



XVII

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

Montevideo, 29–30 August 2019

Distr.

LIMITED

LC/CRP.17/6

30 December 2019

ENGLISH

ORIGINAL: SPANISH

19-01203

**REPORT OF THE SEVENTEENTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR
PLANNING OF THE LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN INSTITUTE
FOR ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PLANNING (ILPES)**

Montevideo, 29–30 August 2019



CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Page</i>
A. ATTENDANCE AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK.....	1-7	3
Place and date of the meeting.....	1	3
Attendance	2-3	3
Organization of work	4-7	3
B. AGENDA.....	8	4
C. PROCEEDINGS	9-58	5
Annex 1 Resolutions.....	-	17
Annex 2 List of participants	-	21

A. ATTENDANCE AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

Place and date of the meeting

1. The seventeenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) was held in Montevideo on 29 and 30 August 2019.

Attendance¹

2. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following member countries of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC): Argentina, Bahamas, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Dominica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, and Uruguay.

3. A representative of the British Virgin Islands also attended as an associate member of the Commission.

Organization of work

4. The sixteenth Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America and the Caribbean was held before the meeting of the Regional Council for Planning, offering an opportunity to examine issues that were relevant to development planning in the countries of the region. The subject under discussion at that meeting was “Planning for sustainable territorial development in Latin America and the Caribbean”. The Conference was opened by Álvaro García, Director of the Office of Planning and the Budget of Uruguay; Mireia Villar, United Nations Resident Coordinator in Uruguay; and Alicia Bárcena, Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).

5. Five panels were held on the topics of territorial development and related policy challenges; information for territorial development; implementation and financing of territorial development policies; territorialization of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean; and planning for resilience in the Caribbean countries. Although the countries differed greatly in terms of their institutional and regulatory architecture, the main territorial challenges identified by the panellists were related to common issues, such as the needs to improve local and territorial management and development capacities, to create opportunities for territorial growth and competitiveness and equity, to reduce poverty and to expand opportunities in territories. All participants stressed the importance of coordinating those efforts around various planning instruments, institutions and architectures, with the emphasis placed on different aspects, as appropriate.

6. With regard to financing, participants underscored the importance of moving towards a coherent value chain among the various territories—which presented very marked differences (and inequalities) in terms of production and financing factors—and of closing gaps in fiscal structures in order to invest in a more balanced value chain that was less vulnerable to market cycles. With regard to the urban-rural

¹ See the list of participants in annex 2.

divide, the importance of targeted public and private investment was highlighted, while local management capacity should be expanded. Linking planning and budgets was also identified as a pending issue. Turning to information systems, the country representatives expressed concern about the need to create an integrated system for the production and use of information for territorial development. The representatives of the Caribbean countries said that, as Latin America and the Caribbean was the second most-exposed region in the world to natural disasters, planning for resilience was critical. Representatives said that local and national capacities must be strengthened to address the resilience challenges and to set up integrated and up-to-date information systems, as well as robust legal frameworks for land-use planning and land tenure, particularly of State land, and planning and financing frameworks.

7. The representatives also discussed the challenges faced by multi-island States related to equitable access to and economies of scale for public services, particularly those concerning renewable energy and the resilience of the energy grid. With regard to the territorialization of the 2030 Agenda, panel participants shared their experiences, such as the use of a legal framework to adapt the 2030 Agenda to local contexts, the harmonization of national, subnational and local plans with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and the participation of local communities. They also said that it was important to implement the 2030 Agenda in an integrated manner and to recognize territories' diversity. Lastly, the representatives said that, together with the territorialization of the 2030 Agenda, the issues of decentralization and deconcentration should also be addressed in order to achieve a fairer distribution of tax and human resources, which often could not be managed at the local level because of structural inequalities among territories.

B. AGENDA

8. The Council adopted the following agenda:

1. Election of officers.
2. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work of the seventeenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning.
3. Presentation of the report "Planning for sustainable territorial development in Latin America and the Caribbean".
4. Report on the activities carried out by the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) since the sixteenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning.
5. Report on the status of the Regular System of Government Financing for the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES).
6. Review of the programme of work of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) for 2020.
7. Presentation on the implementation status of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on financing for development in Latin America and the Caribbean.
8. Presentation on the environmental big push.
9. Consideration and adoption of resolutions.

C. PROCEEDINGS

Opening session

9. At the opening session statements were made by Javier Abugattás, Chair of the Board of Directors of the Centre for Strategic Planning (CEPLAN) of Peru, in his capacity as Chair of the Regional Council for Planning of ILPES; Álvaro García, Director of the Office of Planning and the Budget of Uruguay, the host country of the meeting; and Alicia Bárcena, Executive Secretary of ECLAC.

10. The Chair of the Board of Directors of CEPLAN of Peru, speaking in his capacity as the outgoing Chair of the Regional Council for Planning of ILPES, said that the sixteenth Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America and the Caribbean had allowed participants to learn more about and share information on the challenges of territorial planning. Over the last two years, within the framework of the Regional Council for Planning and with the support of ECLAC, the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development in Latin America and the Caribbean had been launched and the PlanBarometer had been developed, which had proved to be very useful tools for the countries. In addition, the SDGs should be mainstreamed at all levels of government institutions, policies, programmes, and projects at subnational level and citizens should take ownership of the 2030 Agenda and the national development plans to ensure that they became State policy and would not be subject to political shifts and changes in government. Lastly, he expressed his thanks to ECLAC and ILPES for two years of fruitful work and said that his country stood ready to support the incoming Chair.

11. After welcoming the participants, the Director of the Office of Planning and the Budget of Uruguay said that territorialization was important; for public policies to be truly valuable, planning must address the territory level and the needs of citizens. His country had made some progress in that regard and his Office was also working with other departments and municipalities in an effort to understand the impact of national realities at the territorial level. Uruguay was digitized and connected to the Internet, thanks to the Basic Computer Connectivity for Online Learning Plan (CEIBAL), among other programmes, through which children in the country's schools had been provided with computers for the last 12 years, given that, for his country, equality was the starting point for sustainable development. He also referred to the Uruguay 2050 national development strategy, which had been presented the previous day and was based on 20 foresight studies produced over the last four years with an inclusive and comprehensive development perspective based on three pillars: the sustainable productive transformation; social transformation; and the transformation of gender relations. That long-term vision for the country was a State policy within the framework of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and had been reflected in the three voluntary national reviews submitted to the high-level political forum on sustainable development in New York.

12. The Executive Secretary of ECLAC thanked Uruguay for hosting the meeting and Peru for its work and the support it had provided to ECLAC and ILPES during its time as Chair of the Regional Council for Planning. She also thanked the representatives of the Caribbean countries for attending, as they were indispensable to the discussion that would take place, and she reiterated the Commission's intention to put the Caribbean first. She said that territorial development implied equality and sustainability and that, for ECLAC, it was vitally important to understand the challenges facing countries and how to assist and support them with planning, foresight and open government tasks, among others. The Regional Council for Planning was one of the oldest subsidiary bodies of ECLAC, serving as a forum for ILPES member countries since its establishment in 1974 as a Technical Committee. At a time when

multilateralism was in crisis, the Regional Council offered a space for inclusive dialogue on universal multilateralism, from which no country was excluded.

13. The Executive Secretary said that incorporating the 2030 Agenda into national plans and budgets was a difficult and misunderstood task, but a fundamental one. The main challenge for the region of Latin America and the Caribbean was the middle-income trap. Antigua and Barbuda, Chile and Uruguay were considered to have graduated, but ECLAC had stated, within both the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the European Union, that this concept was very exclusionary and that the graduation criteria needed to be changed. Per capita gross domestic product (GDP) alone did not reflect a country's real capacity to access or mobilize resources and, therefore, the region should stress that per capita income alone should not be the threshold for excluding middle-income countries from obtaining concessional funding. The region must present a common front in discussions with donors, partners, financial institutions and the World Trade Organization (WTO), among others.

14. The Executive Secretary said that territory mattered, as it was at that level where mutual recognition was given and other aspects of relationships were addressed, where people recognized themselves and connected with others. Cities should not be divided into rich and poor areas. Increasing urbanization had contributed to segregation between urban and rural areas: Panama City accounted for 71% of national GDP, Buenos Aires for 56%, Lima for 49% and Santiago for 48%. Meanwhile, in the Caribbean, 70% of the population lived in coastal cities that were highly vulnerable to the effects of climate change. In addition, rural populations, which made up almost 30% of the population of Latin America and the Caribbean, were being left behind. That exclusion was one of the structural causes of migration, forcing young people to move away from rural areas. Rural areas were crucial for sustainable development and opportunities for change were to be found in territories. ILPES provided countries with tools such as the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development—where national development plans could be consulted and which served as a meeting place with links to the voluntary national reviews—and the PlanBarometer, a self-assessment tool for countries' national planning systems.

Election of officers (agenda item 1)

15. The following Presiding Officers were elected:

Chair: Uruguay

Members: Argentina
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Jamaica
Panama
Paraguay

Host country: Chile

Presentation of the report “Planning for sustainable territorial development in Latin America and the Caribbean”
(agenda item 3)

16. The report was presented by Luis Mauricio Cuervo and Carlos Sandoval, ILPES officials.

17. Luis Mauricio Cuervo said that the report, *Planning for sustainable territorial development in Latin America and the Caribbean*,² had been produced pursuant to resolution CRP/XVI/01³ adopted at the sixteenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning held in Lima in 2017, in which it has requested the Institute to develop proposed contents for a position paper to be presented at the seventeenth meeting of the Regional Council. Subsequently, ILPES had presented a draft annotated index at the twenty-seventh meeting of the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning and had compiled the countries’ comments to produce the final report. The report set out a model for analysis of territorial development policies and plans, called the Territorial PlanBarometer, which was designed as a tool to support planning authorities in creating a properly integrated and coordinated ecosystem of territorial development policies, aimed at improving the quality, implementation and impact of public territorial development policies.

18. He said that the document was intended to be an applied, rather than a theoretical study. Nearly 150 territorial development policies of the 33 countries of the region had been reviewed as the basis for the report. That research had indicated that governments of the region had a broad interest, in reducing the gaps in well-being, access to services, opportunities and public goods among the different territories. That set of policies formed a family or cluster that shared a territorial focus but was not sufficiently coordinated and integrated. Countries’ situations were very different and diverse, so the Territorial PlanBarometer was intended to be used to design strategies that addressed each country’s unique institutional, political, social and territorial contexts. For example, the same strategies could not be applied to the Caribbean as continental Latin America, given that, among other things, natural disaster resilience plans were more important for the Caribbean subregion. The report indicated that 38% of territorial development plans did not define a financing mechanism and that the vast majority of them did not set out their costs. Comprehensive financing frameworks must therefore be created to take advantage of opportunities at the global and regional levels.

19. Carlos Sandoval said that the Territorial PlanBarometer was the result of the systematization of the chapters of the position paper presented by ILPES. The analysis focused on national instruments and policies for territorial development. The methodology reflected the experience of the more than 15 countries of the region that had implemented such instruments and policies for national development plans and was based on four steps: (i) policy classification, which included the compilation of an inventory of policies and analysis of their degree of proximity to territorial development goals; (ii) the relationships between policies; (iii) models for policy classification; and (iv) the definition of a decision-making strategy. The review of over 150 policies had revealed different approaches: (i) central policies that were very closely related to territorial development; (ii) policies on specific issues linked to different territorial factors; and (iii) policies that affected territories indirectly. Lastly, he said that the quality and impact of territorial development policies depended on the quality of their design and implementation, the financing and evaluation.

² LC/CRP.17/3.

³ See annex 1 of the *Report of the sixteenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES)*. Lima, 12 October 2017 (LC/CRP.16/6).

20. The representatives of Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Jamaica, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay and Peru took the floor. They welcomed the report and said that they agreed that territories were where citizens' problems should be resolved and where the 2030 Agenda needed to be implemented.

21. The representative of Argentina said that his country's national system for comprehensive risk management (SINAGIR) involved provincial, municipal and regional planning processes, which had allowed five Argentine cities to be rebuilt from scratch in accordance with resilience parameters, protecting the populations from climatic phenomena. Information was vital for planning processes and the PlanBarometer was a major contribution in that regard.

22. The representative of Chile said that the Regional Council was a valuable space for dialogue and discussion, conducive to sharing experiences, and that planning without action was a mere academic exercise, while action without planning did not make sense either. It was therefore necessary to plan actions. Although it did have government plans, his country did not have a national development plan as such, there was therefore no long-term planning instrument.

23. The representative of Colombia said that her country was strengthening the tools to support management in the territories and that a territorial planning kit was available for that purpose.⁴ The challenge for countries was to make the tools useful and easy to use. The territorial planning kit allowed the authorities to find out what resources were available to them. Meanwhile, training must be given to those authorities and a strong institutional framework established to ensure that policies were State policies and not government ones and that the tools would endure over time. Lastly, she said that the kit was available to other countries and offered to explain, via videoconference, its features to those interested in learning more about it.

24. The representative of Ecuador concurred with the other speakers about the challenges faced by countries and the need for a long-term vision. The links among the different levels of government was fundamental. In Ecuador, parishes were the territories with the lowest administrative political rank and received few economic resources; nevertheless, a number of parishes could form associations to carry out projects together.

25. The representative of Guatemala expressed his appreciation for the work of ILPES and said that in addition to the challenge of defining policies, there was also the issue of governance of those policies. Peoples' problems should be resolved at the territorial level, through State interventions at the national and municipal levels. Guatemala's territory was heterogeneous, in which different ethnicities and social configurations coexisted, so, in an effort to reduce conflicts, some of the policies to be applied could be developed at the national level—in cases where problems affected the whole State—and then adapted to the territorial level. But there were also instances where policies would have to be formulated at the territorial level to solve more specific problems.

26. The representative of Jamaica welcomed the discussion and the report, particularly the chapter on the Caribbean, which was very detailed and useful. He said that the issue of urbanization was very important, as the majority of the urban population in the Caribbean lived in coastal areas where the effects of climate change were evident. The Caribbean was highly dependent on tourism and investment was needed in capacity-building and training, as the subregion must promote, *inter alia*, the development of environmental statistical information.

⁴ See [online] <https://portalterritorial.dnp.gov.co/AdmKITTerritorial/MenuPpalKITTer>.

27. The representative of Mexico expressed his thanks to ILPES for the presentation and said that the report provided guidelines for attaining the 2030 Agenda and that it was in line with his country's 2019–2024 National Development Plan, which included a territorial pillar, in addition to those of gender equality, non-discrimination and inclusion, covered by the social, economic and environmental dimensions of the 2030 Agenda. The National Development Plan was also aligned with the 2030 Agenda, as Mexico was committed to leaving no one behind.

28. The representative of Panama said that one of the great challenges facing his country was the integration of the territorial dimension into the international economy. To identify the causes of the decline in competitiveness, global policies had been analysed; often these policies had been implemented at the territorial level. It was therefore difficult to identify the causes and to take appropriate action to resolve the issue.

29. The representative of Paraguay said that it was important to travel around the country to understand land use. Production should be democratized, as no progress would be made if the focus remained on external factors such as the trade tensions between China and the United States. Instead, it was time to concentrate on endogenous factors and design public policies that geared towards citizens' needs.

30. The representative of Peru said that he concurred with the representatives of Colombia and Guatemala on the importance of governance and of strengthening territorial institutional frameworks. Given that territorial policies covered numerous topics, he urged countries to carry out self-assessments using the dimensions and criteria of the PlanBarometer.

Report on the activities carried out by the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) since the sixteenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning (agenda item 4)

31. Under this agenda item, Cielo Morales, Chief of ILPES, presented the report on the activities carried out by the Institute between 1 July 2018 and 30 June 2019, and said that the Institute's programme of work was contained in the Draft programme of work of the ECLAC system, 2018–2019, that had been adopted by the Commission's member States at its thirty-sixth session.⁵ The programme's objective was to improve planning processes in the region within the framework of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. The expected achievements were: (i) strengthening of competencies and capacities in the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean in matters of planning and public administration for development with a regional perspective and gender sensitivity; and (ii) increased coordination and exchange of best practices, and enhanced cooperation among governments of the region and other stakeholders in matters of planning and public administration for development.

32. She said that at the sixteenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning, held in Lima in 2017, the countries had requested that ILPES continue its efforts to strengthen planning in Latin America and the Caribbean, by: (i) consolidating the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development in Latin America and the Caribbean; (ii) the sharing of knowledge and good practices regarding the use of planning instruments, methodologies and tools; (iii) capacity-building in linking national development plans with the 2030 Agenda; (iv) the promotion of good-quality planning by implementing tools for characterizing development planning systems, processes and tools; (v) the development of national and regional territorial planning capacities; (vi) the generation of a regional strategy for linking the Addis Ababa Action Agenda of the Third International Conference on Financing for Development with national

⁵ LC/G.2665(SES.36/8).

planning processes. They had also requested that the Institute develop proposed contents for a position paper to be presented at the seventeenth meeting of the Regional Council.

33. She said that three modalities had been used to carry out the Institute's programme of work: training, applied research and technical cooperation. Eight international courses, 25 workshops, a distance learning course and 5 subnational courses had been organized. In addition, within the framework of the strategic partnership with the Latin American and Caribbean Economic System (SELA), a course on results-based management had been undertaken. Three courses and other activities had been organized with the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID). In total, 1,771 participants from 14 countries had attended ILPES courses and workshops, which corresponded to more than 1,300 hours of training given not only to public officials, but also to representatives of civil society, the private sector and academia. With regard to the participant distribution by sex, she said that 44% were women and 56% were men.

34. She drew attention to the technical assistance activities carried out with the authorities of the province of Buenos Aires in Argentina; those carried out in the framework of an agreement with the National Council for the Evaluation of Social Development Policy (CONEVAL) of Mexico to assess the evaluation criteria of social programmes; and those undertaken with the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Finance and the Civil Aviation Authority of Panama to strengthen the planning system. With regard to applied research, she highlighted the systematization of cases and good practices, such as the analysis of the open government action plans of 16 countries, as well as a study on poverty and hunger, undertaken in collaboration with United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), which identified 100 territories free from hunger and poverty.⁶

35. Turning to the Regional Observatory of Planning for Development, she said that, with more than 300,000 visits in 2019, it was a recognized tool that allowed users to see, in one place, the national development plans of the countries of the region and the institutional framework for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda in each country. With regard to the PlanBarometer, she drew attention to the updating of the Strategic Territorial Plan of Argentina, and the new Territorial PlanBarometer presented at the meeting. The Regional Observatory and the PlanBarometer were established regional public goods. Lastly, she said that one of the greatest challenges facing the Institute was assisting countries in the territorialisation of planning processes and of the 2030 Agenda.

36. Alicia Williner, Senior Research Assistant of ILPES, gave a brief presentation on the Regional Observatory of Planning for Development, which had been created pursuant to resolution CRP/XV/01, adopted at the fifteenth meeting of Regional Council for Planning,⁷ held in Yachay (Ecuador) in 2015, and launched at the Regional Council's sixteenth meeting in Lima in 2017. The Observatory was a dynamic, collective forum, which the 33 countries of Latin America and the Caribbean had helped to construct. Five types of planning instruments for each country were available on the Observatory's website: national development plans or government plans; urban planning instruments; territorial management plans; open government action plans; and planning documents related to the 2030 Agenda. The Observatory also contained news, videos and other useful planning resources. The Observatory published a biannual newsletter and monthly planning notes that disseminated regional planning news. Lastly, she asked member States to provide the information needed to keep the Observatory up to date.

⁶ See Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), "Ruralidad, hambre y pobreza en América Latina y el Caribe", *Project Documents* (LC/TS.2018/119), Santiago, 2018.

⁷ See annex 1 of the *Report of the fifteenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES)*. Yachay (Ecuador), 19 November 2015 (LC/L.4151).

37. In the ensuing discussion, statements were made by the representatives of Chile, Guatemala, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru and the British Virgin Islands. The representatives agreed that the aforementioned tools were global public goods that needed to be preserved, as they allowed very valuable information from the national and subnational levels to be consolidated in one place, and provided access to good practices and experiences. The representative of the British Virgin Islands said that capacity-building was extremely important for the Caribbean. The subregion also wanted to contribute, and she said that it would be a major step forward if associate members could be included in such initiatives. The British Virgin Islands were expected to have a sustainable development plan by 2020, which they hoped could be included in the Observatory.

Report on the status of the Regular System of Government Financing for the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) (agenda item 5)

38. The Chief of ILPES reported on the status of the Institute's finances. She referred to the establishment of the Institute in 1962, which had initially been financed by the precursor of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). The Institute had been established as a permanent institution of ECLAC in 1974 and, in 1983, it had created the Regular System of Government Financing (RSGF), to which countries had pledged to contribute. Since then, the system had not been changed and the contributions had remained the same. Currently, 43% of the resources of ILPES came from the RSGF, but country contributions had been declining since 2016. She said that ILPES was producing regional public goods, such as the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development and the PlanBarometer, so it was necessary to seek a renewed commitment from member States to strengthen the Institute in the transition period before it was fully integrated into the ECLAC budget structure. Training and technical assistance for countries were important for generating such public goods, promoting learning and capacity-building. Lastly, she urged the countries to regularize their contributions and asked the representatives to convey that message to the ministries responsible for finance. She also said that she was available to help countries to resolve any difficulties that they might have with comptroller's offices or other accountability bodies, as the Institute must work together with countries to identify which ones faced challenges and what the barriers were, in order to be able to overcome them.

39. The Director of the Office of Planning and the Budget of Uruguay, in his capacity as Chair of the Regional Council for Planning, said that it was important that ILPES had resources, as the products it made available to countries were public goods useful for everyone. Although there was a regular system of contributions, the contributions were not being made regularly. He therefore called for the systematization of government contributions, which were crucial to support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

40. The representatives of Guatemala, Honduras and Panama called on countries to not only regularize their contributions, but also to update them, given that the Institute's needs were growing and the space for work and collaboration must be strengthened. They also stressed the countries must honour their commitments and pay any outstanding contributions.

Review of the programme of work of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) for 2020 (agenda item 6)

41. François Fortier, Senior Economic Affairs Officer of ILPES presented the Institute's programme of work⁸ and said that the aim of the programme of work was to improve planning and public

⁸ LC/CRP.17/DDR/1.

management processes in the region in order to advance the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and the expected accomplishments were: (a) strengthened capacities of Latin American and Caribbean countries in planning and public management for development, including both open government and gender sensitivity approaches; and (b) strengthened capacities, knowledge and exchange of experience through learning communities among key stakeholders in the region, including governments, in planning and public management for development.

42. He said that the next cycle of the programme of work would be annual rather than biennial, in line with the Secretary-General's reform of the United Nations development system, the aim of which was to make the Organization more agile and responsive to countries' needs in order to implement the 2030 Agenda. That would require some additional programming, implementation and reporting efforts. In that context, the programme of work for 2020 would continue the efforts already made by ILPES in terms of planning, implementation and evaluation of development, as well as its knowledge management modalities (capacity building, technical cooperation and applied research) and resource provision, such as communities of practice and the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development. The Institute also hoped to consolidate some of its newer resources, such as applying the PlanBarometer at the regional level. Lastly, he said that ILPES would seek to respond to emerging needs by developing new courses and tools related to evaluation, resilience (especially for the Caribbean subregion) and holistic planning for and implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

43. Some representatives then said that, in the context of the planning, annual programming was more complex, and asked that consideration be given to the possibility of continuing to work with a multi-year perspective and a programme of work with a few aims but that could be translated into concrete action for the benefit of the countries.

Presentation on the implementation status of the Addis Ababa Action Agenda on financing for development in Latin America and the Caribbean (agenda item 7)

44. Daniel Titelman, Chief of the Economic Development Division of ECLAC, gave the presentation and raised the issue of mobilizing domestic resources in a context of low growth. He said that the region was facing an external context characterized by weaker economic activity and global trade and greater uncertainty, volatility and financial fragility. The multilateral system was being questioned and geopolitical tensions had increased. The drivers of global growth remained anaemic (declining investment rates, lower productivity, weaker export growth, potential risks in the financial sector, increasing levels of global debt) and economies, with the exception of India, were experiencing downturns, which clearly reflected both cyclical and structural issues. Greater global financial uncertainty was also affecting the capacity to mobilize resources. In the case of Latin America and the Caribbean, that had led the engines of growth to lose momentum; the contribution of investment and net exports was null and there had been a widespread slowdown in 21 of the 33 countries of the region. Meanwhile, the region's limited structural fiscal space undermined countercyclical policies.

45. The Chief of the Economic Development Division also said that fiscal consolidation remained the fiscal policy objective in Latin America in 2019. The primary deficit of Latin America—as a measure of the short-term fiscal efforts to control the public debt trajectory—was expected to reach 0.2% of GDP in 2019, compared to 0.4% of GDP in 2018. While it was clear that tax revenues were not sufficient, countries were making great efforts to increase or, at least, maintain them. However, they were still insufficient to finance the attainment of the SDGs, owing mainly to tax evasion and avoidance. One of the main barriers to domestic resource mobilization to finance the 2030 Agenda in the region was the high level of tax evasion and illicit financial flows. The most recent ECLAC estimates of the losses stemming

from non-compliance with regard to income tax and value added tax (VAT) were 6.3% of GDP in 2017, or US\$ 335 billion. He said that, if countries could remedy part of that non-compliance, the additional income could advance significantly the achievement of the social and economic targets of the SDGs.

46. He said that primary expenditure had accelerated in the Caribbean, as public revenues had opened up fiscal space for more active policies in some countries. Total revenues were expected to continue to increase, from 27% of GDP in 2018 to 27.7% of GDP in 2019. Primary expenditure was expected to increase in line with public revenues, reaching 26.4% of GDP in 2019, compared to 25.4% of GDP in 2018. Despite those trends, the primary balance was expected to remain in surplus (1.3% of GDP) in 2019.

47. He said that the implementation of the 2030 Agenda required active fiscal policies that could improve the mobilization of fiscal resources and promote their better use. There were four instruments for expanding the fiscal space: (i) reducing tax evasion and illicit financial flows; (ii) re-evaluating tax expenditures to align them with productive investment; (iii) promoting the adoption of taxes to the digital economy, environmental and related to public health; and (iv) strengthening of personal income and property taxes. Lastly, he gave examples of tax expenditures with a territorial scope, such as incentives that reduced the cost of investing in renewable energies or promoted their use; deductions or tax credits for investments in clean production; incentives for investment in forest plantations; the gradual elimination of tax incentives for fossil fuels; incentives for low-carbon consumer goods, such as electric vehicles, LED lighting or solar panels; or tax incentives for the adoption of clean technologies.

Presentation on the environmental big push (agenda item 8)

48. Joseluis Samaniego, Chief of the Sustainable Development and Human Settlements Division of ECLAC began his presentation by saying that the environmental big push for a new development model was a central concept for ECLAC, as it was necessary to change the current development model and break the vicious circle formed by patterns of production and consumption associated with a peripheral development model and insufficient momentum that led to the reproduction of inequalities and inadequate concentrated and unfair patterns of spatial organization. For ECLAC, the environmental big push referred to three characteristics of investment for development: complementarity among different types of investment, including investment in education and technological capacities; the expansion of markets towards goods less intensive in carbon and natural resources; and public investment over a prolonged period, until such a time as private investment would be able to sustain the expansion. The aim was to achieve economic growth, develop productive value chains, create jobs, reduce environmental footprints and maintain or recover the production capacity of natural capital (including environmental services).

49. He said that it would not be easy to balance achieving the commitments of the 2030 Agenda with those of the Paris Agreement. That had produced a development trilemma: the region had grown as much as the global context would allow, but that growth was, on the one hand, insufficient to achieve social targets and, on the other hand, too much to meet the environmental targets. While more growth was needed to attain the SDGs, that additional growth could have adverse effects if it was not accompanied by other policies. In that regard, renewable energies offered an opportunity for increasing growth, while, at the same time, making progress towards social targets. The trilemma must therefore be addressed, by directing investment and structural change towards growth that would generate more jobs and less emissions. Public policies should be consistent with the social, environmental and economic targets, and the SDGs and nationally determined contributions were a clear guide in that regard.

50. In the discussion that followed, the representatives of Guatemala, Mexico and Panama agreed that the picture was complex, both economically and environmentally. Investment was needed in new forms of energy and, above all, the prevailing development model must be rethought, as it affected the whole world, but the consequences were more serious for developing countries.

51. The Director of the Office of Planning and the Budget of Uruguay, in his capacity as Chair of the Regional Council for Planning, said that people must wake up to how they were hurting themselves and their offspring, and the fact that they had little time left to respond to the challenge of reconciling the social, economic and environmental dimensions of the 2030 Agenda. On the one hand, consumption patterns must be changed and, on the other, the region must begin to be part of the digital revolution, which would allow physical processes to be replaced with virtual ones, helping to increase productivity without damaging the environment. Digitalization presented opportunities for citizens, such as reducing costs in collaborative economies, but it also posed challenges, as, if it was not addressed properly, it could lead to the loss of rights.

52. The representative of Jamaica said that the region was not homogenous, with differences between countries and subregions. In his country, for example, poverty was measured by consumption, because people were sometimes reluctant to disclose their real incomes, and that information was therefore difficult to obtain. The issue of fiscal resources was very important, because regardless of how efficient planning was, without resources, the plans and policies could not be implemented.

53. The Executive Secretary of ECLAC said that it was crucial to find ways to support the analysis of fiscal policy in the Caribbean, which was very different from fiscal policy in Latin America. It was also interesting to understand what measures Jamaica had taken to reduce its debt so significantly.

Consideration and adoption of resolutions (agenda item 9)

54. The representatives of the member countries of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) adopted the resolutions contained in annex 1.

Closing session

55. At the closing session, statements were made by Alicia Bárcena, Executive Secretary of ECLAC, and Álvaro García, Director of the Office of Planning and the Budget of Uruguay.

56. The Executive Secretary of ECLAC thanked the representatives for their participation in what had been intense and very fruitful days of work and exchanges, which had cemented the most important feature of the Regional Council—one of the oldest subsidiary bodies of ECLAC—, namely establishing, strengthening and developing a genuine Latin American and Caribbean community of planners who identified common challenges and enriched the capacities of all countries on the basis of each other's knowledge and experiences. The Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America and the Caribbean that had preceded the meeting of the Regional Council had provided fresh perspectives on territorialization, which had offered detailed insight into the unique challenge of planning for resilience in the Caribbean. In that regard, she expressed particular thanks to the representatives of the Caribbean countries for having travelled to Montevideo to participate actively and meaningfully in both meetings.

57. She said that, over the three days of the meeting, the countries had agreed that planning was related to all the dimensions of the SDGs. The more immediate deadlines were often prioritized in planning, but long-term planning was very important, given that it underpinned policies that transcended governments' terms in office. She stressed the need for a multilateralism that strengthened democracy, as a response compatible with the 2030 Agenda, and that boosted confidence in international cooperation and collective action for the provision of global and regional public goods. She also said that more multilateralism, more cooperation and more collective action was needed, as the cost of not cooperating was too high for the region, and that ECLAC was there to hear what the countries considered to be priorities and how it could support and assist them. One of the challenges that they faced was how to integrate the SDGs into development plans, now it was time to take a major leap to mainstream the SDGs into the territories and budgets. Lastly, she expressed the hope that the meeting had allowed all participants to expand their planning "toolboxes" and that those capacities would help to change the region for the better, by putting equality at the centre.

58. The Director of the Office of Planning and the Budget of Uruguay, in his capacity as Chair of the Regional Council for Planning, welcomed the successful conclusion of the meeting and urged the countries to continue working for the well-being of the citizens of the region. After thanking ILPES and ECLAC for their work, he reiterated that his country was committed to providing continuity to the work of the Regional Council for the next two years.

Annex 1

RESOLUTIONS**RESOLUTION CRP/XVII/01**

The Regional Council for Planning,

Recalling resolution CRP/XVI/01, adopted by the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning at its sixteenth meeting, held in Lima in 2017, in which the Council requested the Institute to continue its efforts to strengthen planning in Latin America and the Caribbean,

Bearing in mind the agreements adopted by the Presiding Officers of the Council at their twenty-seventh meeting, held in Santo Domingo in 2018, concerning the activities of the Institute,

Bearing in mind also resolution 728(XXXVII), adopted by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean at its thirty-seventh session, held in Havana in 2018, in which the Commission welcomed the strategic priorities for the work of the Institute,

Having reviewed the role and priorities of planning for development and public management in Latin America and the Caribbean in the framework of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development,

1. *Endorses the Report on the activities carried out by the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), 2018–2019;*¹

2. *Welcomes* the activity of the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development in Latin America and the Caribbean and its new analytical products and the adjustments made to PlanBarometer, welcomes the Territorial PlanBarometer model proposed in the position document *Planning for sustainable territorial development planning in Latin America and the Caribbean*² and recognizes that these tools require reflection and sustained commitment by the countries to improve and implement them, as well as the provision of relevant information for this process;

3. *Takes note* of the position document and recognizes that it provides important inputs for strengthening territorial planning in Latin America and the Caribbean;

4. *Welcomes* the contribution of the institutions of the countries of the region and donors who contribute through strategic partnerships to the activities of the Institute and its operation: the cooperation programmes with the Government of Germany through the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development and Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit, with the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation and with the Government of the Republic of Korea;

¹ LC/CRP.17/4.

² LC/CRP.17/3.

5. *Recognizes* the importance of public policy consistency for strengthening the processes and instruments of planning for development and public management for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in Latin America and the Caribbean, and requests the Institute to maintain applied research, technical cooperation, advisory work and training to promote cross-sectoral and multi-level integration of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in planning for development;

6. *Requests* the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning to continue its efforts to strengthen planning in Latin America and the Caribbean, by: (i) strengthening national planning systems, including territorial development planning, by means of PlanBarometer and its territorial application and reporting on lessons learned at the eighteenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning; (ii) broadening the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development in Latin America and the Caribbean through new analytical products that enable the region overall to gain greater knowledge of planning for development, public management and national planning systems; (iii) the sharing of knowledge and good practices regarding the use of instruments, methodologies and tools on planning and public management and collaboration in this regard; (iv) strengthening capacities for development planning at all stages of the cycle of public management for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, with particular emphasis on gender equality, public leadership, transparency, accountability and citizen participation, as well as continuous technical assistance on these issues and the systematization of good practices; (v) strengthening national and regional capacities in planning and land use management in both urban and rural forms; (vi) the inclusion of nationally determined contributions, commitments in the areas of agriculture, energy and infrastructure, among others, and strategies for adapting to climate change in national planning systems;

7. *Also requests* the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning to develop a proposal of contents for a document to be presented at the eighteenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning, and to circulate that proposal at the twenty-eighth meeting of the Presiding Officers.

RESOLUTION CRP/XVII/02

The Regional Council for Planning,

Recalling resolution CRP/XVI/02, adopted by the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning at its sixteenth meeting, held in Lima in 2017,

1. *Reaffirms* that the Regular System of Government Financing is essential for the continuity of the Institute and the implementation of its programme of work, as a complement to the regular budget of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean;

2. *Expresses* its concern at the critical level of resources reached by the Regular System of Government Financing¹ and requests member States to take the necessary measures to make and regularize their contributions to the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning in conformity with their respective normative frameworks, with a view to making regular, timely contributions;

3. *Requests* the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean to make the necessary arrangements to ensure and strengthen the operation of the Institute within existing resources of the regular budget of the organization, and to continue to seek extrabudgetary funds;

4. *Also requests* the secretariat to make such arrangements as it deems necessary to obtain financing for new projects to be conducted at the request of interested countries.

¹ See *Report on the status of the Regular System of Government Financing for the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES)* (LC/CRP.17/5).

RESOLUTION CRP/XVII/03

The Regional Council for Planning,

Recalling resolution CRP/XIV/03, adopted by the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning at its fourteenth meeting, held in Brasilia in 2013, in which it instructed the Institute to hold regular meetings of the Presiding Officers of the Council,

Expressing its satisfaction at the holding of the twenty-seventh meeting of the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning in Santo Domingo in 2018,

1. *Takes notes* of the report of the twenty-seventh meeting of the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning;¹

2. *Convenes* the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning to a meeting in the second half of 2020 at a location to be decided by the member countries;

3. *Conveys its appreciation* to the Government of Uruguay for the excellent organization of the seventeenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning and for the hospitality extended to delegations.

¹ LC/MDCRP.27/7.

Annex 2

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 Obra Pública, email: planificacion@mininterior.gob.ar

BAHAMASRepresentante/Representative:

- Sidney Collie, Embajador de Bahamas en Washington, D.C., email: scollie@bahamasembdc.org

BRASIL/BRAZILRepresentante/Representative:

- Welles Matias de Abreu, Coordinador General del Plan Plurianual, Subsecretaría de Planificación Gubernamental, Ministerio de Economía, email: welles.abreu@planejamento.gov.br

CHILERepresentante/Representative:

- Carlos Cereceda, Jefe, División de Evaluación Social de Inversiones, Subsecretaría de Evaluación Social, Ministerio de Desarrollo Social y Familia, email: carlos.cereceda@desarrollosocial.cl

Miembro de la delegación/Delegation member:

- Iris Boeninger, Embajadora de Chile en el Uruguay, email: echile.uruguay@minrel.gob.cl

COLOMBIARepresentante/Representative:

- Gloria Amparo Alonso Másmela, Directora, Departamento Nacional de Planeación (DNP), email: galonso@dnpp.gov.co

Miembros de la delegación/Delegation members:

- Amparo García Montaña, Subdirectora General Territorial, Departamento Nacional de Planeación (DNP), email: agarciam@dnpp.gov.co
- Fernando Sanclemente Alzate, Embajador de Colombia en el Uruguay, email: fernando.sanclemente@cancilleria.gov.co
- Fabio Agudelo Forero, Consejero, Embajada de Colombia en el Uruguay, email: fabio.forero@cancilleria.gob.co
- Liliana Olarte, Asesora, Departamento Nacional de Planeación (DNP), email: lolarte@dnpp.gov.co

CUBARepresentante/Representative:

- Héctor Fragnals de la Torre, Embajador de Cuba en el Uruguay, email: emcuburu@adinet.com.uy

Miembros de la delegación/Delegation members:

- Claudia González Toledo, Primera Secretaria, Encargada de Asuntos Económicos y Comerciales, Embajada de Cuba en el Uruguay, email: cubaladi@vera.com.uy
- Mónica Rodríguez, Encargada de Asuntos Políticos, Embajada de Cuba en el Uruguay, email: asuntospoliticos@vera.com.uy

DOMINICARepresentante/Representative:

- Gloria Joseph, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Planning, email: gloriajoseph101@gmail.com

ECUADORRepresentante/Representative:

- Sandra Katherine Argotty Pfeil, Secretaria Técnica de Planificación, “Planifica Ecuador” email: sargotty@planificacion.gob.ec

Miembro de la delegación/Delegation member:

- Andrea Nina, Ministro del Servicio Exterior, Embajada del Ecuador en el Uruguay, email: anina@cancilleria.gob.ec

GUATEMALARepresentante/Representative:

- Miguel Ángel Moir, Secretario Nacional de Planificación y Programación, Secretaría de Planificación y Programación de la Presidencia de la República (SEGEPLAN), email: miguel.moir@segeplan.gob.gt

HONDURASRepresentante/Representative:

- Efraín Corea Yáñez, Director Presidencial de Planificación Estratégica, Presupuesto por Resultados e Inversión Pública, email: ecorea@scgg.gob.hn

JAMAICARepresentante/Representative:

- Wayne Henry, Director General, Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ), email: deniese.sealey@mfaft.gov.jm

MÉXICO/MEXICORepresentante/Representative:

- Víctor Manuel Barceló Rodríguez, Embajador de México en el Uruguay, email: cdacunha@embamex.com.uy

Miembros de la delegación/Delegation members:

- Ramón López de León, Primer Secretario de Asuntos Políticos, Embajada de México en el Uruguay, email: embajada-mexico@embamex.com.uy
- Jaime Rojas Herrera, Segundo Secretario, Embajada de México en el Uruguay, email: jrojash@sre.gob.mx

PANAMÁ/PANAMARepresentante/Representative:

- José Agustín Espino, Director de Programación de Inversiones, Ministerio de Economía y Finanzas, email: jespino@mef.gob.pa

PARAGUAYRepresentante/Representative:

- Carlos Alberto Pereira Olmedo, Ministro, Secretaría Técnica de Planificación, email: ministro@stp.gov.py

PERÚ/PERURepresentante/Representative:

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

Miembros de la delegación/Delegation members:

- Augusto Arzubiaga, Embajador del Perú en el Uruguay, email: aarzubiaga@embaperu.org
- Jessica Pasara, Cónsul del Perú en el Uruguay, email: jpasara@embaperu.org

REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA/DOMINICAN REPUBLICRepresentante/Representative:

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

SAINT KITTS Y NEVIS/SAINT KITTS AND NEVISRepresentante/Representative:

- Austin Jay Farier, Senior Physical Planner, Department of Physical Planning, Ministry of Sustainable Development, email: austin-farier@gov.kn; j_farier@yahoo.com

SANTA LUCÍA/SAINT LUCIARepresentante/Representative:

- Werner Houson, Physical Planning Officer, Department of Physical Planning, email: whouson@yahoo.com; whouson@gosl.gov.lc

TRINIDAD Y TABAGO/TRINIDAD AND TOBAGORepresentante/Representative:

- Ayleen Alleyne Ovid, Deputy Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Planning and Development, email: ayleen.alleyneovid@planning.gov.tt

URUGUAY

Representante/Representative:

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

Miembros de la delegación/Delegation members:

- Santiago Soto, Subdirector, Oficina de Planeamiento y Presupuesto (OPP), email: ssoto@opp.gub.uy
- Jenny Merlo, Coordinadora General, Oficina de Planeamiento y Presupuesto (OPP), email: jmerlo@opp.gub.uy
- Lucía Wainer, Directora de Presupuestos, Control y Evaluación de la Gestión, Oficina de Planeamiento y Presupuesto (OPP), email: lwainer@opp.gub.uy
- Fernando Isabella, Director de Planificación, Oficina de Planeamiento y Presupuesto, email: fisabella@opp.gub.uy

B. Miembros asociados Associate members

ISLAS VÍRGENES BRITÁNICAS/BRITISH VIRGIN ISLANDS

Representante/Representative:

- Patlian Johnson, Recovery and Development Cooperation Specialist, email: pjohnson@policysolutionsbi.com

C. Secretaría Secretariat

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

- Alicia Bárcena, Secretaria Ejecutiva/Executive Secretary, email: alicia.barcena@cepal.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@cepal.org
- Daniel Titelman, Director, División de Desarrollo Económico/Chief, Division of Economic Development, email: daniel.titelman@cepal.org
- Joseluis Samaniego, Director, División de Desarrollo Sostenible y Asentamientos Humanos/Chief, Sustainable Development and Human Settlements Division, email: joseluis.samaniego@cepal.org
- Jimena Arias Feijoó, Oficial de Asuntos Sociales, Oficina del Secretario de la Comisión/Social Affairs Officer, Office of the Secretary of the Commission, email: jimena.arias@cepal.org
- Guido Camú, Oficial a Cargo, Unidad de Información Pública/Officer in Charge, Public Information Unit, email: guido.camu@cepal.org
- François Fortier, Oficial Superior de Asuntos Económicos, Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES)/Senior Economic Affairs Officer, Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), email: francois.fortier@cepal.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@cepal.org

- Lydia Rosa Geny, Oficial Adjunta de Asuntos Sociales, Oficina del Secretario de la Comisión/Associate Social Affairs Officer, Office of the Secretary of the Commission, email: lydia.rosageny@eclac.org
- Alicia Williner, 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: alicia.williner@cepal.org
- Carlos Sandoval, 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: carlos.sandoval@cepal.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@cepal.org
- Karen Haase, Asistente Superior de Gestión de Documentos, Oficina del Secretario de la Comisión/Senior Documents Management Assistant, Office of the Secretary of the Commission, email: karen.haase@cepal.org

Sede subregional de la CEPAL para el Caribe/ECLAC subregional headquarters for the Caribbean

- Diane Quarless, Directora/Chief, email: diane.quarless@eclac.org