar

**BRASIL/BRAZIL**

Representante/Representative:

- Dorotea Blos, Analista de Políticas Sociales, Secretaría de Planificación y Asuntos Económicos, Ministerio de Planificación, Desarrollo y Gestión, email: dorotea.blos@planejamento.gov.br

**CHILE**

Representante/Representative:

- Andrea Alvarado, Jefa, División de Evaluación Social de Inversiones, Ministerio de Desarrollo Social, email: aalvarado@desarrollosocial.gob.cl

**COLOMBIA**

Representante/Representative:

- Juan Pablo Remolina, Director Encargado de la Dirección de Descentralización y Desarrollo Regional, Departamento Nacional de Planeación (DNP), email: jremolina@dnp.gov.co

**CUBA**

Representante/Representative:

- Mildrey Granadillo de la Torre, Viceministra, Ministerio de Economía y Planificación, email: mildrey@mep.gob.cu

**DOMINICA**

Representante/Representative:

- Gloria Joseph, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Planning and Economic Development, email: pscplanning@dominica.gov.dm

## **ECUADOR**

### Representante/Representative:

- Patricio Proaño, Subsecretario General de Planificación y Desarrollo, Secretaría Nacional de Planificación y Desarrollo, email: fproano@senplades.gob.ec

## **GUATEMALA**

### Representante/Representative:

- Miguel Ángel Moir, Secretario de Planificación y Programación de la Presidencia, email: miguel.moir@segeplan.gob.gt

## **JAMAICA**

### Representante/Representative:

- Elizabeth Emanuel, Programme Director, Planning Institute of Jamaica, email: elizabeth\_emanuel@pioj.gov.jm

## **HONDURAS**

### Representante/Representative:

- Martha V. Doblado, Secretaria de Coordinación General de Gobierno por Ley, Secretaría de Coordinación General de Gobierno, email: aardon@scgg.gob.hn

## **MÉXICO/MEXICO**

### Representante/Representative:

- Carlos Tirado Zavala, Embajador de México en la República Dominicana, email: ctiradoz@sre.gob.mx

### Miembro de la delegación/Delegation member:

- Martha Eugenia Tapia Benavides, Jefa de Cancillería y Asuntos Políticos, Embajada de México en la República Dominicana, email: mtapia@sre.gob.mx

## **PANAMÁ/PANAMA**

### Representante/Representative:

- Noris Vásquez, Jefa, Departamento para el Desarrollo del Plan Estratégico Nacional, Dirección de Políticas Públicas, Ministerio de Economía y Finanzas, email: nvasquez@mef.gob.pa

## **PERÚ/PERU**

### Representante/Representative:

- Javier Abugattás, Presidente del Consejo Directivo del Centro Nacional de Planeamiento Estratégico (CEPLAN), email: jabugattas@ceplan.gob.pe



## REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA/DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

### Representante/Representative:

- Isidoro Santana, Ministro de Economía, Planificación y Desarrollo, email: isantana@economia.gob.do

### Miembro de la delegación/Delegation member:

- Yván Rodríguez, Viceministro de Planificación, Ministerio de Economía, Planificación y Desarrollo, email: yvanrod@gmail.com

## URUGUAY

### Representante/Representative:

- Álvaro García, Director, Oficina de Planeamiento y Presupuesto, email: agarcia@opp.gub.uy

## **B. Secretaría Secretariat**

### **Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe (CEPAL)/Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)**

- Raúl García-Buchaca, Secretario Ejecutivo Adjunto para Administración y Análisis de Programas/Deputy Executive Secretary for Management and Programme Analysis, email: raul.garciabuchaca@un.org
- Cielo Morales, Directora, Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES)/Chief, Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), email: cielo.morales@un.org
- Jimena Arias, Oficial de Asuntos Sociales, Oficina del Secretario de la Comisión/Social Affairs Officer, Office of Secretary of the Commission, email: jimena.arias@un.org
- Guido Camú, Oficial a Cargo, Unidad de Información Pública/Officer in Charge, Public Information Unit, email: guido.camu@un.org
- Luis Mauricio Cuervo, Oficial de Asuntos Económicos, Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES)/Economic Affairs Officer, Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), email: luismauricio.cuervo@un.org
- Alicia Williner, Asistente Superior de Investigación, Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES)/Senior Research Assistant, Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), email: alicia.williner@un.org
- Alejandro Bustamante, Asistente Superior de Asuntos Económicos, Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES)/Senior Economic Affairs Assistant, Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), email: alejandro.bustamante@un.org
- Luis Riffo, Asistente Superior de Investigación, Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES)/Senior Research Assistant, Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), email: luis.riffo@un.org
- Carlos Sandoval, Asistente Superior de Investigación, Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES)/Senior Research Assistant, Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), email: carlos.sandoval@un.org
- Paulina Pizarro, Asistente de Investigación, Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES)/Research Assistant, Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), email: paulina.pizarro@un.org