The Central American Integration Process

Region Background and Recent Developments

The Central American isthmus embraces an area of 533,000 square kilometers, almost 35 million people and an array of diverse multicultural and multilingual societies comprised of indigenous, Afro-Caribbean, mestizo and white groups. Even though it is much smaller and less diverse than many large countries in the world, Central America includes seven countries with ten political borders—Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama. In addition, Dominican Republic is the only Caribbean democracy of Hispanic origin, and feels culturally and economically close to Central America—it has been admitted as an observer thus far, and will become a full member of the integrated region shortly.

Despite the number of small countries, civil and political leaders of Central America have long identified the need for the region to act to some extent as a unified block, both from a political as well as from an economic perspective. The degree of that integration, however, is an issue over which there seems to be no unified view. Acting on that belief, Central America started to take seriously its integration process in the middle of the last Century. The dynamics of that process stalled with the onset of the civil disturbances and the debt crisis of the 1980s. The region leaders, as one of the elements to restore peace, democracy and economic viability to the region, decided to revamp the integration process during the 1990s.

Trade has been the issue on which integration has focused the most throughout this period, and especially so during the early stages of integration. The volume of regional trade, as measured by the share of imports and exports to other regional partners in total trade, grew vigorously between 1950 and 1981, with just three years showing negative or close to zero growth rates (Chart 1). While
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1 This profile is part of a series that is being prepared by the CDF Secretariat to deepen the understanding of the CDF principles, broaden the experience, and share valuable lessons. The profiles are based on roundtables among stakeholders, with external actors, including the Bank, acting as observers. The roundtable that served as a basis for this profile was held in San Salvador on April 24, 2003. Among the 28 participants there was an impressive selection of Central American leaders from all relevant sectors—governments, opposition parties, parliaments, private sector, trade unions, civil society and universities and think-tanks. Panama was the only country not represented, but the Dominican Republic attended as observer. The roundtable was planned in consultation with the Central America Department, and WBI was our internal partner. Our external associates were SICA, INCAE, International IDEA, and, formally, ILPES-CEPAL.

2 Data taken from the Direction of Trade Statistics of the International Monetary Fund. The regional trade is defined as the sum of exports and imports to other countries in the region, including Belize and Dominican Republic, throughout the entire period.
in the early stages of integration. Honduras and Panama had significant shares in total regional trade; the last decade has shown a rather stable situation where the major trading partners of the region are Costa Rica, El Salvador and Guatemala, with Honduras, Nicaragua and Panama playing a lesser role (Chart 2). Belize and Dominican Republic, due to sheer size, have a rather limited share of total trade.

In 2002, SICA, the Secretariat for the Integration System of Central America, approached the CDF Secretariat of the Bank and proposed that we help them carry out a round table to explore the applicability of the CDF principles to the Central American integration process. According to SICA, the CA region is at a cross-roads and needed to begin a dialogue on its regional strategy. The roundtable allowed us to explore the applicability of CDF principles in a regional context—where nations individual development strategies are fully intertwined. Given the number of CA institutions established over the years, this region provided an appropriate forum to explore the socioeconomic and political issues presented by CDF.

Long-term Vision and Development Strategy

Despite the many years of regional integration efforts at the governments level and the people's aspirations for and action in the region, Central America is still in the process of developing a formal collective vision. Central Americans share a dream of a region free of poverty that lives in peace and democracy, and that has a market economy where property rights are recognized, labor is somewhat mobile and entrepreneurs are free to choose where and when to invest. These elements, however, are just the building blocks on which Central Americans are articulating a holistic and comprehensive vision of an integrated region for the long-term.

The CAFTA Challenge. Today, Central Americans are being confronted like never before with the need to develop a long-term vision for an integrated region. The free trade negotiations with the United States and, eventually, the European Union, as well as the development of their own Plan Puebla-Panama are being seen as catalysts in moving the nations towards a shared regional agenda.

Central America as a region has succeeded in negotiating free trade agreements with Canada and Mexico thus far. However, the degree of integration is being tested by the trade negotiations with the United States, the largest trading partner of each of the economies of the region. While bilateral negotiations are underway with each one of the Central American countries, trying to address the differences between the economies of the region, many in the region see this event as an opportunity to move forward with the integration process.

The People's Vision. There are at least two major visions of an integrated Central America that have to be brought together in the process of building a shared vision of an integrated region. One of these visions expresses itself in the way private agents act and manifest themselves in Central America. A recent poll carried out by Sistema de Integración Centro Americana, SICA, shows that three fourths of Central Americans travel regularly to visit relatives in other countries of the region, and that more than half know couples where one of the partners is from a different country in the region. Moreover, beyond family matters, private investors are quietly but actively integrating the region, through trade, regional investments and joint ventures.

When asked about the views on integration, about two thirds of Central Americans polled by SICA thought that the region should present itself before the world as a block of fraternal nations, while 60 percent felt that they were gaining from integration. Moreover, about 60 percent of them believed that integration should be accelerated, with about 50 percent viewing governments as the agents that should play a leading role in doing so. However, more than half of them are very keen on liking and loving the country in which they live, and over 80 percent had a strong preference for having the nationality they had instead of another one. Interestingly, there was no prevailing view as to what integration really entails; the two leading answers were 46 percent believing that integration meant unifying the political systems, and 26 percent thinking that integration meant just free trade among partners and a common market. Furthermore, only 11 percent associated integration with harmonizing social policies and 7 percent with democracy for all.

A poll with similar questions carried out
among opinion makers in the region confirmed for the most part the overall trends discussed above, albeit with a stronger showing of the preferences and a much higher degree of information about the integration process. The overwhelming majority, however, views integration as a free trade or market-augmenting issue with three additional objectives carrying each one about one third of those polled: political union, integration of social policies, and elimination of cross-border checkpoints (i.e. traveling without needing a passport). The freedom of movement is seen by these leaders as including free labor mobility.

**The Official Vision.** Aside from the perception of the regular people in Central America about regional integration, the other major vision comes from the governments and the official regional entities lead by SICA. The 1990s was the decade of revamping an integration process that had started in 1951 with the Organization of Central American States (ODECA) and had gained some momentum after the introduction of a basic common market in 1960. The common market was developed under the aegis of ECLAC, with a strong import substitution orientation. The first step of the this new revamped phase was the Tegucigalpa Protocol of 1991, in which the Presidents of member Central American countries agreed to push forward the integration process, giving it a holistic content that included the political, social and environmental dimensions besides the common market. In addition, to drive forward these views, they instituted SICA as the coordinating entity of the process.

The presidents have further defined the vision of the formal integration process in a number of declarations. Through the Guatemala Protocol of 1993, they agreed that trade integration meant moving toward an economic union that included both a common market and a common negotiating position in a globalized world. In that same Protocol they adopted consensus, flexibility and solidarity as some of the guiding principles of the integration process. Also in 1993, the Presidents signed the Treaty on Social Integration, which creates a framework for a common social policy. In 1994, the Presidents issued the Guacimo Declaration establishing an Alliance for Sustainable Development, ALIDES, bringing forward the environmental concerns, and stressing once more the need to take into account the social aspects of development. Further, in 1995, the Framework Treaty on Democratic Security of San Pedro Sula defined Central America as a region of “peace, freedom, democracy and development”. The Treaty clearly spelled out a commitment to the rule of law, addressed issues related to the security of Central Americans and their property, and agreed on a series of principles relating to regional security.

The contents of the vision are also brought to life through a number of regional institutions that
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have been developed gradually and that are operating in their own areas of influence, either fulfilling their own charter or forwarding integration further. These institutions include the Meeting of Presidents, as the supreme authority, a Central American Supreme Court established in 1992, and a Central American Parliament that was created as part of the Esquipulas Declaration of 1986. The institutions also include about 26 executive organizational developments that mostly spin out of the presidential decisions, and which operate under the coordination of SICA. (Annex 1). The areas covered by these institutions encompass almost every major area of government involvement, such as education, health, social security, environment, money and banking, tourism, agriculture, transportation, infrastructure, telecommunications, housing, natural disaster prevention, research and technology, and sports and recreation.

Notwithstanding the official efforts of the last decade, the poll of ordinary people on Central American integration showed that only 22 percent of those polled acknowledged that they had at least some information about the integration process, and only 16 percent had some recollection of SICA, the central official agency of the integration process. Moreover, polled opinion leaders for the most part believed that ordinary people had a very skim understanding of or none at all about the integration process. An overwhelming majority of them saw integration stalling due to insufficient dialogue and shortness of tangible results and outcomes. About one third of these opinion makers also felt that the biggest forces opposing integration were the political parties, citing them as the leading road block to the process.

These statistics show the long path that Central Americans have before them in developing the institutional setting for regional integration. SICA was seen by many participants in the roundtable as an institution that had to move beyond a simple coordinating role to a more executive role. This move, however, would require that the individual countries relinquish part of their sovereign authority over certain issues. It was not clear whether Central America had already arrived to a threshold where such an institutional change was wanted and feasible. Moreover, further integration requires an infrastructure that facilitates the process, instead of forestalling it. In this regard, the speed at which the regional infrastructure is developing was seen as determined to a large extent by the region’s capacity, as well as the support from external partners. In particular, the Plan Puebla-Panama was not perceived as entailing unrealistic expectations, but was being implemented only to the extent that sound financing has been available.

The Central American integration process, however, as viewed by roundtable participants and by those polled by SICA, as well as by how it is expressed by the actions of the leadership, aims at a degree of integration that falls short from the European model. The drivers of the official process are only beginning to explore issues relating to ceding sovereign power to regional institutions. Also, they have yet to addressed issues about what the implementation of a deeper integration process would mean when it comes to macroeconomic and social policies, particularly as regards to an eventual burden sharing in poverty reduction between member countries.

A United Region with Disparities. The great disparities between countries in the region regarding their socioeconomic and political environment are bound to pose major hurdles to the development of a shared regional vision with a deeper degree of integration, probably requiring a gradual and staged process that takes into account the characteristics of each country. The region suffers from poverty and income inequity, and inequitable access to services, with varying degrees between countries. GDP per capita ranges from just over US$2,100 in Nicaragua to over US$12,000 in Costa Rica.
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3 The Esquipulas Declaration of 1986, widely known as Esquipulas I, was the first major step in the region's peace process. Through Esquipulas I the presidents agreed to accept the Contadora Peace Plan, and created the Central American Parliament as a mechanism to promote democracy and elections throughout the region. Decisions by the Parliament, however, are not compulsory.

4 The IADB is financing most of the major road infrastructure of the Plan, but there is certainly room for additional available infrastructure financing.

5 In current US dollars, adjusted by purchasing power parity (PPP); the figures for the region, except Nicaragua are for 2000; those of Nicaragua are for the most recent available year, which is 1998.
The data is for 1997 in Costa Rica and for 1998 for the remaining countries mentioned.

The most recent available data for Costa Rica and Dominican Republic is for 1992, and for Honduras and Nicaragua for 1993.
interests are converging. Nevertheless, there appears to be a need for a more systematic assessment of these steps, as well as a more involved discussion about them. A number of these steps were indeed identified as responding to the pressure of external partners to develop regional institutions in order to channel aid and financing at a regional rather than a national level.

Regional Ownership

The revamped integration process that begun in the early 1990s is clearly owned by Central Americans. The actions of the civil society, the private sector and several branches of the member governments have propelled the integration process on the ground, outpacing the official process driven by the governments leaders. This impetus has been encouraged further by the many external partners who have insisted in funding projects at a regional level, and more so, by the region’s major trading partners, namely the United States, the European Union, Canada and Mexico, who have insisted in negotiating trade agreements with the countries as a region and not individually. Nevertheless, by bringing to the fore the huge differences between the countries, these negotiations have tested the process itself and its ownership.

The Governments’ Role. The presidents and the ministries of foreign affairs of the member countries, who are the ones formally in charge of the regional integration process, have been the most responsive to the integration initiatives that have been presented to them, but they are not perceived as conducing and leading the process. The Esquipulas I and Esquipulas II Agreements, the Tegucigalpa Protocol and the Framework Treaty on Democratic Security are cited as examples of regional political commitment to integration. Moreover, the other international agreements that make up the Central American integration process, as well as the many institutions that have been developed to carry it forward, together with development such as the free trade agreements with Canada and Mexico attest to the political will on the part of the leadership.

In their efforts, regional leaders have focused mostly on solidifying the peace process, improving democratic governance and the rule of law, protecting their environment, and trying to remain as a common block in trade negotiations. The leadership's efforts to engage Central Americans in a dialog about integration beyond those themes has been limited. The efforts comprise the establishment of a consultative council for SICA with ample civil society representation at a regional level, and the commissioning of the above-mentioned exploratory poll to ordinary citizens and opinion leaders. Accordingly, developing a wide-based regional consensus and broadly shared values beyond the existing basic one will require skillful steering.

Civil Society Participation. Civil society has been an active participant in the Central American integration process. The different units of civil society organization, starting with the families and going all the way up to religious organizations, are constantly weaving integration through their actions. In addition, and beyond what happens on the ground, Central American civil society was given a clear and well defined mandate and space in the integration process from the very outset of the revamping of the 1990s. When establishing SICA, the Tegucigalpa Protocol of 1991 already defined that there should be a Consultative Council with presence from the private sector, trade unions, think tanks and other civil society organizations, giving representation to all economic, social and cultural segments of Central America.⁸ Four years later, after the necessary preparatory work, the Consultative Council started operating.⁹

Aside from its regular meetings, the Consultative Council has shown its presence through two key activities. It was an active participant in the I Consultative Group for the Reconstruction and Transformation of Central America that met in Stockholm in 1999, and it organized a series of workshops with the civil society of each one of the member countries between 1998 and 1999. The limited knowledge of ordinary people about the formal integration process is evidenced by SICA’s poll points at the challenges faced by civil society organizations in serving as a conduit between the people and its
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⁸ The full list of civil society organizations that conform the Consultative Council can be found in Annex 1.

⁹ The Consultative Council work is being funded, in part, with contributions from Canada through CIDA.
leaders. The results also show the difficult road ahead for the leaders of the integration process, including the Consultative Council.

**Private Sector Participation:** The private sector—which holds many views—is a major player in Central America, and is undoubtedly the most visible engine in the economic integration process. Regional private capital is a major player in Central America, visible in several regional enterprises such as TACA, the Central American airline, or Banco Cuscatlán. Intra-regional trade is significant, and has been increasing throughout the last decade. In addition, there is anecdotal evidence of how porous borders are, about the existing barriers to formal cross-border trade, as well as about the widespread presence of integrated joint ventures, informal trade and barter. These developments would suggest that reported regional trade probably underestimates the true volume of economic integration among Central American countries, a fact that is regarded with concern and seen as warranting further looking into.

Private sector participants pointed at the difficulties that it has to face in its intra-regional trade and investments. Governments were not seen as being sufficiently keen on addressing the issues raised by poor customs and other trade and investment barriers. In many instances, these barriers had forced investors to scrap projects and limit themselves to doing business at home, hampering the integration process. The efforts being made by SIECA, the Secretariat for Economic Integration, were still at the early stages, making the objective of achieving a common market rather elusive.

Even though the private sector is keenly aware of the bottlenecks to integration and about the institutional reforms needed to propel the process further, it is also prepared to look at its own role with a critical eye. Private sector participants felt that the sector was coming across as myopic, because it was not articulating the opportunities and risks that integration affords. Some of the productive sectors of the regional economies were more competitive than complementary, lessening the gains that could be expected from a more integrated market. In addition, the private sector was not making the most of the opportunities offered by the trade negotiations with the United States, as well as from the trade agreements reached with Canada and Mexico.

In some instances, protecting small interests was being allowed to dominate domestic policies, without taking into full account the gains that the same private sector would have in an amplified market with the Canada, Mexico and the United States.

**The Role of Parliaments:** Central America has its own parliament; but its role is very limited. Introduced as a means to promote democracy in the second half of the 1980s, the Parliament has an advisory role in the integration process, following the lines of the European Parliament. Although parliamentarians are elected through popular vote, they see the role of the Parliament as an instance to promote integration further. In particular, the Parliament has defined as its strategic objective the fostering of the political will, commitment and participation of all in the integration process. All parliamentarians are clearly aligned with their own countries' political parties.

Notwithstanding the activities of the Central American Parliament and its close ties with national political parties, at the regional level, national parliaments are perhaps the actors that are least active in the regional integration process. The opinion poll carried out by SICA showed the tension that exists between a process that some think may lead to political integration, and the perceived role of political parties in the process. The representation crisis that is affecting many Latin American countries has not spared Central American political institutions. There is latent demand for improved electoral processes.

**Regional Capacity for Integration:** Central Americans have shown that they can carry the integration process forward, provided that there is the political will to do it. This capacity is evidenced by the very autochthonous way in which Central American leaders blended the peace efforts of the 1980s with the revamping of the integration agenda. Moreover, a well articulated Puebla-Panama plan had been developed by the Central American integration institutions by the time President Fox of
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10 Although the Parliament was created in the Esquipulas-II Declaration of 1987, it only started to operate formally in October 1991.
Mexico suggested that there should be one in his inauguration speech. Also, within the development of that plan, Central American nations have managed to agree with the IADB a significant financing package for the infrastructure of the plan, just as they have been able to agree with the Bank and other external partners the financial support for the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor. External partners, especially the European Union, have provided some technical assistance for integration; Central Americans, however, feel that the assistance could be greater.

Implementation and Partnership

The fact that Central American integration is going on in different spheres suggests that the leadership of the “official” integration process is not as strong as it could be, given the people’s willingness to move forward. People appear to be ready to accept a greater degree of official leadership toward integration, rather than continue along a path where the official process seems to lag behind the advances made by other actors and stakeholders. The private sector and the civil society would welcome a more active role in the integration process. They are clearly willing to carry their own burden within the integration process, although it is not clear to them to what extent there is scope for burden-sharing schemes across countries.

The moment thus seems right for the “official” integration leaders to assume a greater role in reaching out to all regional stakeholders, and getting them involved in the process by defining additional integration spaces for them. In particular, there is demand for regional fora where the difficult issues of integration, such as migration, customs and trade insurance, can be discussed and options assessed.

Solidifying the leadership of the official drivers in the integration process will require a different approach to the way in which these drivers communicate and relate with the Central American private sector and civil society. The people seem eager to be more involved in the official process, and have made an effort to identify the factors that they feel hinder integration on the ground. They would also like to see much more information flowing regarding the official process and its handling, as well as more transparency in official actions.

The challenge for the official sector is to find ways to reach out to the people in ways that assert its leadership and effectively propel the integration process forward. Along these lines, a recent effort by SIECA led to a number of concrete recommendations to the member governments on ways in which they could improve customs and border checkpoints to facilitate a greater flow of people and goods across them.

In most of the Central American countries, local governments and communities play a major role within their own countries, making them a key player in the integration process. National dialogues show in many Central American countries, a theme that is voiced time and again by some regions that territorial exclusions. Some areas of a number of Central American countries have been left aside in the development process. Education, health and sanitation services are very limited in those areas. In addition, difficult roads and communications effectively sever their markets from those of the rest of the country and the world. On the positive side, however, the problems of political representation are not as acute at the level of municipalities within the new democratic arrangements, giving some voice to these territorially excluded communities. People usually get involved in the local issues and heed to the leadership of their mayors. Within this setting, local governments should play a key role in the integration process, serving as a two-way conduit between the local communities and their interests, and the political leaders of Central American integration.

External bilateral partners, including the EU, have provided support to the Central American integration process, from the initial support to the Esquipulas Agreements to the latest willingness to negotiate free trade agreements. By insisting that trade negotiations be carried as a block, these external partners have helped improve the environment for integration and move forward the process at a quicker pace.11 External partners have also provided financial assistance to a number of regional projects. In some of these instances, however, external partners have contributed to the proliferation of regional institutions that do not necessarily

11 Central America has negotiated as a block trade agreements with Canada and Mexico, and is in the process of negotiating CAFTA with the United States. The European Union has expressed its willingness to negotiate an trade agreement with the region in the near future.
fit within the existing institutional layout of the region. Roundtable participants felt that help from external partners would be much more fruitful if it were to build on the exiting regional institutions, and would contribute to the process of bridging the information gap with the people and adding transparency by locating those projects within institutions that had some degree of accountability vis-à-vis Central American people.

Multilateral external partners have begun to back the integration process by providing financial assistance to regional development projects. The IADB has been a leader in this area, financing about 30 projects within the Plan Puebla-Panama. IADB-financed projects cover areas dealing at a regional level with human development, sustainable development, regional trade development, telecommunications, regional integration of road networks, interconnection of electricity networks, disaster prevention and mitigation, and tourism. The Bank, on the other hand, has been active co-financing part of the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor project. The Corridor, which is a public-private partnership that also has financing from other external partners, focuses in areas such as conservation and biodiversity, land administration and sustainable management of forest resources.

Several participants—including the private sector—called on the Bank to play a more active role in the integration process, particularly in helping reform regional institutions and in providing financing for regional projects. One way in which multilateral external partners were seen as being able to increase their role in the integration process was by facilitating the dialogues and the consultations that are being considered in furthering the development of the regional vision and its realization. Participants were emphatic, however, in having multilateral external partners use the consultation instruments that Central Americans have developed for and by themselves.

Focus on Results and Accountability

To the extent that Central America's vision and strategy are just in the process of being defined more precisely, there is a loose relationship between results and their feedback into the management of the vision and strategy. The region's focus on regional results is clearly limited in scope and content, even though outcomes in terms of social indicators are being reviewed every year in a publication called “Estado de la Region”, which is prepared by a leading think tank in the region with backing from UNDP and the EU. The information in the publication, however, is limited, contains data mostly with a two-year lag and shares the caveats of statistical information in the region. Moreover, there is no evidence that the governments or the drivers of the integration process are using this information to coordinate their regional activities or manage external partners.

In terms of public expenditure management, information available to the public is limited to what is available at a national level. The regional institutions report to the presidents and ministers of foreign affairs on the use of their budgets, but that information is not passed on regularly and systematically to the Central American people. In addition, regional projects financed by external partners and carried out by some of the smaller regional organizations or NGOs have their own budgets and operate quite independently. For the most part oversight is limited to what is requested by external partners and very limited information on outcomes and use of resources is reported to the official institutions of the integration process, including the presidents and ministers of foreign affairs. Moreover, beyond the regional scope, most of these projects operate outside the national budgets, a condition that places them outside the control of the national fiscal authorities or supreme audit institutions. Regional public expenditure information has, accordingly, a rather meager and limited coverage. Nevertheless, roundtable participants felt strongly that transparency in the integration process should be maintained, and the time was right to create a regional auditing body to oversee the use of funds by the official integration agencies and the projects financed by external partners.

Beyond budget matters, participants complained about the narrowness of information available to the public at large about the “official” integration process. Press coverage was limited to the participation of political figures in regional events. The media rarely ventured into in-depth reporting about the issues related to integration and its statistical information. Lack of interest, information and understanding were mentioned as the causes for the off-hand approach of mass media. While the official institutions of integration were making a note-
worthy effort to provide a significant amount of information on the official integration process through their websites, participants acknowledged the constraints of such approach. In Central America, access to the internet is by no means massive, affordable or easy in every member country.

Language was perceived by some as being a hampering issue. Belize, a recent member country in Central American integration uses English, while the rest of the region uses Spanish. In addition, the different indigenous peoples of the region use their own dialects—an issue that was judged to require special care given the traditional exclusion of these groups. At this stage, however, the bulk of the efforts to overcome this barrier were being carried out at the national levels.

There are no plans at this stage to move to tracking development results at the regional level, although action can be expected if Central Ameri-
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can agree on a regional set of targeted outcomes.

Institutions:

Supreme authority:

- Meeting of Central American Presidents; the Presidents call themselves the Central American Council for Sustainable Development, when meeting on sustainable development issues.

Other authorities

- Central American Parliament.
- Central American Supreme Court.
- Meeting of Central American Vice-Presidents.
- Executive Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs.
- Council of Ministers at sectoral or inter-sectoral levels.
- SICA Secretariat.
- Consultative Council (organized civil society, see membership below).

Specialized regional secretariats

- Central American Economic Integration Secretariat, SIECA.
- Social Integration Secretariat, SIS.
- Central American General Secretariat for Education and Cultural Coordination, SG-CECC.
- Executive Secretariat of the Central American Commission for the Environment and Development, SEC-CAD.
- Executive Secretariat of the Central American Monetary Council, SECMCA.
- Secretariat for Central American Tourist Integration, SITCA.
- Central American Agricultural Council Secretariat, SCAC.
- Executive Secretariat for the Central American Commission for Maritime Transport, SECOCATRAM.

Regional Bodies:

- Central American Bank for Regional Integration, BCIE.
- Central American Supreme University Council, CSUCA.
- Central American Institute for Public Administration, ICAP.
- Nutrition Institute of Central America and Panama, INCAP.
- Central American Institute for Research and Industrial Technology, ICAITI.
- Regional Coordinating Committee of Water and Sanitation Institutions of Central America, Panama and Dominican Republic, CAPRE.
- Central American Corporation for Air Control, COCESNA.
- Central American Technical Commission on Telecommunications, COMTELCA.
- Central American Commission for Maritime Transport, COCATRAM.
- Center for the Coordination for the Prevention of Natural Disasters in Central America, CEPREDENAC.
- Regional Commission on Water Resources, CRRH.
- Permanent Central American Commission for the Eradication of the Illicit Production, Traffic, Consumption and Use of Narcotics and Psychotropic Substances, CCP.
- Regional International Organization for Agricultural Health, OIRSA.
- Central American Council of Social Security Institutions, COCIS.
- Central American Council for Electricity, CEAC.
- Council of the Central American Isthmus for Sports and Recreation, CODICAIDER.
- Central American Commission for Housing and Human Habits, CCVAH.
- Science and Technology Commission of Central America and Panama, CTCAP.

Civil Society Members of the Consultative
Group:

- Federation of Municipalities of the Central American Isthmus, FEMICA.
- Federation of Central American Chambers and Associations of Industry, FECAICA.
- Central American and Caribbean Confederation of Small and Medium Enterprises, CONCAPE.
- Central American Confederation of Workers, CTCA.
- Central American Federation of Transportation, FECATRANS.
- Association of Private Universities of Central America and Panama, AUPRICA.
- Union of Small and Medium Coffee Producers of Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean, UPROCAFE.
- Central American Coordinating of Workers, COCENTRA.
- Association of Central American Farmer Organizations for Development Coordination, ASOCODE.
- Central American Agreement of Developmental Organizations, CONCERTACION CENTROAMERICANA.
- Federation of Chambers of Commerce of the Central American Isthmus, FECA.MCO.
- Federation of Private Entities of Central America and Panama, FEDIPRICAP.
- Supreme University Council of Central America, CSUCA.
- Confederation of Central American Workers, CCT.
- Confederation of Cooperatives of the Caribbean and Central America, CCC-CA.
- Central American Council of Workers for Education and Culture, CONCATEC.
- Central American Chapter of the World Council of Indigenous People, CMPI.