

**INTERSESSIONAL PANEL OF THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION
ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FOR DEVELOPMENT (CSTD)**

**Geneva, Switzerland
6 November 2026**

Contribution by Peru

**to the CSTD 2026-2027 priority theme on
“Data Governance for Development: From Asymmetry to Equitable Stewardship”**

DISCLAIMER: The views presented here are the contributors' and do not necessarily reflect the views and position of the United Nations or the UN Trade and Development.

PERU'S INPUTS TO THE CSTD PRIORITY THEME:

"DATA GOVERNANCE FOR DEVELOPMENT: FROM ASYMMETRY TO EQUITABLE STEWARDSHIP"

1. Challenges in building and leveraging data capacities

Peru's National Data Governance Strategy (ENGD 2026–2030) establishes an own maturity diagnostic instrument, synthesizing internationally recognized frameworks, applied to eight reference public entities under a critical-case sampling approach. The resulting aggregate maturity score of 1.57 on a five-point scale situates the national baseline between “Initial” and “Developing,” and, given the sampling method, is understood to represent an upper reference for the broader public ecosystem rather than its average condition.

The pattern observed is one of technological infrastructure and designated roles operating ahead of strategic formalization, planning and dedicated financing — a sequencing that is assessed as transferable to other developing-country contexts rather than a national singularity.

In respect of cross-border data flows, the applicable framework is anchored in Law No. 29733 on Personal Data Protection, which establishes an adequacy-based regime with defined exceptions; the technical determination of adequate protection levels falls under the exclusive competence of Peru's National Authority for Personal Data Protection, whose specific input remains pending consolidation.

On benefit-sharing, the current framework does not yet develop explicit mechanisms for the capture and redistribution of value derived from data, an area in which Peru regards the Working Group's conceptual contribution as particularly valuable.

2. Inequalities and biases in data generation, collection and use

The clearest national illustration of this challenge lies in the explicit, policy-level acknowledgment of data-framework limitations. Peru's National Digital Transformation Policy identifies its per-capita digital citizenship indicator — built on a household survey with a longitudinal perspective exceeding ten years and disaggregated by gender, age group, mother tongue and geographic location — as representative only at the national and departmental levels, given that the survey's inferential framework is insufficient for district-level estimation.

This constraint is corroborated by the ENGd's own diagnostic, which shows the “Data Quality” dimension consistently scoring lowest among evaluated reference entities, with averages below 1.0 in key institutions, reflecting the absence of a formalized data-quality programme and limited human-capital capacity in this area.

The consequence is one of public policy, not merely technical scope: the country can describe its gaps — including the gender gap — at national and departmental scale, but cannot yet localize them at the territorial unit where public spending and service delivery occur. This is consistent with the annual gender-gap reporting produced by Peru's national statistics authority, which tracks disparities across education, health, employment, income, political participation and information

and communication technology access, including a dedicated digital gender-gap index monitoring internet use by sex, age, education level and geographic area.

Measures under implementation to address these disparities include an Ethical Data Use Model under development by the digital government secretariat in coordination with the personal data protection authority, encompassing algorithmic ethics guidelines and mandatory privacy and data impact assessments; deliberate promotion of women's participation in data science and artificial intelligence talent pipelines, with gender-disaggregated formation indicators; and explicit treatment of algorithmic bias mitigation within the National Artificial Intelligence Strategy.

3. National strategies, regulatory frameworks and lessons learned

Peru's framework is structured across four normative levels: a legal tier (the Digital Government Law, the National Digital Transformation System framework, the Digital Trust Framework, the Personal Data Protection Law, and the Law promoting artificial intelligence), a regulatory tier, a policy and strategy tier (the National Digital Transformation Policy to 2030, the ENGD 2026–2030, and the National Artificial Intelligence Strategy 2026–2030), and an operational tier of sectoral directives.

Three lessons stand out from implementation. First, disposing of an own maturity baseline before scaling obligations to public entities allows prioritization grounded in evidence rather than targets disconnected from institutional capacity. Second, the heterogeneity of capacities across entities led to the adoption of a Federated and Differentiated Governance Model rather than a uniform regime, on the understanding that homogeneous requirements applied to unequal capacities tend to widen, rather than narrow, existing asymmetries. Third, cultural resistance and limited change management capacity are recognized as underestimated factors in data governance design, insofar as formalization and standardization can be perceived by public servants as an increase in administrative burden rather than a governance gain.

4. Experience in reducing asymmetries across development sectors

In public administration broadly, the National Georeferenced Data Platform integrates spatial, georeferenced and statistical information from more than three hundred public entities, functioning as a shared geovisualization service for subnational governments that lack their own technological resources — an approach to reducing capacity asymmetry through common infrastructure rather than by requiring each entity to build independent platforms.

In the agricultural sector specifically, a cooperation framework between the national statistics authority and the agricultural development ministry, active since 2021 and formalized through standardized survey instrumentation in 2022, strengthened the Integrated Agricultural Statistics System underpinning the National Agricultural Survey. This is complemented by the Agricultural Producers' Registry, a national dataset covering the country's agricultural producers across thirty-eight variables, operationalized through a public Observatory and a Digital Identity tool for producers designed to connect smallholder farmers directly with sectoral services.

The 2026 National Plan for Specialized Agricultural Information Dissemination reported, in its 2025 implementation cycle, over twenty thousand participants across thirty specialized events, with women representing twenty-eight percent of participants, while the underlying statistics platform recorded more than half a million visits — evidence of a deliberate, equity-oriented approach to closing the agricultural information gap for family farming.

5. Institutional mechanisms fostering collaboration

Three formalized mechanisms merit mention. A Standing Coordinating Committee for the country's Spatial Data Infrastructure promotes the development, exchange and use of geospatial data and services across all levels of government, the private sector, non-profit organizations and academic and research institutions.

A Standing Multisectoral Commission for Interoperability and Data Governance in the Justice System, anchored in law and integrating security, judicial and prosecutorial authorities alongside the digital government secretariat, was recognized in 2026 for the implementation of citizen-impact practices.

In the agricultural sector, the statistics authority and the agricultural development ministry maintain a formal cooperation framework combining technical standardization with piloting across multiple regions, illustrating a collaboration model anchored in institutional agreement rather than ad hoc coordination — a pattern observed to be more sustainable than arrangements dependent on coyuntural initiative.

6. Bilateral, regional and international partnerships

Peru participates in a fifth-edition international recognition mechanism for open data, developed jointly with a regional intergovernmental organization and a Latin American open-data initiative, combining capacity-strengthening support with a citizen-use innovation component; the experience has been registered by the OECD's Public Sector Innovation Observatory.

Peru also hosted the Digital Government Ministerial Meeting of the Americas, organized with the Inter-American Development Bank and regional and hemispheric partners.

At the multilateral level, Peru serves as a Latin America and Caribbean regional representative within the CSTD Working Group on Data Governance at All Levels, where it has advanced a position of federated data sovereignty — national data nodes and reference standards favored over imposed models — anchored in the ENGD 2026–2030 and in Peru's open-data and georeferenced-data platforms, both of which have been cited as good-practice examples within the Working Group's own progress report.

Benefits observed include external validation as an effective complementary compliance incentive; challenges observed include that reputational incentives drive initial publication but do not by themselves guarantee sustained updating or metadata quality, both of which depend on permanent institutional capacity.

7. The role of international cooperation and of the CSTD

Four considerations emerge from Peru's cumulative experience. First, an own maturity baseline, built by synthesizing recognized international frameworks, constitutes a precondition for adopting realistic international commitments; comparable diagnostic instruments across countries would be a significant contribution from international cooperation.

Second, the pattern of technological capacity outpacing strategic formalization suggests that cooperation directed exclusively at infrastructure yields limited returns; accompaniment in strategic formalization, data quality, semantic architecture and governance structures is equally determinant.

Third, addressing the gender data gap requires strengthening national statistical systems to operate at subnational granularity with adequate metadata and quality obligations — a technical, not merely declarative, undertaking.

Fourth, the legal dimension of interoperability, while anchored in national law, remains the least developed in comparative practice and frequently the most determinant for cross-border flows, since conceptual divergences codified at legal rank cannot be corrected administratively and raise the cost of harmonization considerably.

On this basis, Peru considers the CSTD uniquely positioned to convene an exchange of verifiable national experiences that captures obstacles alongside achievements, to develop shared conceptual grounding on data benefit-sharing — an area where Peru, like many developing countries, lacks consolidated instruments — and to favor terminological convergence between national frameworks, recognizing that interoperability built on unresolved conceptual divergence, including the distinction between data sovereignty, data autonomy and free, trusted cross-border flows, risks reproducing rather than reducing existing asymmetries absent accompanying conditions of institutional capacity, technology transfer and financing.

Points of contact

Yuri Aldoradin Carbajal — Secretariat of Digital Government and Transformation (SGTD),
Presidency of the Council of Ministers — yaldoradin@pcm.gob.pe

Coral de Cielo Cano Gallardo — Department of Science, Technology and Energy (DCT),
Directorate General for Economic Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Peru —
ccano@ree.gob.pe