

ILPES



XV Meeting of the Regional
Council for Planning of ILPES

Distr.
LIMITED
LC/L.4072(CRP.15/4)
11 November 2015
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

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

**THE STATE OF THE ART AND CHALLENGES OF PLANNING FOR DEVELOPMENT
IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN**

SUMMARY*

* Work on this document was supervised and coordinated by Jorge Máttar, Chief of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Development (ILPES). The contents were prepared by Luis Mauricio Cuervo, staff member of the Institute, with contributions from other ILPES staff members. The main inputs for section B were provided by Marianela Armijo, consultant, on the basis of the nine case studies.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION.....	3
A. PLANNING FOR DEVELOPMENT IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN AT THE START OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY.....	4
1. The professionalization of public administration and new relations with planning	5
2. From functions to processes and national planning for development systems	6
3. New societies, new leaderships, citizen participation and challenges of the State-market-society equation	7
4. Economic dynamics, public policy and planning for development.....	8
5. The global context: changes in the world from now to 2030	11
6. New and traditional planning challenges.....	12
B. THE DILEMMAS OF INTEGRALITY IN PLANNING FOR DEVELOPMENT: TIMES, SCALES AND SECTORS IN NINE CASE STUDIES FROM LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	13
1. The dilemma of combining timescales and deadlines (inter-temporality) in planning for development processes	16
2. Coordination between levels of government in development planning processes	20
3. Combining the comprehensive and sectoral dimensions in planning for development processes	23
C. PLANNING FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE REGION AND THE WORK OF ILPES: CURRENT CHALLENGES AND COMPONENTS OF THE WORKING AGENDA.....	25
1. Elements present and absent in the management of planning for development systems as a whole	26
2. Progress and challenges in interconnecting timeframes, deadlines and levels, and combining specialized sectoral planning with comprehensive national planning	26
3. Towards a platform for promoting regional cooperation in planning for development and the integration of Latin America and the Caribbean.....	27
Bibliography.....	32
Annex 1	35

INTRODUCTION

This document summarizes an ongoing project of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) that aims to provide an overview of the state of the art in planning for development in Latin America and the Caribbean, identify and analyse the main challenges in this regard and develop policy guidelines accordingly, including forms of cooperation by which ILPES can support the countries in this area. As a development management tool, planning is a fundamental discipline for furthering the strategy for sustainable and inclusive development with equality in Latin America and the Caribbean, in line with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. In accordance with the resolutions adopted at the fourteenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning of ILPES, held in 2013, and the agreements of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth meetings of the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning of ILPES,¹ held in 2014 and 2015, respectively, the present document is presented to the Regional Council for Planning for consideration at its fifteenth meeting, with a view to receiving feedback and preparing a revised and expanded version for publication in 2016.

At the start of the twenty-first century, the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean underwent major transformations in their government and public administration models, and one of the most notable of these was the repositioning of planning for development. Although the sectoral, territorial and urban expressions of planning were preserved in many cases, in the vast majority of the countries their use was weakened in the adoption of more comprehensive processes related to national development conditions. Along with the revindication of the State's role in the development process since the start of this century, planning has reasserted itself as a valuable component in the matters of government; this can be seen in the transformation of institutional and regulatory frameworks and in the practice of planning itself in countries where, on account of the market reforms some of those countries implemented during the 1980s and the majority undertook in the 1990s, it had been virtually abandoned.

The document is divided into three parts. The first (part A) sets out the reasons for the recent transformations in government and public administration models and summarizes the defining features of contemporary planning for development in the region. It describes the broad vectors of global change and the challenges and dilemmas that must be met.

The second part (part B) highlights the lessons learned from important planning experiences in the region and the challenges that they pose, using nine case studies that outline planning trends in the region and emphasizing their obstacles and results. Previous studies by ILPES, by the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) as a whole and by similar institutions are cited to support this evidence.

The third part (part C) connects the main findings with the components of a regional strategy to be implemented, with joint ILPES and ECLAC support, to construct a platform for planning for development and Latin American and Caribbean integration in line with the agreements of the Regional Council for Planning. It offers a medium-term proposal for work structured around the following components: (i) a repository of development plans and programmes, to facilitate a greater understanding of those that exist in the region and to allow them to be analysed and shared, (ii) a proposal for a white paper to promote good practices in the use of planning tools and methodologies, (iii) the construction of a

¹ See the reports on these meetings in ECLAC (2013d, 2014e and 2015c).

2030 vision for Latin America and the Caribbean, and (iv) a regional capacity-building programme for implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.²

A. PLANNING FOR DEVELOPMENT IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN AT THE START OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

Planning as an institutional practice, as a profession and as a theory emerged in the mid-twentieth century, at the same time as the creation of the United Nations and of other institutions —such as the World Bank— dedicated, first, to reconstruction and, later, to the promotion of development. In the Americas, the 1961 Punta del Este Conference agreed to create the Alliance for Progress, in order to “bring a better life to all the people of the Continent”,³ which led to the creation of many of the government agencies dedicated to development planning in the region.

At the same time as the term *developing countries* arose, so did the global challenge of constructing an institutional apparatus to promote the industrialization, growth and well-being of underdeveloped societies. Its emergence marked the start of the long years of planning of development (and not “for development” as it is currently styled). Industrialization was seen as the catalyst for modernization and economic and social change; the State was charged with promoting it, while planning was given the role of setting out the path to be followed and of organizing processes of comprehensive change. Thus, at the very onset, the great challenges of planning became apparent: reconciling its timescale for action (short, medium and long terms), its scale (local, regional, national, continental) and its sectoral dimensions (economic, social, institutional).

The countries’ approaches evolved from tackling this process sporadically through great missions or grand programmes to creating institutions for permanent planning as a central element in how the State and public functions were organized. National specifics notwithstanding, the practice of planning at this time and the thinking behind it shared certain common features: the central role of science, technology and objective knowledge as basic ingredients in planning; the central place of industrialization as the motor of change; the leading and oftentimes exclusive role of the State; and the key role played by the national or federal level of government. Planning was an exercise left to the experts, with very low societal involvement and practically no dialogue with academics or the private sector. The State’s powers of intervention covered a broad spectrum, including such direct mechanisms as public investment and the creation of State institutions responsible for different aspects of everyday and economic life, such as the direct provision of goods and services. These ideas and practices reached their maximum expression in the 1970s but were abruptly interrupted in the following decade by the demands imposed by the debt crisis (Máttar and Perrotti, 2014).

Meeting those debt commitments in the 1980s meant adapting the forms of management and public policies that had been prevalent until then. State-owned public companies were dismantled, sometimes gradually, sometimes brutally; budgets and operations were cut back; policies were redesigned; and the priorities of State action were redefined. Notions of adjustment dominated public policy in the 1980s, before giving way in the 1990s to openness, liberalization, deregulation and privatization as the watchwords of State functions. Over the course of those two decades, the institutions and practices of planning were discarded and dismantled: in some cases their names remained the same but their functions were changed, while in others they were simply eliminated. In some sectors, the

² See the goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in United Nations (2015).

³ See: Alliance for Progress [online]: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alliance_for_Progress.

practice of planning was preserved, particularly at the subnational and urban levels, as well as in certain fields such as energy and infrastructure.

The stabilization of currencies, public finances, economies and democracies in the 1990s provided a new opportunity for the reappraisal of development planning at the start of the twenty-first century. Shifts in the political orientation of the region's governments came along with those changes and accelerated the creation of a new political and institutional arena for development planning. This re-emergence obviously occurred in its own context, with components and trends that were very different from those that prevailed during the twentieth century.⁴

1. The professionalization of public administration and new relations with planning

The painful lessons of the 1980s and the sharp contrast of the results of the 1990s came about with a major consolidation of the discipline of public administration and of its institutional framework, which was forced to address large, growing needs with ever-decreasing resources. The re-emergence of planning was not unaware of that situation: on the contrary, it took it on board, integrated itself with it and learned from it. Several multilateral organizations came together in this process of consolidating and learning about public administration and its institutional framework, including the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), the World Bank and —through ILPES— ECLAC.

For example, the IDB structures its work around diagnostic assessment processes that examine institutional capacities in five pillars of a cycle of results-based public administration: results-based planning, results-based budgeting, financial management, programme and project management, and follow-up and evaluation (IDB/CLAD, 2007; García and García, 2010; Kaufman, Sanginés and García, 2015). This framework of results-based management and the creation of public value have accompanied the main public administration modernization reform process in the world over the past thirty years. In practically all the world's regions, including Latin America and the Caribbean, major reforms have been put in place in a bid to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of public spending within the framework of the new public administration paradigm (Barzelay, 2001).⁵

The OECD organizes its conceptual approach to government action as a process of public production. This conceptual organization obeys the logic of the public value creation chain in government, promoting results and impacts of importance for the citizenry, the private sector and future generations through public production (OECD, 2009, 2011 and 2015).

⁴ The international stage, characterized by dynamic globalization, also played a role in the promotion of planning in the region: for example, the recognition of the complexity of public problems, the need to involve multiple stakeholders in problem solving, the renewed leadership of the State, the recognition that the challenges of development demand the provision of global, regional, national, territorial and local public goods, the progress made with social sciences applied to public administration, modelling based on technological changes and progress in soft public policy methodologies in the world are among the external catalysts.

⁵ For a perspective from the region's viewpoint, see: ECLAC, 2014c.

Similarly, those institutions help determine the current challenges in planning and public administration in the region. Governments face at least four major challenges in the area of public policy formulation: insufficient technical capacity at the centre of government⁶ for formulating and evaluating policies (ex ante and ex post); limited coordination between sectoral policies, which leads to inconsistencies and incoherence; scant possibilities of challenges being levelled —from either the executive or legislative branches or from outside the public sector— during policy formulation; and a disconnect between policy formulation and implementation. More specifically, it is possible that planning agencies, while they may have analytical capacity, may not have enough influence over the executive branch or budget policies (World Bank, 2011, p. 2).

These diagnostic assessments also highlight other topics of central importance: where the capacity for programme monitoring and evaluation has developed, it has generally been limited to specific projects and programmes, but not to plans, strategies and policies, and it has not effectively been used in formulating new policies or correcting old ones. While both parliaments and civil society actors (social movements and technical forums) have been strengthened vis-à-vis developing and proposing policies, they remain weak, and that weakness also affects their function of demanding accountability from governments and authorities regarding government results.

The results-based management systems implemented to date in the region have largely remained at the level of projects and programmes, disconnected from sectoral or national development policies, and superficially connected to the development goals set out in government programmes and development plans. The information available through those systems still chiefly addresses processes and products, while information on results and social outcomes needs to be strengthened (ECLAC/SEGIB, 2011). Executive-branch systems for following up on national goals are still weak, with indicators that are often inadequately defined or that fail to specify how the actions of the executing agencies contribute to attaining those goals. Neither do they help alleviate budgetary inertia or to improve the general coherence of government programmes (World Bank, 2011). One current challenge is to strengthen the quality control of public policies by better defining how ministries and agencies are to contribute to countries' priority development goals.

2. From functions to processes and national planning for development systems

Work by ILPES based on the ministerial planning dialogues (Cuervo and Máttar, 2014) underscores the growing complexity of development planning processes and national institutions. In line with that transformation, some countries have set out in their laws and regulations the components, characteristics, functions and processes of the new organizational reality that the existence of national planning systems represents.

As a result of this approach, a new organizational challenge —that of providing adequate solutions for the management of a dynamic and complex system such as this one— has to be resolved. Defining its different constituent functions is no longer enough, nor is providing the tools for the integrated management of those functions; instead, it is now also necessary to enquire as to the best ways and strategies to keep that complex system operational and to ensure it functions with efficiency, versatility, flexibility and —most challengingly— relevance.

⁶ “Centre of government” means the ranking political authority within the executive branch, together with the central offices (cabinet and planning offices) and ministries (treasury) that provide the centre with vital administrative and technical support.

Table 1 in the annex illustrates the breadth and complexity of the institutional universe for development planning in the region. Leaving its diversity to one side, this institutional architecture is generally based on constitutional and legal provisions that define its strategic function. Nevertheless, in most cases it is common for the lead planning agency to be nothing more than the tip of an iceberg of vast size and depth. The panoramic and systemic overview of this universe and of its complexities and interrelations indicates a new focus for attention, for which theory, practice and the institutional framework must provide suitable answers in order to ensure its correct management, coherence and impact.

3. New societies, new leaderships, citizen participation and challenges of the State-market-society equation

In recent decades, wide ranging transformations have occurred in very different areas, which have created a new context for development in the region. The most salient of those changes include urbanization, increased levels of schooling, technological change, the stagnation of employment, tertiarization of the economy, the expansion of the middle classes, democratization processes, citizen participation in the business of government and a return to primary production. This new context poses challenges for the State, the government and the public administration that also affect the interests of planning for development.

The first challenge lies in the simultaneous dynamics of cooperation and conflict between social actors, which largely determine the constraints within which public action can operate. Those dynamics vary significantly both over time and between different countries and territories. According to several recent analyses, this context —or societal framework— is characterized by growing complexity, by the emergence of new groups or social actors and by far-reaching changes in individual and social attitudes and values (Castells, 2012; Rosanvallon, 2007; Dubet, 2013). Those adjustments refer to the relationships between society, the market and the State that, in the opinion of ECLAC, must lead to a new equation between those three actors that serves the goal of inclusive and sustainable development with equality.

As evidence, a 2013 Latinobarómetro survey revealed a greater willingness to protest among the region's citizens. Although the public states that it does not participate massively in organizations, it does say it is ready for mobilization if the circumstances warrant, indicating a clear situation of "latent activism". "A specific conflict can therefore trigger protests in a given country with no prior warning (...) This development in participation indicates a political system that finds it difficult to understand the public's expectations and to represent them. It is a symptom of the crisis of representation" that has been present since the 1990s (Corporación Latinobarómetro, 2013, p. 42).

Citizen participation and social mobilizations are seeking openings in the region in response to highly concentrated power structures, economic dynamics that are not always competitive on the international market, relatively weak State institutions with little legitimacy, problems of violence, citizen security and social exclusion (inequality and poverty), limited levels of citizen participation and incomplete and irregular mechanisms for the institutional recognition of cultural identities (UNDP, 2012, p. 22). Thanks to democratization, increased education and access to information and communications technologies, the population of Latin America appears to be evolving towards a "full awareness of their situation and the injustices it entails. Social asymmetries are no longer seen as something normal or inherent to a certain teleological order in the world" (UNDP, 2012, p. 115).

As part of this concern and in an attempt to identify public policy solutions, multilateral agencies—including ECLAC, through ILPES— have been working to promote open government policies as an expression of the modernization of State functions. The open government paradigm is based on interplay between three basic principles: (i) transparency, which implies providing information on what the government is doing, making its sources and databases available and encouraging public accountability and permanent social oversight; (ii) participation, to promote the public’s right to participate actively in the formulation of public policies and to provide a way for public administrations to benefit from citizens’ knowledge, ideas and experiences, by creating new forums for meetings and dialogue that foster the leadership, involvement and deliberation of the citizenry in public affairs; and (iii) collaboration, which means the commitment and involvement of citizens and other social actors in joint efforts to resolve public problems, capitalizing on the potential and energy that is available in vast sectors of society. It entails collaboration, cooperation and joint work not only with the citizenry, but also with companies, associations, civil society organizations and other actors, and it enables joint efforts within administrations and, in a crosscutting way, between them and their officers (Ramírez-Alujas and Naser, 2014).

Similarly, ECLAC has highlighted the need to redefine the relations between the State, the market and society (ECLAC 2010, 2012 and 2014a), in which citizen participation is essential since, to date, disputes, disagreements and agreements have chiefly arisen between the State and the market. Contemporary planning demands participatory processes in its different phases —preparation, implementation and evaluation— across national territories.

Those circumstances call on planning to contribute to the construction of leaderships in line with this context, geared towards promoting the capacity to “inspire and mobilize others to undertake collective action in pursuit of common good”, as proposed by Crosby and Vryson (2005). Those same authors also suggest the need for eight basic skills, the meaning and contents of which give rise to challenges for capacity building in planning and public administration: the capacity to understand the environment (leadership in context), to identify assets (personal leadership), to build effective teams (team leadership) and organizations (organizational leadership), to create collective visions (visionary leadership), to make decisions in different situations (political leadership) , to punish unethical behaviours (ethical leadership) and to coordinate strategic objectives (policy entrepreneurship).⁷

4. Economic dynamics, public policy and planning for development

Over the past three decades, a series of transformations have modified the general conditions in which economic policy and public policies in general operate. They have also changed the context within which planning for development re-emerged.

As a result of the painful experience of the adjustment policies of the 1980s and of the unmet expectations of the liberalization policies of the 1990s, the region’s countries achieved stability in the areas of finance, exchange rates and fiscal policy. In addition, as the result of the new focus of public policy in the 2000s, that stability was equipped with new dimensions, specifically as regards the role of welfare and social protection policies and the recovery of growth as a prerequisite for development.

⁷ Since 2013 ILPES has given a course on public leadership for development with equality that seeks to transmit the main conceptual and public-policy guidelines of the ECLAC proposals and to fuel a debate on the kinds of leadership required in the region to pursue a Latin American agenda for development.

Low inflation rates, moderate levels of fiscal deficits, sharp falls in public debt and the relative stability of exchange rates (up until a few years ago) eloquently illustrate the progress referred to above. In the social arena, the onset of the twenty-first century brought with it promising developments, such as pronounced and systematic drops in poverty and extreme poverty, reduced inequality measured by the Gini coefficient and, most significantly, the delinking of poverty from the business cycle.

Thus, between 1980 and the early 2000s, the region made no progress in reducing poverty rates because, during the recession years, they grew at an accelerated rhythm and, during the years of recovery, they fell less than proportionally. At the start of the twenty-first century, not only did a trend of permanently falling rates of extreme poverty and poverty begin, but also the drop in output in 2009 —caused by the subprime crisis— and, some years later, the economic slowdown have prevented both from rising (ECLAC, 2014b and 2015a).

One of the most interesting consequences of this stability in macroeconomic and social policies and their results is the growing interest in medium- and long-term planning, in the construction of long-term national development visions and in the use of foresight as a tool for policy and public administration, as shown in table 1. One of the reasons for this interest was the availability of public finance resources as a result of the extraordinary earnings of raw material exports during the 2002-2008 boom, which fuelled a cycle of public investment expansion in some countries, particularly in South America (Máttar and Perrotti, 2014).

Although experiences from one country to the next have been very different in the region, they translate into a search for mechanisms to identify and launch long-term policies that transcend the temporal limits of individual governments and connect with the strategic aspirations of national societies. Nevertheless, the practice of foresight still lacks mechanisms and consolidated bridges for interconnecting with public policy and its implementation. In addition, it has been institutionalized in only a small number of cases and, in general, there is an absence of training for both individuals and institutions (Rodríguez and Cuervo, 2014). “Foresight” refers to processes of anticipation that identify opportunities and threats which may arise in mid- to long-term future scenarios. As a way of thinking, foresight also encourages innovation, strategic evaluation and the proactive shaping of the future (GCPSE, 2014, p. 4).

The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development calls on the region to strengthen its institutional capacities for the systematic and structural incorporation of foresight into government affairs, as a tool for promoting development plans and programmes with a long-term perspective, alongside other planning tools such as the design of mechanisms for the crosscutting implementation of the 2030 Agenda in national and subnational planning, as Colombia has done with its National Development Plan (DNP, 2015)⁸ and as other countries are also expected to do.

⁸ See details on the synergy between Colombia’s National Development Plan and the Sustainable Development Goals in Lucci, Surasky and Gamba (2015).

Table 1
Latin America and the Caribbean: foresight and planning exercises for development

Country	Long-term development plans or visions of the future	Date launched
Argentina	<i>Argentina 2016. Policy and National Strategy for Development and Territorial Governance</i>	2004
Barbados	<i>The National Strategic Plan of Barbados 2005-2025</i>	2005
Belize	<i>Vision for Belize by the Year 2030</i>	2010
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	<i>Vision for 2025 (The Road to Living Well)</i>	2012
Brazil	<i>Brazil 2022 – Brazil 3 Times</i>	2010
Colombia	<i>Vision Colombia Second Centenary: 2019</i>	2010
Costa Rica	<i>Bicentenary Project: Development Objectives, Targets and Indicators for the Costa Rica of 2021</i>	2010
	<i>Costa Rica 2030: National Development Goals</i>	2013
Cuba	<i>Information on the results of the Debate on the Guidelines for the Economic and Social Policy of the Party and the Revolution. Sixth Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba, May 2011</i>	2011
	<i>2030 Development Programme (under construction)</i>	2015
Dominican Republic	<i>National Development Strategy 2010-2030. A Journey of Transformation towards a Better Country</i>	2010
Ecuador	<i>Vision 2021 (covered in the current National Plan for Living Well)</i>	2013
	<i>Vision 2035 (in preparation)</i>	2015
El Salvador	<i>Strategic Commitments for the Year 2024 (contained in the 2010-2014 Five-year Development Plan)</i>	2009
Grenada	<i>Grenada Strategic Development Plan 2030</i>	
Guatemala	<i>K'atun, Our Guatemala 2032</i>	2014
Haiti	<i>Strategic Development Plan for Haiti 2030</i>	2010
Honduras	<i>2010-2038 Country Vision</i>	2010
	<i>2010- 2022 National Plan</i>	2010
Jamaica	<i>Vision 2030 Jamaica. National Development Plan</i>	2012
Mexico	<i>Vision 2030. The Mexico We Want</i>	2007
Panama	<i>National Vision 2020</i>	1999
Paraguay	<i>National Development Plan: Paraguay 2030</i>	2014
Peru	<i>Bicentenary Plan: Peru Towards 2021</i> <i>Peru 2040</i>	2011
Saint Lucia	<i>Saint Lucia National Vision Plan</i>	2008
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	<i>National Economic and Social Development Plan 2013 -2025</i>	2013
Trinidad and Tobago	<i>The New Policy Agenda 2014-2023</i>	2014
	<i>Vision 2020 Draft National Strategic Plan</i>	
Uruguay	<i>Uruguay: Vision and Demographic Scenarios for 2050</i>	2011

Source: Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), on the basis of a repository of development plans of Latin America and the Caribbean of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) and official information from the respective countries; Costa Rica, Ministry of National Planning and Economic Policy; Government of Grenada; Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning; and Uruguay, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA).

5. The global context: changes in the world from now to 2030

The global context of planning and public administration in the contemporary world is marked by the existence of universal agreements regarding development priorities: first, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) for the period up to 2015, followed by the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) within the framework of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Those agreements crystallize the vision of the world we want, indicate the priorities that must be addressed and even propose strategies and methods for attaining the goals set.

Under the Millennium Development Goals, Latin America and the Caribbean (albeit with significant disparities in certain countries with respect to some of the targets) took major strides in reducing extreme poverty, hunger, undernourishment and child mortality, and in providing better access to drinking water and improved sanitation facilities. Conversely, not enough progress was made on universal primary education, gender equality in the workplace and in national parliaments, maternal mortality, access to reproductive health services and forest loss (ECLAC, 2015b, p. 8).

The broader and more integrated vision of the 2030 Agenda goes further than the MDGs and proposes a larger number of more ambitious targets. For example, instead of halving extreme poverty, it sets the goal of eradicating it by 2030. It also aspires to reducing inequality, the levels of which in Latin America and the Caribbean remain the highest in the world. The new Agenda also proposes enhancing well-being in a climate of democratic coexistence and respect for human rights and, in addition, it emphasizes the importance of jobs, technological innovation, environmental sustainability and the provision of public goods. Gender equality, as one of the most direct routes towards a truly sustainable and inclusive development, is also a key theme (ECLAC, 2015b, p. 8).

Pursuant to that line of thought and action, ECLAC will emphasize the following priorities to support Latin America and the Caribbean in implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and in monitoring and following up on the SDGs in the region: (i) placing equality front and centre, (ii) diversifying the production matrix and consumption patterns by incorporating an environmental dimension, (iii) pursuing technological innovation and developing the information and knowledge society, (iv) ensuring access to information and citizen participation, (v) redefining the equation between the State, the market and society, (vi) institution-building, (vii) including regional voices on the global agenda and in world forums, (viii) promoting a balanced integration of the economic, social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development in the formulation and implementation of national strategies and policies for sustainable development; (ix) supporting South-South cooperation and sustaining the rise of middle-income countries, (x) helping to create a solid follow-up and review architecture for the post-2015 development agenda, (xi) strengthening national capacities with respect to statistics and data, (xii) promoting multi-stakeholder dialogue and forums to build policy coherence and (xiii) coordinating the United Nations system at the regional level (ECLAC, 2015b, p. 84).

Through its subsidiary bodies (such as the ILPES Regional Council for Planning), ECLAC provides a platform for experts and decision makers from the region to meet and share experiences, best practices, lessons learned and innovative policy proposals (ECLAC, 2015, p. 84). Accordingly, the third part of this document outlines the ILPES proposal for ECLAC to serve as the lead entity in a regional capacity-building programme for implementing the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development that addresses the aforesaid priority topics.

6. New and traditional planning challenges

According to “Planning for development in Latin America and the Caribbean: back to the future — First report on the Ministerial Planning Dialogues” (Cuervo and Máttar, 2014), the contemporary concept of planning re-frames the founding principles of the discipline and expresses them in a language which is suitable for the current moment. Thus, planning is understood to be a political act, a theory and a discipline for creating a sense of belonging and of future, and for the multi-scale, cross-sector and multi-temporal governance of development.

Politically, planning is called on to help construct organic leaderships, beginning with its own, without which it will lack the required strength. Planning also requires theoretical reflection that is on a level with the challenges of the moment, which is indispensable for accelerating learning and knowledge processes through practice. It also requires the reconstruction of schools and training institutions that develop individual and collective skills for its exercise and continuous improvement (Cuervo and Máttar, 2014). Planning requires a discourse and a political narrative that emphasizes not only the immediate and urgent, but also the transcendental and the structural, that helps trace out paths and that works for agreements to assist transformations towards a better future with the help of foresight (Bitar, 2014).

Its capacity to create meaning must be consolidated or reconstructed (as applicable) on the basis of its growing and ever vital awareness of the social, political and economic imbalances and disparities that surround it and that it must clarify and confront to contribute to the construction of broad and legitimate prospects of well-being. As part of this process, the commitment of placing planning at the service of building a world that is consistent with the vision of sustainable development by the year 2030 agreed on at the 70th session of the United Nations General Assembly on September 25, 2015, must be reaffirmed.

The correct response to the challenges of governance is based on recognizing the indissoluble partnership between planning and public administration for development. That requires continuity in the search for interconnections, improvements and permanent innovations in the tools and insistence on planning as part of an endless cycle of feedback between the planning, management, coordination, evaluation and monitoring of public development policies. It is also necessary to remain aware of the complexity of the organizations and systems in which planning is involved, with the consequent demand that it be managed appropriately. Specific efforts must be made to identify strategies that address the very basic need of discovering novel ways of meeting development challenges with a long-term perspective.

Faced with this broad range of challenges, ILPES seeks to make a contribution to knowledge in this area, by socializing and sharing recently concluded case studies, promoting cooperation for the understanding, dissemination and application of new planning instruments, approaches, methods and tools, proposing an agenda that will enable it to fully discharge its function of accelerating learning and consolidating individual and collective capacities for development planning, and providing technical support for the implementation of plans, policies and programmes, including their design, monitoring and evaluation. That is the rationale behind the discussion set out in part B of this document, which summarizes the most salient and revealing results of the case studies in nine countries of the region.

**B. THE DILEMMAS OF INTEGRALITY IN PLANNING FOR DEVELOPMENT:
TIMES, SCALES AND SECTORS IN NINE CASE STUDIES
FROM LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN**

In its recent work, ILPES has focused on understanding the role of planning in the governance of development, with a particular interest in the challenges of managing increasingly complex and dynamic planning systems. In applying the exploration tools deployed in the ministerial planning dialogues (2012-2014) (Cuervo and Máttar, 2014) and in this more recent overview of the state of the art and challenges of planning in Latin America and the Caribbean (2014-2015), the main focus has been on understanding practices and processes, in order to go beyond the traditional approach centred on regulations and institutional structures.

With the aim of expanding experience-based knowledge and of analysing planning practices in light of the evidence, nine case studies were carried out to examine the lessons learned and institutional challenges in dealing with what the ministerial dialogues have called the challenges of planning for development; in other words:

- (i) The inter-temporal dilemma, which deals with the definition of the different timescales —long, medium and short terms— of planning and with the interrelations between them.
- (ii) Multi-scale coordination, which deals with the definition of the different territorial scales of planning for development —local, subnational, national and global— and with the interrelations between them.
- (iii) The interplay between the sectoral and global levels, which deals with the definition of and interrelations between the specialized and sectoral approaches to planning, both among themselves and vis-à-vis the global view.
- (iv) A fourth area of planning challenges has to do with the sociopolitical content and background of planning, which is related to what ECLAC has called a new equation between the State, the market and society, in pursuit of the goals of inclusive and sustainable development with equality (ECLAC, 2010 and 2014a).

Nine countries were chosen for the case studies because of the breadth of their experiences, their relevance to the challenges, the availability of information and evidence and the possibility of drawing conclusions that could be of use to other countries.⁹ The selected countries and the priority challenges identified can be seen in table 2. Table 3 below presents the titles and summaries of the studies; the full versions are available for consultation and will be published by ECLAC in the near future.

The four challenges set out above were explored in each of the case studies, albeit not exhaustively (later research projects could take the analyses further and include other countries). Specific aspects or experiences were selected from each of the cases, and both the costs and the benefits of that decision were assumed. The cost was the lack of standardization in the topics addressed (although not in the questions), which complicated the tasks of comparison and extrapolation. The benefit was the possibility of obtaining, in each case, a more precise and individual understanding of the experience, with the advantages that represents in terms of understanding and lessons learned. In that the aim was for the

⁹ A second round of studies has been proposed to enrich, expand and provide contrasts for the findings.

study to be of use for planning practice, the approach adopted emphasized the questions, the learning and the shortcomings of each experience.

The following paragraphs offer a summary of the learning acquired with respect to each of the first three challenges and its interplay with the fourth—the relationship between the State, the market and society—which affects them all. The section concludes with a series of interpretations of the data set. The proposals, summarized facts and analyses are based on the case studies; other studies and research by ILPES and by other agencies were used to contrast, compare, adjust or corroborate the evidence.

Table 2
The challenges of planning in Latin America and the Caribbean: case studies from selected countries

Countries	Plans, programmes, strategies and processes	Planning challenges
Argentina	Strategic Territorial Plan (PET)	Multi-scale coordination
Brazil	Renewed planning in Brazil. Growth Acceleration Programme (PAC)	Interconnection between planning at the national, sectoral and micro levels
Chile	Coherence between long- and short-term planning Results-based budget	Inter-temporal coherence (long, medium and short terms)
Colombia	National System for Evaluation of Management and Results (SINERGIA)	Inter-temporal coherence (long, medium and short terms)
Cuba	Guidelines for the Economic and Social Policy of the Party and the Revolution. Sixth Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba, May 2011	Multi-scale coordination and the inter-temporal dilemma
Dominican Republic	Medium-term planning in the Dominican public sector	Inter-temporal coherence (long, medium and short terms) and multi-scale coordination
Ecuador	National Territorial Strategy	Multi-scale coordination
Guatemala	National Development Plan. K'atun: Our Guatemala 2032	Inter-temporal coherence (long, medium and short terms)
Mexico	Multi-level planning and the challenges of compatibility	Multi-scale and sectoral coordination

Source: Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), on the basis of Marianela Armijo, “La coherencia entre la planificación del largo y corto plazo: el presupuesto orientado a resultados en Chile. Estudio de caso,” Santiago, ECLAC, 2015, unpublished; Augusto Barrera and Nathalia Novillo, “La estrategia territorial nacional. Ecuador. Estudio de caso,” Santiago, ECLAC, 2015, unpublished; Victoria Chanquín, “Guatemala: la experiencia de formulación del Plan Nacional de Desarrollo K’atún: ‘Nuestra Guatemala 2032’. Estudio de caso,” Santiago, ECLAC, 2015, unpublished; Oscar Fernández Estrada, “El desafío de Cuba: extender el mercado, desarrollar la planificación,” Santiago, ECLAC, 2015, unpublished; Orlando Gracia, “El sistema nacional de evaluación de gestión y resultados de Colombia: Sinergia. Estudio de caso,” Santiago, ECLAC, 2015, unpublished; Luciano Pugliese, “El Plan Estratégico Territorial. Argentina. Estudio de caso,” Santiago, ECLAC, 2015, unpublished; Clemente Ruiz, “Planeación multinivel y los retos de su compatibilización. México. Estudio de caso,” Santiago, ECLAC, 2015, unpublished; Aníbal Jorge Sotelo, “La planificación de mediano plazo en el sector público dominicano. El Plan Nacional Plurianual del Sector Público,” Santiago, ECLAC, 2015, unpublished, and José Celso Cardoso Jr. and Cláudio Alexandre Navarro, “A retomada do planejamento governamental no Brasil e a experiência recente (2007 a 2014) do PAC (Programa de Aceleração do Crescimento),” 2015, unpublished.

Table 3
**Latin America and the Caribbean: summaries of the planning for development
 case studies in nine countries**

Country	Title of the study	Summary
Argentina	“The Strategic Territorial Plan. Argentina. Case study.”	Sets out the elements of the Strategic Territorial Plan (PET), the country’s main instrument for development planning and territorial governance since 2004. Describes progress made with the three phases of the PET and offers an analysis of its achievements, with specific reference to successful results, before finally listing the future challenges.
Brazil	“Brazil’s return to government planning and recent experience with the Growth Acceleration Programme (PAC).”	Describes the origins, development and content of Brazil’s Growth Acceleration Programme (PAC), together with the results it has attained and its future prospects.
Chile	“Coherence between long- and short-term planning: the results-based budget in Chile. Case study.”	Describes the Chilean planning system, starting with long-term planning and then the follow-up and management control system. Identifies the strengths and weaknesses of both systems, and offers conclusions and recommendations in connection with each.
Colombia	“Colombia’s National System for Evaluation of Management and Results: SINERGIA. Case study.”	Sets out the history and legal, institutional and implementation framework of the National System for Evaluation of Management and Results (SINERGIA), and then analyses the Colombian case in terms of its compliance with the best practices for results-based management and budgeting established by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). The analysis also covers the strengths and weaknesses of the country’s planning experience.
Cuba	“The challenge of Cuba: extending the market, developing planning.”	Highlights the importance of planning in Cuba’s new economic context, in which it will have to live alongside the market. Describes the historic relationship between planning and the domestic economy and concludes with proposals for institutionalizing the use of strategic foresight in policy design and analysis.
Dominican Republic	“Medium-term planning in the Dominican public sector. The National Public Sector Multi-year Plan.”	Sets out the experience of developing the Dominican Republic’s National Public Sector Multi-year Plan under the aegis of its National Development Strategy and describes its main elements. Identifies its strengths and weaknesses, and lists its future challenges.
Ecuador	“The National Territorial Strategy. Ecuador. Case study.”	Sets out the main components of Ecuador’s National Territorial Strategy, which is part of the 2013-2017 National Plan for Living Well of the Government of Ecuador. Describes the strategy’s key elements, offers an analysis of the level of implementation to date, provides conclusions and identifies the challenges facing its correct implementation.
Guatemala	“Guatemala: the experience of formulating the K’atun National Development Plan: ‘Our Guatemala 2032’. Case study.”	Gives a detailed description of the different phases (diagnostics, public dialogues and planning) in the formulation of the K’atun 2032 National Development Plan, and identifies the good practices, lessons learned, and challenges highlighted by the actors who participated in the process.
Mexico	“Multi-level planning and the challenges of compatibility. Mexico. Case study.”	Describes the evolution of Mexico’s multi-level planning system, from its foundation document, the National Development Plan, and explains its relationship with sectoral and State plans, including the federal budget and the result evaluation system. Identifies the instruments and systems and describes their component elements, with emphasis on the identification of good practices, and, finally, offers proposals in the areas where improvements could be made.

Source: Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), on the basis of Marianela Armijo, “La coherencia entre la planificación del largo y corto plazo: el presupuesto orientado a resultados en Chile. Estudio de caso”, Santiago, ECLAC, 2015, unpublished; Augusto Barrera and Nathalia Novillo, “La estrategia territorial nacional. Ecuador. Estudio de caso”, Santiago, ECLAC, 2015, unpublished; Victoria Chanquín, “Guatemala: la experiencia de formulación del Plan Nacional de Desarrollo K’atún: ‘Nuestra Guatemala 2032’. Estudio de caso”, Santiago, ECLAC, 2015, unpublished; Oscar Fernández Estrada, “El desafío de Cuba: extender el mercado, desarrollar la planificación”, Santiago, ECLAC, 2015, unpublished; Orlando Gracia, “El sistema nacional de evaluación de gestión y resultados de Colombia: Sinergia. Estudio de caso”, Santiago, ECLAC, 2015, unpublished; Luciano Pugliese, “El Plan Estratégico Territorial. Argentina. Estudio de caso”, Santiago, ECLAC, 2015, unpublished; Clemente Ruiz, “Planeación multinivel y los retos de su compatibilización. México. Estudio de caso”, Santiago, ECLAC, 2015, unpublished; Aníbal Jorge Sotelo, “La planificación de mediano plazo en el sector público dominicano. El Plan Nacional Plurianual del Sector Público”, Santiago, ECLAC, 2015, unpublished, and José Celso Cardoso Jr. and Cláudio Alexandre Navarro, “A retomada do planejamento governamental no Brasil e a experiência recente (2007 a 2014) do PAC (Programa de Aceleração do Crescimento)”, 2015, unpublished.

The case studies and the research provide a broad array of evidence for development planning, in such areas as the organizations involved, the approaches used, the processes triggered, the tools and methodologies deployed, the constitutional and legal provisions and certain temporary rules, together with some of the results obtained. This evidence represents the outcome of political, social and legislative processes that are difficult to record empirically, since that would require a more detailed, exhaustive and multidimensional —quantitative and qualitative— follow-up of the decision-making, conflict resolution, communication and leadership processes on which they are based and that, ultimately, serve to explain the more easily visible facts and results.

Bearing this in mind, the lessons learned will be drawn from the recording, organization and collation of the evidence and visible facts and from the examination—in this case, more conjectural and interpretative— of the political, social and leadership processes on which they may be based. Similarly, they will be the result of the emphasis placed, in the observations, on both what was actually obtained and on the information gaps: in other words, on what—according to the judgement, experience and theories used by the observers— must be considered a shortcoming.

1. The dilemma of combining timescales and deadlines (inter-temporality) in planning for development processes¹⁰

A review of the legal frameworks for the planning systems created or redesigned in the region's countries in recent years indicates that their main purpose is to enable long-term planning and to identify mechanisms for interconnecting them with the medium-term perspective, programming and budget. This can be seen in those countries that have recently enacted laws to create national planning systems, such as Mexico (2006), the Dominican Republic (2006), Ecuador (2011) and Guatemala (2011). Most of those systems are based on legal frameworks at the constitutional level (REDEPLAN, 2015). There are some 20 countries in the region that over the past decade have developed a long-term view of development, with varying degrees of interconnection with short and medium-term planning, with different levels of involvement by important social actors and as the result of different methodological processes (ECLAC, 2013) (see table 1).

The interrelation between long- and medium-term instruments remains embryonic, which constitutes one of the main challenges of planning. Even though most of the regulatory frameworks provide for a connection between long-term and medium-term goals, in practice this process is only just beginning. The Dominican Republic's experience in this regard is innovative. The National Development Strategy 2030 (END-2030) defines explicit follow-up mechanisms, which facilitates its implementation in medium-term sectoral and institutional plans. Political will and leadership have been crucial in the promotion and sustainability of long-term perspectives in the Dominican Republic's recent planning, and this can also be seen in the cases of Brazil, Colombia and Peru (Rodríguez and Cuervo, 2014).

As regards the medium term, although most of the countries have national development plans that cover one presidential period, the paths they take are very different. A small group of countries— including Brazil, Colombia and Costa Rica— have consolidated planning practices with regulatory frameworks and planning systems that have been in existence for some time. Other countries have strengthened their practices and institutions over the past seven or eight years, by creating or renewing

¹⁰ In this document, “medium term” is used to equate with a period of government; thus, “long term” refers to a longer period than that, while “short term” covers a shorter duration.

their planning systems. Examples of this include Ecuador, Mexico and the Dominican Republic. Similarly, El Salvador, Guatemala and Jamaica have very recently reported promising experiences in that regard.

There are also countries that do not have an institutionalized scheme for their national development plans, where medium-term objectives are expressed through alternative instruments, such as government agendas or direct statements of government programmes (for example, Argentina, Chile, Panama and Uruguay), or where planning is structured around chiefly sectoral objectives. Regardless of the different paths chosen and levels of consolidation attained, the state of the art in the region as regards addressing the inter-temporal dilemma in planning is characterized by the following:

- (i) The structure of the plans addresses different levels of interconnection, making medium-term plans dependent on instruments with a longer timescale (country vision or long-term strategy).
- (ii) The strategic objectives and visions of development set by the countries are very different, but they broadly agree that the main objective that interconnects all the others is “closing social gaps”.
- (iii) The frameworks that govern planning provide that national plans are paralleled in territorial and sectoral planning, in which planning processes at the national level must be taken as a reference point.
- (iv) In preparing national budgets, consideration must be given to the objectives and goals of the medium-term plan (national development plan).
- (v) Formal mechanisms for citizen participation or consultation are provided.
- (vi) Systems or mechanisms for following up on and evaluating results are implemented, to a greater or lesser degree.

(a) Progress and challenges in interconnecting the short, medium and long terms

As a part of the progress made in long-term planning, exercises to construct visions of the future use methodologies that combine foresight with other instruments to address different timescales: in Colombia, to 2019; in the Dominican Republic, to 2030; in Guatemala, to 2032; in Ecuador, to 2035; and in Honduras, to 2038.

In the Dominican Republic, for example, this long-term exercise produces an instrument that frames public policies over the coming 20 years and arose in response to demands made, since the start of this century, for the definition of a national plan that transcended the four-year duration of each successive government. That experience therefore reflects a national concern expressed by different sectors that were convinced of the need to undertake actions over the medium and long terms. Over the past decade, the continued presence in government of mid-level and senior officials driving a vision for the nation has contributed to the continuity of policies and programmes. That experience is worth following, since it could be used as an example for State policies in the region. The timing is propitious, since the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development will require a long-term view of policies and planning.

In Ecuador, planning in general —and, specifically, territorial planning— is a substantive function of the State; its progress at the conceptual, institutional and strategic levels therefore goes hand-

in-hand with the characteristics of the country itself. Three elements served as determining factors in the realignment of that country's planning: (i) political stability and government continuity (a characteristic shared with the Dominican Republic), (ii) the explicit recovery of the State as a substantive element within the political proposal, and (iii) the institutional transformations undertaken, which reflect the vision at the level of concrete management.

Guatemala's national development plan sets out the view of the country going forward to 2032. It offers a structured, well argued and technically grounded proposal for making it a reality by means of continuous processes at the short, medium and long terms to overcome the main structural problems—social, economic, environmental, cultural and political—that have shaped the country's traditional model of exclusive development. Guatemala's development challenges are enormous, as is the effort its planning authority has deployed. The efforts made to engage the public in formulating the plan should ensure its continuity under future administrations.

One planning exercise that involved a wide range of actors was the inclusion of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in the objectives of several countries' development plans, either explicitly or as guidelines for national goals. Those initiatives contributed to interconnections between the long and medium terms. However, in addition to examining their contribution to overcoming shortfalls in development, thought must be given to the institutional challenges that still remain, such as the design of goals and indicators, governmental coordination mechanisms and the monitoring and accountability of progress, all of which are relevant issues in connection with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

Second, medium-term planning is progressing towards greater consolidation. Thus, the national development plans of Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala and Mexico are novel instruments, in that they are more demanding and reliable. Their main features are the following: (i) they have goals and indicators that are more specific, based on historical behaviour patterns and on baselines and specific studies; (ii) they include modules for following up on and evaluating achievement of goals, and yearly monitoring indicators, (iii) they include accountability instruments and processes, regarding which reports are prepared for different agencies, (iv) with varying levels of development, they include the subnational dimension in their goals to identify existing shortcomings (Colombia and Ecuador), (v) national budgets operate as the organizers of the possible, so that the goals do not remain at the levels of promises made in a government mandate, and (vi) they use methodologies to measure the physical output of programmes and they include indicators of effectiveness, efficiency and results, with that information then used in given phases of the budgetary process.

Some of the strategies used in the consolidation of these medium-term planning practices should be highlighted because of their particular interest and replication possibilities:

- (i) Coordination with government actors and citizen participation: diagnostic assessments, citizen dialogues and planning, collective construction processes, participatory methodologies involving different sectors of society (Guatemala), and construction of multidisciplinary teams for examining and discussing theoretical frameworks, concepts and methodologies, input analysis, scenario building, the identification of trends and goal setting (Dominican Republic).
- (ii) Gathering information and conducting evaluations to generate useful inputs for decision-making, together with peer-group experience exchanges: noteworthy in this area was the interest shown in exploring experiences and good practices from countries with more highly developed methodologies (for example, Ecuador's National Planning and Development Secretariat (SENPLADES) supported the design of Guatemala's K'atun National

Development Plan, and Colombia supported the Dominican Republic's development of its evaluation system).

- (iii) Technical support and strengthening, at the national and subnational levels, for the implementation of development plans and results-based budgets: intensive training processes in strategic planning, the construction of indicators and logical frameworks, in which national or federal planning agencies have played a key role in technical capacity building.
- (iv) Use of information and communications technologies to follow up on goals: the visibility and updating of the goals of strategies and development plans has been increased, as have real-time exchanges of information between lead planning agencies and other entities; most of the countries have on-line systems in place to provide data on their plans' goals and indicators.

Third, in interconnecting the medium and short terms, understanding the progress the region has made with budgeting processes, instruments, techniques and methods is of particular importance. The analysed experiences reported an effort to improve the definition of objectives and goals, making them more specific, measurable and monitorable and thereby facilitating their use and credibility. In Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala and Mexico, the relationship between medium-term planning and the budget preparation process was identified. That relationship is established through legal, regulatory and methodological frameworks. However, in the long-term visions, the budgetary allocations are not necessarily made explicit, much less the assurance of their funding.

In the Dominican Republic, pursuant to the Planning and Public Investment Law, No. 498-06, and Decree No. 493-07 (adopting its Enforcement Regulations No. 1), it was decided that the Multi-year Public Sector National Plan (PNPSP) would contain the priority programmes and projects to be executed by the agencies of the non-financial public sector and the corresponding resource allocations, in accordance with the guidelines of the National Development Strategy, fiscal policy and the financial framework of the multi-year budget. In Mexico, where major progress has been made with the implementation of a results-based budget, the efforts to interconnect programmes with the policies, objectives and goals of the National Development Plan can be seen more clearly. In Guatemala, one of the most recent notable experiences was the initiative to associate national development objectives with the budget, as a part of the provisions that established the National Development Plan as the guiding axis and that implemented the results-based management approach.

Chile does not have a specific formal institutional framework for planning, but that has not prevented it from defining medium-term objectives through its Government Programme, which serves as the main reference point for setting global objectives at the ministerial level. In addition, the Management Evaluation and Control System also plays a partial role in defining and organizing objectives (through the strategic ministerial definitions) (Leiva, 2012).

At the same time, in recent years planning has strengthened ministries as agencies for the formulation of policy priorities, planning and the control of public service management. Nevertheless, in spite of the extensive development of results-based budgeting in Chile, the model does not yet allow public spending priorities to be assigned in accordance with criteria of quality and efficiency. The evidence indicates that its strength has more to do with supporting improvements in the management of public services.

Finally, as regards the continuous cycle of interconnections between the medium and short terms, observing the systems for evaluation, follow-up and monitoring provides indications about their fluidity,

impacts and possible obstacles. The studies provide evidence about the use of methodologies and instruments within the central administration and, in some cases, at the subnational level. In the Dominican Republic, the implementation of strategic planning processes and the incorporation of the concepts of value and public production were particularly notable; in Mexico, useful lessons were drawn from the systematic application of the logical framework methodology, which has helped identify the contribution that programmes make to development goals, provided guidelines for budget allocations and increased accountability in the programmes of the federal public administration.

Mechanisms for interconnections between plans and budgets are established on the basis of result evaluation systems: in Chile, the Management Evaluation and Control System and, in Colombia, the National Management and Results Evaluation System (SINERGIA). In Mexico, the Performance Evaluation System (SED) is the mechanism used to measure compliance with intermediate annual indicators (referring primarily to management) and the targets of the annual government budget. The system does not evaluate the objectives and goals of the National Development Plan, which covers a period of six years. In Ecuador, the Integrated Planning and Public Investment System (SIPeIP) is linked to the budget through the pro forma budget. Brazil has its Integrated Planning and Budget System (SIOP) for evaluating plan goals (budgetary execution), which is used to assess progress with the programmes that make up the multi-year plan.

However, although most of the countries have this kind of monitoring and performance evaluation systems and enjoy their benefits, the greatest shortfall lies in the absence of useful information about the effectiveness and costs of programmes and policies to inform decision-making. Progress is therefore needed towards early-warning reporting schemes, combined with strategic monitoring to provide feedback for decision-making at several levels of government action. The commitment towards complying with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development offers a good opportunity for redoubling efforts aimed at strengthening systems for monitoring and evaluating progress with the Sustainable Development Goals.

Cutting across all the foregoing, progress must be made with identifying the current and potential contribution of civil service and human resource systems, to allow the deployment of mechanisms that will enable steps to be taken towards a reliable public management for the administration of public policy (ECLAC, 2014c).

2. Coordination between levels of government in development planning processes

The examination of this challenge centres on the interconnections that exist between the national level and the subnational levels of government. National levels of government can be either unitary or federal, while the subnational level covers a range of intermediate or local units or, alternatively, groups of such units.¹¹ The first part of this section reviews the state of knowledge prior to the research, and then indicates a number of novel features found in the study.

Over recent decades, the region's countries have used different approaches to resolve this dilemma of interconnection. The idea and practice of regional planning arose in the mid-twentieth century, understood as a public policy for agencies of the central government to promote development in

¹¹ In the document the concepts of level and scale of government are used as synonyms.

areas deemed underdeveloped, excluded or marginalized.¹² That institutional practice was expanded with the more integrated aim of reducing inequalities or disparities in development between territories. This first institutional practice remained in place between the 1950s and the late 1970s, with specific durations and evolutions in each country, and was known as *regional policy*.

During the 1980s, as the result of State adjustment and contraction policies, regional policy and its institutions were dissolved and its instruments for action were deactivated. In response to the productive dismantling, unemployment and economic decline that characterized that decade, during the 1990s local, urban and territorial economic development policies arose in response to the vacuum left by State regional policy. These sought to activate the territories' own resources (social, economic and institutional assets, both tangible and intangible), encouraging the use of their own initiative and placing particular emphasis on interconnections with the external market and the establishment of a diverse range of social and public-private partnerships for the design and execution of those processes.

In the late 1990s and, subsequently, in the early twenty-first century, national governments rediscovered an interest in territorializing a wide array of different public policies and in the wealth and development disparities between the different components of territories. ECLAC (Ramírez, Silva and Cuervo, 2009) illustrated this process of change and offered the concept of *territorial policies* to refer to the presence of new dilemmas in the inter- and multi-scalar planning of development. Territorial policies were understood as the institutional response to the need to interconnect local development policies with the new regional policies, and in their definition reference was made to the territorial policy family. There arose at that time an awareness of the dispersion and disconnection of the various strategies for territorializing national public policies (for poverty, competitiveness, science and technology, environment and natural resources, etc.) as well as of the disconnect between local efforts (bottom-up) and regional efforts (top-down) to promote territorial development.

(a) Progress and challenges in interconnecting the territorial levels of planning for development

Most of the planning laws in the region's countries contain regulatory provisions that establish the relationship with subnational planning and define the mechanisms whereby it is linked to the national level. This can be seen both in unitary countries, such as Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala and Peru, and in countries with a federal structure, such as Argentina, Brazil and Mexico.

Mexico's national planning model has set the goal of attaining *interconnected federalism*, as a strategy for tackling the extreme centralization of power, resources and decisions, the absence of effective coordination mechanisms between its levels of government and its incomplete decentralization processes, which have heightened the disparities between regions, states and municipalities. Accordingly, the National Development Plan (PND) aims to clarify the competences and responsibilities of each level of government and to further the redistribution of authority, functions and resources to the states and municipalities through dialogue and intergovernmental consensus-building. That dialogue, once established, has allowed aligned planning at the three levels of government, although it operates somewhat unequally across the nation's 31 states and Federal District. In support of the execution of the inclusive and geographically broad PND, a major shift was introduced into regional development policy in 2012 in pursuit of harmonious territorial development and the reduction of the considerable disparities

¹² The term territory refers to the different ways that subnational levels of government are organized, such as intermediate units (states, regions, provinces or departments), local units (municipalities, communes, parishes or districts) and different groups formed from those.

between the states, which is made clear in the 2014-2018 Regional Development Programme of the Secretariat of Urban, Territorial and Agricultural Development (SEDATU).

In Ecuador, the National Territorial Strategy (ETN) is the National Plan's territorial governance tool. The technical assistance provided by SENPLADES for updating the 2014-2015 Territorial Governance Plans (PDOTs) of the decentralized, autonomous governments (GADs) is forging closer ties between local development and the National Plan for Living Well (PNBV), but the process is still in the initial phases. To date, this has been a "top-down" exercise; in other words, the territorialization of the National Strategy and the participation of different stakeholders in the definition of goals and guidelines has been very low. At the same time, the complexity of the instruments designed for implementing these processes must be noted; the construction of the ETN must be permanent, with the different stakeholders, and it must last for the long term, to serve as the basis for long-term policies. In addition, the sectors are not required to interconnect in alignment with the ETN; as a result, each sector creates its own plans and policies outside the ETN, with which contradicting goals can emerge within a single territory.

The Ecuadorian experience is new but promising; in it, the institutional foundations for making the ETN viable are being set, which requires the forging of basic national pacts enriched through local and sectoral processes. If not, there could be a risk of short-term urgency and concrete political demands over-riding the foresight-based approach and the necessary interconnection of the territorial scales.

In the Dominican Republic, the territorial dimension is one of the pending topics of global medium-term planning, including the enactment of the controversial territorial governance law. Another pending issue is the inclusion in the Multi-year Public Sector National Plan of an indication of the interventions at the territorial level planned for the coming four years. Not only does the absence of those definitions hinder awareness of the central government's strategies in the different regions of the country, it also discourages the necessary sectoral and intersectoral institutional coordination, in both the formulation and execution phases.

In Argentina, the Strategic Territorial Plan (PET) has, over time, succeeded in constructing a regional view that is constantly increasing in sophistication and incorporating new perspectives. The general orientation of national spending for overcoming regional disparities appears to have a strong correlation with the strategic commitments set out in the PET. Thus, with the information available, it can be seen that between 2003 and 2008 at the least, national spending succeeded in paying more attention to the less developed provinces at a time of a substantial increase in total spending. Nevertheless, the systematic construction of an agenda for overcoming regional imbalances requires additional and sustained efforts for intersectoral interconnections. In addition, there is a deficit in what are known as the "strategic and political spaces of spending," in which public sector players come together under explicit rules to contribute to the strategic calculation in spending-related decision-making, and, in the political arena, there is no great development as a frame of reference for public and private players who are directly or indirectly involved in specific policies.

The studies illustrate how the national, intermediate and local planning processes interconnect at several levels of analysis: formulation of general and specific objectives, relations between sectoral actions (national) and comprehensive actions (intermediate or local), regarding the phases of the public policy cycle, criteria and mechanisms for allocating resources between different levels of government, and implementation of systems for monitoring objectives and goals set at the national, subnational and local levels. In addition, the continuity of the commitments set out in the objectives remains in place from one government to the next, as can be seen in Ecuador and in Mexico, where the institutional designs, while not free of difficulties, facilitate such an integrated approach.

However, in most cases, there is a need to strengthen coordination mechanisms and institutional capacities, as well as the systems for monitoring and subnational evaluation. Programmatic cooperation agreements seek to create the interconnection of commitments between the government agencies that operate between the national and subnational levels. However, in Argentina, Ecuador and Mexico, the relationship between those planning levels requires strengthened legal and regulatory frameworks to improve the resource allocation process.

The main challenges in coordinating between levels of government are, first, improving the interconnection and coherence of national and subnational goals, by focusing on and prioritizing regional development goals and their contribution to national development. The second challenge, largely derived from Argentina's experience with the PET, is promoting a discussion about a broad development agenda, including regional disparities, environmental conflicts, poverty and urban growth patterns. Third, the place of planning and its national and territorial manifestations in genuine transformation processes must be clarified, as indicated by the implementation of the model proposed by the PET. Fourth, progress must be made with strategic planning from the centres of decision-making (a key element in constructing the public value chain), as the basis for operational planning or programming and the budgeting process. Fifth, mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation must be strengthened. Sixth, institutional capacities for planning at the national and decentralized levels must be improved. Finally, it is necessary to remember that inter-scalarity is a complex managerial challenge that must be present in planning.

3. Combining the comprehensive and sectoral dimensions in planning for development processes

An analysis of the interconnections between comprehensive national planning and specialized sectoral planning seeks to understand how the two dimensions interconnect and whether they mutually assist or hinder each other. Among the achievements of sectoral planning (in such areas as infrastructure, health, technology, competitiveness and the environment) are, first of all, its capacity to engage different nongovernmental stakeholders (who are, in any case, indispensable) and, second, its provision of designs that reveal specific, tangible benefits for the public and in which the long, medium and short terms come together.

Under the results-oriented management approach, the medium-term sectoral plan is the result of strategic planning exercises over periods that generally range from between four and six years. The importance of these plans is that by setting a series of prioritized objectives based on empirical evidence, they indicate results towards which sectoral management should be focused. These documents can be a part of the medium-term national plan, although in that case the national plan must be broken down by sectors (IDB, 2015). Research into this topic indicates that although some sectors improve their long-term views—that is, they define plans with goals, indicators and baselines—there is no progress in coherence between sectoral plans and the government's objectives and goals (IDB, 2015). Thus, studies measuring results from the 2007 to 2013 period indicate little progress with coherence between sectoral plans and government goals (IDB, 2015, p. 70).

There are several reasons for this lack of interconnection. The first is the timescale used for the objectives of national and sectoral plans. In general, national plans' goals cover periods of government of between four and six years, while most sectoral goals are long-term objectives (Armijo and Espada, 2014). Second, the mechanisms for coordination between the ministries responsible for the plans—or between the ad hoc agencies that are established when several ministries that make up a sector are involved (coordinating ministries in Costa Rica, Ecuador and others)—are weak or insufficient. In only a few cases do performance agreements related to the attainment of the ministerial goals exist. Third, there

are difficulties in ensuring funding for sectoral goals that cover a period of years, which could be resolved by using multi-year budgets. Finally, the sustainability of sectoral objectives is closely related to the existence of institutional capacities and solid techniques, particularly from the point of view of managing public finances: countercyclical policies, tax projections, budgets integrated with monitoring and result evaluations (to provide feedback on the progress of public programmes and make the necessary adjustments) and appropriate accountability mechanisms.

(a) Progress and challenges in interconnecting the specialized territorial level and comprehensive national level of planning for development

The Dominican Republic's National Development Strategy (END) stands as a reference point for long- and medium-term sectoral planning. Even though the experience began relatively recently (2006), the first analyses of the implementation of the END and the National Public Sector Multi-year Plan indicate that they have become general references for institutional planning processes. To exemplify this, there are sectoral policies and programmes that require an inter-temporal approach, such as the electric compact, the digital agenda, the environmental protection strategy, the development of drinking-water services, local development initiatives, territorial governance plans, the efforts related to food security, the strategies for tourism, education, housing and technological development, together with international cooperation policy.

In Argentina, the relationship between the Strategic Territorial Plan and the sectoral strategies for economic activity are worthy of note. Planning initiatives of great import can be identified, such as those that gave rise to the 2020 Industrial Strategic Plan, the 2010-2016 Participatory and Federal Agrifood and Agribusiness Plan, the "Innovative Argentina 2020" National Science, Technology and Innovation Plan and the 2020 Federal Sustainable Tourism Strategic Plan.

In Brazil, the Growth Acceleration Programme (PAC) represents an innovative experience in government planning and the public administration of infrastructure investments, with repercussions across the nation's territory. This initiative helped expand the country's network of economic, social and urban infrastructure, and it also allowed real improvements in the standards of living of Brazil's population. It was not planning that triggered the return to growth; instead, the need to strengthen growth led, in 2007, to the formulation of the PAC, which has continued since then through successive phases with objectives adapted to changing conditions but maintaining the goal of promoting growth.

In Chile, the Management Evaluation and Control System has been in existence since 1997, with redesigns and adjustments arising from its own evaluations and those of external agencies, such as the World Bank and the OECD. Medium-term planning at the ministerial level (for example, for public works in the corresponding ministry) and for public services has been predominant and has been strengthened with the design and implementation of the management control and result evaluation system. The critical factors behind its success—in terms of the effects generated, the goals attained and the improvements in institutional management and in the efficiency and effectiveness of public spending—were the following: (i) a solid methodology, with instruments for improving the management of public services, monitoring and evaluation, (ii) inclusion of performance information in the budgetary cycle, (iii) institutional continuity since its launch in 1994, (iv) strengthened institutional capacities of the agency responsible for leading the process (the Budget Office of the Ministry of Finance, which underwent a major institutional redesign and was given human and financial resources and the necessary powers), (v) an agreement with Congress establishing the number and type of programme evaluations carried out, and (vi) accountability mechanisms (comprehensive management balance sheet).

The methodologies used were decisive in consolidating the evaluation system. The experience with coordinating presidential goals in the first stage of government following the restoration of democracy in the early 1990s facilitated the design and implementation of coordination mechanisms for launching initiatives to restore the institutional framework, to combat poverty and to exercise governance. This effort was assisted by a broad training programme on the modernization of public management for public officials.

In Brazil, the Growth Acceleration Programme (PAC) was created in 2007 from the Investment Pilot Project (PPI), which was launched in 2005 as a portfolio of undertakings in different areas of infrastructure (such as transport, irrigation and water supply, and research and development). Along with the *Bolsa Familia* conditional cash transfer programme for poor families across the country, it was designed as the guiding instrument for the transformations of the Brazilian economy during President Lula da Silva's second term.

This institutional arrangement was favoured by the confluence of a wide range of factors, including the following: a series of intensive monitoring activities conducted in conjunction with the Court of Accounts; the creation of a special group to assist with judicial proceedings related to the PAC; the accelerated transfer of resources to the States and municipalities; the reduction of the time required to release resources for sanitation and other works projects, with counterpart contributions from the States and municipalities; the simplification of procedures for environmental licensing; improvements in the mechanisms for public works bidding and contracting; and the restoration of the State's technical and planning capacity in the preparation, execution and oversight of infrastructure projects, through the creation of new public companies.

Of the three challenges examined, that of interconnecting the global and sectoral levels was the most complex to define and analyse, partly because of the wide range of experiences and sectors involved, and partly because of the difficulty in identifying elements that could be used to produce good practices. Sectoral policies are generally proposed in isolation from global planning or policies, or with very weak ties to them, often as a result of—or influenced by—the strength of business associations and their capacity to impact policy decisions.

To summarize, the following are the main challenges in improving interconnections between global and sectoral planning: (i) the implementation of mechanisms to facilitate the coordination of national and sectoral goals, coordination between ministries and lead agencies and institutional strengthening in the areas of strategic planning, indicators and evaluation; (ii) the implementation of national public investment systems—or their strengthening, if they already exist—as the basis for multi-year sectoral investment budgets, (iii) the strengthening of sectoral institutional capacities, and (iv) the strengthening of evaluation and accountability mechanisms at the subnational level, such as the National System for Evaluation of Management and Results (SINERGIA) in Colombia and the National Territorial Strategy (ETN) in Ecuador.

C. PLANNING FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE REGION AND THE WORK OF ILPES: CURRENT CHALLENGES AND COMPONENTS OF THE WORKING AGENDA

The orientation and focus of this research project revealed the array of steps forward taken by the region in its development planning practices related to one central challenge: that of jointly managing systems of increasing complexity and sustained dynamism. The innovations and uniqueness of planning for development in Latin America and the Caribbean have been noted in earlier works by ILPES (Leiva,

2012; Cuervo and Máttar, 2014). The cases and topics selected in this research project were derived from that identification of innovative practices and processes, although this is not in itself a procedure for collecting and identifying such cases or topics.

1. Elements present and absent in the management of planning for development systems as a whole

The institutional practice of planning for development in the region has expanded and consolidated one of its emerging features of the twenty-first century: the growing interconnection between the tools for planning and for public administration. In this way, a continuum emerges between these two traditions of practice, thought and professionalization, with visible benefits in its contribution to consolidating the role of planning as the nerve centre (or brain) of management and public policy for development.

Among the main challenges facing the work of ILPES and the focus of the Regional Council for Planning as the guidance and policy agency is the need to construct a method for the permanent observation of those practical innovations, to speed up learning and the transfer of knowledge between peers: in other words, between the public management and planning systems of the different countries. It is therefore necessary and timely to consolidate working tools and initiatives such as the repository of development plans of Latin America and the Caribbean; learning through knowledge transfers among peers for exchanges and feedback on planning approaches, instruments, methodologies and tools; the guide of good planning practices and lessons learned from their use, as a kind of white paper; the construction of a shared vision of the region's future; and the launch of a programme to support the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Essentially, these are the basic components of the working agenda that ILPES has been pursuing under the agreements of the Regional Council for Planning, and which are aimed at the construction of a platform for cooperation in the field of planning for development. The remainder of this section sets out the progress made and challenges still pending in connection with the challenges posed by planning and, then, proposes the guidelines for such a platform, as a contribution to the process of responding to those challenges.

2. Progress and challenges in interconnecting timeframes, deadlines and levels, and combining specialized sectoral planning with comprehensive national planning

In the dimension of interconnecting planning timescales and deadlines, the significant progress and the contributions made by the use of results-based management methodologies in the growing consolidation of medium-term planning and its relations with the short term are evident. That interconnection was one of the major planning tasks left pending from earlier times and, in addition to being noteworthy, it requires continuity of efforts, amidst the recognition of the different paths and courses that the countries have built in that regard: from the plan to the budget, and to evaluation and monitoring, and from the budget to the public administration, evaluation and monitoring, to identify the two models that are most clearly distinguishable and significant.

Interconnecting the long, medium and short terms is a pending task that requires heightened efforts in both the consolidation of emerging emblematic practices and the fine-tuning of the theory, methodologies and tools that can contribute to that aim. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development can provide the elements for consolidating a road map for strengthening the interconnection of timescales in public policy and planning.

In this dimension, as in the other two examined in this research project, there is one shortcoming of the utmost importance: the tools and instruments for evaluating, monitoring and following up on policies and the public administration are applied sparsely to planning as such.

The progress made with interconnections between levels of government is also worthy of note, particularly as regards the growing concern for intervening in and correcting territorial (subnational) development inequalities. The research project explored a number of innovative experiences that provide immense opportunities for learning and that also offer important prospects for evolution and progress.

The research and interpretations derived from the results of those experiences also point to one of their most important shortcomings. The reflection and progress are clear both in the consolidation of regional policy (from the top down) and in the coordination, by national governments, of a broad array of components that make up the territorial policy family. Nevertheless, little value is placed on the initiatives and on the contribution of local (subnational) development policies, or on the ways they interconnect with the aforesaid regional policies: that is the challenge of contemporary territorial policies (from the top down, and from the bottom up). In order to address that limitation, attention should be paid to the call for inclusive implementation made in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which tackles the importance of coordination between different levels of government in attaining the Sustainable Development Goals.

The continental and global levels are notably absent and, in the present circumstances, marked by the 2030 Agenda, the challenge of establishing interconnections from the national level emerges. It is therefore necessary to place particular emphasis on the role of the 2030 Agenda in the challenges of both multi-scalar and multi-temporal interconnection, given that it sets out the need for, and interest in, the long term in the task of consolidating planning for development.

The currency and weight of sectoral and specialized planning enabled learning processes to be kept alive and ongoing during the times of greatest decline in planning for development at earlier stages of regional history. It is still important to recognize its specificity and its currency, and to continue working to respond to the challenges of interconnecting with the more comprehensive dimension of planning. Planning systems must continue to acknowledge the diversity of timescales, deadlines and intensities, while not weakening the necessary construction of comprehensive approaches and of practices that guarantee the consistence and coherence of efforts.

3. Towards a platform for promoting regional cooperation in planning for development and the integration of Latin America and the Caribbean

The investigation conducted by ILPES, with the support of the evidence drawn from the case studies, has allowed the formulation of some hypotheses regarding the challenges of public administration and planning for development in Latin America and the Caribbean. It has also been valuable in identifying possible public interventions for addressing them. This is of direct relevance to the ECLAC agenda, in its mission of contributing to sustainable, inclusive development with equality, within the framework of the ILPES working agenda set out by the Regional Council for Planning. Accordingly, work has been underway on the construction of a planning cooperation programme, involving four central subprogrammes: (i) the repository of development plans of Latin America and the Caribbean, (ii) the planning white paper, to encourage good practices in planning processes, (iii) the capacity-building programme for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and (iv) contributing to the construction of a long-term view of development for Latin America and the Caribbean.

In proposing this working agenda, ILPES offers to cooperate with the Member States, through technical cooperation, direct advisory services and training for the development of skills and abilities, in order to create products and specific outcomes associated with the interventions. In addition, ILPES reiterates its willingness to continue promoting the establishment and strengthening of dialogue forums for the exchange of experiences among national planning authorities and policy-makers.

Each of the components is briefly described below.

(a) Repository of development plans of Latin America and the Caribbean

Pursuant to resolutions of the fourteenth meeting of the ILPES Regional Council for Planning in 2013 and agreements of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth meetings of the Presiding Officers of the ILPES Regional Council for Planning in 2014 and 2015, the Institute has developed an online platform for collecting, storing and analysing the region's development plans. The repository of development plans of Latin America and the Caribbean, which was made available to the public in 2014, is intended to systematize, on a single web page, the broad array of development plans, programmes and agendas in the region, at the national, subnational and sectoral levels, including summaries of the information contained in each, in order to allow comparisons between them and facilitate their consultation by interested parties.¹³

At a later stage, it will incorporate substantive analyses of the plans for making comparisons and identifying trends and common denominators, and for conducting comparisons with plans from other regions. It will also be possible, as new plans are published, to see how closely their objectives correspond to the Sustainable Development Goals and to what extent national planning is aligned with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

This repository is expected to become a meeting place of permanent interest to institutional, social and academic players in Latin American planning, and particularly for high-level public officials responsible for those topics. It is also hoped that it will become a source of information and inspiration for the development of learning processes among peers, the design of courses and training and the implementation of regional technical cooperation programmes. In the future, the repository is planned to evolve into an observatory, which will enable the development policies and plans of the region's countries to be monitored and evaluated.

(b) Guide of common elements for planning processes: the planning white paper

This strategy aims to produce a guide of common elements for planning processes, in order to facilitate dialogue and exchanges of planning experiences and good practices in the region at the regional, subregional, national and subnational levels. Its design will be informed by such basic criteria as the following: it will be the result of a participatory technical process; it will take its inspiration from the ISO standards model; it will focus more on planning processes than on the final outcomes; and it will draw on the broadest range of sources, including a variety of approaches and schools, and contributions from both the public and private sectors and from academia and dedicated research centres.

In recent years, the re-emergence of planning as a tool for development has been repeatedly highlighted and documented by ILPES. Among the specific actions in which the implementation of planning has been visible is the formulation and/or execution of national development plans in many of

¹³ See [online] planes.cepal.org.

the region's countries. The analysis of these plans and their design and implementation processes has revealed significant differences that go beyond the objectives set by the countries in the long term.

Pursuant to the resolutions adopted at the fourteenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning in 2013 and the agreements of the twenty-fourth meeting of the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning in 2014, substantial support for the exercise and practice of planning in the region—including exchanges of experiences among the countries— must consider the use of “good practices” in the formulation, design and implementation of governments’ long-term, territorial and sectoral development plans.

The chief aim of the white paper will be to systematize in a single document the lowest common denominators that must be included in processes for the formulation of different kinds of plans, the content and structure of plans and their implementation processes. This white paper is expected to guide the countries in formulating, implementing and following up on their plans.

It is also expected to contribute to exchanges of experiences among the countries and to the improvement of planning practices in the region, and to be a reference point for planners as regards planning approaches, methods and tools.

Preparing such a guide requires the engagement of the national planning authorities and for them to be in permanent contact with ILPES, given that the document's quality will largely depend on the effective inclusion of the lowest common denominators revealed by the countries' practical planning experiences. It is a “living” document that must be open to constant updates and additions derived from experiences with planning processes in the region and in the world.

(c) Capacity-building programme for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development¹⁴

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) offer a valuable guide for enriching and renewing policies, planning and public administration in the region. Attaining them will require ongoing, consistent and sustained efforts from a range of stakeholders, including States and their institutions, the private sector and society as a whole, through policies and planning with a long-term perspective. The route set out by the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development could serve as the main driving force for the structural change needed to attain inclusive, sustainable development with equality in Latin America and the Caribbean. The countries must assimilate and adapt the relevant elements of the 2030 Agenda in accordance with the objectives and priorities of their national agendas.

The capacity-building programme for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda seeks to promote the pursuit of the SDGs and to make their attainment viable, through training, technical assistance and institutional development. The aim is to create a permanent forum for studying and discussing the 2030 Agenda's scope, objectives, goals and indicators. Since this is a multidisciplinary agenda that requires a multisectoral approach, the proposed programme seeks to identify and encourage the use of strategic tools for the cross-cutting placement of the SDGs in development institutions, policies and plans, to strengthen specific skills and to assist with institutional governance and the capacities of the public administrations of the region's countries through the use of new methods and conceptual frameworks, techniques for

¹⁴ This section summarizes the contents set out in detail in the “Draft programme: capacity-building for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development” (LC/L.4073(CRP.15/5)).

government and public management and analytical and methodological tools that will allow the sharing—through learning by interaction—of good practices for planning and the design of public policies.

The programme will be executed by ILPES, with coordination provided by ECLAC. The initiative is inclusive and it seeks to attract different groups of stakeholders; it will therefore encourage the participation and collaboration of regional agencies, governments, the public, civil society, nongovernmental organizations, academics and the private sector.

The programme will mainly involve technical advice and cooperation, courses, seminars and workshops for the region's countries, in areas related to the goals of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, with a modular structure that will allow different types of approach to the goals and a new depth, in accordance with the specific needs and priorities of the region as a whole and of the countries in particular. The production of supports materials—such as publications, manuals, audiovisual materials, tools and methodologies—is also planned, in order to attain maximum dissemination and outreach.

(d) Towards the construction of a long-term view of development for Latin America and the Caribbean¹⁵

In 2010 ILPES embarked on its work programme for foresight in development. Its main objectives are to assist with building the capacity for foresight and its interconnections with public policy. Those capacities must be consolidated in each country, as well as in the region as a whole.

At the national level, there is a clear interest in foresight and in long-term thinking, and the region already has more than 20 exercises of that kind. At the international level, however, the region lacks a vision of its role in the contemporary world and of how that situation could determine the success of its aspirations for well-being and development (Bitar, 2014). As a part of this process, the Regional Council for Planning, at its November 2013 meeting in Brasilia, identified foresight as one of the strategic working areas of ILPES, along with promoting and realizing a vision of the future for Latin America and the Caribbean.

This proposal involves developing a multi-stage process that will lead to the construction of the desired vision of the future of Latin America and the Caribbean. The exercises carried out in the recent past include the Millennium Project, which sets scenarios for the region in 2030, based on consultations with a group of experts, and with support of the Delphi method. The proposed exercise is special in that it is designed to be an informed, collaborative and inclusive effort, so that the vision it produces will be the result of the mosaic of visions to which different social groups in the region aspire. The work will be led by the States, with the assistance and advice of ILPES and of ECLAC as a whole. Of the three possible types of standard vision that can be identified in the literature and international experience—declaration of identity, declaration of values and description of preferred future—it has been suggested that this exercise be geared toward the third (Bezold, undated).

This task must be part of a process through which the region can incrementally develop its capacity for thinking with foresight. According to this criterion, this proposal is being put forward as the first step in a long process. The recommendation is to begin by conducting an exercise with high-level public officials from the areas of development planning and foreign affairs, who will work on drawing up a first outline of the desired vision of the future.

¹⁵ For further details, see: ECLAC (2015d).

As part of the preparations for that process, between September and October 2015 ILPES conducted the second consultation on the climate of equality in Latin America and the Caribbean, looking forward to 2030.¹⁶ That exercise involved consulting a broad group of people regarding the prospects for closing development gaps in the region, and it produced inputs for the construction of the 2030 vision of Latin America and the Caribbean, in accordance with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

A total of 1,273 answers were obtained, mostly from people claiming to be experts in different disciplines, with a 50:50 gender breakdown. The questionnaire inquires about the prospects for the evolution of different development gaps —economic, productive, fiscal, social, labour, gender, territorial and environmental— looking forward to 2030. The results will be published in the near future. Using the Schwartz axes technique, four scenarios were constructed and, of these, the most probable was the one that promises relatively high institutional and economic development with relatively low well-being and social development.

¹⁶ The first phase, on the equality climate in the region by 2020, was conducted between 2012 and 2013. See: ECLAC (2013).

Bibliography

- Armijo, Marianela (2015), “La coherencia entre la planificación del largo y corto plazo: el presupuesto orientado a resultados en Chile. Estudio de caso”, Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), unpublished.
- Armijo, M. and M. Espada (2014), “Calidad del gasto público y reformas institucionales en América Latina”, *Macroeconómica del Desarrollo series*, No. 156 (LC/L.3881), Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).
- Barrera, Augusto and Nathalia Novillo (2015), “La estrategia territorial nacional. Ecuador. Estudio de caso”, Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), unpublished.
- Barzelay, M. (2001), *The New Public Management: Improving Research and Policy Dialogue*, Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bezold, C. (n/d), “Using vision in futures”, *Futures Research Methodology Version 3.0*, The Millennium Project [online] <http://www.millennium-project.org/millennium/FRM-V3.html#toc>.
- Bitar, Sergio (2014), “Las tendencias mundiales y el futuro de América Latina”, *Gestión Pública series*, No. 78 (LC/L.3681), Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).
- Castells, M. (2012), *Redes de indignación y esperanza. Los movimientos sociales en la era de Internet*, Madrid, Alianza.
- Chanquín, Victoria (2015), “Guatemala: la experiencia de formulación del Plan Nacional de Desarrollo K’atún: ‘Nuestra Guatemala 2032’. Estudio de caso”, Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), unpublished.
- Corporación Latinobarómetro (2013), *Informe Latinobarómetro 2013*, Santiago.
- Crosby, B and J. Bryson (2005), *Leadership for the Common Good. Tackling Public Problems in a Shared-Power World*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Cuervo, Luis Mauricio and Jorge Máttar (2014), “Planificación para el desarrollo en América Latina y el Caribe: regreso al futuro”, *Gestión Pública series*, No. 81 (LC/L.3838), Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).
- Dubet, F., (2013), *El trabajo de las sociedades*, Buenos Aires, Amorrortu.
- ECLAC (Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean) (2015a), *Economic Survey of Latin America and the Caribbean: Challenges in Boosting the Investment Cycle to Reinvigorate Growth* (LC/G.2645-P), Santiago.
- _____ (2015b), *Latin America and the Caribbean: Looking ahead after the Millennium Development Goals. Regional monitoring report on the Millennium Development Goals in Latin America and the Caribbean, 2015* (LC/G.2646), Santiago.
- _____ (2015c), *Report of the twenty-fifth meeting of the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES)* (LC/L.4077), Santiago, 2015.
- _____ (2015d), “Visión América Latina y el Caribe 2035. Propuesta ILPES-CEPAL”, Santiago, February, unpublished.
- _____ (2014a), *Compacts for Equality: Towards a sustainable future* (LC/G.2586(SES.35/3)), Santiago.
- _____ (2014b), *Social Panorama of Latin America, 2014* (LC/G.2635-P), Santiago.
- _____ (2014c), *Panorama de la Gestión Pública en América Latina y el Caribe* (LC/W.633), Santiago, November.
- _____ (2014d), *Report of the fourteenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), Brasilia, 22 November 2013* (LC/L.3782), Santiago.
- _____ (2014e), *Report of the twenty-fourth meeting of the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (Antigua, Guatemala, 19-20 June 2014)* (LC/L.3940), Santiago.

- _____ (2013), *Prospectiva y desarrollo: el clima de la igualdad en América Latina y el Caribe a 2020* (LC/G.2579), Santiago.
- _____ (2012), *Structural Change for Equality: An integrated approach to development* (LC/G.2524(SES.34/3)), Santiago.
- _____ (2010), *Time for Equality: Closing gaps, opening trails* (LC/G.2432(SES.33/3)), Santiago.
- ECLAC/SEGIB (Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean/Ibero-American Secretariat (2011), *Espacios iberoamericanos: hacia una nueva arquitectura del Estado para el desarrollo* (LC/G.2507), Santiago, October.
- Fernández Estrada, Oscar (2015), “El desafío de Cuba: extender el mercado, desarrollar la planificación”, Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), unpublished.
- García López, R. and M. García Moreno (2010), *La gestión para resultados en el desarrollo: avances y desafíos en América Latina y el Caribe*, Washington, D.C., Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).
- GCPSE (Global Centre for Public Service Excellence) (2014), *Foresight as a Strategic Long-Term Planning Tool for Developing Countries*, Singapore, United Nations Development Programme (PNUD) [online] <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/global-centre-for-public-service-excellence/Foresight.html>.
- Gracia, Orlando (2015), “El sistema nacional de evaluación de gestión y resultados de Colombia: Sinergia. Estudio de caso”, Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), unpublished.
- IDB (Inter-American Development Bank) (2015), *Building Effective Governments Achievements and Challenges for Results-Based Public Administration in Latin America and the Caribbean*, Washington, D.C.
- IDB/CLAD (Inter-American Development Bank/Latin American Centre for Development Administration) (2007), *Open Model for Public Sector Results-Based Management*, Washington, D.C.
- Marcel, M. (2005), “Renovando una institución pública estratégica. Dirección de presupuestos 2000-2005”, paper presented at the X International Congress of the Latin American Centre for Development Administration (CLAD), Santiago, October.
- Máttar, Jorge and Daniel Perrotti (2014), *Planificación, prospectiva y gestión pública. Reflexiones para la agenda de desarrollo*, ECLAC Books, No. 126 (LC/G.2611-P), Santiago, May.
- Leiva, Jorge (2012), “Pensamiento y práctica de la planificación en América Latina”, *Gestión Pública series*, No. 75 (LC/L.3465), Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) (2015), *Government at a Glance 2015*, Paris, OECD Publishing.
- _____ (2011), *Government at a Glance 2011*, Paris, OECD Publishing.
- _____ (2009), *Measuring Government Activity*, Paris, OECD Publishing.
- Pugliese, Luciano (2015), “El Plan Estratégico Territorial. Argentina. Estudio de caso”, Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), unpublished.
- Ramírez Alujas, A. and A. Naser (2014), “Plan de gobierno abierto: una hoja de ruta para los gobiernos de la región”, *Manuales series*, No. 81 (LC/L.3802), Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).
- Ramírez J.C., I. Silva and L.M. Cuervo (2009), *Economía y territorio en América Latina y el Caribe: Desigualdades y políticas*, ECLAC Books, No. 99 (LC/G.2385-P), Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).
- REDEPLAN (Latin American and Caribbean Network of Development Planning) (2015), *Diagnóstico de los sistemas de planificación de la región*, unpublished.

- Rodríguez, L.A. and L.M. Cuervo (2014), “Visiones de desarrollo y planeación de largo plazo en América Latina y el Caribe. Notas a partir de la experiencia de cuatro países”, *Gestión Pública series*, No. 82 (LC/L.3837), Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).
- Rosanvallon, P. (2007), *La Contrademocracia. La Política en la era de la desconfianza*, Buenos Aires, Manantial.
- Ruiz-Durán, Clemente (2015), “Planeación multinivel y los retos de su compatibilización. México. Estudio de caso”, Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), unpublished.
- Sotelo, Aníbal Jorge (2015), “La planificación de mediano plazo en el sector público dominicano. El Plan Nacional Plurianual del Sector Público”, Santiago, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), unpublished.
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) (2012), “La protesta social en América Latina”, *Cuaderno de Prospectiva Política*, No. 1, Buenos Aires, Siglo XXI.
- World Bank (2011), *The Practice of Policy-Making in the OECD: Ideas for Latin America*, October.

Annex 1

Table A1.1
Latin America and the Caribbean: national planning for development institutions

Country	Current regulatory framework	Lead agency	Agency type
Antigua and Barbuda	n/a	n/a	n/a
Argentina	Decree 27 of 2003, Organizational Chart of the Centralized Administration of the Ministry of Federal Planning, Public Investment and Services. Decree 1142 of 2003, Organizational Structure.	Ministry of Federal Planning, Public Investment and Services	Ministry
Bahamas	n/a	n/a	n/a
Barbados	n/a	Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs	Ministry
Belize	n/a	Ministry of Finance and Economic Development	Ministry
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Law 3351 of 2006, on the Organization of the Executive Branch, creating the Ministry of Development Planning. State Constitution, Articles 298, 300, 302 and 316.	Ministry of Development Planning	Ministry
Brazil		Ministry of Planning, Budget and Management	Ministry
Chile	Law 20530 of 2011, creating the Ministry of Social Development, as amended. Decree Law 1263 of 1975 of the Ministry of Finance, Organic Law on the Financial Administration of the State. Decree with the Force of Law 1-19175 of 2005, updated text of Law 19175, the Organic Constitutional Law on Government and Regional Administration.	Ministry of Social Development	Ministry
Colombia	Decree 1832 of 2012, amending the structure of the National Planning Department. Law 1450 of 2011, enacting the 2010-2014 National Development Plan.	National Planning Department (DNP)	National department
Costa Rica	Law 5525 of 1974, the National Planning Law, establishing the formulation of the National Development Plan. Executive Decree 31324-PLAN of 2003, National Development Plan of the Ministry of National Planning and Economic Policy (MIDEPLAN). Law 8131 of 2001, Financial Administration of the Republic and Public Budgets. Law 6227 of 1978, General Law of the Public Administration. Decree 37735-PLAN of 2013, General Regulations of the National Planning System.	Ministry of National Planning and Economic Policy (MIDEPLAN)	Ministry
Cuba	Decree Law 147 of 1994, on the Reorganization of Agencies of the Central Administration of the State, whereby the Central Planning Board was converted into the Ministry of Economic Affairs and Planning.	Ministry of Economic Affairs and Planning	Ministry

Table A1.1 (continued)

Country	Current regulatory framework	Lead agency	Agency type
Dominica	n/a	n/a	n/a
Dominican Republic	Law 496-06 of 2006, creating the Secretariat of State of the Economy, Planning and Development (SEEPYD). Law 498-06 of 2006, on Planning and Public Investment, creating the National System for Planning and Public Investment.	Ministry of Economy, Planning and Development (MEPyD)	Ministry
Ecuador	Executive Decree 1372 of 2004, creating the National Secretariat for Planning and Development (SENPLADES). Constitution of the Republic of Ecuador, Article 255. Organic Code of Planning and Public Finances, 2011.	National Secretariat for Planning and Development (SENPLADES)	Ministry
El Salvador	Currently being updated.	Technical Secretariat of the Office of the President	Attached to the Office of the President of the Republic
Grenada	n/a		
Guatemala	Decree 114 of 1997 of the Guatemalan National Congress, Law of the Executive Branch, creating the Secretariat for Planning and Programming of the Office of the President.	Secretariat for Planning and Programming of the Office of the President (SEGEPLAN)	Attached to the Office of the President of the Republic
Guyana	n/a	Ministry of Finance	Ministry
Haiti	n/a	Ministry of Planning and External Cooperation	Ministry
Honduras	Constitution, Article 329. Legislative Decree 286 of 2009, Law for the Establishment of a Country Vision and the Adoption of a National Plan for Honduras. Regulations for the Organization and Functioning of the Council of the 2010-2022 National Plan.	Technical Secretariat for Planning and External Cooperation	Attached to the Office of the President of the Republic
Jamaica	n/a	Ministry of Finance and Planning	Ministry
Mexico	Planning Law, published in the Official Journal of the Federation on January 5, 1983, as amended.	Secretariat of Finance and Public Credit, Secretariat of Agrarian, Territorial and Urban Development	Secretariat
Nicaragua	n/a	Presidential Public Policy Coordination Office	Attached to the Office of the President
Panama	Law 97 of 1998, creating the Ministry of Economy and Finance as a result of the merger of the Ministry of Finance and the Treasury and the Ministry of Planning and Economic Policy.	Ministry of Economy and Finance	Within the Ministry of Economy and Finance

Table A1.1 (concluded)

Country	Current regulatory framework	Lead agency	Agency type
Paraguay	Decree Law 312 of 1962, creating the Technical Secretariat of Planning for Economic and Social Development. Decree 4070 of 2004, reorganizing the Technical Secretariat of Planning for Economic and Social Development.	Technical Secretariat of Planning for Economic and Social Development (STP)	Attached to the Office of the President of the Republic
Peru	Legislative Decree 1088 of 2008, Law of the National System for Strategic Planning and the National Centre for Strategic Planning. Supreme Decree 046 of 2009-PCM, adopting the Regulations for the Organization and Functions of the National Centre for Strategic Planning (CEPLAN).	National Centre for Strategic Planning (CEPLAN)	National department
Saint Kitts and Nevis	n/a		
Saint Lucia	n/a	Ministry of Finance, Economic Affairs, Planning and Social Security	Ministry
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	n/a	Central Planning Division of the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning	Ministry
Suriname	n/a	n/a	n/a
Trinidad and Tobago	n/a	Ministry of Planning and Development	Ministry
Uruguay	Article 230 of the Constitution (1967), establishing the creation of the Office of Planning and the Budget.	Office of Planning and the Budget (OPP)	Attached to the Office of the President of the Republic
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	Decree 6217, with the Range, Value and Force of Organic Law on the Public Administration, Official Gazette No. 5.890 Special, of 31 July 2008. Organic Law of Public and Popular Planning, Official Gazette No. 6.011 Special, of 21 December 2010. Homeland Plan. Second Socialist Plan of Economic and Social Development of the Nation 2013-2019, Official Gazette No. 6.118 Special, of 4 December 2013. Decree 237, Organic Regulations of the Ministry of People's Power for Planning, Official Gazette No. 40.213, of 23 July 2013. Decree 380, enacting the Organic Regulations of the Ministry of Planning and Development, Official Gazette No. 36.825, of 9 November 1999. Decree 1045, Organic Regulations of the Central Office of Coordination and Planning of the Office of the President of the Republic (CORDIPLAN), Official Gazette No 35.903, of 16 February 1996.	Ministry of People's Power for Planning	Ministry

Source: Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), on the basis of a Repository of development plans of Latin America and the Caribbean of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES); Ministerial Planning Dialogues 2012-2014; Latin American and Caribbean Network of Development Planning (REDEPLAN), *Diagnóstico de los sistemas de planificación de la región*, 2015, unpublished; and official information from the respective countries.

Note: n/a = not available.