On September 26 and 27, 2012, the city of Lima, Peru, hosted the Meeting of the Executive Technical Group (GTE) on the Integration Priority Project Agenda (API) Continuous Monitoring System (CMS), which was attended by the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, Suriname and Uruguay, as well as by representatives from the General Secretariat of UNASUR and from IIRSA Technical Coordination Committee. The meeting agenda and the list of participants are attached as Annexes 1 and 2, respectively.

The objectives of the meeting were the following: (i) present two API structured project simulation cases for the countries to discuss and reach a consensus concerning the data fields and functionalities that the system should have; (ii) reach a consensus on the criteria for defining the schedule of the projects life cycle; and (iii) present the files of the structured projects so that the National Coordinators and project managers had the opportunity to exchange information about them and to agree upon and complete the filling out of the basic data fields.

After the meeting was opened by the Presidency Pro Tempore (PPT), held by Peru, the Peruvian and Argentine National Coordinators presented the simulation cases for the “Callao - La Oroya - Pucallpa Road, Ports, Logistics Centers and Waterways” and “Argentina - Bolivia West Connection” projects. These presentations are attached as Annexes 3 and 4, respectively.

Subsequently, the delegations commented on the following issues:

- It was stated that the CMS is a fine tool for monitoring the API projects. It was pointed out that time commitment from officials from different government agencies is required in order to collect the information and enter it in the system.

- It was noted that the CMS gathers information on two levels: the domestic/national level, regarding the implementation of the individual project(s), and the strategic level, concerning the progress of the structured project in the regional context.

- As the CMS is a regional planning tool, it must tend to identify obstacles and bottlenecks in project management, thus promoting decision-making by high-ranking authorities in order to solve them.
It was agreed to continue the practice of classifying the projects into four major implementation stages, as used in the Project Portfolio Database. There are no difficulties with the “profiling” and “completed” stages. As for the “pre-execution” and “execution” stages, they would be divided into sub-stages. A proposal will be prepared to clearly specify the scope of each sub-stage.

Next, the information contained by the structured projects files was considered, and the following conclusions were reached:

- Consensus regarding inclusion in the structured projects files was reached as follows:
  - As for the “executing agencies,” “type of financing” and “financing sources” fields, consider the possibility of including the information for each country.
  - Include the general balance of the structured project in the “current status” field. The information on the current status of the individual projects will be retrieved from the Project Portfolio Database through links to each of them.
  - Include information about the social and economic impacts of the structured projects in the “rationale” field.

- October 5 was established as the final deadline for submission of the agreed-upon structured projects files so as to incorporate the information in the API Progress Report 2012, which will be presented at the Third Ordinary Meeting of COSIPLAN Ministers.
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