

Jorge M. VEGA

PhD candidate in International Security (IUGM). National University of Distance Education (UNED). International Doctoral School.

E-mail: vegamauro@hotmail.com

Results vs capabilities? Theoretical perspectives on security planning in South America

Abstract

The article explores the national security policy planning process in South America, combining a theoretical approach of methodological perspectives with an empiric analysis of case studies. To this end, firstly inquiries about the conceptual relation between regional dominant models applied to sustainable development planning in general and specifically to national security. Then, analyses the practical application of sustainable development planning standards in the national security systems of Chile and Peru, selected as unities of analysis because they represent diverse regional conceptions of the scope and organization of security and defense sector. Among its findings stands out the technical compatibility between both planning models and, as consequence, the applicability of good practices in results-based management for sustainable development as a valid methodological reference for national security policy planning.

Keywords

National security; sustainable development; results-based management; strategic planning; South America.

Cite this article:

Vega, J.M. (2021). Results vs capabilities? Theoretical Perspectives on Security Planning in South America. *Spanish Institute for Strategic Studies*, issue 18, pp. 433-452.

Introduction

Planning re-emerged as an instrument for development in Latin America and the Caribbean at the dawn of the 21st century, in a sort of ‘return to the future’ according to Cuervo and Mattar¹ which positions it as a valid means to account for the public policy needs demanded by the political, economic, social and institutional environment of the time. We refer to a contemporary version of planning that distances itself from its traditional normative-indicative approach by incorporating strategic conceptions, participatory formulas and visions of the future². This new planning is tributary to public management, with both being understood as ‘pieces of a complex whole’³ whose integration seeks to achieve sustainable development results in a holistic and not only economic perspective.

A consequence of this synergetic link between planning and management are the state modernisation initiatives that have proliferated throughout the region in recent decades. In general, they were structured on the basis of results-oriented public administration standards, operating as a «conceptual framework designed to optimise the process of creating public value in public organisations, ensuring the maximum efficiency, effectiveness, and efficiency of their performance, the achievement of government objectives and the continuous improvement of institutions»⁴. In fact, planning is one of the basic systems underpinning the management for results (MfDR) model⁵ promoted by the United Nations (for example, through ECLAC and UNDP) and the main specialised regional bodies (IDB, CLAD, among others). Although there is no uniformity of methodological criteria among them, they do agree on the weighting of the model as the ideal toolbox for improving government effectiveness.

For the Management for Development Results (MfDR) approach sponsored by the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), planning is precisely the first pillar of the model. Conceptually, this encompasses its strategic, operational and participatory dimensions⁶. Results-focused planning (RfP) thus understood takes the form of

1 Cuervo, L. and Máttar, J. (2014). *Planificación para el desarrollo en América Latina y el Caribe: regreso al futuro*. Santiago (Chile), CEPAL. P. 19.

2 Máttar, J. and Perrotti, D. (2014). *La planificación como instrumento de desarrollo con igualdad en América Latina y el Caribe: tendencias y desafíos*. Santiago (Chile), CEPAL. P. 45.

3 Máttar, J. and Cuervo, M. (2017). *Planificación para el desarrollo en América Latina y el Caribe: enfoques, experiencias y perspectivas*. Santiago (Chile), CEPAL. Pp. 21-22.

4 Inter-American Development Bank (Idb) and Latin American Centre for Administration and Development (CLAD) (2007). *Open model of managing for results in the public sector*. [s.l.], IDB and CLAD. P. 167.

5 Makón, M. (2014). Algunas reflexiones sobre la gestión por resultados. In Máttar, J. and Perrotti, D. (eds.). *Planificación, prospectiva y gestión pública*. Santiago (Chile), CEPAL. P. 119.

6 Armijo, M. and Sanginés, M. (2015). Planificación orientada a resultados. In Kaufmann, J., Sanginés, M.; García Moreno, M. (eds.) (2015). *Construyendo gobiernos efectivos: logros y retos de la gestión para resultados en América Latina y el Caribe*. Washington DC, IDB. P. 49.

systematised strategic planning exercises (strategic capacity), instruments that translate the strategy into an annual programming of activities and resources (operationality) and mechanisms that incorporate the views of the legislature and civil society into strategic plans (participatory nature)⁷.

In this context, the article explores the application of this planning scheme to national security policy, i.e. «where the referent object is the nation-state»⁸. Under a traditional view, this would imply limiting the analysis to the institutional sphere of national defence (national security in the classic sense). However, as the concept has evolved since the end of the 20th century⁹, national security management transcends national defence and also includes the coordinated action of other contributing portfolios (e.g. diplomacy and justice), implying a multidimensional, multiagency and multilevel approach¹⁰ (national security in a broad sense). The formal ascription of South American countries to one or the other perspective is disparate, given the underlying presence of different normative-institutional positions on the relationship between external security (national defence) and internal security (state or public)¹¹.

The motivation for this analysis lies in the dichotomy that seems to exist between the regional reactivation of planning as a suitable management tool applicable throughout the public sector to generate development results and the permanence within some national security systems of endogenous planning criteria, dissociated from such processes and general standards¹². This disjunction of technical criteria is not exclusive to one or the other position on the concept of national security, but it is accentuated in those cases that ascribe to the aforementioned classic meaning, where it is interpreted from a theoretical standpoint as a watertight policy sector that is alien to state strategies and capacities to generate sustainable development. Under this logic, sustainable development and national security would be independent problems for the public administration, whose management cycle takes place in a compartmentalised manner and with few points of contact.

It should be noted as a contextual factor that the regional organisations specialised in development (ECLAC and IDB, among others) do not consider national secu-

7 Kaufmann, J., Sanginés, M. and García Moreno, M. (eds.) (2015). *Construyendo gobiernos efectivos: logros y retos de la gestión para resultados en América Latina y el Caribe*. Washington DC, IDB. P. xxvii.

8 Laborie Iglesias, M. (2013). Seguridad nacional y estrategia. Escenarios actuales del Centro de Estudios e Investigaciones Militares, año 18, n.º 3, p. 5.

9 laborie iglesias, M. (2011). La evolución del concepto de seguridad. *Framework Documents of the Spanish Institute for Strategic Studies* [online]. No. 5/2011.

10 Arteaga Martín, F. (2011). Propuesta para la implementación de una estrategia de seguridad nacional en España. *Real Instituto Elcano Working Papers* [online]. No. 19, p. 5.

11 Vega, J.M. (2019). Modelos de planeamiento de la seguridad en Iberoamérica. In González Piote, L. (ed.). *Escenarios Emergentes: Asia-Pacífico y Sahel*. Madrid: UNED. P. 326.

12 Vega, J.M. *Op. cit.*, pp. 319-346.

urity as a permanent work topic, intervening only in specific initiatives such as, for example, the design of the standardised methodology for measuring defence spending between Argentina and Chile¹³. This undoubtedly contributes to the fact that in South America, national security planning—and therefore the application of MfDR postulates to this policy sector—is an embryonic subject of scientific research, as is its analysis as public policy¹⁴. Perhaps one of the few exceptions to this general principle of academic disinterest is the attention given to the capabilities-based planning technique, whose application has proliferated in recent decades in the national defence portfolios of many of the region's countries, not without conceptual differences and methodological variants.

On the basis of the above, the article sets out to explore how national security is planned as public policy in South America. To account for this, we first characterise both perspectives on planning, the developmental perspective coined by international agencies and focused on achieving results, and the national security sectoral perspective, marked by the recent extensive use of the capability-based planning approach in national defence. Second, two case studies are analysed, Chile and Peru, selected for the heterogeneity of their organisation and functioning in both spheres—national security and sustainable development—as proposed by Rial¹⁵ and Vega¹⁶ on security, and by Mattar and Cuervo¹⁷ and Kaufmann, Sanginés and García Moreno¹⁸ on development.

Development planning as a reference

The instrumental relationship between planning (means) and development (end) in Latin America dates back to the middle of the last century, being problematised as «two sides of the same coin»¹⁹ whose first five decades (1950-2000) were characterised by the «ups and downs»²⁰ suffered by planning as an instrument at the service of development. However, the situation at the dawn of the 21st century is different: planning

13 Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) (2001). *Common standardised methodology for the measurement of defence expenditure*. Santiago (Chile), CEPAL.

14 Vega, J.M. *Op. cit.*, p. 324.

15 Rial, J. (2014). América Latina y sus problemas de seguridad y defensa: incertidumbre en tiempos de cambio constante. In Spanish Institute for Strategic Studies (IEEE) and General Gutiérrez Mellado University Institute (IUGM) (eds.). *Defence cooperation with Latin America (Strategy Papers 171)*. Madrid, IEEE and IUGM. Pp. 31-55.

16 Vega, J.M. *Op. cit.*

17 Máttar, J. and Cuervo, M. *Op. cit.*

18 Kaufmann, J., Sanginés, M. and García Moreno, M. *Op. cit.*

19 Máttar, J. and Perrotti, D. *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

20 Máttar, J. and Perrotti, D. *Op. cit.*, p. 41.

has recovered the leading role lost since the 1980s as a result of multiple internal, external, conjunctural and structural factors²¹, adopting an enriched significance that incorporates novelties in political-institutional practice, such as the construction of long-term development visions and the introduction of foresight as a public policy tool²².

For this approach, planning is understood as a «political act, a theory and a discipline for the creation of meaning (of belonging and future) and the multi-scale, intersectoral and pluritemporal governance of development»²³, a meaning that takes up the original instrumental aspirations of the idea of planning, while «allowing for the incorporation of new learning and more recent challenges»²⁴. Among the many original ingredients of this renewed sense of planning,²⁵ highlights, on the one hand, its complementary association with public management for development and, on the other hand, its contribution to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)—emanating from the United Nations 2030 Agenda—at each level of government.

The integration between planning and management makes it possible to understand its modern practical scope, since the most deeply rooted connotation of planning in the contemporary public sector is as a pillar of the management for results (MfDR) model which, in its various organisational forms, underpins an important part of the agenda of institutional modernisation and state reform in the region. Whether it is understood as a «conceptual framework for organisational management»²⁶ or an «overall management strategy»²⁷, MfDR encompasses and links all stages of the public policy cycle, with planning being the initial link from which to define the results to be achieved and then decide on the best combination of inputs, activities and outputs to achieve them²⁸.

In this perspective, the concept of «result» is key, as it represents the very *raison d'être* of planning as a tool in the service of public administration. For MfDR, the idea of outcome corresponds to the core notion of public value, interpreted as «observable and measurable social changes that the state brings about in response to democratical-

21 Máttar, J. and Perrotti, D. *Op. cit.*, pp. 45-46.

22 Cuervo, L. and Máttar, J. *Op. cit.*, p. 19.

23 Máttar, J. and Cuervo, M. *Op. cit.*, p. 35.

24 Cuervo, L. and Máttar, J. *Op. cit.*, p. 20.

25 Máttar, J. and Cuervo, M. *Op. cit.*, pp. 21-31.

26 IDB and CLAD. *Op. cit.*, p., 159.

27 United Nations Development Programme (PNUD) (2009). *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Results*. UNDP, New York. P. 10.

28 García López, R. and García Moreno, M. (2010). *La gestión para resultados en el desarrollo: avances y desafíos en América Latina y el Caribe*. Washington DC, BID. P. 8.

ly legitimised social needs or demands»²⁹. For Sotelo Maciel³⁰, it is understood as the change that occurs in social variables and not as the satisfaction of the needs of individual citizens through the consumption of goods or services (products) provided by the state. Planning translates these changes into strategic objectives, with intermediate or final results being their quantified expression³¹.

The prolific regional literature on MfDR offers a variety of methodological proposals for putting the premises of results-oriented planning (RfP) into practice. One of the most complete and influential is the one edited by Kaufmann, Sanginés and García Moreno³², whose proposal for operationalisation lies in the existence and consistency of national and sectoral government plans—and the concordance between both—in the articulation between plans, programmes and budget; in the link between the medium and the short term; and in the participation of the legislative branch and civil society in the process. Each of these variables has varying degrees of implementation by country, creating a mosaic of national employment scenarios.

Such diversity does not imply the absence of shared implementation deficits, i.e. common unfinished business, including the lack of alignment of administrative rules with MfDR, the inconsistency between sectoral and national planning, and the disarticulation between planning and budgeting³³. This last point is of perennial academic interest as a condition of success for the model³⁴. With a comprehensive view, Mattar and Cuervo³⁵ group the multiple challenges of planning around four challenges: combining time and deadlines (pluritemporality), coordination between levels (multiscalarity), combining the global and the sectoral (intersectorality), and learning (evaluation and monitoring).

29 García López, R. and García Moreno, M. *Op. cit.*, p. 6.

30 Sotelo Maciel, A. (2012). La cadena de valor público: un principio ordenador que previene la colisión metodológica. *Revista Internacional de Presupuesto Público (ASIP)* [online]. No. 80. [Accessed: 18 October 2020].

31 Martirene, R. (2013). Modelo de integración del plan estratégico institucional a un presupuesto público orientado a resultados. *ASAP Magazine* [online]. No. 52, p. 56. [Accessed: 18 October 2020].

32 Kaufmann, J., Sanginés, M. and García Moreno, M. *Op. cit.*

33 Kaufmann, J., Sanginés, M. and Santiso, C. (2015). Tenencias de la gestión para resultados en el desarrollo en América Latina y el Caribe. In Kaufmann, J., Sanginés, M. and García Moreno, M. *Construyendo gobiernos efectivos: logros y retos de la gestión para resultados en América Latina y el Caribe*. Washington DC, IDB. Pp. 43-47.

34 As reflected, for example, in the following publications: Sotelo Maciel, A. (2008). La relación planificación-presupuesto en el marco de la gestión orientada a resultados. *Journal CLAD Reforma y Democracia*. No. 40, pp. 1-15; Martirene, R. *Op. cit.*; and BONARI, D., *et al.* (2015). La vinculación entre planificación y presupuesto como herramienta de la gestión pública por resultados. *Documentos de Políticas Públicas (CIPPEC)* [online]. No. 146.

35 Máttar, J. and Cuervo, M. *Op. cit.*

State of play on security planning

By virtue of the above, a comprehensive diagnosis of national security planning in South America should not exclude the MfDR paradigm and the type of planning it promotes as a contextual variable. Especially because RfP—by definition—has no methodological restrictions to be used across levels of government, policy sectors or types of institutions, and is applicable throughout the public administration. Thus, MfDR reforms, especially those implemented through formal state modernisation initiatives, are often mandatory for the entire level of government from which they emanate (including ministries, autonomous entities and even sub-national governments)³⁶. In short, analysing national security planning (like that of any public policy) necessarily entails looking at how well it meets RfP standards.

It should be clarified that the delimitation of national security as a policy sector adopted by the study revolves around the state as the referent object and adopts the broad approach of the term that emerged post-Cold War. To this end, we refer to the conceptualisation by Ballesteros Martín³⁷ and to the characterisation of the decision-making levels, management processes and intervening institutions presented by Arteaga Martín and Fojón Lagoa³⁸. This interpretation of national security is the predominant one in the normative-institutional design of European and North American countries³⁹, representing the conceptual underpinning from which they formulate their contemporary National Security Strategies. The adoption of the approach has been growing in South America over the last two decades under different models⁴⁰, although there are still cases with a *classical* orientation where the architecture of national security management is in line with that of national defence.

The incorporation of the broad notion of national security generates (at least at the theoretical level) favourable institutional conditions for RfP to be seen as an appropriate methodology for planning sectoral policy, given that its management is not limited to the sphere of national defence (or specifically to the military) but involves multilevel coordination of actions between various state portfolios and agencies with direct competencies and specific objectives in the area of sustainable development. However, this process is in its infancy and there are few official and ac-

36 For example, the National Policy for the Modernisation of Public Management to 2021 in Peru (Supreme Decree No. 004-2013-PCM) and the State Modernisation Plan in Argentina (Decree No. 434/2016).

37 Ballesteros Martín, M. (2016). *En busca de una estrategia de seguridad nacional*. Madrid, IEEEE. Pp. 57-63

38 Arteaga Martín, F. and Fojón Lagoa, E. (2007). *El planeamiento de la política de defensa y seguridad en España*. Madrid: IUGM.

39 Ballesteros Martín, M. *Op. cit.*

40 Vega, J.M. *Op. cit.*

ademic references on concrete applications, success stories or lessons learned. In fact, as mentioned, the South American literature on national security planning is scarce⁴¹, generally resorting to specialised sources of European and North American origin, with the latter and Spanish sources having the greatest academic and governmental impact in South America.

This scientific apathy is compounded by the absence of methodological positioning on good practices applicable to national security planning as public policy by regional bodies. In this sense, while organisations specialising in development management (e.g. ECLAC and IDB) usually exclude national security from their activities, those competent in security and defence matters (basically, the Organisation of American States (OAS) and the now inactive Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) lack technical proposals in this area. Although this state of affairs represents a limitation for the generation of specialised knowledge and management solutions tailored to the regional reality, it can also be seen as an opportunity to enrich existing international cooperation networks in the short term.

Probably one of the few exceptions to the described disinterest revolves around the sectoral applicability of the Capabilities Based Planning (CbP) approach, introduced by the United States of America at the turn of the century⁴² and now the gold standard⁴³ for the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), the European Defence Agency (EDA) and several of their respective member states⁴⁴. Its reception spread in parallel in South America with disparate interpretations, presenting itself at the discursive level as a politically appropriate form of national security planning for a region that defined itself as a zone of peace⁴⁵. This is based on opposing the postulates of the CbP to the threat-based approach (TbA), whose rationality and application is associated with the traditional hypotheses of conflict of a neighbourhood nature once widespread throughout the region and now deconstructed.

In technical terms, the CbP proposal is to endow national defence policy (and, consequently, the national security system) with a management dynamic aimed at developing and maintaining capabilities understood as «generic military capabilities»⁴⁶. By definition, this process is multi-level, as it involves the interaction of different insti-

41 Diagnosis not applicable to other dimensions of security of widespread political and academic interest such as—for example—public, human and citizen security.

42 Revisión Cuadrienal de la Defensa (QDR) (2001).

43 Hales, D. and Chouinard, P. (2011). *Implementing Capability Based Planning within the Public Safety and Security Sector: Lessons from the Defence Experience*. Canada: Defence R&D Canada—Centre for Security Science.

44 Colom, G. (2017). Una revisión del planeamiento de la defensa por capacidades en España (2005–16). *Papeles de Europa* [online]. vol. 30 (1), p. 50.

45 II Declaration of the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC) (2014).

46 Arteaga Martín, F. and Fojón Lagoa. *Op. cit.*, p. 204.

tutional decision-makers (mainly government, contributing ministries and the armed forces), and is cyclical in nature (e.g. quadrennial), starting *from the top* with policy definitions that guide lower levels⁴⁷. In general, the implementation of the CbP pivots around the defence portfolio and the joint military authority as central decision-makers. Taking the Spanish case as a reference, capacities are disaggregated into groups (capacity areas) to which targets are assigned based on needs (capacity objectives), whose degree of satisfaction is defined through an iterative process between priorities and availability of resources (budget)⁴⁸.

At the methodological level, the CbP technique is not by nature incompatible with the postulates promoted by RfP. Thus, there are countries with a long tradition of managing for results within the framework of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) whose security sector applies the capability-based approach under NATO standards (e.g. Australia and Canada). However, in South America, the conceptual articulation between both theoretical approaches is incipient, and the sectoral individualisation of a public value chain archetype⁴⁹ is a crucial step towards its consolidation. Without ignoring the inherent complexity of measuring pure public goods⁵⁰, such research would contribute to the identification of outputs and outcomes based on capacities, areas and their objectives. Purchased analysis of successful extra-regional cases such as those mentioned above is also valuable, especially as a source of lessons learned and good practices.

The growing operational polyvalence of the region's military institutions, materialised in the incorporation of multiple subsidiary missions (for example, community support in disaster situations), also constitutes a contextual condition that favours the sectoral incorporation of RfP, including in an articulated and convergent manner with the postulates of CbP. This is because the aforementioned «capability areas» no longer include not only actions linked to the main mission of the military instrument, but also other subsidiary actions related to addressing issues of the national development agenda, which by nature contribute to the fulfilment of the SDGs. For example, natural disaster support can be understood as contributing to the achievement (at a minimum) of SDG 6 (Clean Water and Sanitation) and SDG 13 (Climate Action). In fact, their results should be measured and incorporated into the voluntary annual reports that countries submit to the UN on the status of implementation of the 2030 Agenda.

47 Puig, M. (2015). Planificación y diseño de la fuerza militar por capacidades: la importancia de una correcta comprensión y aplicación. *Cuadernos de Trabajo del Centro de Estudios Estratégicos (ANEPE)* [online], No. 17/2015, p. 9.

48 García Sierio, J. (2006). Planeamiento por capacidades. *Revista Española de Defensa*. Year 19, No 20, p. 38-43.

49 Sotelo Maciel, A. *Op. cit.*

50 Martirene, R. *Op. cit.*, p. 67.

Practising security planning for results

The following analysis of the practice of national security policy planning in South America, specifically its degree of compliance with RfP standards, is based on a multiple case study with two main units of analysis⁵¹, the national security systems of Chile and Peru, chosen as a representative regional sample of the diversity of existing models and states of affairs on the management of national security and sustainable development. The choice of the method is based on its usefulness for analysing topics with little previous scientific production⁵² and responds to a hybrid type of case study whose objective is both to contribute to the confirmation or invalidation of a theory or generality and to lay the foundations for the generation of future working hypotheses on the subject⁵³.

Under this premise, the first criterion for selecting the units of analysis was to reflect the «disparate views» identified by Rial⁵⁴ on the relationship between national defence and public security in Latin America. Specifically, this involved designing a sample that incorporates two types of cases, one that falls into the category of «separate and specific domains» (Chile) and one that falls into the category of «interdependent concepts» (Peru). This methodological decision is based on the conditioning factors that such approaches entail for the delimitation of national security as a policy sector and, according to Vega⁵⁵, for the configuration of the normative-institutional model finally used for strategic planning purposes.

Such «disparate views» help to explain the substantive normative and organisational differences in national security as public policy between the two countries. According to the Book of the National Defence of Chile 2017⁵⁶ the country maintains a classic vision of security associated with its external dimension (external security), circumscribing its scope as a policy sector to the area of defence (and diplomacy). On the other hand, in terms of its National Security and Defence Policy⁵⁷, Peru adheres to a multidimensional meaning associated with national security, exhibiting an institutional scaffolding of «security and defence» that transcends the latter portfolio to encompass other areas (horizontal, multisectoral articulation) and levels of government

51 Yin, R. (1998). Case Study Research: Design and Methods. *Applied Social Research Methods Series*. Newbury Park: Sage. P. 28.

52 Yin, R. *Op. cit.*, p. 23.

53 Ortega Expósito, I. (2012). La naturaleza comparativa de los estudios de caso: una revisión politológica sobre el estado de la cuestión. *Encrucijadas Revista Crítica de Ciencias Sociales*. No. 4, pp. 88-89.

54 Rial, J. *Op. cit.*

55 Vega, J.M. *Op. cit.*, p. 338.

56 Ministry of National Defence. *Libro de la Defensa Nacional de Chile 2017*, p. 98.

57 Supreme Decree No. 012-2017-DE (points V and VI).

(vertical, multilevel articulation) under the supraministerial guidance of the National Security and Defence Council (Consejo de Seguridad y Defensa Nacional).

The second selection criterion was to compare cases with different types of evolution and progress in the application of RfP standards at the national level according to recent research carried out by ECLAC and the IDB. In this sense, although both countries have raised their rating (from medium to high) in the recent past, Peru did so with a «substantial» degree of progress and Chile «regular»⁵⁸. This disparity is at least partially explained by the nature and temporal scope of their planning instruments, contrasting the existence of a National Development Plan (PND)⁵⁹ (long term) in Peru with a Government Programme (medium term) in Chile⁶⁰. It is also due to the greater formal institutionalisation of the process in Peru, with a system (SINAPLAN) and a governing planning body (CEPLAN) created by law⁶¹, both of which are absent in Chile⁶².

These differences form a contrasting frame of reference for sectoral planning. While in Chile it revolves around the ministries as the bodies responsible for formulating policy and planning priorities based on the global objectives defined in the government programmes⁶³, in Peru it is part of a top-down process of definitions by level (national-sectoral-institutional) whose methodological-conceptual articulation is the responsibility of a supra-ministerial entity such as CEPLAN. In this way, the multi-sectoral (PEM) and multi-annual sectoral (PESEM) plans are derived from National Policies (these in turn from the PEDN and the PGG⁶⁴) and are operationalised by means of strategic (PEI) and operational (POI) plans, the dynamics of the preparation, updating, monitoring and evaluation of which are also parameterised by the CEPLAN⁶⁵.

The analysis of the case studies draws conceptually and methodologically on the RfP pillar measurement model presented by Kaufmann, Sanginés and García Moreno⁶⁶, whose design is framed within the PRODEV Evaluation System (SEP) developed by the IDB to assess the maturity of the state's institutional capacities in MfDR. In line with this, the analysis adopts the planning components identified by the SEP (strategic

58 Armijo, M. and Sanginés, M. *Op. cit.*, p. 58.

59 Plan Estratégico de Desarrollo Nacional Actualizado: Perú hacia 2021 (PEDN).

60 ECLAC (2017). *Overview of public management in Latin America and the Caribbean: citizen-centred open government*. Santiago (Chile), ECLAC. P. 46.

61 The National Strategic Planning System (SINAPLAN) and the National Centre for Strategic Planning (CEPLAN) were created by Legislative Decree No. 1088 (2008).

62 Máttar, J. and Cuervo, M. *Op. cit.*, p. 55.

63 Máttar, J. and Cuervo, M. *Op. cit.*, p. 67.

64 General Government Policy (PGG) (Supreme Decree No. 056-2018-PCM).

65 For example, through the National Policy Guidelines (2018) and Institutional Planning Guidelines (2018).

66 Kaufmann, J., Sanginés, M. and García Moreno, M. *Op. cit.*

capacity, operability and participatory nature) and operationalises them through a simplified matrix of their respective indicators, to which is added the concordance between the sectoral plan (medium term) and the government plan (national level)⁶⁷. This is in order to prioritise the applicability of the model in the face of the limitations that its application in a historically hermetic policy sector such as national security presents for the normative-documentary survey as a technique for gathering information.

The study is then structured on the basis of each of the planning components identified by the SEP using the following indicator matrix as an analytical reference: (1) strategic capacity: (1.1) existence of a medium-term sector plan, (1.2) alignment between the medium-term sector plan and the government's objectives and targets, (1.3) publication of the medium-term sector plan on the internet; (2) operationalisation: (2.1) identification of programmes, outputs and responsible units in the medium-term sector plan, (2.2) articulation between the medium-term sector plan and the budget and (2.3) breakdown of the medium-term sector plan into annual targets; (3) participatory nature: (3.1) participation of the legislative branch in the elaboration of the medium-term sector plan, (3.2) participation of civil society in the elaboration of the medium-term sector plan.

Strategic planning capacity

Sectoral planning in both countries is informed by policy guidelines of presidential origin (prepared at ministerial level) although their nature and linkage to government plans is dissimilar in each case. In Chile, the «Defence Policy» is embodied in the National Defence Book (LDN), an instrument regionally used as a confidence-building measure (CBM)⁶⁸ rather than as a trigger for domestic security planning cycles. In fact, the timing of its updating does not usually coincide with the presidential term of office⁶⁹. Peru, on the other hand, systematically prepares the «National Security and Defence Policy» in the context of the SINAPLAN on the basis of the strategic objectives and actions established in the PEDN⁷⁰. It should be noted that both policy documents are public and easily accessible on the internet⁷¹.

67 For the SEP, sector planning (medium-term sector vision) is measured through the pillar «Programme and Project Management» (Kaufmann, Sanginés, García Moreno. *Op. cit.*, p. 69).

68 Un Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean (UN-LIREC) (2015). *Basic guidelines for the elaboration of Defence White Papers* [online]. Lima: UN-LIREC.

69 The National Defence Books (LDN) were published in Chile in 1997, 2002, 2010 and 2017.

70 The National Security and Defence Policy (2017) references its objectives and guidelines with the provisions contemplated in Strategic Axis No. 3 (State and Governance) of the PEDN.

71 [Accessed: 18 October 2020]. Both documents are available, respectively, at the following links: <https://www.defensa.cl/media/LibroDefensa.pdf> and <https://busquedas.elperuano.pe/normaslegales/decreto-supremo-que-aprueba-la-politica-de-seguridad-y-defen-decreto-supremo-n-012-2017-de-1600032-1/>

Both countries have planning directives that operationalise these supra-ministerial orientations⁷², which form the basis for a multi-level process of intra-sectoral definitions (Ministry-Joint Chiefs of Staff-Armed Forces). In Chile this is divided into segments (primary and secondary)⁷³ and its main products are the Strategic Plans for force employment (short term) and capacity building (long term). Peru is organised around the Multiannual Sectoral Plan of the Ministry of Defence (PESEM)⁷⁴, from which the institutional Strategic Plans (PEI) and Operational Plans (POI) of the Ministry⁷⁵, the Joint Command and the Armed Forces are derived. With the exception of the Peruvian planning directive⁷⁶, none of the above-mentioned documents are public. In Peru, however, the legal instruments of approval are secret and are formally classified as secret.

Operationalisation of planning

Restricting public access to the content of planning documents makes it impossible to analyse their operability. However, in Peru, it could be assumed that PESEM, PEI and POI together receive the best practices for this dimension of planning. This is by virtue of the guidelines in this direction contained in CEPLAN's methodological guides and also by examining the content of the plans of other areas available⁷⁷, where for each strategic action (classified by objectives and defined in terms of goods and services to be provided) their annualised goals, the responsible organisational units and the contributing investments⁷⁸. In Chile, according to the LDN 2017, the study of the subject should cover the documents of the procurement programming stage in addition to the planning documents⁷⁹, especially those related to the defence investment system⁸⁰.

72 Defence Planning Directive (DIPLADE) and General Directive on Defence Sector Planning in the Military Field, respectively.

73 Supreme Decree No. 113 (2014) establishing the national defence planning process.

74 For example, the Updated Multiannual Sectoral Strategic Plan—PESEM 2017-2021 from the Ministry of Defence, approved by Ministerial Resolution No. 2054-2017-DE/SG.

75 For example, Institutional Strategic Plan—PEI 2018-2020 from the Ministry of Defence, approved by Ministerial Resolution No. 2084-2017-DE/SG, and Institutional Operational Plan—POI 2018 of the Ministry of Defence, approved by Ministerial Resolution No. 2116-2017-DE/SG.

76 For example, General Directive on Defence Sector Planning in the Military Field 2017-2021, approved by Ministerial Resolution 927-2017-DE/SG.

77 For more information on other sectoral plans, see: <https://www.ceplan.gob.pe/>

78 The tenth recital of the resolution approving the PESEM 2017-2021 (Ministerial Resolution No. 2054-2017-DE/SG) explains that the plan contains 4 sectoral strategic objectives, 22 strategic actions with their respective goals and military capability indicators.

79 Planning, Programming and Budgeting (PPB) System.

80 For more information see chapter XVII of the National Defence Sourcebook (LDN) 2017.

In Peru, the issue of programme budget financing is approached methodologically by using the annual operational plan as a tool to articulate the strategic plan with the budget, as understood by the specialised academy⁸¹. In this sense, the POI includes not only the multi-annual programming of operational activities and investments defined on the basis of the PEI but also their physical, costing and financial programming, thus linking strategic objectives and actions to budget categories. In Chile, the LDN 2017 defines the budget as the final stage of the integrated planning and control scheme (PPB), explaining the duality of existing funding sources⁸² and describing the respective procedures and authorities responsible for its formulation and modification⁸³.

Participatory nature of planning

The scarce progress described by Armijo and Sanginés⁸⁴ in the adoption of RfP best practices in this dimension of planning would also apply to the national security sector, given that in the documents analysed in both countries there is almost no mention of the legislative branch's powers in the discussion and monitoring of the planning process. In this way, its participation is limited to the annual approval of the budget without prior involvement in the determination of the objectives and strategic guidelines that should underpin its formulation. The intervention of the Chilean Senate in the discussion on the National Security and Defence Strategy (ENSYD) represents an isolated case, made possible by an *ad-hoc* political decision of the Executive and not as part of a systematic dynamic of legislative participation in the elaboration of documents of this type.

Civil society participation in the planning process is foreseen in both countries. In Chile, the LDN 2017 refers to national legislation on associations and citizen participation in public management, highlighting the consultative role of the Civil Society Council of the Ministry of Defence (COSOC-MINDEF)⁸⁵. In Peru, the very instrument that created the SINAPLAN⁸⁶ promotes the generation of synergies between the public sector and civil society, encouraging the coordination of plans through direct

81 Armijo, M. (2011). *Planificación estratégica e indicadores de desempeño en el sector público*. Santiago (Chile), Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES). Pp. 21-25; and Berretta, N. and Kaufmann, J. (2011). *Gestión para resultados en el desarrollo en gobiernos subnacionales: módulo 2, la planificación orientada a resultados*. [S.l.], PROVED, INDES and IDB. Pp. 35-54.

82 Public Sector Budget Law and Reserved Copper Law (No. 13,196).

83 For more information see chapter XVI of the National Defence Sourcebook (LDN) (2017).

84 Armijo, M. and Sanginés, M. *Op. cit.*, p. 74.

85 Ministry of National Defence. *Libro de la Defensa Nacional de Chile 2017*, p. 100.

86 Legislative Decree No. 1088 (2008). Article 10.

participation methodologies and opinion polls. The National Security and Defence Policy⁸⁷ also mentions the need to involve academia and civil society in the articulation and coordination of its objectives and guidelines. However, the aforementioned opacity of the sector's plans makes it impossible to analyse in depth the extent to which these forecasts have been used in practice.

Final considerations

The theoretical framework of national security planning in South America has not historically corresponded to that applicable to development, with the two evolving along parallel paths with little history of convergence. Thus, international cooperation regimes specialised in development management exclude national security as an area of analysis and use of their initiatives, representing a kind of *non-issue* for the main relevant regional bodies. This disconnect has its origins in the classic characterisation of national security and sustainable development as watertight and competing dimensions of state action—recall the famous economic dichotomy between guns and butter—and is currently manifested, for example, through the incorporation of a specific planning methodology for the national security sector (specifically for defence) such as capability-based planning.

However, in the last two decades this world view has begun to lose its practical relevance with the expansion of security as a policy sector (no longer limited to national defence institutions) and the emergence of multiple concurrent responsibilities of national defence itself with other areas of public policy directly linked to development, as in Chile, where the military instrument contributes to the country's development, for example, in emergency or disaster situations. Another factor that fosters this ongoing paradigm shift lies in the imposition of the results-based management model on national security through cross-cutting state reform and modernisation strategies, a situation that encourages sectoral methodological innovations such as, for example, the technical articulation between results-oriented and capacity-based planning within the specific institutional sphere of national defence.

The study confirms that such a confluence is technically possible as they do not involve methodological proposals that are incompatible by definition, as they are usually classified as such, and are in fact found to be compatible to a greater or lesser degree in the cases analysed. It also demonstrates the instrumental applicability of the results-oriented planning measurement scheme promoted by ECLAC and the IDB to national security in its different institutional configurations (classic or expanded), not without necessary adaptations of scope and content to its particularities, especially in relation to the confidential nature of a large part of its documents. Along these lines, the publication of dissemination versions of the plans could be considered, as in other

87 Supreme Decree No. 012-2017-DE (point VI).

parts of the world, so that the consistency and methodological traceability of the planning process can be evaluated without socialising sensitive information.

The scarce academic production on the subject and the absence of technical standards emanating from the competent international bodies represent a limitation both for the construction of specialised scientific knowledge and for the development of good management practices. This analytical-referential vacuum (only scarcely covered by the local third sector) favours the generation of endogenous responses per country of a more political than technical nature, losing the possibility of finding common solutions to shared problems whose identification could also constitute a measure of regional mutual trust. This should undoubtedly prompt a substantive rethink of regional development cooperation regimes, whose politico-normative rigidity prevents the national provision of solutions that are technically already within reach.

The continuous improvement of such technical assistance solutions should be the convergent vector of academic, non-governmental (think tanks) and intergovernmental efforts of a triangular, north-south and especially south-south nature, with their thematic agenda of work being set in at least two directions. First, in the conceptual articulation between development results and security capacities, identifying a model public value chain for the sector applicable to the different normative-institutional variants adopted by the national security sector in the region. Second, in the design of a methodological matrix for the measurement of *results-oriented security planning*, based on good practices for each of the planning components (strategic capacity, operability and participatory nature).

Bibliography

- Armijo, M. (2011). *Planificación estratégica e indicadores de desempeño en el sector público*. Santiago (Chile), Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Economic and Social Planning (ILPES).
- Armijo, M. and Sanginés, M. (2015). Planificación orientada a resultados. In Kaufmann, J., Sanginés, M., García Moreno, M. (eds.). *Construyendo gobiernos efectivos: logros y retos de la gestión para resultados en América Latina y el Caribe*. Washington DC, Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). Pp. 49-79.
- Arteaga Martín, F. (2011). Propuesta para la implementación de una estrategia de seguridad nacional en España. *Elcano Royal Institute Working Papers* [online], No. 19. Available at: http://www.realinstitutoelcano.org/wps/portal/rielcano_es/contenido?WCM_GLOBAL_CONTEXT=/elcano/elcano_es/zonas_es/dt19-2011
- Arteaga Martín, F. and Fojón Lagoa, E. (2007). *El planeamiento de la política de defensa y seguridad en España*. Madrid: Instituto Universitario General Gutiérrez Mellado.
- Ballesteros Martín, M. (2016). *En busca de una estrategia de seguridad nacional*. Madrid, Instituto Español de Estudios Estratégicos.

- Inter-American Development Bank (Idb) and Latin American Centre for Administration and Development (CLAD) (2007). *Open model of managing for results in the public sector*. [S.l.], IDB and CLAD.
- Berretta, N. and Kaufmann, J. (2011). *Gestión para resultados en el desarrollo en gobiernos subnacionales: módulo 2, la planificación orientada a resultados*. [S.l.], PROVED, INDES and IDB.
- Bonari, D., et al. (2015). La vinculación entre planificación y presupuesto como herramienta de la gestión pública por resultados. *Documentos de Políticas Públicas (CIPPEC)* [online]. No. 146. Available at: <https://www.cippec.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/1255.pdf>
- UN Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and The Caribbean (UN-LIREC) (2015). *Basic guidelines for the elaboration of Defence White Papers* [online]. Lima, UN-LIREC. Available at: <http://scm.oas.org/pdfs/2015/LIBROSBLANCOS.pdf>
- Colom, G. (2017). Una revisión del planeamiento de la defensa por capacidades en España (2005–16). *Papeles de Europa* [online], vol. 30 (1), pp. 47–68. Available at: <https://revistas.ucm.es/index.php/PADE/article/view/56335>
- Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) (2001). *Common standardised methodology for the measurement of defence expenditure*. Santiago (Chile), CEPAL.
- (2017). *Overview of public management in Latin America and the Caribbean: citizen-centred open government*. Santiago (Chile), CEPAL.
- Cuervo, L. and Máttar, J. (2014). *Planificación para el desarrollo en América Latina y el Caribe: regreso al futuro*. Santiago (Chile), Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).
- García López, R. and García Moreno, M. (2010). *La gestión para resultados en el desarrollo: avances y desafíos en América Latina y el Caribe*. Washington DC, Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).
- García Sierio, J. (2006). Planeamiento por capacidades. *Revista Española de Defensa*, year 19, No. 20, pp. 38-43.
- Hales, D. and Chouinard, P. (2011). *Implementing Capability Based Planning within the Public Safety and Security Sector: Lessons from the Defence Experience*. Canada, Defence R&D Canada – Centre for Security Science. Available at: http://cradpdf.drdc-rddc.gc.ca/PDFS/unc122/p537217_A1b.pdf
- Kaufmann, J., Sanginés, M. and García Moreno, M. (eds.) (2015). *Construyendo gobiernos efectivos: logros y retos de la gestión para resultados en América Latina y el Caribe*. Washington DC, Inter-American Development Bank (IDB).
- Kaufmann, J., Sanginés, M. and Santiso, C. (2015). Tenencias de la gestión para resultados en el desarrollo en América Latina y el Caribe. In Kaufmann, J., Sanginés,

- M., García Moreno, M. *Construyendo gobiernos efectivos: logros y retos de la gestión para resultados en América Latina y el Caribe*. Washington DC, Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). Pp. 25-48.
- Laborie Iglesias, M. (2011). La evolución del concepto de seguridad. *Framework Documents of the Spanish Institute for Strategic Studies* [online]. No. 5/2011. Available at: http://www.ieee.es/Galerias/fichero/docs_marco/2011/DIEEEM05-2011EvolucionConceptoSeguridad.pdf
- (2013). Seguridad nacional y estrategia. *Escenarios actuales del Centro de Estudios e Investigaciones Militares*, year 18, No. 3, pp. 5-14.
- Makón, M. (2014). Algunas reflexiones sobre la gestión por resultados. In Máttar, J. and Perrotti, D. (eds.) (2014). *Planificación, prospectiva y gestión pública*. Santiago (Chile), Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC). Pp. 113-136.
- Martirene, R. (2013). Modelo de integración del plan estratégico institucional a un presupuesto público orientado a resultados. *ASAP Magazine* [online]. No. 52, pp. 39-87. Available at: <https://docs.asap.org.ar/public/doc/Revista%20Institucional%2052>
- Máttar, J. and Cuervo, M. (2017). *Planificación para el desarrollo en América Latina y el Caribe: enfoques, experiencias y perspectivas*. Santiago (Chile), Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).
- Máttar, J. and Perrotti, D. (2014). *La planificación como instrumento de desarrollo con igualdad en América Latina y el Caribe: tendencias y desafíos*. Santiago (Chile), Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).
- Ministry of National Defence (Chile) (2017). *Libro de la Defensa Nacional de Chile 2017*. Santiago (Chile), Ministry of National Defence.
- Ortega Expósito, I. (2012). La naturaleza comparativa de los estudios de caso: una revisión politológica sobre el estado de la cuestión. *Encrucijadas Revista Crítica de Ciencias Sociales*. No. 4, pp. 81-94.
- United Nations Development Programme (PNUD) (2009). *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Results*. UNDP, New York.
- Puig, M. (2015). Planificación y diseño de la fuerza militar por capacidades: la importancia de una correcta comprensión y aplicación. *Cuadernos de Trabajo del Centro de Estudios Estratégicos (ANEPE)* [online], No. 17/2015. Available at: <http://www.anepe.cl/wp-content/uploads/maqueta-cuaderno-N%C2%BA17.pdf>
- Rial, J. (2014). América Latina y sus problemas de seguridad y defensa: incertidumbre en tiempos de cambio constante. In Spanish Institute for Strategic Studies; Institute and General Gutiérrez Mellado University Institute (eds.). *Defence co-operation with Latin America (Strategy Papers 171)*. Madrid, Spanish Institute for Strategic Studies and Institute and General Gutiérrez Mellado University Institute. Pp. 31-55.

- Sotelo Maciel, A. (2008). La relación planificación–presupuesto en el marco de la gestión orientada a resultados. *Journal CLAD Reforma y Democracia*, No. 40, pp. 1-15.
- (2012). La cadena de valor público: un principio ordenador que previene la colisión metodológica. *Revista Internacional de Presupuesto Público (ASIP)* [online]. No. 80. Available at: <http://asip.org.ar/la-cadena-de-valor-publico-un-principio-ordenador-que-previene-la-colision-metodologica/>
- Vega, J.M. (2019). Modelos de planeamiento de la seguridad en Iberoamérica'. In González Piote, L. (ed.). *Escenarios emergentes: Asia-Pacific and Sahel*. Madrid, National University of Distance Education (UNED). Pp. 319-346.
- Yin, R. (1998). Case Study Research: Design and Methods. *Applied Social Research Methods Series*. Newbury Park, Sage.

Article received: 18 May 2020.

Article accepted: 1 March 2021.
