



ILPES

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

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

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

**THIRTEENTH MEETING OF THE PRESIDING OFFICERS
OF THE REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR PLANNING**

E.XIII.03

Santiago, Chile, 5 - 6 November 1990

New ILPES Texts
Ref. NTI/E.XIII.03

**ILPES: "NEW INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT 1989/1992":
13TH EDITION**

Presiding Officers/CRP

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

Headquarters and Subregional Offices

COSTA RICA
CHILE
TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

W.XIII.03

THIRTIETH MEETING OF THE PRESIDENTS AND VICE-PRESIDENTS
OF THE REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR PLANNING

Santiago, Chile, 1962 - a number of years

Low level text
Ref. W.XIII.03

IPPER - NEW INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT 1962-1963
13TH EDITION

Regional Development
First Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Second Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Third Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Fourth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Fifth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Sixth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Seventh Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Eighth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Ninth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Tenth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Eleventh Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Twelfth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Thirteenth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Fourteenth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Fifteenth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Sixteenth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Seventeenth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Eighteenth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Nineteenth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Twentieth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Twenty-first Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Twenty-second Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Twenty-third Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Twenty-fourth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Twenty-fifth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Twenty-sixth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Twenty-seventh Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Twenty-eighth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Twenty-ninth Meeting - Santiago, Chile
Thirtieth Meeting - Santiago, Chile

FOREWORD

The present document is the 13th edition of a series which, since 1982, systematically updates the NEW INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT (NIP). As indicated by ILPES in its address to the XIII Meeting of Presiding Officers, said version corresponds to NIP-II PHASE-1989/1992 and has as its closing date 16 October 1990.

On this occasion, a new procedure has been established concerning the preparation and dissemination of this document, which is expected to make easier its analysis by Member Governments and, also, activate the pace of discussions on it by the XIII Meeting of Presiding Officers. The double confidential character of this document has always been recognized: it refers to financial data for the exclusive attention of the members of the Meeting of Presiding Officers and contains data -also confidential- on the situation of the governmental contributions to the Institute.

These reasons have always led to a limited and ad-hoc distribution of this document in its previous versions. Progressively, an appendix to the central text has grown, with background of previous editions, on this sort of multilateral agreement that established a new relation "United Nations-Member Governments-ILPES" and has been in force for 8 years.

Now, with sufficient anticipation, the part that precisely contains an updated summary of previous decisions is being distributed as the central text of this document. This allows a previous and better familiarization with the basic structure of the NIP, especially for those delegates that possibly will attend for the first time this meeting as members. On the other hand, it reinforces the agreements reached by the Regional Council for Planning and are used as guidelines for the work of the Meeting of the Presiding Officers, in between the meetings of the Council.

On this occasion, two annexes have been prepared, containing the most up-dated financial data, that will keep their character of "confidential documents" and that will be handed to the participating governments of the Meeting. Annex A contains the state of account of the Institute (closed on 16 October 1990); Annex B contain updated tables on the governmental contributions. The proposals and alternatives that, possibly, the Institute might submit, will also contain these two brief annexes, for it will depend on the information contained therein.

Its approval, together with the modifications or improvements that the XIII Meeting of Presiding Officers might make, constitute for 1991 the norm of the financial relations of the Institute, with the 39 member governments. Certainly this norm is complementary to the rules and procedures of the United Nations, with which ILPES must comply. It should be reiterated that this report confines itself to the financial situation of the Institute, for another document refers to its technical activities (see document NTI/E.XIII.3). As usual, a more detailed analysis will be made in the presentation of the Director General of ILPES to the XIII Meeting of Presiding Officers.

It is worth recalling that in the last edition of the NIP (March 1990), the Executive Secretary of ECLAC expressed his deep concern on the delicate financial situation of the Institute. He indicated it might end in a liquidity crisis that could imply -in the short term- a reduction of the programme activities of this body of the ECLAC System.

Finally, it should be noted that this version has not been submitted to the official Editing Division of the System integrated by ECLAC's Secretariat, ILPES and CELADE. The Institute's Direction welcomes the observations and remarks that will enable it to improve this report. Likewise, ILPES is ready to provide any additional information the XIII Meeting of Presiding Officers may request.

ILPES, Santiago, Chile
30 September 1990

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD	i
Chapter I ILPES: SOME BASIC BACKGROUND	1
Section I.A THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETINGS	1
Section I.B SOME RECENT BACKGROUND	3
Chapter II THE "NIP": AN INSTITUTE IN TRANSITION AFTER 1982	5
Section II.A NIP: FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF CONSENSUS OF THE CRP	7
Section II.B BASIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PREVIOUS NPI.	9
Section II.C MINIMUM GUIDELINES FOR THE PERIOD 1989-1992	11
Chapter III STRUCTURE AND CHRONOLOGY OF THE MULTILATERAL MEETINGS	16
Section III.A CHAIRMEN AND MEMBERS OF THE RCP	16
III.A.1 PRESENT PHASE: "REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR PLANNING"	16
III.A.2. SECOND PHASE: "TECHNICAL COMMITTEE": 1975/1986	16
III.A.3. FIRST PHASE: "EXECUTIVE COUNCIL":1962/1974	17
Section III.B CHRONOLOGY OF SCCOPALC, CRP AND MD/CRP	19

Chapter I

ILPES: SOME BASIC BACKGROUND

1. Since its establishment in June 1962 1/, the Institute has been conceived as a permanent and autonomous body, and part of the regional system of the United Nations for Latin America and the Caribbean, officially known as "ECLAC System". **Both attributes - autonomy and permanence presupposed a strong direct control of Member Governments over the Institute and also its direct financial support 2/.** During its first fifteen years this same conception was discussed and reiterated on several occasions; as from 1977, however, it has gained force with the official convening of the Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning of the Region, ILPES acting as Technical Secretariat of this new system (SCCOPALC) 3/.

Section I.A. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL MEETINGS

2. As known, the "Executive Council", established in 1962 was replaced (Port-of-Spain, May 1975) by the "Technical Committee", **constituted by the Ministers or Heads of National Planning Bodies**

1/ "At the end of the fifties it became clear, in the Economic Commission for Latin America, that the Secretariat could not face with its own resources the great demand of member governments in matters related to training and advisory... and it was thus recommended (Resolution 199/IX, May 1961) **to establish the Institute, with support of the United Nations Special Fund** (the same which, with the Technical Assistance Programme, merged within UNDP in January 1966". See ILPES: Report for the period 1962-1971, Inst L.65, August 1971, page 2).

2/ Its establishment originally appears in the Resolution of the Member Countries of ECLAC 199/IX of 30 May 1961, and 219/AC.50 and 219/AC.52, both of 1962. This last resolution **determined the organization of ILPES, established a multilateral Directive Council and the post of Director General.**

3/ SCCOPALC: **Coordination and Cooperation System among Planning Bodies of Latin America and the Caribbean.** (Ratified in accordance with Resolution 317, XVII Session of ECLA/May 1977). See the chronology of these intergovernmental meetings in the last page of this document (period 1975-1993); see the structure (by country) of all these meetings, since 1962, in the immediately preceding pages.

of each member country or Associated State 4/. The "Technical Committee" was established as the main head of the Institute, responsible for providing its general guidance and approving its Work Programme; said Programme had to be revised approximately every two years. To supervise it yearly the "Technical Sub-Committee" was set up (it met for the first time in the Contadora Island, Panama, in November 1975). **Both collective bodies reinforced the dual character of the Institute: at the same time, a permanent regional organization of the United Nations System and, a multilateral agency providing services, directly supervised by its own Member Governments 5/.**

3. It is worth recalling that when the official convening of the Conferences of Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America and the Caribbean (Caracas, April 1977) took place as a larger meeting for "external relations" of the NPBs, **the Institute was designated as its Technical Secretariat.** The national representations to these Conferences increased their number of delegates; besides, many international organizations of economic and technical

4/ Traditionally, NPB or National Planning Body have been adopted to designate the national body with highest hierarchy in the technical co-ordination of public policies and which is the representative of the member governments in these collective bodies. The generic abbreviation "NPB" replaces -in a simplified manner- each of the official designations: Ministry, Secretariat, Council, Office, etc. It is recalled that three basic criteria usually define the hierarchic level of the NPB in order to consider it at the "ministerial level": First, the holder should report to the President of the country or to a Prime Minister; second, he must have a place in the ministerial councils and interministerial bodies; and third, he must be responsible for some function of interministerial coordination, with a ruling voice at least on the national investment budget. **Subsequently the original "Executive Council" was officially replaced by the "Technical Committee" (Resolution 340/AC.66, January 1974).**

5/ As a permanent regional organization, the Institute is **subject preeminently to the rules and procedures established by the General Secretariat of the United Nations.** Please recall -and this is not the case for ECLAC- that the member countries of the "Technical Committee" or its successor "The Regional Council for Planning" pertain exclusively to Latin America and the Caribbean.

co-operation, regional multilateral and governmental organizations in the field of planning and development were included as participants or as observers. From the beginning of SCCOPALC, and in the framework of each conference was convened the meeting which today is the Regional Council for Planning, which had met separately until then. First as a custom, later officially, the Council and its Presiding Officers (ex Technical Sub-Committee) met with the purpose of preparing the Conferences and assessing the work of ILPES for SCCOPALC 6/.

Section I.B SOME RECENT BACKGROUND

4. **The end of the seventies.** Besides the historical aspects just mentioned, there are other facts that overlap some roots of the "New Institutional Project" of ILPES. The following context is one of them. "The Institute, as well as the remaining of the ECLAC System, has been faced in this last year and a half to a sharp increase of its operational costs because the host country has kept invariable its rate of exchange since July 1979, under circumstances that its personnel costs -specially support personnel- have increased considerably, and the Institute has not been provided with additional resources. In other words, **its income budget has been invariable while its expenditures have increased more or less 40%**. This, of course, would mean to incur in a deficit if it were not due to the fact that the Institute has counted on

6/ The specific multilateral meetings that guided directly ILPES from its beginnings, started a third phase as from March 1987, reaching since then their present structure. The internal jurisprudence of the United Nations System officially incorporated these changes when the governments decided unanimously to "ratify the replacement of the Technical Committee by the **Regional Council for Planning**, and the Technical Sub-Committee by the **Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning**" (article 6, Resolution 493/XXII, Session 237, April 1988, subsequently ratified by the corresponding ECOSOC). A new referral to the chronology of the multilateral Meetings, submitted in the last page of this document, may facilitate the understanding of the links between SCCOPALC, CRP and MD/CRP).

some reserves that will allow it to face its commitments in 1981, specially with its personnel"^{7/}.

5. **The end of 1981.** Practically a year later, the financial difficulties of the Institute -already aggravated on the side of costs (in accordance with the above paragraph)- were further weakened, now on the side of income. **UNDP -that was at that time the main source of resources- decides a decrease of funds for the following year** in the framework of the Pluriannual Budget previously approved for the Institute. In April 1980-1982 ILPES is informed that the resources assigned "will be reduced by one quarter, totalling a cut of US\$830.444 of the current budget, of which more than US\$141 thousand will affect 1983". (See document I.3, op. cit., paragraph 14).

^{7/} Reproduction of a text of document E/CEPAL/ILPES/R.32 (21 November 1980). The same document states: "the future frame, however, is not flattering if the same norms are kept with respect to the exchange rate, **for there is no budget capable of absorbing indefinitely increasing costs at 40% per year if on the other side the income does not increase**".

Chapter II

THE "NIP": AN INSTITUTE IN TRANSITION AFTER 1982

6. As stated before (paragraph 1), NIP's first roots arose out of the historic commitment in which governments of the region, in coordination with the United Nations, proposed and supported the creation of the Institute in the early sixties. 8/ The more recent roots are attached to previously mentioned facts, specially that UNDP had to withdraw its direct support of the Institute's ordinary budget, which it had helped to maintain in an uninterrupted fashion for 20 years. The cutting back of this direct support increased from 1982 onward, until it ended completely on December 31, 1986 (see figures 1 and 2). 9/

7. In essence, the New Institutional Project (V RCP, Buenos Aires, May 1983) established a different kind of association between governments of the region and the United Nations, for sharing the responsibility of supporting the Institute's ordinary budget: the governments, through specific contributions equally shared among them; and the United Nations, through permanent posts

8/ The governments of Colombia, Chile and Venezuela requested this to the United Nations' Special Fund (see ILPES: "Report for the Period 1962-1971", August 1971, p.2; the Fund merged into UNDP in January 1966). **The IX Session Period concluded with the affirmation that the new body "would, in time, be directed and supported by Latin American governments"** (Resolution 199, May 13, 1961, item 7). As is known, ILPES was created the following year (Resolution 220/AC.52, of June 6, 1962).

9/ After reaching a maximum contribution of 97% of the Institute's budget, said amount was progressively cut until it disappeared in January 1987. From that date onward, funds provided by the only UNDP/ILPES regional project -involved in specific tasks- were equivalent to 16% of the Institute's entire budget. Besides, **this is an interagency project with a financing shared by ILPES** through resources provided directly by member governments, besides providing a significant support in kind.

assigned to the Institute as from 1977. 10/

8. Within the framework of the NIP, the new governments-United Nations 11/ association sought from the beginning, to stabilize the Institute's ordinary budget. It should be recalled that in the event that governments contributed US\$1.500.000 (in 1982 US\$) and the United Nations maintained its 16 permanent positions 12/, the Institute undertook to raise the remaining on its own. It should also be recalled that consensus was reached on the

10/ It is important to note that this last contribution - the only stable one for it depends on the Regular Budget of the United Nations- consists on the assignment of 6 technical staff and 10 staff of the General Services category or local technicians. Travel expenses, daily subsistence allowances, communications, office support and other expenses related to the work of the permanent staff have been largely financed with extrabudgetary resources of the Institute but fundamentally with its "own resources", made up with the direct contributions of member governments.

11/ There were important antecedents of this kind of association in previous stages of ILPES' history. One: the annual contribution of the host government (Chile) in the early years, amounted to 20% of the Institute's ordinary budget. Two: subsequent reports recorded voluntary government contributions, although in a random and fluctuating fashion. In 1977 already 11 countries -Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela- immediately pledged their contributions, in response to a call at the end of 1976. (See ILPES: "II CRP Report", Caracas, April 1977, p. 8 & 9). Subsequently, until 1982, UNDP and United Nations resources managed to cover the entire overall budget, with government contributions being discontinued, except for a few countries. Three: from 1983 onward, government contributions increased in volume and in relative weight, becoming thus the main source of support for the Institute.

12/ Based on paragraph 10, Resolution 467/XX of April 1984, ILPES fulfilled the mandate it had been given by member governments to request an extension of the number of technical positions (from 6 to 10), which would have raised the quota of the United Nations permanent positions (from 16 to 20). The positions created at that time, however, did not incorporate those which the Institute had requested. From 1985 onward, one technical position was frozen (with only five being occupied), which situation was temporarily overcome as of March 1989. The other 10 permanent positions are at the level of support staff. (Figure 3 shows the evolution of Institute personnel).

following:

"The ordinary budget level adopted in NIP was defined as that which would minimize contributions of both governments and United Nations. Anything lower than this level, ILPES' technical core would have little or no possibility of generating additional resources" (see V through VIII CRP Reports and those corresponding to MD/CRP; in its first two years, that is to say, 1984-1985, the new association began to bear fruitful results).

Section II.A. NIP: FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF CONSENSUS OF THE CRP

9. Despite the fact that since May 1983 (V RCP, Buenos Aires), it has been unanimously recognized that it is inadequate that "regular expenditures" should depend on "non-regular resources" and that "it would be suitable to reduce dependance of ILPES' basic functioning regarding resources obtained through specific and contingent services". The Institute's natural limitation to generate its own resources has likewise been recognized, given: i) the restrictions of use of resources arising from the United Nations System (permanent personnel and UNDP), and ii) procedures regarding resources stemming from agreements and specific projects 13/.

13/ As is known, the other possible source is made up of "resources for project" (overhead) which are generated in an irregular manner and in amounts of small importance. (Refer to Document NTI/E.X.03, Annex A, paragraph 8). In fact, of the 13% of overhead charged by the United Nations, 20% is "frozen" as reserves. Of the remaining 80%, the Institute receives 66%, 34% or nothing, depending on each case, for it must transfer a fixed amount to the rest of the regional system. **The amount obtained by the Institute is usually below the actual expenditures of the technical or administrative backstopping**, that each project demands from headquarters in Santiago. The governments of the RCP have recognized that in fact, in the vocabulary of financial flows, "overhead" is not a synonymous of "donation"; in the best of cases

10. Under these circumstances, in the 12 preceeding editions of the NIP there was consensus that **government contributions were considered to be unsubstitutable, as was the restoring of Institute minimum reserves for supporting various kinds of expenditures and for concreting the greater part of its operation activities.** Including, as indicated, to mobilize personnel whose salaries are financed by other regular sources of the United Nations (permanent posts) 14/.

11. **The Institute's accounting continues to be odd: the expenditure column has very stable components, while the income column is virtually random. This affects the efficient organization of its own internal activities: in effect, expenditures have to be reprogrammed each time there is an entry of new resources. "Programme budgeting becomes unviable; finance management risks to become "emergency help".**

12. Following this train of thought, in all up-datings of the NIP, two main reasons were set forth to ensure an adequate regular budget:

- i) that the professionals assigned to contingent specific projects" (agreements between the Institute and Member Governments), **have contract durations and technical specialties which do not always coincide with the needs of the permanent central team; and**
- ii) **That resources generated by "specific projects" are insufficient for financing the main team. (See footnote 13).**

it could be a "credit supplier" and that -in most cases- it can be assimilated to "reimbursement". On the other hand, in the United Nations "overheads" are only credited after the expenditures have been made; in other words, although generated only once (for example in January of a given year), final/partial payments can be credited after one year or even later (see note 17 of document NTI/F.VII.4, March 1987, VII RCP, page 15).

14/ On the other hand, **cash imbalances cannot be compensated by short-term operations: the Institute cannot benefit from credit operations.**

13. In order to regularize the Institute's budget income, CRP unanimously established a greater stable contribution from member governments, distributed equally between all and avoiding its concentration in a few countries. One must note with great optimism the increase in direct government contributions which neared a million dollars in 1985/1987 and in 1989. Likewise, there was an increase in the number of countries which ratified the agreement established in May 1983 (V Technical Committee) and which met in full.

Section II.B - BASIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PREVIOUS NPI.

14. As is known, 1982 was taken as a base for redefining ILPES' "size", in terms of uses and sources of resources. Since then, governments discussed and approved, always unanimously, the other 12 updatings of the NPI. The overall budget had been in the order of US\$ 5,400 thousand (at 1988 prices): a larger "size" would be inadequate for the times of sobriety lived by the region; a lesser one would require more direct support on the part of governments. That is, the Institute in this case would be unable to obtain, by its own means, sufficient complementary resources for supporting itself. (See again paragraph 8).

15. Within the New Institutional Project, the size of the "main technical personnel" was set at around 30 professionals (a minimum of 25 international and the remainder local). ^{15/} If one adds administrative personnel the situation would come close to 52

^{15/} Strictly speaking, the number 34 was adopted, including a small quota of "eventual contracts" but continuous at headquarters. As known, the Institute's capacity to act as catalyst allows it to mobilize up to 130 experts/year to meet its Work Programme. (see paragraph 16). Nevertheless, the Institute's main team has experienced successive cuts (see again table 2).

officials. On September 30, 1990 this number may be reduced to 28 (excluding very short term contracts).

16. Despite cutbacks in its plant, **the Institute's actual work capacity is based on the interrelation of a diversified set of technical resources from different origins.** These include: **a)** the Institute's own international and local professional team; **b)** hired experts and specialists (an average of around 50 per year); **c)** senior personnel from other international bodies (number which can fluctuate between 80 and 100 mobilized per year, for periods of varying length, the majority from ECLAC); **d)** high level experts mobilized through interinstitutional agreements or with non-member governments (approximately 10 per year); **e)** experts associated with the Institute for very different periods of time (6 months to 3 years, according to cases which have already occurred); **f)** counterpart officials in national projects (for advisory services, training or research); **g)** the work capacity of private or non-governmental entities subcontracted by ILPES; and **h)** costless reports prepared by special guests and submitted to technical events promoted by the Institute.

17. All together, this diversified team can exceed 120/130 experts per year which constitutes a significant overall capacity to meet its technical work 16/. **Nevertheless, the main technical team at headquarters is the dominant factor.** A reduction below the minimum level weakens the whole system of services provided by ILPES, including that of national projects even though they have their own

16/ This total includes **short-term contracts or mobilizations (between 2 and 3 weeks) while others are of longer duration (2 and up to 3 or more years)**, (see, however, the following footnote). The first professional category considered includes the team of six experts that have permanent contracts. At technical meetings and seminars convened by the Institute every year (approximately 15) converge several documents/activities proposed/carried out for ILPES, but which do not imply expenditures (see, in the Annex on bibliography, the tasks with reference "O", that is to say from others or third parties).

financing.

18. In the last fora (CRP and MD/CRP), the need was unanimously recognized for **staunching the technical decapitalization which the Institute has been undergoing over the last years** and which is evidenced in the reductions in number and seniority of its main technical team. This however, will only be possible if regular resources are sufficiently stabilized for financing the Institute's current activities. 17/

Section II.C. MINIMUM GUIDELINES FOR THE PERIOD 1989-1992

19. Approval has been given already to the following NIP principles, ratified by the Sessions of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (see Resolution 493/XXII of 27 April 1988, specially items 2 and 3; and Resolution 511/XXII of 11 May 1990, items 2,4,6,8 and 9). **For easy reference, the different decisions have been numbered in a sequence series.**

- a) To maintain the original NPI principles. This has meant:

NPI/Decision

- | | |
|--------|---|
| No. 01 | Maintain the policy of austerity adopted since 1982 by the Direction of the Institute. |
| No. 02 | Maintain the "tripartite financing" with participation by United Nations (11%), by governments (33%) and by other resources obtained by the Institute as non regular budget (56%). (See F.VIII.4, paragraph A.10, item a, VIII RCP, May 1988) <u>18/</u> . |

17/ From **contracts with an average duration of 2 or more years until 1981, the central technical team has experienced progressive degradation of these periods**, with most contracts renewed in 1990 on a monthly basis. This is an unsustainable situation which is not consistent with the normal functioning of the United Nations Organizations.

18/ These percentages refer to overall budget. The absolute value of United Nations collaboration through permanent positions (16, one of them frozen since 1985) is exogenous information for

No. 03 To consider the contributions as cross-entry, this is, to acknowledge that the **member governments contributions represent the regular financing of the Institute's "multilateral activities"** (or generic, in other words, with regional projection).19/

b) To regularize contributions. CRP has called for each member government to make an effort to "regularize" its contributions from a legal point of view, and payment procedures for its contributions to the Institute 20/.

NPI/Decision

No. 04 Admit the possibility that one or another payment **be made (exceptionally) in national currencies.**

No. 05 Recommend **the abolishment of partial payments** of the yearly contributions.

No. 06 Request each Government to seek **the most adequate modality for shortening the effective income time period of its contribution to the Institute's funds.**

the Institute: it depends on how personnel costs within the System evolve and on exchange rates to be established (especially between the US dollar and the Chilean peso). It is worth mentioning that thanks to the efforts of the Institute to obtain a maximum of extrabudgetary resources, the contributions of the overall budget decreased from an initial commitment of 40% (1982), to 33% (1989), reaching 28% (XII MD/CRP, 1990).

19/ This is, the contributions of each country should not be conditioned to the volume of the bilateral activities of the Institute, that is to say to those activities carried out therein in a bilateral relation Institute/Member Government, with or without collaboration of other bodies (see Doc. NTI/F.VII.4, paragraph 4, March 1987).

20/ "In the New Institutional Project of ILPES, the national contributions are linked to expenditures in the same year; contributions made in the second semester or possibly with greater delays produce disturbances that affect principally the hiring of personnel (VII RCP, Doc. F.VII.4, paragraph 26, item 3). On the other hand, financial rules and procedures of the United Nations indicate that an expenditure can only be incurred when the corresponding resources are actually available.

No. 07 **Set the date of 31 March of each year as the date limit for annual payments (see again footnote 20).**

- c) Four-year programming. In truth, this is another of the New Institutional Project's initial "principles" established in 1983 and ratified successively.

NPI/Decision

No. 08 **Upon renewal, a new phase of NIP for the period 1989-1992 was approved.**

No. 09 **The new contribution commitments should ideally be established within each member government with a minimum temporal horizon corresponding to the same four year period.**

- d) To maintain size limits. The bases of the present proposal have already been presented. In summary, they unfold in two ways:

NPI Decision

No. 10 **To reiterate the consensus on the minimum need for a stable technical team, (which is interpreted both quantitatively as well as in terms of professional seniority).**

No. 11 **To establish size on the basis of the regular or ordinary budget of the Institute, defined by the NIP as the sum of the "contribution of the United Nations with permanent posts" and the total of "government contributions (see also Decision No.12).**

No. 12 **Since overall budget can vary (positively or not) depending on the hiring of new services or the establishing of contracts with non-member countries, the contribution commitment on the part of member governments should not be altered.**

20 With regard to ILPES interinstitutional relations, the following guidelines have been approved since 1987:

- e) ECLAC/ILPES relations. From the Regional Council for Planning, it was agreed to request ECLAC's Executive Secretary's Office:

NPI/Request

- No. 01 To renovate, for the coming four year period a 13% restitution for the Institute of governmental contributions deducted as overhead and to review the procedure for its reimbursement.
- No. 02 To recover the United Nations Regular Budget resource quota, corresponding to ILPES' permanent positions.
- No. 03 To improve the internal conditions so that the Institute may fulfill its role as "executing agency" in projects for which it has been designated as such.
- No. 04 To perceive the Institute's specificity as an intergovernmental agency, regularly and directly maintained by member governments.
- No. 05 To offer facilities through "reallocations" to help strengthen its technical and administrative personnel.

- f) ILPES/UNDP relations. The CRP also took into account the support given to ILPES by the UNDP Liaison Unit, to a great extent in direct collaboration with the Operations Division in aspects related to the execution of project RLA 86/029. The proposals approved with regard to UNDP were the following:

NIP/Request

- No. 06 To consider UNDP's financial support as "specific projects".
- No. 07 In a transitory way, to support possible institutional expenditures up to the maximum of the financial contributions of the Institute to joint projects (transferred to the UNDP as cost-sharing in cash).
- No. 08 To encourage UNDP to consider other projects with the Institute of a subregional and regional interest, and at a national level.^{21/}

^{21/} Certainly, in the case of national projects, the corresponding decisions pertain to the Governments with which ILPES collaborates. It is important to note that the UNDP network of Resident Representatives continued to give invaluable support to

- g) Relations with other international bodies and with non-member governments. Other propositions were added in connection with the principles established. They concern:

NIP/Request

No. 09 Recognition as being highly stabilizing for the effects of ILPES budget problem **that medium term agreements (3 to 4 years) should be signed for interinstitutional and multilateral joint cooperation, in which situation technical personnel could be mobilized to strengthen the Institute's permanent team.**

No. 10 As, on the other hand, the progress made in **cooperation relations with non-member governments has progressively depended on initiatives which have been almost exclusively its own, it was also suggested that greater support be given this Forum in the sense of encouraging other governments to set up pluriannual agreements, which would permit the strengthening of ILPES service-rendering capacity in multilateral areas of interest in Latin America and the Caribbean.**

21. In spite of the relatively dense contents of this document, the background that has been summarized favours a better understanding of the development of the NIP since 1982 (first proposal) until 1993 (present programming). On the other hand, the systematization of the previous decisions avoids to go back to subjects on which the Regional Council for Planning has already pronounced itself.

the Institute's activities, in close association with member governments. During the entire decade, there were numerous and repeated CRP resolutions regarding UNDP/DRALC support for the Institute, subsequently ratified in Sessions of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. The following Resolutions refer to this interinstitutional relation: VI CRP (April 1985) item 2c, points iii & iv; VII CRP (March 1987) item d2 point vi and item 6 and VIII CRP (May 1989), Resolution 02. The most recent was Resolution 511/XXIII, article 9, May 1990.

Chapter III

STRUCTURE AND CHRONOLOGY OF THE MULTILATERAL MEETINGS

22. This **first** section contains a list (from 1962 to 1993) of the Chairmen of the present Regional Council for Planning and its predecessor (Technical Committee); it also puts forward the members of the other multilateral meeting that initially guided technically the Institute (Executive Council). A **second** section contains a complete chronology of all multilateral meetings as from 1975.

Section III.A. CHAIRMEN AND MEMBERS OF THE RCP

III.A.1 PRESENT PHASE: "REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR PLANNING"22/

- xvii) 1990/1993
 - CARDOSO DE MELLO, Zélia/Brazil 23/
 - BAPTISTA DE ABREU, Joao/Brazil

- xvi) 1989
 - BAPTISTA DE ABREU, Joao/Brazil
 - ZEDILLO PONCE DE LEON, Ernesto/Mexico

- xv) 1988
 - ZEDILLO PONCE DE LEON, Ernesto/Mexico
 - ASPE ARMELLA, Pedro/Mexico

- xiv) 1987
 - SALINAS DE GORTARI, Carlos/Mexico

22/ The "Regional Council for Planning" replaces the "Technical Committee", as approved at the VII RCP, May 1987 and ratified by Resolution 493(XXII), April 1988, item 6.

23/ As from 15 March 1990, as Minister of Economic Affairs, Finance and Planning.

III.A.2. SECOND PHASE: "TECHNICAL COMMITTEE": 1975/1986 24/

- xiii) 1983/1986
- SALINAS DE GORTARI, Carlos/Mexico
- xii) 1982
- KING, Luiz/Ecuador
- xi) 1979/1981
- GONZALES, Gustavo/Panama
- x) 1975/1978
- ARDITO BARLETTA, Nicolás/Panama

III.A.3. FIRST PHASE: "EXECUTIVE COUNCIL":1962/1974 25/

- ix) 1974
- IGLESIAS, Enrique/Secretario Ejecutivo de la CEPAL
- viii) 1973
- AGUAYO CUBILLO, Pedro/Ecuador
- CASAS GONZALEZ, Antonio/Venezuela
- CASTILLO, Carlos Manuel/Costa Rica
- DESMARAS LUZURIAGA, Raúl/Argentina
- LACARTE MURO, Julio/Uruguay
- LANSWORTH MOORE, Eugenio/Trinidad & Tobago
- SOKOL, José B./Panama
- REIS VELOSO, Joao Paulo/Brazil
- ROSAS, Luis Eduardo/Colombia
- SOLIS MANJARREZ, Leopoldo/Mexico

24/ The "Executive Council" (established in 1962) was replaced by the "Technical Committee" (Resolution 340/AC.66, January 1974), originally with 7 representatives elected by Member Governments.

25/ These are only the names of the counselors elected by ECLAC Governments, in accordance with Resolution 220 (AC.52). The other three members of the Council were the IDB President, the Executive Secretary of ECLAC and the General Secretary of OAS, or their representatives.

vii) 1972

- ARENAS BONILLA, Roberto/Colombia
- CASTILLO, Carlos Manuel/Costa Rica
- BONNICK, Gladstone/Jamaica
- MARTNER, Gonzalo/Chile
- OBERTO, Luis Enrique/Venezuela
- REIS VELOSO, Joao Paulo/Brazil
- ROSENTHAL, Gert/Guatemala
- SOLIS MANJARREZ, Leopoldo/Mexico
- SOURROUILLE, Juan V./Argentina
- REIS VELOSO, Joao Paulo/Brazil

vi) 1971

- ARENAS BONILLA, Roberto/Colombia
- BONNICK, Gladstone/Jamaica
- CASTILLO, Carlos Manuel/Costa Rica
- IGLESIAS, Enrique/Uruguay
- MARTNER, Gonzalo/Chile
- OBERTO, Luis Enrique/Venezuela
- ROSENTHAL, Gert/Guatemala
- SOLIS MANJARREZ, Leopoldo/Mexico
- SOURROUILLE, Juan V./Argentina
- REIS VELOSO, Joao Paulo/Brazil

v) 1969

- BELTRAO, Helio/Brazil
- CASTILLO, Carlos Manuel/Costa Rica
- GARCIA REYNOSO, Plácido/Mexico
- IGLESIAS, Enrique/Uruguay
- MOLINA, Sergio/Chile
- OBERTO, Luis Enrique/Venezuela
- ROCHAC, Alfonso/El Salvador
- SAN MIGUEL, Manuel/Argentina

iv) 1967

- BELTRAO, Helio/Brazil
- FUENTES MOHR, Alberto/Guatemala
- GARCIA REYNOSO, Plácido/Mexico
- GUERRERO, Gustavo/Nicaragua
- IGLESIAS, Enrique/Uruguay
- MAYOBRE, José Antonio/Venezuela
- MOLINA, Sergio/Chile
- SAN MIGUEL, Miguel/Argentina

iii) 1965

- CAMPOS, Roberto/Brazil
- CARRANZA, Roque/Argentina
- FUENTES MOHR, Alberto/Guatemala
- GARCIA REYNOSO, Plácido/Mexico
- GUERRERO, Gustavo/Nicaragua
- IGLESIAS, Enrique/Uruguay
- MOLINA, Sergio/Chile
- PATIÑO, Alfonso/Colombia

ii) 1963

- ESCOBAR CERDA, Luis/Chile
- FUENTES MOHR, Alberto/Guatemala
- FURTADO, Celso/Brazil
- GARCIA REYNOSO, Plácido/Mexico
- HURTADO, Héctor/Venezuela
- JIMENEZ MONGE, Bernal/Costa Rica
- SAN MIGUEL, Manuel/Argentina
- VALDIVIA, Angel/Peru

i) 1962

- ESCOBAR CERDA, Luis/Chile
- FURTADO, Celso/Brazil
- GALARZA, Felipe Antonio/Bolivia
- GARCIA REYNOSO, Plácido/Mexico
- HURTADO, Héctor/Venezuela
- JIMENEZ MONGE, Bernal/Costa Rica
- SALGADO, Germánico/Ecuador
- SOLARI, Alejandro/Argentina

Section III.B - CHRONOLOGY OF SCCOPALC, CRP AND MD/CRP

23. Finally, a general chronology, ad from 1975, of the multilateral meetings: SCCOPALC, CRP and MD/CRP, is submitted. It is recalled that in 1974 the "Executive Council" of the Institute (its first collegiate directive body, with an intergovernmental character) was replaced by another body, elected directly by all Member Governments. **Since then, 28 multilateral meetings of the**

three bodies mentioned have taken place, including this XIII Meeting of Presiding Officers.

24. On the other hand, considering the Institute prepares a special report for its submission to each Session of ECLAC, it can be concluded from the following table that, since 1983 -when the New Institutional Project began to be implemented- ILPES has informed on his work at 19 multilateral meetings. This means informing directly to Governments every six months, and thus is a clear indication of the intergovernmental character of the Institute. In the last column of Table 1 there is a special indication of the series of editions that have periodically brought up-to-date the New Institutional Project of ILPES.

SCCOPALC & CRP: CHRONOLOGY OF THE MULTILATERAL MEETINGS

ORDER	YEAR	MONTH	DAYS	CITY/COUNTRY	MULTILATERAL MEETINGS			MEMBER COUNTRY/CHAIRMAN		EDITION N.I.P.
					SCCOPALC	CRP	MD/CRP	SCCOPALC	CRP	
1	1975	May.	07	PORT OF SPAIN, T. & Tabago		I		-	Panama	-
2		Nov.	02	ISLA CONTADORA, Panama			I	-	Panama	-
3	1976	Set.	12	BOGOTÁ, Colombia			II	-	Panama	-
4/5	1977	Abr.	13/16	CARACAS, Venezuela	I	II		Venezuela	Panama	-
6	1978	Abr.	21/22	PANAMA, Panama			III		Panama	-
7/8		Nov.	15/18	LIMA, Perú	II	III		Perú	Panama	-
9	1980	Feb.	14/15	SANTIAGO, Chile			VI		Panama	-
10/11		Nov.	26/29	GUATEMALA, Guatemala	III	IV		Guatemala	Panama	-
12	1982	Nov.	29/30	SAN JOSE, Costa Rica			V		Ecuador	1a
.....										
13/14	1983	May.	09/10	BUENOS AIRES, Argentina	IV	V		Argentina	Mexico	2a
15		Nov.	28/29	MEXICO CITY, Mexico			VI	-	Mexico	3a
*	1984	Abr.	06	(LIMA, Peru/XX PS) <u>a/</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-
16		Dic.	03/04	BrazilIA, Brazil			VII		Mexico	4a
17/18	1985	Abr.	15/17	MEXICO, CITY, Mexico	V	VI		Mexico	Mexico	5a
*		Ago.	23	(NEW YORK, E.U.A./Pl.18)	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	1986	Ene.	20/21	BOGOTA, Colombia			VIII		Mexico	6a
*		Abr.	25	(CITY OF MEXICO, Mexico/XXI PS) <u>a/</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-
20		Dic.	01/02	LIMA, Peru			IX		Mexico	7a
21/22	1987	Mar.	23/26	HAVANA, Cuba	VI	VII		Cuba	Mexico	8a
23	1988	Mar.	28/29	CARACAS, Venezuela			X		Mexico	9a
*		Abr.	27	(RIO DE JANEIRO, Brazil/XXII PS) <u>a/</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-
24		Nov.	14/15	SAN JOSE, Costa Rica			XI		Mexico	10a
25/26	1989	May.	08/10	MONTEVIDEO, Uruguay	VII	VIII		Uruguay	Mexico	11a
27	1990	Abr.	02/03	CURAÇAO, Netherlands Antilles			XII		Brazil	12a
*		May.	11	(CARACAS, Venezuela/XXIII PS) <u>a/</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-
28		Nov.	05/06	SANTIAGO, Chile			XIII		Brazil	13a
29 <u>b/</u>	1991			(to be decided)			XIV		Brazil	14a
30/31	1992	Mar.		MADRID, SPAIN <u>c/</u>	VIII	IX		Uruguay	Brazil	
*		(2o Tr.)	--	(SANTIAGO, Chile/XXIV PS) <u>a/</u>	-	-	-	-	-	-
32		(4o Tr.)	--	(to be decided)			XV		Brazil	
33/34	1993			KINGSTON, Jamaica	IX	X		(Ad/Hoc)		

a/ The lines with an asterisk (*) indicate those Sessions at the Economic Commission for Latin America & the Caribbean, which have taken place since the approval of the NIP (V RCP, Buenos Aires, 1983). The dotted line indicates the beginning of the N.I.P.

b/ As from line 29 the scheduling of the Meetings of the Presiding Officers is tentative, with possible other meetings until 1993.

c/ The VIII Conference was originally convened as extraordinary. The RCP decided (May/1991) to meet at Full at that time.

