



XXX

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

Santiago, 27 and 28 November 2024

Distr.
LIMITED
LC/MDCRP.30/7
7 May 2025
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH
2500196[E]

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

Santiago, 27 and 28 November 2024



CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraph</i>	<i>Page</i>
A. ATTENDANCE AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK	1–2	3
Place and date of the meeting	1	3
Attendance.....	2	3
B. AGENDA	3	3
C. SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS.....	4–76	4
Annex 1 Agreements.....	–	19
Annex 2 List of participants	–	21

A. ATTENDANCE AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

Place and date of the meeting

1. The thirtieth meeting of the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) was held in Santiago on 27 and 28 November 2024.

Attendance¹

2. The meeting was attended by representatives of the following member countries in their capacity as Presiding Officers: Dominican Republic (Chair), Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala, Jamaica and Peru. Guest panellists were also in attendance.

B. AGENDA

3. The Presiding Officers adopted the following agenda:

1. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work.
2. Presentation of the position document prepared by ECLAC for its fortieth session, *Development Traps in Latin America and the Caribbean: Vital Transformations and How to Manage Them*.
3. Panel 1. Challenges in transforming institutional frameworks for development planning.
4. Panel 2. Changes in current and new requests for training in the region.
5. Presentation of the document entitled “Guidelines for the drafting of a regional agenda on governance of planning and public management for sustainable development in Latin America and the Caribbean”.
6. Presentation of the report on the activities carried out by the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), 2023–2024 and of the report on the status of the Regular System of Government Financing for the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES).
7. Presentation of the programme of work of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), 2025 and preparation of a programme of activities on the governance of planning and public management for sustainable development in Latin America and the Caribbean.
8. Preparations for the twentieth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES).
9. Consideration and adoption of agreements.

¹ For a complete list of participants, see annex 2.

C. SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Opening session

4. At the opening session, statements were made by José Manuel Salazar-Xirinachs, Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), and Pável Isa, Minister of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic, in his capacity as Chair of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES).

5. The Executive Secretary of ECLAC outlined the Commission's position regarding the three development traps faced by Latin America and the Caribbean: low capacity for growth; high inequality and low social mobility and cohesion; and weak institutional capacities and governance. Within that framework, ECLAC had identified 10 major development gaps that had led it to define 11 crucial changes that the region needed to make. Those changes were described in detail in *Development Traps in Latin America and the Caribbean: Vital Transformations and How to Manage Them*. In addition to identifying what the region should do in order to extricate itself from those traps, ECLAC had focused on working out the “hows” of accomplishing that and had determined that efforts to bring about those changes should be centred on governance and on technical, operational, political and prospective (TOPP) institutional shifts, spaces for social dialogue and the political economy of the reforms. Productive development policies and innovative governance methodologies such as cluster initiatives had an important role to play in that respect.

6. The Executive Secretary went on to say that the Commission sought to open up new avenues of thought, research and technical assistance and to invite governments and society to rethink, reimagine and transform while taking a forward-looking approach to the task of building the future within the framework of a more robust and forward-thinking form of governance in each and every relevant area of policy. That conceptual framework would help to broaden consensus and shared commitments as part of a process in which planning and public administrative institutions played a central part. He therefore applauded the fact that the Regional Council for Planning was launching negotiations on a regional agenda on governance of planning and public management for sustainable development in Latin America and the Caribbean. ILPES had been helping countries to build their capacities for over 60 years, and the region could rely on the Commission's and the Institute's commitment to the promotion of more effective governance and to working alongside the countries of the region to build a productive, inclusive and sustainable future.

7. The Minister of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic expressed his appreciation for the confidence that the member countries had placed in his country by conferring upon it the honour of chairing the Regional Council for Planning. The proposal for a regional agenda on governance of planning and public management for sustainable development in Latin America and the Caribbean that would address the growing needs to be observed in a wide range of areas had been presented to the countries, and the representatives in attendance were about to embark on an analysis of the proposed guidelines for designing that agenda. The world was confronted with multiple crises. In the region, those crises were posing serious difficulties for the countries as they strove to transform their production structures, move towards more sustainable forms of production and consumption, and attain higher levels of well-being for their populations. Those crises were also posing formidable challenges for democracy and for the legitimacy of States in which so many members of the populace were frustrated by how difficult it was proving to be to achieve the desired results. Given so many causes of concern in the world of today, it was difficult to imagine a more challenging point in time than the present one.

8. That state of affairs made it all the more essential to build institutional and governance capacity. And in order to do so, the countries needed to develop possible future scenarios and to have clear-cut objectives. They also needed systems that would link short-term planning with medium- and long-term planning, forums for deliberation and citizen participation in the design of a public policy agenda based on a shared vision, monitoring and evaluation procedures that would underpin good policies, greater technical and management capacities and closer collaboration between policymakers and the people responsible for applying the policies they developed. It was also necessary to have frameworks for planning and financing development that incorporated not only sectoral, comprehensive and foresight perspectives but also a territorial perspective. In terms of the political situation and the state of the climate and the natural world, time was running out, and the authorities had an obligation to take action. Planning and public policy management had a part to play in developing an effective response, and it was his hope that the present meeting would make headway in that direction.

Presentation of the position document prepared by ECLAC for its fortieth session, *Development Traps in Latin America and the Caribbean: Vital Transformations and How to Manage Them* (agenda item 2)

9. The Executive Secretary of ECLAC presented the position paper, which he characterized as an invitation by the Commission to rethink, reimagine and transform the development models of Latin America and the Caribbean. He noted that the world was transitioning towards a new scenario in terms of globalization, geoeconomics and geopolitics which had numerous implications that posed challenges for the region. The opportunities which that transition was opening up could not be seized without the help of proactive policies on productive development and the attraction of investment or without international and regional collaboration and partnerships. The increase in polarization challenged institutions' capacity for channelling, processing and regulating social and political conflicts at the national, regional and global levels. ECLAC had identified 10 structural gaps in the development model, some of which coincided with the three development traps that he had mentioned earlier. In order to close those gaps and extricate itself from those traps, the region needed to work towards bringing about at least 11 vital transformations. The position paper analysed four of those interrelated transformations in detail: rapid, sustained, sustainable and inclusive growth (productive development, productivity and employment); reduced inequality and increased mobility and social cohesion; the big push for sustainability and address climate change; and macroeconomics for development and sound and strong tax systems.

10. Managing those transformations would involve not only technical, policy-related aspects but also the ability to guide and coordinate collective action. It was therefore essential to strengthen governance, institutions' TOPP capabilities, spaces for social dialogue and the political economy of those transformations. Development was a complex, long-term process, and the countries' levels of development were linked to the decisions they took and the efforts each of them made. If the countries of the region succeeded in increasing their collective capacity for setting their own course and staying on that course during successive terms of government, they could inspire hope and build a better future.

11. In the ensuing discussion, the Secretary for Planning and Programming of the Office of the President of Guatemala expressed appreciation for the effort made by ECLAC to outline a series of specific actions. The variables to be considered in the analysis of the Central American countries included the nature of the countries' political institutions associated with the regression of democracy; the poverty trap, as poverty levels had been unchanged for over 20 years; and the potential economic impacts of the measures announced by the President-elect of the United States concerning mass deportations of migrants and the possibility of applying tariffs or of taxing remittances. In Guatemala, remittances represented approximately 20% of the country's gross domestic product (GDP).

12. The Deputy Minister for Planning and Public Investment of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic thanked the Executive Secretary of ECLAC for his presentation of the Commission's position paper and then focused his comments on ways of escaping the development traps troubling the region: on the one hand, the Fourth International Conference on Financing for Development would make it possible to speed up changes in multilateral agencies that would enable them to provide more contingent financing, improve climate change adaptation mechanisms and promote innovative forms of financing, such as thematic bonds; on the other, circular migration could be promoted by global partnerships for sustainable development and bilateral accords providing for job training in the country of origin for potential migrants. That could provide a legal migration route for beneficiaries that would allow them to work in their country of destination while also regularizing migration and attracting resources for building capacity in the countries of the region.

13. The Director General of the Planning Institute of Jamaica underscored the timeliness of the position paper, which covered a variety of issues, offered a perspective on the challenges faced by the Caribbean subregion and plotted out a road map for bringing about change. The report drew attention to the development traps that were restricting growth and social mobility, thereby underscoring the urgent need for innovative strategies for escaping those traps. He called upon the countries to implement the recommendations made in the document regarding ways of combating inequality, building institutional capacity and promoting sustainable development so that they could meet the challenges of a rapidly changing world. Jamaica, like other countries, was caught in the three development traps identified in the position paper. The Jamaican government was devoting particular attention to the creation of social protection systems in line with what was said in the document concerning the reduction of inequality. His country also recognized the importance of dealing with the risks associated with such factors as ageing, migration, climate change and disability that impaired people's livelihoods and quality of life. Given the geographic context of the region, Jamaica was placing priority on measures aimed at increasing resilience, such as the establishment of a solid disaster risk management framework, the promotion of sustainable tourism initiatives and the design of policies for advancing a just energy transition. Citing its long-term development strategy as an example, he said that his country was adopting a knowledge economy model that focused on digitalizing services and on productivity gains as ways of promoting innovation. Those steps were being taken in line with ECLAC recommendations about investing in technological development and education to help overcome economic stagnation and advance towards a sustainable and inclusive form of development. He wished to draw his comments to a close by thanking ECLAC for its presentation of the report and reiterating his country's commitment to working with the other countries of the region and its international partners to speed up the necessary transformations and build a prosperous, inclusive future.

14. The Chief of the Interministerial Coordination Division of the Office of the Minister and Secretary General of the Presidency of Chile said that his country was entirely in agreement with the position paper and lauded its comprehensive scope. Areas in which Chile had made some degree of progress in acting upon the proposals made in the position paper included its efforts to diversify its economy, promote innovation and add value to its natural resources. Reducing inequality, fostering social inclusion and promoting sustainability and climate action were also important areas of effort. Social dialogue was essential in order to bring about the necessary transformations and should include the business world as well as civil society. His country's growth, productivity and employment offices were one example in that regard. The directors of those offices travelled to the different parts of the country to meet with representatives of the private sector. It was his government's belief that the State needed to take more effective action to ensure legal certainty. The State protected legal rights in all their forms and would ensure that the civil service would be able to expedite its procedures. It was important for people to have confidence in their institutions, and there was thus a need to measure existing attitudes and then to work to build greater trust with a view to overcoming the problems that stood in the way of the needed transformations.

15. The Assistant Secretary General for Planning of Ecuador expressed appreciation for the inputs provided by the position paper and for the invitation to reflect upon them. The Latin American and Caribbean region was faced with a crisis at a time when it had not yet overcome the preceding one. The institutional, democracy and governance crisis had to be addressed, and the ways in which it influenced efforts to bring about the changes that were needed to drive the development process had to be analysed. The political and economic changes occurring around the world were posing a challenge for the countries as they sought to further their development and put sustainable policies in place. The labour market and the role of today's youth were other highly relevant issues. In addition to the ageing of the population, the countries needed to address the problems associated with informal labour and the lack of job opportunities for young people, women and members of ethnic minorities. The proposals put forth in the document had to be given concrete form in a regional agenda that included specific policies developed by means of a joint effort on the part of all concerned.

16. The National Secretary for Planning of the Ministry of Planning and the Budget of Brazil said that her country was aware of the three traps mentioned in the position paper. In fact, those traps were the focus of her country's national and sectoral plans and particularly of its 2024–2027 Multiannual Plan, which was now under way. In order to extricate itself from those traps, Brazil had incorporated innovative elements, including an enhanced role for societal participation, into the design of that plan. The scope of the participatory process provided for in the plan was the most extensive ever to be undertaken in the country's history, as more than 1.4 million people had been involved in crafting proposals and voting on government programmes. The inputs provided in the course of that process had been used to establish the government's priorities, and those priorities, which dealt with combating hunger and social and regional inequalities, remained in place. Another element of the plan was a results-based approach, which involved a shift in the mindset of civil servants from a concentration on procedures or deliverables to a focus on bringing about genuine change for the people of Brazil. Those innovative elements, which also included the incorporation of foresight planning, were being rolled out to state and local governments, and other measures were being taken to improve the consistency of actions taken at the various levels of government. In conclusion, she wished to say that, despite all the difficulties being faced, she was convinced that positive results were attainable.

Panel 1. Challenges in transforming institutional frameworks for development planning (agenda item 3)

17. The panel was moderated by Javier Medina Vásquez, Deputy Executive Secretary a.i. of ECLAC and Officer-in-Charge of ILPES, and the panellists were Sergio Bitar, former Minister of State of Chile; Wayne Henry, Director General and Chair of the Board of Directors of the Planning Institute of Jamaica; Jeffrey Lizardo, Deputy Minister for Planning and Public Investment of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic; and Gustavo Cuesta, Assistant Secretary General for Planning of Ecuador.

18. The former Minister of State of Chile shared his thoughts about ways to improve the institutional arrangements for foresight planning. The Chilean Senate was working on the design of an institutional foresight authority that would: (i) take a cross-cutting approach; (ii) work closely with the Office of the President of Chile and serve as an autonomous strategic advisory body; (iii) coordinate and network with other agencies; and (iv) provide training in foresight planning. It was also important to develop joint projects for strengthening democracy and to delve into foresight issues as part of group exercises involving participants from different political, academic and civil society sectors.

19. The Director General and Chair of the Board of Directors of the Planning Institute of Jamaica said that the Jamaican government had taken a proactive approach to the task of strengthening its institutions in order to promote transparency and efficiency, and that effort had led to the introduction of tax reforms and

the reform of public sector wage schemes. The contribution of development planning to efforts to address the complex global situation offered a strategic vision for aligning global and national goals. Vision 2030 Jamaica was an example of that. Development planning was also helping to build resilience, particularly in the face of climate change and economic crises, as well as contributing to greater policy coherence and multisectoral collaboration, the promotion of decision-making based on hard data and efforts to address issues relating to inequality and social inclusion, especially in marginalized communities. Although major advances had definitely been made, institutions continued to work in silos and lacked a systemic vision, however. A theoretical re-set was therefore needed that would involve moving away from rigid, top-down models in favour of more adaptive, participatory ones that would provide a way of responding to global disruptions, along with the use of new tools and innovative methodologies in such areas as scenario design, data analysis and artificial intelligence; the expansion of participatory mechanisms to include a broader range of stakeholders, especially among civil society organizations and underrepresented segments of the population; the reinforcement of inter-agency coordination mechanisms; and a focus on implementation and accountability in order to ensure transparency, follow-up and evaluation. Finally, he wished to emphasize the fundamental importance of political will in order to strengthen political, institutional and citizen support for planning; understand long-term planning as an investment rather than as a short-run expense; institutionalize planning processes in law; build the capacity of institutions responsible for carrying out that task; securing the support of the citizenry and encouraging the public to take ownership of planning processes through transparent communication of the benefits of development plans in meetings and on digital platforms; raising the population's awareness of the importance of development planning with the help of educational campaigns; linking up national plans with tangible results in such areas as job creation and the upgrading of public services; and making use of digital tools to promote participation and democratize access to planning processes.

20. The Deputy Minister for Planning and Public Investment of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic said that planning systems needed to be aligned with public policies while also fostering a collaborative culture that would bring many different stakeholders together in support of shared medium- and long-term objectives. Development planning could bolster government action through the visualization of future scenarios at times of uncertainty that would enable governments to take early action to counter risks. New technologies such as artificial intelligence and macrodata systems could be used to strengthen planning mechanisms. In the Dominican Republic, the National Planning System had been strengthened by the alignment of its planning instruments with the 2030 National Development Strategy and with its national monitoring and evaluation system, which was based on participatory mechanisms and a consolidated registry of the demands made by the country's population. ILPES rendered valuable assistance in the implementation of toolkits for the incorporation of cross-cutting approaches into the country's strategic institutional plans. He wished to encourage the countries to work towards integrating a long-term perspective more fully into their planning systems, territorializing planning instruments, improving coordination between the planning system and the budget, consolidating planning information systems and budgeting procedures, putting public investment plans into motion and including non-State actors in the process.

21. The Assistant Secretary General for Planning of Ecuador said that the planning process contributed to development in various ways. Firstly, it promoted long-term thinking based on consistent goals and cogent ideas such as those embedded in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Secondly, it facilitated intersectoral coordination. In Ecuador, such coordination was ensured by the links between its intersectoral offices and the Planning Secretariat, which worked in a broad range of areas. Thirdly, it contributed to the orientation of public policies towards territorial units, thereby promoting a more balanced development process. Fourthly, it played an important environmental role. And, finally, it encouraged citizen participation, since it was a process in which members of the population could voice their support

in order to lend greater legitimacy to public policy. The institutionalization of planning processes also posed certain challenges, however, that could not be overcome simply through the passage of legislation. Planning processes had to extend beyond the bounds of individual Administrations; an agile, flexible approach was needed in order for it to adapt to each new Administration when it took office. Links with civil society and local communities had to be strengthened, consistency with public investments had to be ensured, efforts had to be made to see to it that public investment processes transcended political cycles, while the planning cycle had to be reinforced and extended beyond the design stage to include the implementation and, most importantly, evaluation stages. Planning was called upon to play a fundamental role in the development of instruments, the creation of a planning culture, the strengthening of verticalization, the formation of strategic partnerships and the establishment of connections with different stakeholders such as the academic sector and nongovernmental organizations.

22. The former Minister of State of Chile offered recommendations for building a forward-looking institutional structure in the countries of the region. Institutional systems needed to be designed that could influence decision-makers and educate political actors about what planning institutions did and how they did it. Those institutions should require candidates to back up their project proposals with hard data and long-term projections. It was important for the new system to be a permanent one and to provide scope for debate and the promotion of forward thinking (through such vehicles as, for example, a national “future summit”). It would also need to have teams of civil servants capable of directing long-term policies. Finally, public policies had to produce results and engender political agreements and, for that to be possible, planning institutions needed to be flexible and capable of adapting to changing circumstances.

23. The Director General and Chair of the Board of Directors of the Planning Institute of Jamaica analysed the factors that had enabled his country to establish an effective planning institution. There was general agreement in Jamaica about the importance for the country of long-term planning because it was understood that such plans, along with the work of the Ministry of Planning and Finance, facilitated the continuity of the changes being made in the government. Although the country did have a long-term plan, at the operative level the Planning Institute worked on the basis of medium-term (three-year) cycles in order to ensure policy coherence and facilitate flexible, adaptive planning, as well as evidence-based decision-making. The Planning Institute was regarded as a neutral, objective and credible institution.

24. The Deputy Minister for Planning and Public Investment of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic said that his country’s planning system was recognized as the government’s idea lab, as it worked closely with the Office of the President to prioritize and implement policies. The Dominican Republic was currently introducing reforms that would integrate planning into the budget process more fully and incorporate results-based management and evaluation mechanisms into the planning system so that it would continue to be a credible institution that championed strategic thinking.

25. The Assistant Secretary General for Planning of Ecuador explained that, in his country, the importance of planning was established in the Constitution, while the National Development Plan served as the main guidepost for decisions taken in the country relating to public investment. A territorial component needed to be incorporated into the National Development Plan so that guidelines could be provided at the municipal and local government levels. It was important to encourage the countries to share their experiences and lessons learned with one another.

26. In the ensuing discussion, the representative of Peru drew attention to her country’s Strategic National Development Plan to 2050, which guided State action at all levels and served to marshal the efforts of all members of society to attain a shared vision of progress. That plan was a dynamic tool that was supported by 392 different indicators. One of its fundamental components was the Forum for a National

Accord, which was a space for dialogue that had been introduced in 2000. The success of the Strategic National Development Plan hinged not only on its design but also on follow-up and evaluation, which constituted one of the major challenges to be met. The National Centre for Strategic Planning (CEPLAN) was proposing the use of interactive dashboards that would provide for the cross-referencing of physical and financial benchmarks as a way of promoting transparency and accountability. An observatory that analysed megatrends, risks, opportunities and future scenarios and the GeoCeplan platform, which had 87 layers of georeferenced information that included key data for the public and private sectors, were two other innovative tools developed by CEPLAN to support public action and promote a forward-thinking culture.

27. Closing the panel, the Deputy Minister for Planning and Public Investment of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic noted that other agencies in his country turned to the Ministry for assistance with the preparation of their own plans. Nevertheless, the Ministry had not yet succeeded in providing orientation for the government as such, and it was therefore important to set reforms in motion in order to link the planning system to the budget process.

Panel 2. Changes in current and new requests for training in the region (agenda item 4)

28. The panel was moderated by Jeffrey Lizardo, Deputy Minister for Planning and Public Investment of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic, and the panellists were Virgínia de Ângelis Oliveira de Paula, National Secretary for Planning of the Ministry of Planning and the Budget of Brazil; Carlos Mendoza Alvarado, Secretary for Planning and Programming of the Office of the President of Guatemala; Giofianni Peirano Torriani, Chair of the Governing Council of CEPLAN of Peru; Rodrigo Lavanderos, Coordinator for the Modernization of the State of Chile; and Rodolfo Sabonge, Secretary General of the Association of Caribbean States (ACS).

29. The National Secretary for Planning of the Ministry of Planning and the Budget of Brazil said that one of the main barriers to planning was the lack of interministerial coordination. During the process of drawing up the most recent multiannual plan, the planning network had succeeded in reorganizing itself and agreeing upon cross-cutting agendas shared by a number of different institutions. Another barrier had to do with the tendency for ministries to work in silos and for ministry personnel to work in isolation from other members of the same ministry or other departments, which hampered efforts to integrate the budget into the planning process. It was essential to break down the barriers separating political leaders from members of society, and the participatory process employed in developing the multiannual plan had helped to accomplish that. The credibility of planning systems and the instruments they used could be enhanced by improving those system's diagnostic assessments and by putting mechanisms in place for informing the public what the objectives of each plan were. Ideas for finding ways to overcome the barrier represented by the discontinuity of planning tools included setting up a flexible management system that would ensure effective monitoring and evaluation, integrating planning processes with local perceptions in order to illustrate their relevance and incorporating a longer-term vision into the planning process to demonstrate that challenges could be overcome within that time horizon. Brazil was currently engaged in developing its Strategy 2050, which would serve as a tool for shaping and integrating a unified vision in the country.

30. The Secretary for Planning and Programming of the Office of the President of Guatemala focused his comments on the training required to prepare a person to perform planning functions. More basic skills—such as report writing, graphics preparation and information analysis and interpretation—were needed, as were mid-level skills in areas such as foresight analysis and public policy follow-up and evaluation methodologies. Persons preparing for such roles also needed to develop soft skills, especially those involved in promoting communication, coordination and collaboration. Finally, other skills needed in order to carry out the work of planning institutions included those required to utilize artificial intelligence to increase the

efficiency of certain types of processes, real-time monitoring of plans, programmes and projects, and the early detection of potential problems in their implementation, along with the data handling skills called for in order to develop future scenarios.

31. The Chair of the Governing Council of CEPLAN of Peru referred to the need for continuous learning and for refresher courses for civil servants, which could include asynchronous, virtual and self-teaching modules. It was important to give recognition to personnel who worked on upgrading their skills in order to foster a culture of learning in planning institutions and to motivate other staff members to follow suit. There was a need in her country to forge partnerships with universities so that they could design academic programmes that would be aligned with the 2050 National Strategic Development Plan and provide planners with the skills needed to help close the gaps detected in that instrument. Peru had control panels and dashboards that used artificial intelligence in all of its ministries and on the webpages of its subnational governments, all of which was of use in monitoring the progress of the Plan.

32. The Coordinator for the Modernization of the State of Chile said that the barriers that his office had encountered included public mistrust of the State, political polarization, the absence of government centres that included all State institutions, cultural changes in the workplace environment and budgetary cycles. Those issues could be addressed in the course of the capacity-building process. In addition to promoting the acquisition of technical skills, emphasis should be placed on fostering inter-agency collaboration with a view to becoming more responsive to the general public. Other issues relating to training included innovation, the digital transformation (data handling, integration and interoperability), network formation, the management of uncertainty and the emerging agenda.

33. The Secretary General of ACS gave an overview of his institution and noted that, in order to achieve greater integration, multilateral agencies needed to develop foresight planning capacities within the framework of a regional perspective that would transcend the narrower outlooks of individual countries.

34. In a second round of discussions, the Deputy Minister for Planning and Public Investment of the Ministry of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic, speaking as the panel's moderator, requested the panellists to talk about the training components that should be incorporated into the ILPES programme of work.

35. The National Secretary for Planning of the Ministry of Planning and the Budget of Brazil explained that the workforce of the future had to be prepared to meet the challenges that would be faced in the years to come, such as the digital transformation, the need for closer inter-agency cooperation, database management, the use of new technologies, foresight planning and the development of the soft skills needed to provide high-quality public services.

36. The Secretary for Planning and Programming of the Office of the President of Guatemala indicated that the issues that were of the greatest interest to his country were those relating to the management of uncertainty and the emerging agenda, data governance and networking. It was important to differentiate between the courses needed by personnel in policy-oriented positions and those required by technical personnel. Increased inter-country exchanges of experiences were needed so that lessons could be learned that would be of use in meeting the challenges that they all faced.

37. The Chair of the Governing Council of CEPLAN of Peru called for a return to in-person training and learning experiences in order to help build an institutional identity. Planning personnel needed to develop more monitoring and assessment skills as opposed to planning skills per se and to promote foresight planning, which would be helpful in adapting planning routines to the situation on the ground more successfully.

38. The Coordinator for the Modernization of the State of Chile seconded what had been said by the representative of Guatemala concerning the differentiation of courses for different planning functions. Greater use should be made of innovative learning methodologies other than course-based modules, such as team mobilization and inter-agency placements.

39. The Secretary General of ACS invited the member States to learn more about the strategic updating process that his institution was conducting.

40. In the discussion that followed, the representative of Ecuador noted that one of the main challenges at the institutional level was the development of career paths for personnel in the public sector and that planning offices needed to work more closely with academic institutions in order to do so.

Presentation of the document entitled “Guidelines for the drafting of a regional agenda on governance of planning and public management for sustainable development in Latin America and the Caribbean” (agenda item 5)

41. The document was presented by the Minister of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic in his capacity as Chair of the Regional Council for Planning of ILPES. He indicated that, because the countries of the region were facing common challenges and their planning and public management systems had many of the same weaknesses, the development of a collective regional agenda had been proposed with a view to bolstering their capacities and counteracting adverse trends. The Regional Council for Planning was an ideal forum for debate and for discussing practices, experiences and perspectives relating to planning and public management. He went on to outline the diagnostic assessments, objectives and strategic guidelines pertaining to each of the four areas proposed for the regional agenda: (1) governance, institutional frameworks and social dialogue; (2) anticipatory governance and the dimension of the future in the framework of sustainable development; (3) coordination for comprehensive and coherent public policies; and (4) evaluation, public value and establishing a culture of continuous learning.

42. The Deputy Executive Secretary a.i. of ECLAC and Officer-in-Charge of ILPES said that the document contributed to the continuity of the proposals made at the meeting held by the Regional Council for Planning the year before, thereby paving the way for the conclusion of an agreement on the content of a future regional agenda. That agenda could provide a new organizational paradigm that would underpin greater networking, collaborative leadership and the sharing of experiences with a view to accelerating the countries' learning process. The idea was for the Regional Council for Planning to serve as a forum for regional integration.

43. Rolando Ocampo, Chief of the Statistics Division of ECLAC, explained that the Statistical Conference of the Americas of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean could serve as a model for the implementation of the regional agenda and its governance. The Statistical Conference was a subsidiary organ of ECLAC that worked to improve statistical policies and activities in the region and thus promoted international and regional cooperation in that connection. Its objectives included developing national statistics and statistical comparisons at the international level, pursuing international, regional and bilateral cooperative activities and preparing a biennial programme that addressed the member countries' needs. It operated through working groups that produced specified outputs during the biennium relating to a subject of importance to the region. Countries serving as coordinators, central banks or international agencies took part in those working groups, which were formed at the close of each biennium by means of a call for proposals and a subsequent regional consultation during which the proposals that garnered the greatest interest were selected. Once the make-up of the groups had been defined, countries were invited to volunteer to join the various groups. The Statistical Conference met once every two years,

at which time its biennial programme was presented. The Executive Committee of the Conference met twice in the interval of meetings of the Conference and received updates on the headway made by the working groups, along with other reports, and adopted resolutions. In 2021, an advisory group on gender mainstreaming had been set up. The Statistical Conference had a strategic 10-year plan that defined the region's long-term objectives, mission, vision and values. Other opportunities for collaborative work included the Knowledge Transfer Network, virtual communities focusing on specific subjects, the Statistical Coordination Group for the 2030 Agenda in Latin America and the Caribbean, and seminars and side events.

44. In the ensuing dialogue, the representative of Chile expressed appreciation for the presentation of the document and voiced his country's support for the development of a regional agenda. The representative of Brazil observed that the four areas to be included in the regional agenda were closely related to the challenges faced by the countries of the region. The representative of Jamaica said that it would be of interest to include the issue of experimentation and innovation in Area 4.

Presentation of the report on the activities carried out by the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), 2023–2024, and of the report on the status of the Regular System of Government Financing for the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) (agenda item 6)

45. The Deputy Executive Secretary a.i. of ECLAC and Officer-in-Charge of ILPES said that the report covered the period from 1 June 2023 to 31 August 2024. He reviewed the three areas of work of ILPES (research, technical assistance and training) and invited the countries to view them as a virtuous triangle that generated a constructive feedback loop.

46. In the period covered by the report, the Institute had provided technical assistance to 20 national and subnational institutions in the countries of the region in such areas as long-term planning, sustainable development capacities, public management, monitoring and evaluation, digital government and open government, territorial development, public policy design, public leadership, resilience in disaster risk management and multi-stakeholder dialogue. In the area of applied research, it had produced the publication *Foresight for Development: Contributions to Forward-looking Territorial Governance*,² which had been presented at the nineteenth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning of ILPES, and an overview of public management in the region in 2023 and climate action (*Panorama de la Gestión Pública en Latin America and the Caribbean, 2023: un Estado preparado para la acción climática*).³ Other subjects dealt with in ILPES publications included the open State, territorial resilience, comprehensive public policy, collaborative public leadership, public investment and the territorialization of the Sustainable Development Goals. In the area of training, ILPES personnel had given 10 open international distance courses, 9 courses for staff in other ECLAC divisions, 19 restricted-enrolment distance courses at the request of member countries and 10 distance and in-person seminars. A total of 3,593 persons (52% women and 48% men) had participated in training activities. He urged the countries to continue to contribute to the work of the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development in Latin America and the Caribbean, which was one of the Institute's knowledge management resources. Another resource was the Latin America and Caribbean Development Planning Network, which provided a means of sharing experiences and engaging in collective analysis and had over 3,000 registered members throughout the region. Technical activities with institutional partners included cooperation projects with the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)

² LC/CRP.19/3.

³ LC/PUB.2023/27-P.

and the Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation (AECID), which were strategic partners of ILPES, and support from the United Nations Development Account for the implementation of the project entitled “Resilient and inclusive public management systems for sustainable development in Latin America and the Caribbean”.

47. The Regular System of Government Financing had been designed in the 1980s and was suffering from problems because of the irregular intervals at which funds were being paid into the system. The resulting lack of financial sustainability was hampering the Institute's ability to take on long-term commitments. He invited the countries to think about different ways of improving and updating the Regular System in order to move the regional agenda forward and make a greater degree of strategic convergence possible. The work of ILPES had an impact and influence on the countries, and the regional agenda was therefore an opportunity to develop a medium-term (five-year) financial strategy, enhance its resources and capacities, and leverage greater synergies for bringing about pro-development change.

48. ILPES provided an institutional response to the needs of the countries, and the regional agenda opened up an opportunity for the Institute to work with the countries more proactively. In the area of training, the aim was to work towards employing hybrid modalities that would strike a balance between the benefits of virtual and in-person activities.

49. In the ensuing discussion, the representative of Guatemala underscored the work done by ILPES and indicated that his country could coordinate international cooperation in different ways in order to secure more direct financing for ECLAC and, in particular, for ILPES.

50. The representative of Ecuador noted that ILPES was a strategic ally for all of the region’s planning institutions, expressed appreciation for the invitation to look to the future and recommended that efforts should be made to increase the visibility of the Institute's work.

51. The representative of Chile pledged to make the necessary changes in the planning network to ensure that the country could fulfil its commitments to ILPES. He proposed exploring other forms of inter-country collaboration, such as the development of thematic clusters, to support shared learning.

52. The representative of Brazil requested clarification on the budget needed to fund the Institute’s operations. She also requested further information on the ILPES activities that were open to the countries and those that were not (and that therefore required an additional payment or not). It was necessary to define the Institute's role in the initiative to establish a school of development studies in honour of Maria da Conceição Tavares that was being headed up by the Banco Nacional de Desenvolvimento Econômico e Social (BNDES) and ECLAC with a view to the creation of synergies that would be of benefit for all.

53. The representative of Jamaica appreciated the fact that ILPES had given a course on digital government in English and expressed interest in having it offer other English-language courses on such subjects as foresight planning for development. He joined with other speakers in requesting further information on the Institute’s operating expenses and the activities that were being funded by voluntary contributions.

54. The Minister of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic shared his experience in working with ILPES and observed that its work had been strengthened since 2021, when it had begun to receive regular contributions. His institution had worked alongside ILPES and had developed a very constructive relationship that had enabled it to achieve more advanced forms of planning in the Dominican Republic. Those regular contributions had thus proven to be a sound investment.

55. The Deputy Executive Secretary a.i. of ECLAC and Officer-in-Charge of ILPES explained that 2025 could be a transitional year for the development of a new financial proposal for ILPES. The Institute's budget was funded from the Regular System of Government Financing, ECLAC and extrabudgetary resources. Since the Institute had taken on new tasks and new initiatives in connection with the regional agenda, it would need more resources in order to carry them out and to reposition ILPES as a lead agency for development planning. That would also require it to reshape its strategic alliances and work in tandem with the United Nations. He invited the participants to plan out and draw up an agenda for activities and financing over a five-year time horizon.

56. The Secretary of the Commission reviewed the history of ILPES and the origins of the voluntary Regular System of Government Financing. He suggested formalizing the system for payments by means of instruments such as memorandums of understanding signed by ILPES with each country based on their commitments with the Institute. A proposal for the introduction of such a system could be submitted at the next meeting of the Regional Council for Planning, which was to take place in 2025.

57. The Minister of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic, speaking as the Chair of the Regional Council for Planning of ILPES, added that the regional agenda was a medium-term instrument that would require the Institute's business and financial models to be reworked in ways that would allow for a broader approach than encompassed more than set, fixed contributions. The new business model needed to be a functional one in terms of the regional agenda.

58. The representative of Guatemala said that more information about the cost of activities carried out by ILPES was needed so that each institution could detail those costs in its annual operating plans and submit the necessary funding requests.

59. The Deputy Executive Secretary a.i. of ECLAC and Officer-in-Charge of ILPES thanked the representatives for their comments and summarized the points on which they had agreed: first, they supported the proposal to draw up a regional agenda and the idea of planning activities over short-, medium- and long-term horizons; second, the business model and financial structure of ILPES needed to be reworked and to involve other modalities in addition to voluntary contributions; third, other inter-country cooperation mechanisms should be explored, along with non-financial inputs, such as in-kind contributions (in the form of translations, for example), that would help to set the activities provided for in the regional agenda in motion; fourth, clear, specific information on the cost of ILPES activities and its budget needed to be provided; and fifth, specific bilateral agreements and other commitments needed to be established with ECLAC in order to provide material support for ILPES initiatives.

Presentation of the programme of work of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), 2025, and preparation of a programme of activities on the governance of planning and public management for sustainable development in Latin America and the Caribbean (agenda item 7)

60. Elena Díez Pinto, Chief of the Planning, Prospective and Territorial Development Area of ILPES, presented the Institute's programme of work for the coming year. She explained that it revolved around the regional agenda, the four areas defined therein and the strategic dialogues that were to take place on those issues. Those multi-stakeholder dialogues would provide the foundation for the guidelines that the Institute and the countries would work together to develop for submission to the Regional Council of Planning at its next meeting and that could then serve as the basis for a position paper. In the area of applied research and publications, interest had been expressed in updating the relevant manuals and incorporating cross-cutting and emerging issues, such as artificial intelligence or territorial conflicts. In the area of technical assistance services, requests had been received to date from nine countries of the region (Argentina, Brazil, Chile,

Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Jamaica, Mexico and Paraguay). In the area of training, more hybrid courses would be offered, but in-person courses would also be made available. Some training courses with certification options would be offered free of charge, and courses in English and Portuguese would also be organized in order to broaden the scope of the Institute's activities throughout the region.

61. In the area of knowledge management resources, the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development in Latin America and the Caribbean was introducing interactive maps and automatic data updates that would facilitate data analysis. Networking and communities of practice would be strengthened in response to requests made by the countries. The Latin America and Caribbean Development Planning Network would continue to be consolidated as a channel for the exchange of experiences and good practices and as a source of inputs for the research agenda.

62. In sum, in 2025 ILPES would broaden the training services it provided based on the TOPP capabilities approach and would reach new audiences through its work with new strategic partners and strengthened alliances. Technical assistance capabilities would be optimized in order to provide a full range of services to the countries and to leverage the virtuous triangle of the Institute's three areas of work (research, technical assistance and training). An effort would be made to ensure the Institute's financial sustainability and to diversify its funding sources in line with the regional agenda so that it could offer the countries services and deliverables that met their needs within a flexible and innovative framework. She invited the countries to comment on the programme of work and to reach agreement on how they wished to begin the debate concerning the regional agenda.

63. During the representatives' collaborative working session, the representative of Chile stated that the countries were ready and willing to make decisive progress towards the development of an ambitious regional agenda. A number of suggestions had been made that could be incorporated into the areas of research pursued by ILPES, especially in relation to coordination functions and government centres for setting interministerial (cabinet) and multi-level (territories) coordination in motion. Chile could share its experience and would be interested to learn how that kind of coordination was carried out in other countries of the region. His country would like to offer to serve as a co-organizer for the dialogue on coordination.

64. The representative of Guatemala highlighted the role of ILPES as a regional innovation hub in the area of planning and public management, given its position as a knowledge management think tank in the region. Greater opportunities were needed for sharing experiences and good practices so that all the countries could fully benefit from the lessons learned by each country. The issue of coordination and government centres was an extremely important one, and ILPES was in a position to provide a clear regionwide picture of the work being done by each country in that respect. To that end, he requested that the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development in Latin America and the Caribbean should provide information on the professional profiles of the staff of each country's planning office, along with information on those offices' structures, legislative basis and budgets.

65. The representative of Brazil suggested that ILPES could take a proactive approach to designing courses based on the main challenges faced by the region in terms of institutional and capacity-building issues. She also recommended including a survey on the skills possessed by the staff of the region's planning agencies in the next edition of the Institute's overview of public management in the region, along with a list of the capacities or skills needed to drive the necessary changes for development. That information could then be used by ILPES to tailor its training and technical assistance activities. With respect to the debate surrounding government centres, it was important to analyse the linkages among the various planning instruments and to see how they tied in with the budget, public investment and territorial planning. Her country would place priority on areas of research, technical assistance and training in which ILPES would be able to provide support.

66. The representative of Ecuador said that his country could draw upon its experience with its intersectoral offices to provide assistance as a co-organizer of the multi-stakeholder dialogue on coordination. Issues and new demands had been raised in Ecuador regarding, in particular, foresight planning and open government, and his institution was therefore keen to make progress on that front.

67. Speaking as Chair of the Regional Council for Planning of ILPES, the Minister of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic summarized the points on which the representatives had reached agreement at that stage in the discussion: Guatemala would co-organize the dialogue on governance, institutional frameworks and social dialogue (Area 1); the Dominican Republic would do so for the dialogue on anticipatory governance and the dimension of the future in the framework of sustainable development (Area 2); and Ecuador and Chile would serve as the co-organizers for the dialogue on coordination for comprehensive and coherent public policies (Area 3) and the dialogue on evaluation, public value and establishing a culture of continuous learning (Area 4).

68. In addition to organizing the dialogues, the relevant dates would have to be set and the methodologies to be used for negotiations on the agenda would need to be specified. The eighth meeting of the Forum of the Countries of Latin America and the Caribbean on Sustainable Development, which was to take place in 2025, could serve as an opportunity for launching the dialogues.

69. The Deputy Executive Secretary a.i. of ECLAC and Officer-in-Charge of ILPES endorsed that proposal and observed that the dialogues could be carried out in a virtual or in-person format. Following each meeting, a brief document (policy report) of no more than 20 pages in length could be prepared that would set out the issues addressed in each area, the reasoning that had led to the conclusions reached, the objectives and the strategic lines of action identified for their achievement. That material could then be used to plot out a road map for the implementation of the regional agenda.

70. The Minister of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic, speaking as Chair of the Regional Council for Planning of ILPES, clarified that, while the countries to be tasked with leading and coordinating each dialogue had been selected, an invitation would be sent out to the other member countries of the Regional Council to encourage them to take part in those dialogues.

Preparations for the twentieth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES) (agenda item 8)

71. The Deputy Executive Secretary a.i. of ECLAC and Officer-in-Charge of ILPES confirmed that the next meeting of the Regional Council for Planning would be held in the final quarter of 2025. The document to be presented to the Council at that time, which would cover the four areas of the regional agenda, would be the outcome of the collaborative efforts of the participating countries, including the countries leading the dialogue in each area. Discussions would also be held within the framework of the Forum of the Countries of Latin America and the Caribbean on Sustainable Development to move the process along. Determining the status of the issues in question, defining the problems faced and developing proposals for resolving them, in addition to examining notable experiences, would all be involved in the tasks to be undertaken.

72. The representative of Brazil said that her country wished to offer to host the twentieth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning.

Consideration and adoption of agreements (agenda item 9)

73. At their thirtieth meeting, the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council for Planning of ILPES adopted the agreements contained in annex 1 hereto.

Closing session

74. At the closing session, statements were made by Javier Medina Vásquez, Deputy Executive Secretary a.i. of ECLAC and Officer-in-Charge of ILPES, and Pável Isa, Minister of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic, in his capacity as Chair of the Regional Council for Planning of ILPES.

75. The Deputy Executive Secretary a.i. of ECLAC and Officer-in-Charge of ILPES thanked all those present for their active participation and commitment. As the meeting drew to a close, he wished to underscore some of the central messages to be borne in mind, such as the need to deal with the three development traps faced by the region by bringing about the 11 transformations that had been identified and the importance of focusing on key aspects (governance, institutional capacities, political economy and social dialogue) and on the “hows” for moving forward—a dimension to which ILPES should devote special attention. With regard to the repositioning of ILPES, he wished to reaffirm the commitment to consolidate the Institute as an institution with a central role to play in addressing the third trap: the trap of weak institutional capacities and governance. The Institute's work in the areas of research, training and technical assistance must be in line with the region's needs. Another central message concerned the importance for the countries of developing and strengthening their TOPP capabilities in order to meet the challenges that they faced. Some of the key agreements reached during the meeting had been the formation of working groups to help build the regional agenda by addressing the issues of: (1) governance, institutional frameworks and social dialogue, to be led by Guatemala; (2) anticipatory governance and the dimension of the future in the framework of sustainable development, to be headed up by the Dominican Republic; and (3) coordination for comprehensive and coherent public policies and (4) evaluation, public value and establishing a culture of continuous learning, to be led by Ecuador and Chile. He referred to a group tasked with rethinking the Institute's business model and financial strategy, to be led by him and the Presiding Officers, which would then draft a report to be presented at the meeting of the Regional Council for Planning to take place in 2025. It had also been agreed that Brazil would host that meeting of the Regional Council and would serve as the next Chair of the Presiding Officers.

76. The Minister of Economic Affairs, Planning and Development of the Dominican Republic, speaking as the Chair of the Regional Council for Planning of ILPES, reaffirmed the importance of the Institute's role in addressing the third development trap referred to at the meeting and in strengthening TOPP capabilities at all levels. He also referred to the Institute's proposal to build an agenda for change and for strengthening governance, planning and public management. The meeting's accomplishments included the consideration of the four proposed key areas and the formation of working groups to address each of those areas, as well as a group that would deliberate on issues relating to the Institute's business model and its financing.

Annex 1

AGREEMENTS

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

1. *Take note of the Report on the activities carried out by the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), 2023–2024,¹ which includes the Institute’s technical assistance, applied research and training activities;*

2. *Also take note of the Report on the status of the Regular System of Government Financing for the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES);²*

3. *Recognize the work of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning in the period 2023–2024, in which it provided advisory services to 20 institutions and subnational governments of eight countries of the region, published 10 research papers, organized 19 restricted courses and workshops in the framework of technical assistance to the countries of the region, held 10 webinars and seminars, organized 10 international courses (virtual, hybrid or in-person) open to all, and brought together planning authorities from 22 Latin American and Caribbean countries in the Regional Council for Planning;*

4. *Also recognize the consolidation of and progress achieved by the Regional Observatory on Planning for Development in Latin America and the Caribbean in updating information on the institutional framework for national planning systems and in the collection, systematization and analysis of planning instruments of the region;*

5. *Take note of the proposed guidelines for the drafting of a regional agenda on governance of planning and public management for sustainable development in Latin America and the Caribbean,³ presented by the Chair of the Presiding Officers, and organize, in the first half of 2025, four multistakeholder dialogues—one for each axis of the agenda—convened by the Chair with the support of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning, the results of which will serve as inputs for the draft regional agenda to be submitted for consideration at the twentieth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning;*

6. *Request the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean to submit, for consideration by the Regional Council for Planning at its twentieth meeting, a strategy to mobilize the financial resources needed to ensure the operational sustainability of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning and implementation of the future regional agenda on governance of planning and public management for sustainable development in Latin America and the Caribbean;*

¹ LC/MDCRP.30/3.

² LC/MDCRP.30/4.

³ LC/MDCRP.30/5.

7. *Reiterate* the call to the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean to make the necessary arrangements to ensure and strengthen the operation of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning within existing resources of the regular budget of the organization, and to continue to seek extrabudgetary funds;

8. *Request* the secretariat of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean to convene the twentieth meeting of the Regional Council for Planning and the nineteenth Conference of Ministers and Heads of Planning of Latin America and the Caribbean in October 2025 in Brazil on a date to be decided.

Anexo 2

**LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES/
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS¹**

**A. Miembros de la Mesa Directiva del Consejo Regional de Planificación/
Members of the Presiding Officers of the Regional Council on Planning**

BRASIL/BRAZILRepresentante/Representative:

- Virgínia de Ângelis Oliveira de Paula, Secretaria Nacional de Planificación, Ministerio de Planificación y Presupuesto, email: virginia.paula@planejamento.gov.br;

CHILERepresentante/Representative:

- Paul Floor, Coordinador, División de Coordinación Interministerial, Secretaría General de la Presidencia, email: pfloor@minsejpres.gob.cl;

ECUADORRepresentante/Representative:

- Gustavo Cuesta, Subsecretario General de Planificación, Secretaría Nacional de Planificación, email: gcuesta@planificacion.gob.ec;

GUATEMALARepresentante/Representative:

- Carlos Antonio Mendoza Alvarado, Secretario de Planificación y Programación de la Presidencia, email: carlos.alvarado@segeplan.gob.gt;

Miembros de la delegación/delegation members:

- Romeo Manuel Escobar Castillo, Encargado de Negocios a.i., Embajada de Guatemala en Chile, email: rescobar@minex.gob.gt;
- Francisca Weinstein Izuck, Asistente, Embajada de Guatemala en Chile, email: embchile@minex.gob.gt;
- Liza Cifuentes Yee, Consejero, Embajada de Guatemala en Chile, email: embasistentecl@minex.gob.gt;

¹ Los datos de esta lista son los suministrados por los participantes en el registro correspondiente que se habilitó para la reunión.
The information contained in this list is as supplied by the participants themselves, in the register provided for the meeting.

JAMAICA

Representante/Representative:

- Wayne Henry, Chairman and Director General, Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ), email: wayne_henry@pioj.gov.jm;

PERÚ/PERU

Representante/Representative:

- Giofianni Peirano Torriani, Presidente del Consejo Directivo, Centro Nacional de Planeamiento Estratégico (CEPLAN), email: gpeirano@ceplan.gob.pe;

Miembros de la delegación/Delegation members:

- Aurora Cano, Segunda Secretaria, Embajada del Perú en Chile, email: acano@embajadadelperu.cl;

REPÚBLICA DOMINICANA/DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Representante/Representative:

- Pável Isa, Ministro de Economía, Planificación y Desarrollo, email: pavel.isa@mepyd.gob.do;

Miembro de la delegación/Delegation member:

- Jeffrey Lizardo, Viceministro de Planificación e Inversión Pública, Ministerio de Economía, Planificación y Desarrollo, email: jeffrey.lizardo@mepyd.gob.do;

B. Panelistas/Panellists

- Javier Medina Vásquez, Secretario Ejecutivo Adjunto a. i. de la CEPAL;
- Sergio Bitar, ex Ministro de Estado de Chile;
- Wayne Henry, Director General y Presidente de la Junta Directiva del Instituto de Planificación de Jamaica;
- Jeffrey Lizardo, Viceministro de Planificación e Inversión Pública del Ministerio de Economía, Planificación y Desarrollo (MEPyD) de la República Dominicana;
- Gustavo Cuesta, Subsecretario General de Planificación del Ecuador;
- Virgínia de Ângelis Oliveira de Paula, Secretaria Nacional de Planificación del Ministerio de Planificación y Presupuesto del Brasil;
- Carlos Mendoza Alvarado, Secretario de Planificación y Programación de la Presidencia de Guatemala;
- Giofianni Peirano Torriani, Presidente del Consejo Directivo del Centro Nacional de Planeamiento Estratégico (CEPLAN) del Perú;
- Rodrigo Lavanderos, Coordinador de Modernización del Estado de Chile;
- Rodolfo Sabonge, Secretario General de la Asociación de Estados del Caribe (AEC);

C. Secretaría/Secretariat

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

- José Manuel Salazar-Xirinachs, Secretario Ejecutivo/Executive Secretary, email: secretarioejecutivo@cepal.org;
- Javier Medina Vásquez, Secretario Ejecutivo Adjunto Interino; Oficial a Cargo del Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES)/Deputy Executive Secretary a.i.; Officer in Charge of the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), email: javier.medina@cepal.org;
- Luis F. Yáñez, Secretario de la Comisión/Secretary of the Commission, email: luis.yanez@cepal.org;
- Elena Díez Pinto, Jefa, Área de Planificación, Prospectiva y Desarrollo Territorial, Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES)/Chief, Planning, Prospective and Territorial Development Area, Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), email: elena.diez@cepal.org;
- Valeria Torres, Jefa, Área de Gestión Pública y Gobierno Abierto, Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES)/Chief, Public Management and Open Government Area, Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), email: valeria.torres@cepal.org;
- Alejandra Naser, Asistente Superior de Asuntos Económicos, Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES)/Senior Economic Affairs Assistant, Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), email: alejandra.naser@cepal.org;
- Alicia Williner, Asistente Superior de Investigación, Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES)/Senior Research Assistant, Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), email: alicia.williner@cepal.org;
- Luis Riffo, Asistente Superior de Investigación, Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES)/Senior Research Assistant, Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), email: luis.riffo@cepal.org;
- Daniela Gebhard, Asistente de Gestión de Programas, Instituto Latinoamericano y del Caribe de Planificación Económica y Social (ILPES)/Programme Management Assistant, Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES), email: daniela.gebhard@cepal.org.