

A

EIGHTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR PLANNING

Montevideo, Uruguay, 9 May 1989

Distr.  
RESTRICTED

LC/IP/R.78  
November 28, 1989

ENGLISH  
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

NTI/F.VIII.8

ILPES: REPORT OF THE EIGHTH REGIONAL  
COUNCIL FOR PLANNING

Presiding Officers/RCP

President: BRAZIL  
First Vice-President: ARGENTINA  
Second Vice-President: CUBA  
Director: COLOMBIA  
Rapporteur: VENEZUELA

Headquarters and Offices

COSTA RICA  
CHILE  
TRINIDAD & TOBAGO



## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
A. ATTENDANCE AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK .....	1
B. SUMMARY OF THE DEBATES .....	2
ANNEX I .....	9
ANNEX II .....	15
ANNEX III .....	17
ANNEX IV .....	19



EIGHTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR PLANNING  
(Montevideo, Uruguay, 9 May 1989)

A. ATTENDANCE AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

Place and date

1. The Eighth Meeting of the Regional Council for Planning (RCP) was held in Montevideo on 9 May 1989, in conjunction with the Seventh Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning of the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean.

Attendance

2. Twenty-two member governments attended the Eighth Meeting of the RCP; participating in the meeting were Ministers, Heads of Planning and representatives from Argentina, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Dominican Republic, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela and the Netherlands Antilles.

3. Also participating were representatives from the Executive Secretariat of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), the Director of the Regional Office of ECLAC for the Caribbean and the Resident Representative of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Uruguay, as well as representatives from the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) and from the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) (see the list of participants in Annex I).

Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning

4. According to the rules of procedure, the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning (PO/RCP) were:

- |   |                        |            |
|---|------------------------|------------|
| - | President:             | Mexico     |
| - | First Vice-President:  | Brazil     |
| - | Second Vice-President: | Costa Rica |
| - | Rapporteur:            | Guatemala  |

### Agenda and documentation

5. The deliberations centered on the agenda proposal unanimously approved by the Council. The General Directorate of ILPES had previously distributed a series of documents as the basis for the discussion, the list of which is found in Annex III.

### Organization of work

6. The RCP concentrated its attention on the Programme of Activities of the Institute, on the updating of the New Institutional Project 1989-1992, and on the proposed regulations of the RCP. It then elaborated a series of Draft Resolutions which would orient the future activities of the Institute and proceeded to elect the new PO/RCP.

## **B. SUMMARY OF THE DEBATES**

7. The meeting was divided into three parts. In the first, the General Director of ILPES gave a concise presentation of the points on the agenda. The representatives of the member governments then made observations, comments and suggestions. Lastly, after a brief intermission, a series of Resolutions of the RCP were proposed and approved and the new PO/RCP was elected.

### Presentation of the General Director of ILPES

8. The General Director of ILPES began his presentation by outlining the main results of the Programme of Activities for 1988 and the guidelines for work for 1989, based on the new technical and operational organization of ILPES approved in the Seventh RCP (Havana, March 1987). It should be mentioned that a preliminary version of this Report had already been approved unanimously in the meeting of the Eleventh PO/RCP (San José, 14-15 November 1988) and the final version sent to the member governments on 30 January.

9. The General Director of ILPES then highlighted the central points of the updating of the New Institutional Project 1989-1992, a document also previously distributed to the member governments, although less in advance, owing to the need to include figures up till 30 April; for this reason, this presentation was more detailed.

10. The General Director of ILPES began by recalling that the New Institutional Project introduced a different type of association between the governments of the region and the United Nations, in order to share the responsibility of supporting the ordinary budget of the Institute. For its part, ILPES committed itself to generate on its own the resources lacking for carrying out the activities included in its work programme. He emphasized that although this association gave rise to beneficial results during the first two years, from 1986 onward governments either delayed or failed to make their respective payments, resulting in the most serious liquidity crisis in the almost 27 years of ILPES' existence, despite the fact that the United Nations fulfilled its commitment and ILPES surpassed the established goals for mobilizing resources not included in the budget.

11. The General Director affirmed that the liquidity crisis of the Institute acquires the following dimension and characteristics: on the one hand, liabilities up to 31 December 1988 exceed the availability of funds at that date; and on the other hand, the sum of pending contributions is insufficient to replenish the reserves to their original level.

12. He concluded that the crisis was a consequence of the fact that ILPES was forced to operate during the five-year period 1984-1988 with resources 32% below the regular planned budget, despite the fact that the Institute surpassed by 18% the goal of generating resources not included in the budget; and that this model--based on using up the financial reserves of ILPES--was exhausted together with the reserves.

13. The General Director of ILPES outlined the direction and proposals of the preliminary design of the Second Phase of the New Institutional Project (NIP-II PHASE/1989-1992), pointing out that:

- the same bases for the intergovernmental agreement approved in 1983 are maintained;

- the share of government contributions in the overall budget of the Institute is reduced in nominal terms from a third to a quarter; apart from marginal adjustments in some quotas agreed upon in 1983, the commitment to contribute (never fulfilled) on the part of some of the smaller countries of the English-speaking Caribbean is eliminated;

- the government contributions continue to be critical for the budget of ILPES; and

- a special effort is called for on the part of the member governments to make their contributions in accord with the established amounts and time limits, in the framework on the guidelines approved for the NIP (Twenty-second Session of ECLAC): maintain their principles; regulate the contributions; programme for a four-year period; and stabilize the minimum size of ILPES.

14. Lastly, the General Director of ILPES succinctly presented the proposed organizational regulation of the RCP, emphasizing: first, the need to examine and approve the parts of the proposal needed to elect the new authorities of the PO/RCP, and second, the advisability of agreeing on a procedure to follow for discussing and approving the overall draft regulation.

15. Regarding the first point, he referred to the proposed new composition of the PO/RCP, its criteria for representation, the necessary conditions for seeking leadership positions and the transitory provisions required for electing the PO/RCP. With respect to the second point, he proposed that the Eighth RCP delegate to the PO/RCP to be elected the authority to provisionally approve the organizational regulation which would be in effect till the Ninth RCP is held in 1992. Once approved by the Ninth RCP, the definitive version would be presented for ratification by the member governments in the corresponding Session of ECLAC.

#### Comments by the representatives of the member governments

16. The President of the RCP thanked the General Director of ILPES for his presentation and opened the floor to the delegates.

17. The Delegate from the Dominican Republic stated that given the difficulties that the countries have in making their contributions to ILPES, new sources of financing need to be explored, especially charging for some of the services provided by the Institute, as well as for the distribution of books and documents.

18. The Delegate from Nicaragua pointed out that it would be good if ILPES increased its activities in Central America, given the possibility of contributing significantly to the proposals under way in that subregion. To that effect, he proposed that ILPES be the executing agency for some of the activities included in the UNDP's Special Programme for Central America.



19. The Delegate from Chile expressed his agreement with the idea of increasing ILPES' income through the carrying out of specific projects. He also stated his disagreement with the proposed elimination of the government contributions of the English-speaking Caribbean, maintaining that the contribution is an indicator of the degree of commitment of the government to ILPES. For that reason, he proposed that all the governments contribute--although in justifiable cases it be only symbolically--and that the quotas be maintained at their original levels.

20. The Delegate from Trinidad and Tobago emphasized that in no case did the governments of the English-speaking Caribbean expect the rest of the countries to finance the activities of that subregion. The main idea was that the governments of the subregion would be progressively more disposed to fulfill their commitments to the degree that ILPES increased its activities in the area.

21. The General Director of ILPES responded to these comments, pointing out that:

- According to previous Resolutions of the RCP, every activity of specific interest to a member government, as is the case of technical co-operation projects, should be self-financed. The government contributions comprise the only acceptable mechanism for financing the generic activities of ILPES, i.e. those of multilateral interest.

- The sale of publications does not generate direct income for the Institute, since it is done through the corresponding agencies of the United Nations System.

- It has not been possible in the case of Central America to obtain financial support from the UNDP within the framework of its Special Programme for the subregion. The important initiative suggested by the Delegate from Nicaragua would be viable only if the Central American countries gave it strong backing in the corresponding forums.

- The elimination of the commitments for contributions of most of the governments of the English-speaking Caribbean only recognizes the fact that those contributions, in spite of their reduced amount, were never made. Consequently, the idea is to explore mechanisms which would compensate for the lack of this income; in this sense, ILPES presented to the UNDP--with the support of some governments--a request for financing for a specific project to expand its activities in the subregion, but without positive results to date.

22. The Representative of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States pointed out that, considering the prestige of ILPES, the strengthening of its Office in Port of Spain would facilitate the task of attracting new resources in order to increase its activities in the subregion.

23. The Representative from the Dominican Republic mentioned that the financial problems faced by ILPES are similar to those affecting other international organizations. Nevertheless, because of its strong links with the countries, if the Institute carried out more projects, it could obtain more income by way of overhead.

24. The Representative of Guatemala insisted on the need to face the financial problems with creativity and imagination; he thus underlined the necessity of exploring alternatives that would help the governments fulfill their commitments to contribute in ways other than cash disbursements. To that effect, he proposed that the countries pay a registration fee to participate in institutional events like the Conferences of Ministers and Heads of Planning and that they use national resources to partially finance ILPES activities, especially training and the publication of books and technical documents.

25. The Delegate from Argentina expressed the opinion that the initiatives presented were worth analyzing in more detail and suggested recommending to the Office of the General Director of ILPES that it elaborate a proposal that would incorporate those initiatives in order to generate additional funds. He stated that, such a proposal notwithstanding, the established mechanism of government quotas would have to continue till a system of alternative financing is assured.

26. The Delegate from Trinidad and Tobago emphasized the need for the governments to fully support the financing of ILPES, in view of the key role it plays in the integration of the different countries and subregions.

27. The Delegate from the Dominican Republic agreed that the present quotas be maintained, but insisted that resources generated by way of overhead by the projects carried out by ILPES in each country could be subtracted from those quotas. He also supported the idea of mandating the Office of the General Director of the Institute to explore other sources of financing.

28. The Delegate from Colombia emphasized that ILPES, as a multilateral organization, constituted an essential and fundamental link for the countries of the region; that ILPES was an institution of the governments and that it developed programmes essential for integration and interdependence. Consequently, he maintained that the governments had the responsibility of supporting it financially, since they could not

assign it tasks without providing adequate resources. He proposed maintaining the present system of quotas and searching for more sources of financing. He stressed, lastly, the need for the governments to be clear about their commitments as the owners of ILPES.

29. The Delegate from Mexico stated that the objectives of ILPES were not in question, but rather the problem of its financing. He observed that ILPES presented a work programme that did not have the necessary financing. He held that an alternative would be to adjust the programme to the available resources. He proposed, therefore, that each country ratify its contribution and that a work programme with a more realistic budget be defined.

30. The General Director of ILPES referred to this second round of comments with the following observations:

- The overhead derived from carrying out projects compensates for the costs incurred and, moreover, is not completely appropriated by the Institute; therefore, it cannot be completely credited as a government contribution.

- The Institute has already shown imagination for mobilizing resources; proof of it is the fact of having exceeded the goal of extrabudgetary resources.

- The Delegate from Trinidad and Tobago introduced a line of thought that could be very fruitful for determining the role of ILPES in the future.

- Thanks are due to the Delegate from Argentina for his support and to the Delegate from Colombia for emphasizing the catalytic role of ILPES and the need for the governments to support it financially.

- The proposed work programme presented by ILPES was elaborated in accord with the commitments for contributions approved by the countries.

31. The Delegate from Mexico declared that the contribution promised by his government had been already paid and that if the budget shows a higher sum, a deficit will be produced.

32. The Delegate from Chile held that, in his opinion, the question was not whether governments should pay their quotas or not. He went on to say that what could be in question was the type of benefits offered by the Institute; to this effect, he proposed distinguishing between regional and national benefits. He concluded by expressing the interest of his government in horizontal co-operation and the important role that ILPES could play in detecting, promoting and making feasible activities in that area.

33. The Delegate from Brazil conveyed the full support of his government for ILPES, evidenced by the fact of having regularly paid its contributions and by the conviction that ILPES is a fundamental agency for the region.

34. Finally, several delegates made suggestions with respect to the format of the Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning. The Delegate from Uruguay, supported by the Delegates from Chile and the Dominican Republic, suggested revising the structure of the Conference. To that effect, the Delegate from Brazil proposed dedicating more sessions to the interchange of experiences in a less formal atmosphere and the Delegate from Trinidad and Tobago added, seconded by the Delegate from Nicaragua, that such an interchange should be directed toward proven ways of examining the solutions to problems.

35. After a brief intermission, used by the Rapporteur of the OP/RCP to consult with different delegates, the RCP met once again in a plenary session to consider the Draft Resolutions. After some discussion which allowed for clarifying and specifying their contents, the RCP unanimously approved the eight Resolutions included in Annex IV.

36. Following that, the Delegate from the Netherlands Antilles offered Curaçao as the seat of the next meeting of the OP/RCP to be held in the first quarter of 1990. This offer was approved unanimously.

37. Lastly, the authorities of the new OP/RCP were elected, according to the changes in composition approved by the Seventh RCP (see Resolution RCP/VIII/8), comprised by the following:

President:	Brazil
First Vice-President:	Argentina
Second Vice-President:	Cuba
Director:	Colombia
Rapporteur:	Venezuela
Representatives of the Headquarters and Offices:	Chile, Costa Rica and Trinidad and Tobago.

38. The Eighth Meeting of the Regional Council of Montevideo closed with this election, with the delegates thanking the outgoing Presiding Officers for their work since 1987.

**A N N E X    I**

9 de mayo de 1989

VIII REUNION DEL CONSEJO REGIONAL DE PLANIFICACION  
EIGHT MEETING OF THE REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR PLANNING

Montevideo, Uruguay 9 de mayo de 1989

LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES  
LIST OF PARTICIPANTSA. Gobiernos Miembros del CRP  
Member Governments of RCP

## ARGENTINA

Representante: René Ortuño, Subsecretario General de Planificación, Secretaría de Planificación de la Presidencia de la Nación

Representante alterno: Héctor Amadeo García, Director, Sector Externo, Secretaría de Planificación

## BARBADOS

Representante: Andrew F. Cox, Senior Economist, Office of the Prime Minister, Division of Economic Affairs

## BELICE

Representante: José Orlando Puga, Senior Economist, Ministry of Economic Development

## BOLIVIA

Representante: Fernando Ruiz, Subsecretario de Inversión Pública y Cooperación Internacional, Ministerio de Planeamiento y Coordinación

## BRASIL

Representante: Joao Batista Abreu, Ministro de Planificación y Coordinación, SEPLAN

Representante alternativo: Clodoaldo Hugueney, Secretario de Asuntos Internacionales, SEPLAN

Miembros de la delegación: Livio de Carvalho, Carlos Roberto Penna, Rubens Yonamine

## COLOMBIA

Representante: Jorge Enrique Vargas González, Subjefe, Departamento Nacional de Planeación

Representante alternativo: Luis Bernardo Florez, Viceministro de Hacienda

## COSTA RICA

Representante: Fernando Herrero, Viceministro de Planificación Nacional y Política Económica

## CUBA

Representante: Antonio Rodríguez Maurell, Ministro, Presidente de la Junta Central de Planificación y Vicepresidente del Consejo de Ministros

Representante alternativo: José Fernández Santana, Vicepresidente de Planificación

## CHILE

Representante: Sergio Melnick, Ministro/Director, Oficina de Planificación Nacional

Representante alternativo: Rodrigo Moncada, Subdirector Regional, ODEPLAN

## ECUADOR

Representante: Fernando Ribadeneira, Embajador de Ecuador en el Uruguay

Representante alternativo: Iván Fernández, Asesor del CONADE.

## EL SALVADOR

Representante: Manuel Calderón, Embajador de El Salvador en Uruguay

## GUATEMALA

Representante: Salvador Del Valle, Subsecretario de Planificación

## HONDURAS

Representante: Jorge Navarro, Director de Planificación Global, Secretaría de Planificación

## JAMAICA

Representante: Lincoln McIntosh, Deputy Director, Planning Institute of Jamaica

## MEXICO

Representante: Rogelio Gasca Neri, Subsecretario de Programación y Presupuesto



## NICARAGUA

Representante: Orlando Solórzano, Viceministro, Secretaría de Planificación

## REPUBLICA DOMINICANA

Representante: Jorge M. Herrera, Director, Oficina Nacional de Planificación, Secretaría Técnica de la Presidencia

## SURINAME

Representante: Christine de Rooy, Coordinator Macro Planning, National Planning Office of Suriname

## TRINIDAD Y TABAGO

Representante: John V. Prince, Senior Planning Officer, Minister of Planning and Mobilization

## URUGUAY

Representante: Ariel Davrieux, Director, Oficina de Planeamiento y Presupuesto

Representante alternativo: Jorge Pelufo, Director Cooperación Internacional, Oficina de Planeamiento y Presupuesto

## VENEZUELA

Representante: Boris Echerman, Economista, Asistente Ejecutivo del Ministro de la Oficina de Coordinación y Planificación de la Presidencia de la República

## ANTILLAS NEERLANDESAS

Representante: Franklyn Crestian, Minister, Ministry for Development and Cooperation

ORGANIZACION DE ESTADOS DEL CARIBE ORIENTAL (OECO)

Representante: George Goodwin, Chief, Sector Policy and Planning

B. Organizaciones Intergubernamentales  
Intergovernmental Organizations

Comunidad del Caribe (CARICOM)

Representante: Fay Housty, Senior Economist

C. Secretaría de las Naciones Unidas  
United Nations Secretariat

Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe (CEPAL)

Horacio Santamaría, Director, Oficina de Planificación y  
Coordinación de Programas  
Armando Di Filippo, Asesor Regional de la División de  
Comercio Internacional y Desarrollo  
Clyde Applewhite, Director ECLAC, Puerto España

E. Secretaría  
Secretariat

Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica  
y Social (ILPES)

Alfredo Costa-Filho, Director General  
Jorge Israel, ATP, Proyecto PNUD/ILPES  
Juan Martín, Coordinador, Área del Sector Público

**A N N E X     I I**

**PROPOSED AGENDA OF THE EIGHTH REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR PLANNING**  
(Montevideo, Uruguay - 9 May 1989)

<u>Time</u> <u>b/</u>	<u>Programme</u>
8:30	- <b>AGENDA:</b> Discussion and approval. <u>a/</u>
9:00	- <b>OPENING:</b> Inauguration by the President of the Eighth Regional Council for Planning
9:10	- <b>MEETINGS:</b> Presentation of the General Director of ILPES (documents <b>NTI/F.VIII.3, F.VIII.3/Add.1 and F.VIII.4</b> )
10:00	- Intermission
10:20	- <b>MEETING I:</b> Speeches by the Ministers and Heads of Delegations, discussion and approval of each of the following documents:
10:30	- (Cont.) - <b>NTI/F.VIII.3 and its Add.1</b>
11:10	- (Cont.) - <b>NTI/F.VIII.4</b>
12:00	- Intermission
12:20	- <b>MEETING II:</b> Presentation and general discussion of other documents:
12:20	- (Cont.) - <b>NTI/F.VIII.5</b>
12:50	- (Cont.) - <b>NTI/F.VIII.6</b>
1:00	- <b>MEETING III:</b> Resolution projects (Document <b>NTI/F.VIII.7</b> , for ad-hoc distribution)
1:40	- (Cont.) - Election of the new Regional Council for Planning Board of Officers
1:50	- (Cont.) - Places and dates of the next meetings ( <b>XII P.O. and IX Regional Council for Planning</b> )
2:00	- <b>CLOSING:</b> Final speeches
2:10	- <b>CLOSING</b>

a/ This first meeting will be eliminated if there is previous approval of the proposed agenda on the basis of formal consultation the night of Sunday 7 with the delegations already in Montevideo.

b/ As explained in another document (NTI/G.VII.2/Rev.1, paragraph 7, note a/), the strict observance of the timetable is essential since the Regional Council for Planning meets in one single day; the meeting will continue in the afternoon if necessary.

**A N N E X     I I I**

**EIGHTH MEETING OF THE REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR PLANNING**

(Montevideo, Uruguay, 9 May 1989)

**LIST OF DOCUMENTS**

(Doc. F.VIII.1/Rev.1)

<u>Regional Council for Planning</u>	<u>ILPES Document No.</u>
<u>Reference</u>	
NTI/F.VIII.1/Rev.1 - LIST OF DOCUMENTS	IC/IP/R.71
F.VIII.2/Rev.1 - Regional Council for Planning: Organization of work and proposed agenda	IC/IP/R.72
F.VIII.3 - ILPES: Report on 1988 activities and work guidelines for 1989	IC/IP/R.73
F.VIII.3/Add.1 - ILPES: List of publications - 1988	IC/IP/R.73 /Add.1
F.VIII.4 - ILPES: Updating of the "New institutional project - 1989-1992"	IC/IP/R.74
F.VIII.5 - Regional Council for Planning: Proposed basic regulations	IC/IP/R.75
F.VIII.6 - ILPES: Proposal for the Eighth Conference (Special, Madrid, 1992)	IC/IP/R.76
F.VIII.7 - Regional Council for Planning: Resolutions of Eighth Meeting <u>a/</u>	IC/IP/R.77
F.VIII.8 - ILPES: Report of the Eighth Regional Council for Planning <u>b/</u>	IC/IP/R.78

a/ Ad-hoc preparation and distribution.

b/ To be distributed after the closing of the Eighth Regional Council for Planning.

**A N N E X      I V**

## VIII REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR PLANNING

## RESOLUTION RCP/VIII/01

1. Endorses and fully supports the resolutions PO/XI/01 of the XI Meeting of the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning (PO/RCP), held on 14 and 15 November 1988.
2. Approves the Activities Report for 1988 as well as the Proposal for the Working Programme for 1989 and requests ILPES to adjust it in accordance with the recommendations contained in the Rapporteur's Report.

## RESOLUTION RCP/VIII/02

1. Endorses and supports resolutions PO/XI/02 in connection with Regional Project ILPES/UNDP/RLA/86/029 on both completed and future activities of the Project. Requests ILPES to include in its work programme the recommendations which will appear in the Rapporteur's Report.
2. Expresses its satisfaction with the structure of activities of the Project and the results obtained to date and which have been communicated to Member Governments. Recommends that the Project be supplied with new resources and thus satisfy in the best manner the requirements of the NPO's.
3. Emphasizes the results of the Working Group (Montevideo, 5-10 May 1989) on the activities carried out in the Caribbean, organized jointly by ILPES and the ECLAC Office in Port of Spain.



**RESOLUTION RCP/VIII/03**

As regards ILPES Office in Central America and Panama;

1. Supports Resolution PO/XI/03; thanks the Government of Costa Rica for its constant assistance to the Office, as well as the Governments of the Isthmus for carrying out such an intensive work programme:
2. Requests the Governments and the Co-operation Organizations to expand their financial assistance to ILPES for undertaking the activities required by the NPO's;
3. Calls on the UNDP, through its Special Programme for Central America and within its guidelines, to support the activities of ILPES in the subregion, in compliance with the requests of the Governments.

**RESOLUTION RCP/VIII/04**

1. Fully supports the function of ILPES as a necessary organization for planning and co-ordinating economic and social policies in the region, through its technical contributions in consulting, research, training and co-operation between planning agencies.
2. Approves the amount of government contributions suggested as necessary for the adequate functioning of ILPES.
3. Reiterates the need to maintain the financing system based on voluntary cash contributions of the member governments, which are requested to define the amount of their respective contribution before 31 July 1989, seeking mechanisms of payment or compensation for them.
4. Requests ILPES to propose new financing mechanisms which may complement its operative budget.

**RESOLUTION RCP/VIII/05**

Regarding the Intergovernmental Organizations acting in the area of planning and public management policies:

1. Expresses its satisfaction with the Report of the President of SCCOPALC for the period 1987-1989 and fully supports the proposals for its reinforcement.
2. Points out the preparatory work of ILPES for the organization of the VII Conference, expresses its satisfaction for the results attained and thanks the government of Uruguay for the excellent arrangements for the event.
3. Reiterates its thanks to the government of Spain for its offer to host the Extraordinary Conference to be held in 1992 as part of the celebration of the 500th Anniversary of the Discovery of America.

**RESOLUTION RCP/VIII/06**

With reference to the inter-agency relation of ILPES:

1. Reiterates its gratitude to the Inter-American Development Bank, the World Bank and its Economic Development Institute.
2. Expresses its gratitude to the International and Co-operative organisms which are supporting and executing joint activities with ILPES.
3. Reiterates its gratitude to those non-member governments such as The Netherlands, France, Spain and Italy for their support and requests that they continue co-operating with the activities of ILPES.
4. Expresses its recognition to UNDP and the Offices of the Resident Representatives as well as the Liaison Office with ECLAC and ILPES for the important support given to the work of the Institute.
5. Reiterates its recognition to the Executive Secretary of ECLAC for the constant support given to the activities of ILPES.
6. Emphasizes the importance of the New Agreement reached between the Secretary General of the OAS and ILPES, to carry out joint activities in the field of Social Policies.

RESOLUTION RCP/VIII/07

With regard to the ILPES Office for the Caribbean:

1. The Regional Council for Planning expresses its satisfaction for the work carried out to date by the Institute.
2. Requests the financial support of ILPES so that it can increase its activities in the subregion. In this respect, it suggests a broader financing of the UNDP/ILPES RLA/86/029 Project, in order to make possible greater relations of co-operation between the Caribbean countries and the remaining countries of the Region.

RESOLUTION RCP/VIII/08

Considering the Preliminary Draft of the Regulation of the RCP and its interim provisions

and bearing in mind the need to appoint the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning,

The Regional Council for Planning

1. Approves the composition of the PO/RPC as follows:
  - a) five elected members: one President, two Vicepresidents, a Director and a Rapporteur;
  - b) one member appointed alternately, for successive meetings of the PO/RPC among the regions and subregions represented by the headquarters and the Offices of the Institute;
  - c) one member as representative of the host country of the corresponding meeting of the PO/RPC; if that country should already be a member of the PO/RPC, this body will invite another member government.
2. Establishes likewise the following provisions:
  - a) that only member governments who have attended a minimum of two thirds of the meetings convened by the RCP and its PO/RCP during the past eight years, shall be candidates to fill the five elective positions.

- b) that at the IX RCP a specific Regulation for the articulation of the countries representing the present Headquarters and Offices of the Institute with the PO/RCP shall be discussed and approved.
  - c) that the first group of countries covered by sub-paragraph 1.b) shall be those where the Headquarters and Offices of the Institute are located.
3. Decides that the following procedure shall be adopted for the discussion and approval of the Regulation
- a) ILPES shall submit to the NPO of each country a revised version of the Preliminary Draft in accordance with the suggestions of this Forum within the following thirty days, incorporating the recommendations of ECLAC.
  - b) The member governments shall have seventy-five days to put forward comments on the text of the Preliminary Draft and forward them in writing to ILPES.
  - c) ILPES shall include these comments in a corrected version and shall distribute it to the members of the XII PO/RCP in which the VIII RCP delegates provisional approval of the Draft Regulations which shall be in force until the IX RCP is held.
  - d) Once this has been approved by the IX RCP, the final version entitled "Basic Rules and Regulations" shall be submitted to the corresponding Session of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean for its ratification.



