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Executive Summary

The core objective of this specific short study is “to explore how ‘capacity building’ (Component 2) is being understood and shaped within the RTD program, two years into its implementation”, to help understand future potential to strengthen this work. Of the six countries where capacity building work is ongoing (Ecuador, Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Honduras), only Guatemala was not included in the study. The methodology followed involved a document review, two rounds of interviews (January and May 2010) per team, and interviews with key program staff.

A. How is ‘capacity building understood?’

The program documents do not describe the C2 work in one clear description. Integrating the different elements brings one to a reading of C2 as generating a ‘new’ territorial vision and action that is generated by key social actors and coalitions in legitimated multi-actor convening spaces, informed by a better (research-based) understanding of territorial dynamics, and equipped with strengthened abilities to advance their vision. These actors and spaces become the points of reference for advocacy efforts to work with local and regional governments, private sector actors, and other territorial prime movers to:

- Refocus development efforts towards existing territorial dynamics; and,
- Advocate and challenge existing power structures to be more sustainable, including balancing environmental and social concerns, particularly the ability of traditionally marginalized actors to participate in and influence these processes.

The RTD program focuses its intended actions on generating knowledge and strengthening key actors to influence public policy and practice, including leveraging resources. It also aims to generate methodologies and work practices in rural territorial development that can be replicated in other territories.

Each territory has a specific set of dynamics, expressed in C1 hypotheses, which support certain dynamics and opportunities, and that the C2 component must consider for its capacity development strategies. Specific themes range from the importance of strengthening actors and processes in agricultural value chains, to supporting actors to influence large-scale infrastructure projects, which are important for economic growth yet also have serious social and environmental consequences.

B. Strategies for Change

Four strategies can be found through which territorial change is facilitated.

1. Carrying out applied investigation as capacity development
   The applied research component (C1) was designed “to include functional, lively, effective means of communication and feedback with the intended users of the research results” (RTD proposal: vi). This is what makes it “applied” research within the component itself. Ecuador and El Salvador are examples of this. One lesson is that territories with advanced participatory planning processes appear more conducive for putting research results to good use, than territories without. Small amounts of strategically used resources can support existing change processes with momentum.

2. Legitimating and strengthening “spaces”, and creating needed spaces
   ‘Spaces’, for the C2 work of the RTD program, refers to known and legitimate places where territorial actors discuss and decide on territorial problems, visions, strategies. These spaces may be formal
structures, such as a non-governmental forum (e.g. CACH, El Salvador) or as a government-sponsored committee (Tungurahua). They may be very active or latent (e.g. MMC, Nicaragua). Given their potential for articulating wide interests and providing a convening platform for diverse actors, it is not surprising that identifying, legitimating and strengthening spaces is a common strategy. However, each territorial team faces specific realities and has differentiated interpretations. The greatest risk for this strategy is the difficulty in generating a space from the ground up, given time and resources.

3. **Bridging and strengthening actors and interests in key spaces**

A recurring strategy is adding CD onto an existing priority theme that has support. For example, in El Salvador, the implementing NGO seeks an important known theme, e.g. the use of seasonably available lands, and a legitimate space, e.g. the Interinstitutional Committee of the Cerrón Grande Wetlands, where the theme can be debated. Its plan is to then offer a technical study that can help bring actors together around better information in a participatory planning process. This process can also identify capacity needs and broader contextual factors that need consideration. Considering the time frame and the complexity of what is being proposed this innovative idea should be further analyzed.

4. **Strengthening marginalized groups for participation in public policy processes**

A focus on the poor and marginalized sectors is mentioned in all the cases because the program prioritizes it. However, only one of the teams planned on getting marginalized and traditionally excluded groups to the table or strengthening these actors. The exception is Nicaragua, which has work with the poor built into the research methodology. The RTD program needs to make clearer how these actors can be strengthened to challenge the power structures that perpetuate their social/economic status. In the case of RTD, this means developing ideas for inclusion of the socio-economically poor as well as those parts of the private sector that do not need alliances of the RTD kind to sustain their business.

C. **Observations on strategy as per January 2010**

*The close alignment between the methodological guidelines and the actual planned strategies on the ground are related to two factors.* First, C2 work should be based on C1 results, even when C1 results were just being processed as C2 was beginning. And second, because of the expediency associated with the need to achieve predetermined results within a tight timeline and very limited budget (as conveyed by territorial teams in the interviews). Regardless of what might emerge from C1, even if it could have been processed quickly, the territorial teams were clear about the expectations set by the C2 results at the territorial level.

*Alignment between methodological guidelines and planned strategies is obviously not a bad thing in and of itself, but trade-offs need to be made.* Guidelines can be very helpful and necessary in communicating broad intentions, offering potential methods and pathways, and promoting some level of consistency across different teams and locations. However, the tradeoff is that territorial teams may not feel empowered to develop their strategies based on emerging realities on the ground.

The RTD concept is complex and innovative, with little written on CD. So a useful question for the DTR program could be *how should CD be conceptualized in a RTD framework.* This allows for a broader inquiry into *what interventions should follow a C1 process in a particular territory.* And it
allows the RTD program to release itself from the current key assumption behind the C2 work, i.e. that people’s capacities need strengthening in order to increase their ability to use high quality information in stimulating positive territorial dynamics.

Currently in the RTD concept and proposal there appear to be mixed messages on the purpose of C2, as well as its breadth and depth of scope. Some see it as a development intervention, bound by very tight budgets ($40,000) and timeframe (nine to 18 months were cited) compared to their perception of the scale of what is being expected. While not incompatible, the focus is on achieving desired results in-situ, rather than action research. Results are framed in terms of numbers of poor involved, investment plans formulated, platforms generated, and not, for example, in terms of methodological insights about operationalising RTD through CD. Yet the CD literature is replete with examples and warnings to avoid promising ambitious results on short timeframes when most factors are outside the control of the program or program.

D. Emerging outcomes and lessons (June 2010)

All of the project teams are making significant advances in carrying out their proposed activities, including successes in O'Higgins (Chile) and Olancho (Honduras) in setting up new multi-actor platforms. Previously existing and functioning platforms in Tungurahua (Ecuador) and Chalatenango (El Salvador), combined with the significant team efforts, seem to be yielding particularly good results. And in el Macizo (Nicaragua) local spaces on which to concentrate efforts have been found in la Dalia, despite the team’s difficulties in activating a broader territorial multiactor space.

Teams are also encountering significant challenges on all of these issues, from structural challenges related to weak institutionality and lack of incentives for powerful actors to participate in territorial spaces, to practical challenges related to a tight project time frame, limited resources, small on-the-ground C2 teams and logistical difficulties in some regions. Finally, there are significant expectations that the different multiactor platforms remain relevant after the project period, which introduces additional complexity.

- **Basic assumptions on CD and RTD.** Knowledge and capacities are inextricably linked to the possibility of stimulating virtuous dynamics. These intangible, dialogical and relational capacities confirm the importance of working in alliance on RTD.
- **Territorial dynamics and change.** Territorial conceptualizations are essential, in particular how identity crosses with economic, administrative, and political territorial views. Real geographical challenges exist to territorial dynamics, and therefore limits of policy influence. Getting key powerful actors to the table, when their only stake is economical, is difficult. Similar, incorporating marginalized groups requires a very strong and specific effort.
- **Institutional infrastructure and enabling conditions.** Maintaining a focus on equity in economic development is difficult, even when equity has been a fundamental condition of virtuous territorial dynamics. And even if influenced, many institutions lack capacity to support or enable change. Initial starting conditions can make or break influence.
- **Time, effort and resources.** All project team interviewees expressed concerns with the practicality of achieving significant capacity development and advocacy impact at a territorial level with quite limited resources and a relatively short time-frame. At the same time all expressed confidence in some of the changes they were seeing on the ground, the direction the projects were heading and “the seeds that were being planted” for longer term harvest.
A documentation and interpretation of how capacity building is being understood and shaped within the RTD program

1. Introduction to the updated report and methodology

The RTD program is based on a set of hypotheses and assumptions regarding the relationships between the development conditions that need to be in place for a rural territorial dynamics vision to be possible, actual rural territorial dynamics on the ground, and the intentions of this particular program to contribute to the emergence of those development conditions by stimulating territorial dynamics. The program characterizes itself as “a research-based policy advice and capacity-development program for rural economic growth, social inclusion and sound environmental governance”. The core objective of this specific short study is “to explore how “capacity building” is being understood and shaped within the RTD program, two years into its implementation”, with an eye towards “helping understand future potential to strengthen capacity building within the RTD program”.

The specific focus is on the role of the explicit capacity development component (C2) in “contributing to the design and implementation of more comprehensive, cross-cutting and effective public policies that will stimulate and support rural territorial dynamics which lead to economic growth, poverty reduction, greater equality and sound environmental governance”? The inquiry ToRs explicitly requested analysis on the C2 assumptions—conceptually and in practice—with regards to how capacity building supports the changes intended in the program.

---

1 From the terms of reference.

2 The program has six components: 1) Applied research; 2) Capacity development (CD); 3) International networking and dialogue; 4) Postgraduate training; 5) Organizational Development of Rimisp; and 6) Communication (a cross cutting component).
The six countries where capacity building work is ongoing are Ecuador, Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Honduras. Guatemala, however, is not included in this study because the M&E team had already involved the team there in another topical inquiry and did not want to burden the teams with too many requests for engagement.

The study methodology was shaped by the program’s M&E team and complemented by me, the consultant. It included the following activities:

- A review of pertinent program documents through December 2009. This included overall RTD program documents, M&E reports and country program documents.
- Two to three interviews with each of the 5 country teams. For each country we aimed to interview a C1 (applied research) representative, the person or persons in charge of the capacity development activities, and the overall program coordinator for that specific territory.
- Interviews with key RTD regional and M&E staff or consultants, including Manuel Chiriboga, Francisco Aguirre and Roberto Iturralde. Additionally, I carried out three related conversations with Irene Guijt, the M&E coordinator.

I interviewed 18 people overall for the first draft. In addition to the given methodology, I chose to process my interview notes by country and prepared a short report in Spanish for each of the country teams—summarizing the key points from my notes. Each country team was asked to provide feedback. After receiving detailed feedback from the teams in Honduras, Nicaragua and El Salvador (Ecuador and Chile did not respond), I finalized the country notes and sent a copy to the Program teams, the RTD regional team and the M&E team.

I submitted a full draft report for review in February of 2010 and received both positive and critical feedback from three country teams and the RTD Coordination unit in March. In discussions with the RTD M&E team in May we agreed that, besides final editing, a small number of new interviews should be carried out in order to update progress from the first half of 2010, as well as to clarify some issues that were dealt with insufficiently in the first round of interviews. However, given that the original report was based on information regarding activities primarily through the end of 2009, it would be impractical to weave updated information from 2010 into the material covering the previous period. As such, we agreed to edit and improve the report as is, before carrying out new interviews. I would then add a new updated section based on the new interviews.

In summary, this report contains an edited and improved main body, which reflects my documentation and reading of how the RTD project was conceiving of CD through January of 2010. It also contains a new section updating progress from January through June of this year, entirely based on a new round of interviews.

In the following section (2) I briefly present my understanding of the CD intentions of the RTD program. In section (3) I present a short description of particular territorial contexts in which program activities are taking place. In section (4), I share some of the main strategies being used in each territory and infer capacity building conceptualizations from that. In section (5), I offer my observations and recommendations. Lastly, section (6) contains the update on CD advances through June 2010 and section (7) contains an overall conclusion.

3 The “Unidad de Coordinación Programa” (UCP)
2. Capacity development intentions in the RTD program

2.1 Why CD intentions?

In order to answer how capacity building is being conceived I first needed to know what the program intends to do. With clarity about the intended purpose of CD in the RTD program, a more meaningfully analysis is possible of program support towards those purposes. I have called this reference point “CD intentions of the RTD Program”. These are understood as purposes or foreseeable directions, not predefined results. I was able to develop this reference point by reviewing program documents, explanations from the study interviewees, and consulting CD literature. It allowed me to compare what the program is currently doing in each country and at the regional level and why, and what it might or could be doing in relation to program intentions, specific territory-level contexts and challenges, and CD literature (if relevant).

When I began the study I read the major program documents looking for a clear explanation of CD intentions for the RTD program. In particular I was looking for something that would clearly state what the program aimed to do in CD, why (e.g. some reference to CD literature that ties it to the RTD approach), and how, at least at a general level. What I found is that while many documents contribute to this understanding, it is not comprehensively laid out in any of them. Therefore, if I was going to be able to generate the needed dialogue between project intentions and interviewee perceptions I would need to assemble and interpret those intentions from the multiple documents reviewed.

2.2 Key intentions found in the documents

In my review of program documents, I was trying to understand the program’s perspectives on the following question: What conditions—including capacities—need to be in place for “territorial

---

4 These documents include but are not limited to the original IDRC proposal, the NZAID proposal, annual reports and other M&E reports, methodological guidelines and other C2-specific regional documents, and country- (territory) specific program documents.

5 Interestingly, although the RTD program is framed as a ‘research-based policy advice and capacity-development program for rural economic growth, social inclusion and environmental sustainability in Latin America’, the literature review section of the original RTD proposal had no direct review of any capacity development literature. Also, in the applied research (C1) methodological framework document (Applied Research on Rural Territorial Dynamics in Latin America. A methodological framework (version 2) February 2008: pages 8-9) the initial nine research questions do not directly ask any capacity questions. In those objectives, for example, the language is geared towards conceptual definitions, descriptions of institutional frameworks that stimulate equitable asset distribution and reward innovation, as well as identification of key actors who would be involved at the level of social actor coalitions. Language more geared towards particular actors, processes, methodologies and capacities is not present. In response to this assertion in the first draft of this document the UCP provided a bibliography showing a broad range of literature that has contributed to a theoretical basis on CD. In my assertion I did not intend to suggest that the program was not informed by CD thinking; rather, that specific CD literature was not included to complement the broad range of literature that was included.
dynamics to support virtuous cycles of economic growth, poverty reduction, social inclusion ("reduced inequality") and environmental sustainability”?

My review of project documents highlights the following capacity development-related intentions:

- The importance of generating sustainable development vision through a contextual **territorial** lens
- The importance this program places on knowledge for development within a RTD framework, and how CD learning can support better understanding of RTD, including by generating methodologies and work practices that can be replicated in other territories
- The importance of identifying key actors (e.g. collective actors and coalitions and spaces), and assuring their participation and influence in supporting public action
  - Within “key actors” an explicit focus on the poor and socially excluded to have greater voice and increased participation in the collaboration, design and implementation of territorial development strategies. This includes specific strategies for identifying and strengthening organizations that represent the poor and socially excluded to inform and influence the formulation of ideas and decision making at the national level related to public action for territorial development.
- The importance of finding multi-actor spaces and mechanisms that are conducive to an RTD agenda and developing strategies for utilizing and strengthening these spaces
- A focus on informing and influencing policies of national and sub-national governments and international development agencies with strategic, research-based analysis of the dynamics of rural territories and their determinants, and how these policies can strengthen sustainable development.
- The importance of capacity strengthening in support of all of the above, but with a particular focus on
  - Strengthening the capacity of public and private development agents (in particular, at the level of provinces and municipalities, and with an emphasis on the organizations of the poor) to engage in public policy
  - Developing strategies for generating or strengthening influencing and advocacy capacities, as particularly relevant in bridging the gap between better knowledge and sustainable development
  - Capacities for networking and collective action as particularly important in the highly complex environments of each territorial context
- The importance of taking power into account when strengthening capacities, because increased capacities of many actors—particularly of the poor and marginalized—do not necessarily lead to the ability to put those capacities to use.

---

6 Please see Annex 1 for my full review of project documents and interpretation of project intentions. Also see annex 2 for a mind map of key assumptions on capacity development that I identified in the project documents and through the interviews.

7 This was not mentioned in the program documents; rather, taken from my review of CD and power literature. I only include here because I assume, and believe, that this is implicit in the capacity development intentions of the program.

8 In other words, it is not enough to strengthen capacities at a “power to” level (i.e. latent knowledge, abilities and resources) without at least trying to take into account: a) how those capacities might be applied towards some developmental change; b) whether enabling conditions are in place that allow this to be possible—i.e. whether key actors have the **power** to put their capacities to use; and c) how the complex, non-linear nature of development conditions both what is desirable and what is possible in particular contexts.
I summarize my understanding of how capacity development is intended to support virtuous territorial dynamics in the six territories as follows:

“New” territorial vision and action is generated by key social actors and coalitions in legitimated multiactor convening spaces, informed by a better (research-based) understanding of territorial dynamics, and equipped with strengthened abilities for advancing their vision. These actors and spaces become the “legitimate” points of reference from which to base advocacy efforts which are ultimately intended to pressure local and regional governments, private sector actors, and other territorial prime movers to:

- Refocus development efforts towards existing territorial dynamics (e.g. infrastructure in Guatemala and Nicaragua, market structures in Tungurahua, etc.);
- In the process, advocate and challenge existing power structures to incorporate more sustainable approaches to doing “a)—including balancing environmental and social concerns, particularly the ability of traditionally marginalized actors to participate in and influence these processes.

In practical terms, strategies for approaching this vision could include, for example, mass mobilization, leveraging resources and investment, advocacy, addressing basic needs to encourage participation of marginalized people, capacity development, etc. On a broad level the RTD program focuses its intended actions on generating knowledge and strengthening key actors to influence public policy and practice, including leveraging resources. However, it also aims to generate methodologies and work practices in rural territorial development that can be replicated in other territories.

3. Different territorial contexts

In this section I include a short description of particular territorial contexts in which program activities are taking place. Each territory has a specific set of dynamics, expressed in C1 hypotheses and more detailed reports that are emerging, that the C2 component must consider for its capacity development strategies. These short explanations were paraphrased from interview notes shared with each territorial team, and complemented by the matrix in annex 3 (provided by Francisco Aguirre), and by the territory level documents reviewed.

In Tungurahua (Ecuador), “territorial dynamics are the result of the historical consolidation of a network of markets that were never monopolized by large-scale businesses and landholders. This allowed access and participation of smaller producers and artisans in these spaces, which even today provides an enabling environment for generating more equitable territorial wealth through these markets, and the broader value chains they belong to” ( paraphrased from interview with Pablo Ospina). This knowledge leads to a C1 hypothesis that strengthening the main agricultural value chains will be a determining factor for improving overall territorial competitiveness.

---

9 Again, for a detailed presentation of the source of these ideas please see annex 1.

10 This objective is my translation, paraphrased from the document ‘Desarrollo de Capacidades: Conceptos y Metodología—Documento Borrador para Discusión, October 2009, p.3.
In Chalatenango (El Salvador), the C1 research hypothesizes that local social capital (social coalitions, local organizations and articulating spaces) exists and has played an active part in pursuing institutional changes and generating territorial development proposals. However, in spite of their active and organized presence, these social coalitions have not been able to influence the design and effects of large scale infrastructure projects so that they might sustainably contribute to local development. These projects are considered part of an economic model that, since the 1990s, has “favored environmental and productive territorial dynamics, strengthening people’s life strategies, reducing poverty, and positively impacting ecosystems”. But these projects in particular have not adequately taken into account broader social and environmental concerns, which, within the RTD concept, are central for generating “virtuous” territorial dynamics. It is thought that the inability to adequately influence infrastructure projects has been due to a lack of political will to support and institutionalize the proposed changes11. As such, the territorial team believes that it is “the local social actor”, expressed in multiactor coalitions, that most needs capacity development, particularly in planning, project definition and advocacy. This capacity development is approached through existing spaces such as the “Comité Ambiental de Chalatenango” or “CACH”. Interviewees emphasized that specific project priorities would emerge in the process and could not be predetermined by the program12. One of the very purposes of a multiactor space like the CACH is to offer space for identifying and negotiating these themes. Notwithstanding, there are known regional priority themes that are likely to be addressed in CACH. In addition to the infrastructure programs, known themes include the use of “green” spaces for sustainable economic purposes (e.g. community tourism), and negotiation of equitable access to seasonably available lands, which are flooded during part of the year. Also mentioned was the need to promote more integrated farm (Finca) management plans which incorporate “green production” and diversification techniques, environmental governance, participation in and representation of interests (in the CACH), and accompaniment of local processes at the micro-territorial level.

In Macizo Peñas Blancas (Nicaragua), economic, distributional, and environmental changes (expected to grow in future) are believed to be primarily driven by competition for use of/control over productive land and water resources. This leads to a macro territorial strategy of “promoting an economically and environmentally sustainable use of the natural resources of the territory”. With regards to influencing, “this implies generating evidence to debate issues such as access to water, rural employment, and advocacy of municipal governments so that they might incorporate environmental protection of the ecological reserve into their agenda”13. Again, the interviewees emphasized that final themes would emerge in the C2 process, but four themes are known: water, ecotourism (within a broader concept of generating economic opportunities), coffee, and participation of marginalized sectors in key convening spaces.

Natural resources are also prominent in Olancho (Honduras), where the C1 research hypothesizes that they can be used in developing local sustainable livelihoods strategies. An underlying

---

11 Translated from the matrix in annex 3.

12 This same point was mentioned by at least one interviewee from four out of the five territorial teams interviewed.

13 Translated from the document ‘SITUACIÓN ACTUAL POR TERRITORIO, COMPONENTE DESARROLLO DE CAPACIDADES’. 
assumption in Honduras is that innovative social coalitions that influence institutional frameworks and favorable distribution and use of natural resources do not currently exist, or at least not in that capacity. The territorial team is asking what is needed for such coalitions to emerge, and if that would require a large use of natural resources. With regards to specific capacity themes, to define these themes and actors a priori would be an error according the Honduras team. That said there are some capacity themes that are known:

“Agricultural commercialization and the lack of ability to generate and manage development initiatives are two of them. Farmers know how to produce but not sell. With regards to development initiatives, people in general are unable to problematize and develop innovative responses to local and regional issues. Specific capacities here include coordination and project management, amongst others” (translated and paraphrased from telephone interview with Pedro Quiel).

Finally, in O’Higgins (Chile) the research hypothesis is that a large public investment in the provision of public and semi-public goods is needed for the enormous productive transformation that would widely benefit the region’s households. This appears to have informed the capacity development work, as the main goal of that process is to present a territorial investment agenda to the regional government of O’Higgins. With regards to specific territorial development themes, again, the team noted that the actual thematic and capacity issues would emerge in the multiactor space that is the focus of the project. But known themes include:

- Water availability and norms and regulations for assigning its use. This is in reference to what is considered to be a generally unregulated, industrial overuse of underground water supplies by private industry;
- Pesticide contamination and its effects on people’s health; and
- Agroindustrial expansion and its negative effects on the environment (paraphrased from the document Hito 2, provided by Eduardo Ramirez).

Additionally problems exist with economic integration of temporary workers, particularly from the Chilean drylands (secano). Of all the themes, the water issues might lend themselves to national level advocacy (telephone interview with Francisco Aguirre).

4. Capacity development strategies

The research that emerges from C1 identifies a broad range of themes, conditions, and actors that contribute to territorial dynamics in the various territories. On the basis of this knowledge specific strategies can be formed to support particular dynamics and opportunities. Specific C1-identified themes range from the importance of strengthening actors and processes in agricultural value chains, to supporting actors to influence large-scale infrastructure projects, which are important for economic growth, yet which also have serious social and environmental consequences. Although there are contextual differences in each territory, the interviews revealed four broad strategies that are already in execution or planned. The purpose of this section, therefore, is to present four clearly identifiable territory-level strategies that were mentioned in the interviews.

---

14 This information was generated before the massive earthquake off the coast of the Maule Region of Chile in late February 2010 that had a large impact in O’Higgins.

15 It is important to note that at the time of the initial set of interviews only one of the five country teams, Ecuador, was well into their C2 implementation (most were in a sort of transition from C1 to C2, even though C1 activities do not necessarily conclude when C2 begins). Chile (O’Higgins) and Macizo Peñas Blancas
• Carrying out applied investigation as capacity development
• Legitimating and strengthening “spaces”, and creating needed spaces where none exist
• Bridging and strengthening actors and interests in key spaces
• Strengthening marginalized groups for participation in public policy processes

After presenting each strategy I offer a short commentary—my own analysis of the strategy, as I understand it. The combination of strategy presentation and my commentary will lead into the following section (5), which focuses on my interpretation of the emerging conceptualization of CD in the program—the purpose of this study.

4.1 Applied research as capacity development

The applied research component (C1) was designed “to include functional, lively, effective means of communication and feedback with the intended users of the research results” (RTD proposal: vi., italics added). This is what makes it “applied” research within the component itself—i.e. before it might become applied in C2 and other program components. Manuel Chiriboga notes the importance of applied research in RTD:

“If the research were completely academic it would be very unlikely to contribute to real processes...It needs to be carried out in conjunction with territorial actors in an iterative process of discussion, research, feedback, adjustment of the process, etc. If this process is done in a systematic way, the specific C2 priorities should emerge through C1. Even more so as the two components process and prioritize results and possibilities” (Telephone interview with Manuel Chiroboga).

Ecuador is an example of this. The research process has been carried out as part of an ongoing dialogue with the provincial government, including program suggestions on territorial

Box 1—C1 applied research as CD

The advanced nature of the Tungurahua (provincial government) regional development process recently allowed for a targeted intervention to strengthen the regional government’s capacity to negotiate territorial interests at the national level. The regional government will be entering a negotiation process later this year in which it will need to request national level support for particular agricultural products (understood within a value chain). The program intervention has helped the regional government grapple with such questions as:

Which value chains are stronger than others (berries and flower seem promising)? Which products would we like to compete nationally, or to export? Which value chains are less competitive, but in need of public support for socioeconomic purposes?—for example dairy products.

This is an example of knowledge from the iterative research process from C1 contributing to the identification of a particular theme that is need of immediate capacity strengthening or other support.

(Nicaragua) were about to begin, Honduras had not begun and was dependent on the political situation in country, El Salvador was just beginning to enter into full activity phase, and Ecuador (Tungurahua) was a bit further along. The point is that these strategies were more planned than executed in most of the cases.
competitiveness and agricultural commercialization (see Box 1). There is a similar receptiveness in El Salvador, where a functioning multiactor space and political receptiveness exists to incorporate research into territorial debates.

Commentary
Francisco Aguirre suggested that perhaps an initial lesson learned (or at least an assumption worth testing) is that territories with advanced participatory planning processes are much more conducive for putting research results to good use, than territories that don’t. It is more likely that small amounts of resources can be strategically placed to support existing change processes with momentum. If the processes are not in place, generating them is probably beyond the capacity of the $40,000 C2 budget per territory.

4.2 Legitimating and strengthening “spaces”, and creating spaces where none exist

“Spaces”, in the RTD concept, usually refers to the geographical territorial spaces. But it can also refer to the location of dialogue and decision making, and in Spanish the term “espacios” is primarily used in this way. Here I refer to “spaces” as known and legitimate places where territorial actors can convene and discuss territorial problems, visions, strategies, or any other theme of relevance. These “spaces” may have a formal structure as a non-governmental forum a in the case of the CACH in El Salvador (see Box 2) or as a government-sponsored committee, in the case of Tungurahua. They may be very active as in the two examples just mentioned or inactive as is the case of the Macizo Management Committee (MMC) in Nicaragua. For example, although recently inactive the MMC has a history of participation from community, governmental, NGO and other territorial actors. This makes this particular “space” potentially more attractive than the currently active local association of Municipal governments, which study interviewees thought to be more politically closed and focused on governmental actors. The RTD program strongly emphasizes “spaces” because of their attractive potential for articulating wide interests and providing a convening platform in which diverse actors can meet, share and debate agendas. As such it is not surprising that identifying, legitimating and strengthening spaces would be a common strategy. In practice however, each territorial team faces specific realities and carries out differentiated interpretations of this general idea.

For example, in El Salvador the CACH exists as a “given”16 starting point—a legitimated multiactor space—for generating regional vision and strategies and dealing with territorial issues (see Box 2). In this case capacity development might be understood as simply supporting key actors to be present in key CACH moments and to be prepared to participate. “Influencing” emerges somewhat organically as issues are dealt with and resolved in what is perceived as a valid space. In Tungurahua, “influencing space” is much broader, largely because the overall territorial development vision and process is already in place, facilitated by the provincial government. This particular space (an inter-institutional committee convened by the provincial government) is politically validated17 and only one of many spaces where the territorial vision is debated and influenced. That said the technical expertise introduced into the Comité by the RTD program and other cooperation agencies has been perceived as extremely important by the public leadership of

---

16 Given in the sense it already exists and functions as a legitimated multi-actor convening space.

17 Although not economically validated, in the sense that it strings together funding and personnel from international development agencies and funds, and not from the provincial government itself.
that committee (personal communication, Josué Salazar and Roosevelt Ríos).

In Nicaragua a multiactor space exists but is inactive. The program strategy is to channel debate and influencing in order to reinvigorate the space as an important territorial actor.

Box 2—Strengthening and legitimating the CACH in El Salvador

Overall, Prisma is trying to strengthen local organizations and the use of multi-actor spaces, to generate development plans in benefit of local needs and improved environmental management. Although there are 3 key spaces the CACH has been prioritized as particularly important. CACH is a non-governmental (and non-registered—no current legal framework) forum led by different voluntary organizations through a coordinating group. CACH currently has four working groups: 1) Economic revitalization; 2) Human development; 3) Environmental management; 4) Advocacy. These and other themes are dealt with through the Departmental environmental management plan (PADEMA), which has four foci: Territorial management; Economic transition, Institutional Reform, Cultural 'recovery'. Prisma currently facilitates the economic revitalization group, which includes themes such as agriculture, tourism, value added in production and crafts. It also participates in the environmental management group and as a member of the overall CACH coordinating group. The regional (departmental) government of Chalatenango does not form part of the coordinating group, although it does participate in some of the working groups. Local municipal governments participate on more of a technical level in the different working groups.

A vision also exists for the CACH to become a space that deals with more regional themes such as infrastructure programs that affect local and regional development (examples include the longitudinal highway program, the reservoir, hydroelectric dams, etc.). CACH could be seen to have some weight in representing certain actors on these themes.

Capacity development is conceived of as strengthening actors to participate in representative spaces—and in the process ‘become strengthened’ by demanding services, and by articulating interests, in an organic territorial manner. Specific capacity strengthening strategies might include:

- Legitimating the space by increasing its utilization in dealing with territorial issues
- Preparing marginalized actors to be present and participate in key meetings
- Identifying ‘dynamic’ (e.g. tourism) or strategic themes (e.g. strengthening the technical staff of the municipal environmental units (UAM)) to place on the agenda
- Actively participating in the current priority theme of the allocation and use of “seasonally-available lands”

The territories in Honduras and Chile also have a vision to legitimate and strengthen spaces, but there are no preexisting spaces or mechanisms in which different actors convene to develop a territorial vision, and where traditionally marginalized groups could participate. Notwithstanding, both territorial teams are planning on creating that space through a participatory process (see Boxes 3 and 4). The need for a space in Chile seems to relate to the C1 main hypothesis: “A large public investment in the provision of public and semi-public goods was needed for the enormous productive transformation that widely benefitted the region’s households”. The focus on the importance of public investment is in line with the component result of presenting a territorial investment agenda to the regional government of O’Higgins. A legitimate actor would be needed to do this (the territorial team could not present these demands as a project), hence the need for a multiactor mechanism.
Honduras is similar to O’Higgins in that a representative multiactor platform with a more regional character does not currently exist — and the space that does exist—the “mancomunidad norte”—is considered to be a politically closed space.

“The problem is that there is no convening space that promotes the participation of the different local actors, coalitions or institutions, and above all, marginalized / excluded sectors. In other words, there is no articulating space that deals with dealing with issues of territorial importance. Although the mancomunidad convenes the mayors to deal with themes in common, the mechanism excludes other important sectors in the territory” (Tel com. Pedro Quiel).

Since spaces are lacking in Honduras, the territorial teams will support the creation of one with a structure to be determined by participants. The Red para el Desarrollo Sostenible (RDS, see Box 3) can play an important role in facilitating this space, and would make sure that the local mayors are taken into consideration for convening the space and participating in its coordinating mechanisms. There is a model in Costa Rica that could be borrowed — community territorial development action groups—which represent various sectors of the territory (paraphrased from interview notes with Pedro Quiel).

**Box 3—strengthening key actors in a multiactor space in Honduras**

The Sustainable Development Network (RDS) would help raise consciousness in key actors on the importance of participating in a newly formed multiactor space, in order to value the benefit of its usage. They would strengthen these actors to be prepared at the table, in a parallel manner, as the space is being developed. The process will essentially be to convene meetings to sensitize actors to themes, do some Social Network Analysis (SNA), and try to generate territorial identity over the area that currently encompasses three municipalities (tel. comm. with Pedro Quiel).

**Box 4—Developing a tactical multiactor space in O’Higgins**

“The achievement of adequate territorial management capacities (for a widespread social benefit of productive transformation achieved by irrigation and highway infrastructure) requires strengthening the attributes of social actors that allow for dialogue, the search for solutions, decision making, the feasibility of successfully implementing agreements and plans that overcome problems and take advantage of opportunities”. (Informe de Avance Hito 2, January 2010)

Strengthening these capacities is problematic in O’Higgins because the region lacks territorial organizational structures that can articulate needs, interests and broader territorial aspirations. Therefore, the program aim is to generate a multiactor platform in place by the end of the C2 phase that is capable of making a concrete demand on the regional government.

At this moment the Platform is designed for tactical purposes—i.e. to produce a regional investment plan to be presented to the regional government. However, if it works and the participating actors are able to elaborate and present an investment agenda to the regional government, the RTD Chile team believes it is feasible to suppose that this platform could become a territorial actor that follows through on territorial agreements. In other words, it could survive if the key actors take interest in it. Currently, the 4 mayors of the region are optimistic, and the regional government is somewhat skeptical. The program is betting that the regional government will want to keep investing after the program period is over. (Paraphrased from interview notes with Eduardo Ramirez)
Commentary

In the case of the CACH, an implicit assumption appears to be that strengthened local social actors (in advocacy, planning, etc.) will increase political will, public policy and overall institutional frameworks for discussing these themes. The strengthening of a multiactor space—CACH in this case—may generate better “push”, with more clear strategies, more unified actors, a more legitimate space, and better articulated proposals (including “investment plans”). Certainly this might influence political will. But does it fundamentally alter the power balances that underlie the existing “lack of political will” (and its roots beyond the formal public sector)? Perhaps the territorial teams could make more explicit that certain governmental actors and the powerful constituencies that influence their decisions, also need to be strengthened and influenced—even if primarily through the CACH. Making this explicit is also important given that local municipal management, along with the policies and programs carried out in the territory, is thought to be the key factor explaining increased income distributions—indeed independent of remittances or the natural resource base. In other words, another territorial dynamic is high municipal government capacity to support positive change, which could be considered in a CD territorial strategy.

In the case of O’Higgins, an assumption appears to be that if the multiactor platform exists and functions, influence will emerge organically in that space, and that the actors will increase their capacity (and motivation) to influence via their participation in this space. Another assumption is that a regional investment plan will be well received by the O’Higgins government, who will perhaps be interested in continuing working through this space, including co-financing its operation.

“It will be a great accomplishment if the program has been able to initiate a process that shows the regional government some of the benefits of working in this way—maybe even lending itself to replication” (Eduardo Ramirez).

In our interview Eduardo Ramirez of RIMISP Chile expressed worries that the elections in March could bring change and discontinuity. He also expressed that it would be problematic if the private sector does not become interested, or the investment agenda that is designed does not generate political interest in taking it seriously.

Perhaps the largest risk for this strategy, in my estimation, is the difficulty in generating a space from the ground up. Eduardo Ramirez describes what is proposed in more detail:

“Begin by identifying key actors in the region and document their interpretations of their territory and its dynamics. This should include an identification of aspirations for the future, as well as identification on motivation of specific actors to work collaboratively and participate in a territorial process. Special effort will be made to identify most marginalized groups (rural salaried, poor farmers, specific interest groups) and strengthen them to arrive at the table with well-elaborated proposals and with increased negotiation capacity. Specific capacity strengthening activities in the construction of the platform include internships, consultancies, diagnostics, meetings, etc. The platform itself is a series of meetings (including workshops or conferences) that Rimisp facilitates but local governments co-convene. The main output of this process is the development of an investment agenda to be presented to the regional government of O’Higgins by July-August timeframe“.

Innovation is an important part of the CD work within the RTD program. But for innovations to have a chance, conditions for their success need to be assessed, as well as possible. I raise the O’Higgins
strategy as a potentially risky one, given the uncertainty on whether enabling conditions exist for developing this platform. Important questions to consider for territorial contexts as O’Higgins are: What conditions need to be in place so that a multiactor space might come together and function effectively? Why do these conditions currently not exist? Does the CD work address these conditions or just to get the space running? Although a different context, these questions would also be worth asking in Honduras.

4.3 Bridging and strengthening actors and interests in key spaces

A recurring strategy that is discussed in most of the territories is the idea of “adding on” capacity development in an existing priority theme (that already has support). For example, in the case of the Cerron Grande reservoir program in El Salvador, Prisma (the NGO implementing the CD work) seeks an important known theme, e.g. the utilization of seasonably available lands, and a legitimate space, e.g. the Interinstitutional Committee of the Cerrón Grande Wetlands, where the theme can be debated. Its plan is to then offer a technical study that can help bring actors together around better information in a participatory planning process. This process can also identify capacity needs and broader contextual factors that need consideration. In this example, Prisma is already very active in this space, participating in discussions on key themes such as industrial contamination, equitable access to the seasonally available wetlands, and other RTD issues. (Paraphrased from interview notes with the El Salvador team)

Prisma also has a vision for strengthening the technical leadership of the newly established municipal environmental units (UAM). These units are charged with carrying out a municipal mandate on production and sustainable management, generated through PADEMA (see Box 2). On a basic level the technical leaders need new capacities to carry out this particular function. But the Prisma team sees the UAM as a unique space for influencing RTD at multiple levels. Because of the widespread presence of the UAM, Prisma envisions the UAM as a strategically placed actor that can act as a convening space that links local actors and themes to regional and national themes being dealt with in CACH, for example. These spaces are also seen as strategic because of their potential to generate more social inclusion. Currently, Prisma believes that marginalized groups do not participate in territorial development for different reasons: e.g. lack of awareness of their existence, irrelevant subject matter being treated, or due to practical difficulties such as distance and cost (paraphrased from interview notes with the El Salvador team). The idea is that by working through the UAM—a space that is closer to the people and with themes more relevant to their realities—some of the self-exclusion could be reduced.

Prisma is proposing a training course that includes various themes and capacities for the UAM technical workers and other people from related governmental ministries. According to the Prisma team members of the UAM will need technical, methodological, anthropological-social, and convening and facilitation capacities. But they also need critical thinking that challenges conservation-centric paradigms.

Commentary

If this is the strategy, Prisma might consider articulating how training and the other activities proposed with UAM technical staff contribute to the purpose of strengthening the UAM as a multi-
actor convening space. For example, would it be as a pilot, with explicit objectives from the beginning? With many participants at the same time or starting with strategically-placed, highly motivated technical leaders? And within what time frame? Who else thinks this is a good idea? Considering the time frame and the complexity of what is being proposed this highly innovative idea should be further analyzed.

4.4 Strengthening marginalized groups

In Nicaragua there seems to be a clear intention to work with marginalized groups—the C1 program team interviewees seem to take much pride in their research methodology that specifically targets the poor. Although all the territorial teams mention the importance of including these groups, I did not hear any specific strategies that were to be used for doing so.

Commentary

It appears that a focus on the poor and marginalized sectors is mentioned in all the cases because the program prioritizes it. However, when territorial teams are focusing on getting the project running and achieving other results during the C2 component period, developing a thoughtful strategy on social inclusion presents many challenges. For example, in O’Higgins Eduardo Ramirez stressed the importance of ensuring that private sector actors are present at the table; otherwise, the legitimacy of the new space is in question. So should the O’Higgins team focus on getting traditionally marginalized groups to the table, only to find themselves expressing their interests in a space where the private sector power brokers are not present? In other words, is it realistic to think that, given the time frame and resources, the territorial teams can bring marginalized groups to the table and motivate the private sector to participate, and then have both sides express their interests openly and arrive at an investment plan with a pro-poor agenda? I am not suggesting that it is impossible to prioritize both, but that doing so would require much creativity, time and resources.

I did not find in the program documents, nor hear in any of the interviews how the territorial teams planned on getting marginalized and traditionally excluded groups to the table or strengthening these actors. The RTD program needs to make clearer how these actors can be strengthened to challenge the power structures that perpetuate their social/economic status. History suggests that more is involved than getting them to the table, and even this is a challenge. Clearly the teams are thinking about this, but it is an area where visions and strategies could be made more explicit.
5. Observations on the emerging conceptualization of CD

5.1 The actors-spaces-interests-capacities-influence model

“This isn’t a model that you can apply in the same way in each territory. At the end of the day you’re intervening with real actors, with distinct processes in each of the territories, with particular conflicts, and with power relationships that first need to be understood if we are to get the actors involved to the table. From there we need to be a bit careful and set goals that are feasible, even if modest, but that show that actors with increased negotiation capacities and better information are able to achieve progress for their territory”. (tel com. Francisco Aguirre)

Although messages like the one above emphasizing that C2 processes needed to be customized to territorial realities have been sent to the territorial teams, they sit alongside parallel messages detailing results and methodologies, and the requirement of standardization across countries. These guidelines clearly state that they are not intended to be followed to the letter of the law; rather to generate consistency in execution over several countries. Nevertheless, the effect seems to be an operational insistence to implement what I am calling the “actors-spaces-interests-capacities-influence” concept. I summarize the concept as follows:

Key actors and interests are joined in a legitimate, functioning multiactor space, ideally with regional criteria introduced (as regional themes that bring people together or as findings from C1). Within the space, a more precise identification of specific needs and capacities occurs, as does planning to address those themes and capacities. This leads to:

a) a coalescence of demands on powerful actors outside (e.g. regional governments or private sector actors), or within the space (e.g. participating decision making authorities);

b) an identification of capacity and influencing needs, and capacity strengthening interventions; and

c) an ongoing legitimating of the space itself as a territorial actor that represents these under-represented issues.

Actual demands are presented through two advocacy strategies—1) by presenting demands on a municipal or regional government who is “external” to the space; and/or 2) by preparing marginalized groups to represent themselves and their interests in the multiactor space itself. Both strategies assume that whatever emerges from the space will have uptake from key decision makers or influential actors; or at least that the space will become an active, effective mechanism in challenging territorial actors to address RTD concerns.

This concept seems guide all the cases with the exception of Ecuador, where it exists in a different configuration. The concept closely mirrors the methodological guidelines offered by the RTD regional team, which lays out a series of steps with the following logic:

a) Identify territorial dynamics as the basis for CD strategies (beginning from C1 results);
b) Identify key territorial actors

c) Identify appropriate (i.e. “ideal”) multiactor spaces;

d) Develop a regional territorial development plan, including investment priorities to present to key public actors (who are not necessarily in charge of the whole territory);

e) Prioritize capacity development and influencing to make sure marginalized groups are at the table.

The close alignment between the methodological guidelines and the actual planned strategies on the ground seems to be related to two sets of pressures. First, there is the expectation that C2 work be based on C1 results, even when C1 results were just being processed as C2 was beginning. And second, because of the expediency associated with the need to achieve predetermined results within a tight timeline and very limited budget (as conveyed by territorial teams in the interviews). Regardless of what might emerge from C1, even if it could have been processed quickly, the territorial teams were clear about the expectations set by the C2 results at the territorial level.  

Alignment between methodological guidelines and planned strategies is obviously not a bad thing in and of itself. Guidelines can be very helpful and necessary in communicating broad intentions, offering potential methods and pathways, and promoting some level of consistency across different teams and locations. Some level of this is clearly necessary in this program and the intentions seem to be precisely this (see Box 5). I only raise issue as worth analyzing further because guidelines issued under pressure can have the opposite effect and be interpreted as fixed set of instructions. So I offer this just as a light precaution to make sure that the territorial teams really feel empowered to develop their strategies based on emerging realities on the ground.

5.2 Shifting to learning about territorial “capacity” dynamics

The RTD concept is complex and innovative. To my knowledge, little has been written on how CD could or should be strategically placed in a RTD program in a way that doesn’t strengthen capacities

---

Box 5—The importance of differentiating goals

“The main problem isn’t the lack of conceptual clarity. Yes, that needs improvement, but the overall concept is similar and generally understood by all. “How can we strengthen key actors—within their local realities and their current capacities to influence territorial policies—to increase their voice, in a more informed manner, and improve their ability to act as brokers between public and private actors and interests”? The main issue is differentiation of goals, because each territory has different priorities and levels of cohesiveness and momentum on RTD issues. In Tungurahua, with its advanced planning processes, a CD goal might be to support the government to negotiate a regional agricultural strategy at the national level. This is a contribution than can be done in the immediate term because they are clear on their vision. In the case of O’Higgins, or Honduras, this would be highly unlikely to be achieved even in a year. Not because we wouldn’t like to, but in a territory that has no multi-actor platform and no territorial-level discussions, we can’t hope to achieve a grand level of influence in the highest levels of government and key private sector actors in the short term. Again, not for lack of desire; rather because we need to go forward with care, beginning with what is in place, and set goals that are possible to achieve—because if we don’t we’re going to be frustrated. (Francisco Aguirre)
generically; rather, in such a way that stimulates territorial dynamics. How CD relates to RTD is something that needs testing and constructing, which perhaps is what the C2 focus ought to have been, and still could be in some cases. *How should CD be conceptualized in a RTD framework* is a research question that the DTR program could usefully be asking itself through action research in conjunction with the C1 and C2 teams.

In Chile, for example, the program seems to be conceiving CD as a process of regional awareness-raising on the importance of equitable spaces for articulating local and territorial interests. CD is also specifically about creating room for marginalized voices at the table. The strategy for this is through constructing and legitimizing this space—recognizing that the space is a vacuum if there are no actors with the capacity (or desire) to organize and present demands; and if there are no mechanisms and incentives to make the platform seem something practical. To some extent time and resources will influence how far along this pathway of change the work in O’Higgins can go. But known and unknown capacity dynamics will also influence what is possible, regardless of time and resources, and I believe that studying this capacity component more closely would yield important insights into RTD.

A possible avenue for the CD work to contribute to operationalization the RTD vision is by seeking to understand the territorial *capacity* dynamics. In other words, what configurations of actors, in specific processes make sense at a given moment in time to invest in, strengthen or accompany? It would be more of a demonstrative act than a strategy to create big change. The RTD program is driven by an important assumption that people’s capacities need strengthening in order to increase their ability to use high quality information in stimulating positive territorial dynamics. This may perhaps be validated through the six territorial experiences. However, given specific territorial dynamics, zooming in on an immediate capacity strategy may well be generic, premature, or overly complex.

I believe a key question is: *what interventions should follow a C1 process in a particular territory?* An initial reaction to this question might be that it takes us back to the age old problems of how research gets into use in any research program. But what makes this process more specific and potentially unique is that we’re saying we focus efforts not generically around a theme (e.g. health or environment), or a political geographic unit (e.g. municipal government), but around territorial dynamics that lend themselves, if understood, to generating virtuous development cycles. An important product of the C2 process could be the participatory design of possible strategies for doing this. What development strategies might support territorial dynamics in XXX territory? This could include demonstrative CD, but as a learning and strategy design process.

Currently within the RTD concept and proposal there appear to be mixed messages on the purpose of C2, as well as its breadth and depth of scope. For example, is the C2 component meant to be the capacity development implementation arm of the RTD program, or an action research component of an overall learning program, or both? The original proposal (p 36) largely framed C2 as a learning component, mainly supporting “Social Learning Programs about strategies, policies, and institutional and organizational arrangements that can affect rural territorial dynamics so that they are more

---

**Box 6**—At what level should RTD capacity development be carried out?

One interviewee put forward that perhaps capacity development in a RTD framework is most feasibly done as national level advocacy—not territorial capacity development. While this represents one viewpoint, it might be insightful regarding the levels at which research results can be
conducive to outcomes of economic growth, social inclusion and sound environmental governance”. There was also a focus on “learning alliances and partnerships acting at the regional level, involving e.g. local, regional and national government, local universities, regional development agencies and programs, social movements, and rural women’s organizations, with a view to scaling up lessons and promoting public dialogue at a regional scale about rural development”. But many of the interviewees stated that they believed C2 to be exclusively focused on capacity for development impact.

A development intervention approach is perfectly compatible with a learning approach, but requires a very careful balance given the limited budget and timeframe—the balance between these two should be reexamined. If C2 is more a classic “capacity development as a means for development impact” program (albeit within an interesting research-informed RTD concept) then, considering the considerable delays in implementation, efforts by the territorial teams may well focus on scrambling to figure out how to quickly strengthen capacities to achieve some of the desired results. There is less clear guidance—hardly any in the documentation so far—to guide the territorial teams in seeing their work as action research. Results are framed in terms of numbers of poor involved, investment plans formulated, platforms generated, and not, for example, in terms of insights about the role of CD for operationalizing the RTD concept. The focus on development outcomes was confirmed by three of the territorial teams interviewed. If, on the other hand, the focus is on learning and building up a “solid methodological approach...” over five years, then it might make more sense to go smaller and test strategic CD interventions in order to learn more about the role of CD in RTD. As such, C2 would not be simply the application of CB interventions as in a typical development program; but C2 as “action research for RTD”. And methodologically the program would need to ask what types of action research would help us learn about the role of CD in territorial dynamics, in each specific territory.19

The pursuit of “development impact” becomes important for its ability to generate learning, which would go hand in hand with the research focus of C1. This would lead to an adjustment in expected results. For example, I have made some modifications [in bold brackets] to the results from Box 8—Results of component 2, from the original proposal:

- [We have a better conceptual and methodological understanding of ways in which the poor and the socially excluded in the territories that make up the program’s network, can have a greater voice and participation in key territorial development processes and programs.]
- [We have a better conceptual and methodological understanding of the actors, processes, spaces, methodologies, resources and capacities (as well as other enabling conditions) that are needed to effectively promote rural territorial dynamics that lead to economic growth, social inclusion and sound environmental governance.]
- The stakeholders in the territories that make up the program’s network utilize the results of the research component as well as the new capacities acquired or strengthened with the support of the program, to improve the design and implementation of their development programs.
- The researchers in the program critically reflect about their research methods, results and products, at the light of the outcomes of their utilization (or not) in the capacity-building activities of the program.
- A broad audience or stakeholders in LAC, is informed about those approaches and practices of rural territorial development in the territories that make up the program’s network.

19 And perhaps territorial “types” as well, as proposed by Bebbington et al, 2008: 2880.
To support this, each C1 study could be critically reviewed to ask the question, from the perspective of the C2 “stakeholder”:

- What are the conditions for rural development from a RTD perspective in this particular context?
- What types of actors (prime movers), processes and interventions might stimulate RTD in this context?
- In what spaces?
- What role should capacity development play in this?
- What are the other enabling conditions?

### 5.3 Time and money

Interviewees from all 5 of the territories mentioned their worry about what they considered to be an extremely short project timeframe (9-18 months were the time ranges cited) and a very small budget of $40,000 for the entire component (consistently mentioned by all interviewees) in relation to their perception of the scale of what is being expected. Capacity development and development literature in general is full of examples and warnings to avoid promising ambitious results on short timeframes when most factors are outside the control of the program or program. If this is the case in the RTD program then perhaps some of the expectations of results might be tempered, or focused on the learning approach mentioned in 5.2.
6. Update on CD advances through June 2010

6.1 Introduction

When I carried out the majority of the interviews in January (and wrote the draft report in early February) the different territorial project teams were at different points in C2 planning and execution. In Olancho (Honduras), primarily due to the national-level political conflict, the CD work had not begun other than initial planning and there was a lot of uncertainty as to when full implementation would actually begin. In el Macizo Peñas Blancas (Nicaragua) C2 work had also not begun, but significant planning by the Nitlapán project team was proceeding alongside with similar planning for the applied research (C1) component. In O’Higgins (Chile), initial implementation was also about to begin, and the planning was perhaps a bit more advanced than in Honduras and Nicaragua. In Chalatenango (El Salvador), the C2 team had developed relationships with key actors and had a clear plan of activities, most of which would begin in earnest after an assembly meeting of the Environmental Committee of Chalatenango scheduled to meet later in January. And in Tungurahua (Ecuador), the C2 representative Edwin Sánchez was formally a part of an external technical team that was actively supporting the provincial government’s development strategy, and was also already accompanying key actors in the dairy and uvilla fruit value chains.

The point is that at the time I carried out the interviews for the first draft of this report capacity development activities had not begun in earnest in four of the five territories. So while the interviews were designed to answer the central report question of “how "capacity building" is being understood and shaped within the RTD program, two years into the program’s implementation”, the responses in the interviews were mostly based on plans and intentions, and not on actual activities. Thus, the main purpose of this update is to continue to answer the core report question, but now with the benefit of on-the-ground activities having been carried out from January through June of this year.

The interviewees for this update were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Territory</th>
<th>Interviewees and date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tungurahua, Ecuador</td>
<td>Pablo Ospina, June 23rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalatenango, El Salvador</td>
<td>Wilfredo Morán, June 28th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elías Escobar, June 28th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macizo Peñas Blancas, Nicaragua</td>
<td>Edgard Castillo Rivas, June 29th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Francisco Perez, June 30th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olancho, Honduras</td>
<td>Pedro Quiel, June 28th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenda Pineda, June 28th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Higgins, Chile</td>
<td>Eduardo Ramirez sent a half page of responses to the interview questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All interviews were carried out by phone (Skype). For Ecuador I also intended to interview Edwin Sánchez, but he did not respond to repeated requests for an interview. For the regional team I intended to interview Manuel Chiriboga during my June visit to Ecuador (I was there for other purposes) but we were not able to find a time to meet.
The primary interview questions were as follows:

1) How is the capacity development work progressing?
   a. What activities are you currently focusing on?
   b. What do you feel is going particularly well?
   c. What challenges are you facing, if any?

2) What are you currently achieving and what do you hope to achieve by the end of the project in the area of capacity development?

3) Specifically how are traditionally marginalized groups being included and participating in project activities

4) What are you learning so far about the relationship between capacity development and rural territorial dynamics?

The methodology followed for this update was as follows:

- I carried out phone interviews in Spanish.
- I transcribed the interviews and lightly edited them for flow and to eliminate redundancies
- I send out the edited transcriptions to the interviewees asking for feedback and editing21.
- I translated into English and assembled the key messages from each team into this report

The remainder of this update section is organized as follows:

- In section 6.2 I briefly present the activities that each territorial team was focused on at the time of the November 2009 and January 2010 interviews, along with an update on current activities—including their own commentary on things that are going particularly well, and things that are presenting more challenges
- In section 6.3 I share a combination of emerging and desired CD outcomes for each territory
- In section 6.4, I share how traditionally marginalized groups are being included and participating in project activities
- In section 6.5 I present what project teams said they are learning so far about the relationship between capacity development and rural territorial dynamics
- In section 6.6 I share some brief concluding comments on emerging conceptualizations on capacity development

6.2 Current CD activities in the different territories

In January of 2010, 4 of the 5 territorial teams were in the process of planning or beginning CD activities, and the Tungurahua team was further along in CD implementation. In this section I present a brief review of the activities that each team was working on at that time, along with an update of current activities—including areas of momentum and challenges.

21 I received detailed feedback and editing from all four territorial teams that I had interviewed.
Chalatenango, El Salvador

**Background**

In January the RTD project team from the local NGO Prisma was participating in the process to bring the Chalatenango Departmental Environmental Management Plan (PADEMA) up to date (see Box 2) within the framework and mechanisms of the Environmental Committee of Chalatenango (CACH). This included mobilizing local actors to participate in the process, and maintaining an active presence in key CACH committees and meetings in order to give input into the PADEMA process from a territorial lens. In general, Prisma was trying to mobilize and strengthen local organizations to participate in multi-actor spaces such as CACH to generate environmental management plans responding to local needs. The three main strategies being conceived of at this time were:

- Targeted strengthening of CACH as an ideal space for linking local and regional priorities with national support processes and systems
- Strengthening the technical managers of the municipal environmental management units (UAM)
- Actively facilitating important territorial themes in CACH and similar existing spaces such as the Intersectoral Committee of the Cerrón Grande Wetlands (CIHCG)

The project is still focusing on these three strategies, as detailed below:

**Targeted strengthening of CACH**

Prisma has been actively accompanying CACH activities and the PADEMA “Plan” is now updated. However, in the process Prisma and the other participants realized that, being a strategic plan, it needed additional work to make it actionable and operational. Towards those ends they are currently developing a PADEMA “development agenda”, based on the priorities of each sub-committee. This will be included as an annex with a year’s worth of detailed activities, projects and programs that ground the overall strategic framework.

Another development with regards to Prisma’s accompaniment of CACH has been an MOU that is being developed between CACH and the Ministry of the Environment (MARN) to “…improve environmental conditions and integrated development, particularly in the areas of environmental territorial planning, identification and response to official complaints of environmental abuses, and mutual support of in the management of technical resources”22. This MOU is particularly important because it develops an immediate advocacy link between the multi-actor platform CACH and an important central government ministry. This also lends more clout to the CACH as a legitimate space for dealing with territorial themes, in spite of the fact that the CACH is an ad hoc forum and not a legally registered representative organization. Lastly this is important because this MOU is the framework through which the MARN validates the capacity development process of the municipal environmental management units, described in the following section.

---

22 Taken from the document “Carta de Entendimiento entre el Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales y El Comité Ambiental de Chalatenango”, page 3 of 6 (File name: Carta de Entendimiento entre el cach y el marn 100610.doc).
Strengthening the technical managers of the municipal environmental units (UAM)

The idea to work with the UAM technical managers is part of Prisma’s cascade strategy\(^{23}\), as explained by Wilfredo Morán:

“We have a cascade strategy. We have neither the resources, nor time, nor personnel to accompany each group of producers or actors in the territory. This is why we are focusing on those actors which can have multiplier effects and why we are putting so much emphasis on the technical managers of the municipal environmental units (UAM), as well as the technical workers of the National Center of Agricultural and Forest Technology (CENTA), who are responsible for advising and technical assistance in the region” \(^{24}\)

The work has now begun with an initial workshop surveying training needs from the perspective of the participating managers. In this workshop 16 out of a total possible of 26 managers were present, in addition to two mayors. The managers that did not participate were consulted through a written survey to make sure their input was included for the subsequent program design. The proposed training themes are as follows\(^{25}\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Uses of GPS and validation of the thematic foci of the CD process</th>
<th>6) Forest fires</th>
<th>11) Facilitation tools for participatory environmental management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Basic ecology</td>
<td>7) Environmental education</td>
<td>12) Developing project profiles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Risk prevention and mitigation</td>
<td>8) Integrated management of water resources</td>
<td>13) GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Integrated management of solid wastes and composting</td>
<td>9) Environmental legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Responsibilities and functioning of the UAM</td>
<td>10) Environmental complaints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On June 29\(^{26}\) the proposal was validated in a workshop which included the first training session on “Uses of GPS and validation of the thematic foci of the CD process”. Process-wise in the workshop it was agreed to carry out one theme per month for the following 12 months (email communication from Elias Escobar, July 19\(^{th}\)).

Strengthening and accompaniment of the Intersectoral Committee of the Cerrón Grande Wetlands (CIHCG)

The CIHCG exists to help determine the appropriate and equitable uses of the seasonably available Cerrón Grande wetlands (also see section 4.3). With the CIHCG the overall focus is on strengthening the Committee as well as actively participating in development themes that are being addressed by the Committee. Themes being addressed include agricultural production and commercialization,

\(^{23}\) Also see section 4.2 for more of Prisma’s intentions with the UAM.

\(^{24}\) From the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG)

\(^{25}\) Taken from the document “Temario para el proceso de desarrollo de capacidades para Técnicos de las Unidades Ambientales Municipales de Chalatenango”, page 1 of 1 (File name: Temario validado.doc)
industrial contamination, and negotiation for more equitable access to these lands for fishing and bamboo production—which offers economic opportunities for marginalized groups. What capacity strengthening does Prisma do in this committee?

“Accompaniment of the many assembly processes in addition to the facilitation of various sub-committees. We are facilitating the spaces where problems are identified and we provide responses... But when we are in charge of a facilitation group the people participate and learn how to facilitate these things. So beyond our facilitation there is the experience that people get from practice. Although it isn’t a training workshop per se, in each activity the people leave with a wealth of new experiences. We think of it as strengthening through facilitation and accompaniment” (Wilfredo).

Wilfredo also adds that when Prisma began working with the CIHCG, “there was just a coordinator and a secretary, and when there were problems with transportation, for example, the whole thing came to a halt”. Today there is a coordinating group (CG) with participation from 6 organizations, including Prisma. Before each assembly the CG meets to set an agenda and Prisma facilitates the CIHGH strengthening working group.

Prisma is currently facilitating and accompanying a process with the fishing sector in response to issues that they identified through a problem identification workshop. Of the issues identified, they are currently focusing on two: 1) overconsumption of fish by the “pig duck” species (pato chancho) and 2) supporting the legal constitution of fishing cooperatives.

Overconsumption of fish by the “pig duck” species
In the problem identification workshop the fishermen mentioned that there was a species of duck that was competing with their fishing. As Elias explains, “we did a study of the duck’s diet and we found that in fact there are 30,000 ducks, and if we estimate a daily consumption of half a pound of fish, it became very significant. At least the preliminary results revealed that the duck is causing losses to the fishing sector, and we have now begun population control activities because they are growing exponentially”.

Supporting the legalization of fishing cooperatives
Prisma is working with overall organizing of the wetlands fishing sector, identifying productive projects that can qualify for financing through a trust fund that fishing cooperatives are able to access. The problem is that only legally constituted cooperatives can access the fund; thus the challenge is to constitute more fishermen into formal cooperatives. Prisma, in coordination with the other institutions working in the CIHCG, is supporting the legalization of cooperatives.

“There are now 11 legally constituted cooperatives and we are in the process of creation of the first federation of fishing cooperatives in continental waters. In El Salvador there are already two federations, but for sea fishing. This would be the first at the wetlands level” (Elias).

---

26 The CG is made up of Cendepesca, MARN, the municipality of San Francisco de Lenpa, the UAM of Potonico, PRISMA, and a University from the area—six institutions overall. It is similar to the CACH in that it doesn’t have a legal structure; rather it works as a convening forum for identifying and responding to problems.
Elías also added that the process is going well, in part because of active coordination with the Ministry of Agriculture27, who is helping in the consolidation process of the federation.

**Other activities**

Prisma has also carried out a consultancy on the commercialization of organic papaya. This consultancy is sort of an overlap between CACH and CIHCG because it was carried out just to the north of the seasonal wetlands, but within the framework of productive lands that CACH addresses through PADEMA. The idea is to see how this particular fruit responds and then apply the process to other products in the region.

“First we will present the results to the technical staff of CENTA. We’ve also done a workshop with CENTA staff to problematize the current agricultural model and its relevance for the dynamics of this territory” (Elías).

Prisma has also carried out an exchange between professors from higher-education tourism schools within its role as facilitator of the CACH economic restructuring committee. Prisma is accompanying the national working group on rural community tourism in order to advocate the importance of this theme for territorial dynamics on the national agenda.

**Momentum and challenges**

Overall Wilfredo and Elías perceive that things are going well, with major activities moving in the intended direction, albeit not exactly on the planned schedule. Wilfredo sums up the complexity of the situation:

“In these processes you can never have a millimetric compliance with what you plan, because you don’t have control of all the variables. One example was the workshop with the technical staff of CENTA. All of a sudden the minister resigns, which meant we had to begin our negotiations anew and move the dates. There has also been extraordinary inclement weather which has generated problems. With the MARN for example, when there are emergencies that becomes their priority, and we’re just entering into the rainy season... But we’re satisfied with the advances we’ve had with the CACH, with the UAM and the wetlands. The most important processes that we included in our CD proposal we believe are moving ahead nicely”.

The biggest challenge the Prisma team is facing is in challenging and changing outmoded ways of seeing the world and operating that they believe are no longer relevant to current territorial dynamics. Wilfredo believes that the current mental models of many of the technical personnel hearken back to the green revolution, focused on “conventional agriculture which removed control from farmers and disappeared peasant farming”. When new guidelines or policies come about to prioritize giving more attention to marginalized groups, it is difficult to translate that into real changes on the ground because the relevant technical staff “has been working for the last 20 years favoring producers with machinery, on flat lands, with irrigation and access to credits”. Wilfredo continues:

---

27 Specifically the “Departamento de Asociaciones Agropecuarias” of the “Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería (MAG)”.
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“Now when they realize that they need to attend to new groups they continue working as before, with little to offer these groups. There are alternative models that aren’t taught in the main universities and are not usually researched in the traditional agricultural research centers. [The problem is] methodological as well, not only technical. The vertical nature of the green revolution needs to be dismantled. An alternative model is needed that values people’s experiences and encourages horizontal knowledge exchange—tacit knowledge that most technical staff doesn’t learn in the universities. We need to challenge and change paradigms”.

Wilfredo also offers an example of how these outdated mental models exist with high level functionaries as well. He cites the example of the current Ministry of Tourism whose strategy he classifies as essentially one of “cruise ships, sun and beaches”. This is problematic for adding rural community tourism to the national tourism agenda because it is seen as insignificant through the lenses of a cruise ship worldview. This quickly becomes a practical problem as the representatives of the Ministry in the CACH are not very active in the assembly meetings, and even if they were they don’t have real influence with their supervisors in the ministry.

“So they hold tight to the guidelines issued by their superiors. This is why this is the case in which we are most keen to prioritize our advocacy efforts. Because the dominant tourism modality favors an elite group and not the majority, whereas rural community tourism tries to achieve a more equitable distribution of resources” (Wilfredo).

Prisma is therefore taking a dual approach to challenging these dominant inequitable worldviews.

- From the bottom up, with technical staff they work through training (formación) and capacity development. In the workshops for example, they focus on reflection in order to influence the development of alternative visions and question current hegemonic visions.
- At the level of ministries and high level functionaries they work through advocacy—for example through their facilitation and participation in the national rural community tourism roundtable.

To summarize, Prisma sees itself confronting the challenge of dominant worldviews through training / formation at the operational level, and through advocacy with the higher decision making spheres.

**Tungurahua, Ecuador**

**Background**

I conducted several interviews in November 2009 and January 2010, in addition to a field visit in November 2009. At that time the project was focusing on the following areas of activity:

- Accompaniment and strengthening of the agricultural value chains, with a focus on dairy products, potatoes and uvilla fruit.

---

28 Note: given that for Tungurahua the entire update is based on my interview with Pablo Ospina, I will not add his name in as a reference when I directly quote him in order to eliminate unnecessary redundancy. All “direct quotes” are attributed to Pablo.
— Supporting the provincial competitiveness agenda
— Supporting a provincial land use planning process based on territorial criteria

The agricultural value chain focus had two emphases: 1) the business side of each value chain—e.g. production processes, value chains, markets, branding, marketing, etc.; and 2) strengthening the associative capacity of specific product value chains. Both of these emphases directly supported the emerging provincial agricultural strategy, which was an ongoing process.

After my initial visit in November uvilla fruit had been dropped as a priority in exchange for working with potatoes. Pablo shared that this was because the uvilla market and value chain were very small and already had a consolidated leadership structure. As such, the team from the Universidad Andina (UA) felt that the RTD project could have more impact with the potato value chain. In January the team was also considering adding the agro ecological products (PACAT) value chain as well, because it was considered new and innovative. Also in the planning phase in January was a series of training modules to be offered at the UA to key leaders of each of the 6 major provincial value chains. This was to include an experiential exchange visit, but the specific themes were still in the planning phase.

With regards to the competitiveness agenda the project had contracted a consultant to support the development of the agenda. The purpose of this agenda was to strengthen the competitive position of the province within the country and in international markets. The agenda would encompass approximately 70 associations and 700 producers. And with regards to the provincial land use planning process, the project hoped to introduce more territorial thinking into the process, which had not yet begun in earnest.

The project is still supporting these three areas and has made significant progress in the first two. An update on each of the three:

**Accompaniment and strengthening of the agricultural value chains**

The project is now in full execution of the training (formación) course for the leaders of the associations of commercialization chains of Tungurahua—approximately 30 participants in total from 6 chains. This includes the courses and an exchange visit to see an experience on coffee commercialization in Loja, a province in southern Ecuador. The program is titled “Training Program for Strengthening the Productive Chains of Tungurahua” and the general objective is “to develop an academic formation program that empowers the socio-organizational and productive strengthening of the chains of producers of Tungurahua”29. The specific objectives are to:

— Analyze the rural and national agrarian contexts and the specific situation of Tungurahua

---

29 The source of all information in quotes regarding the formation program is the document: “Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar–Sede Ecuador –UASB-Programa de Formación para el Fortalecimiento de las Cadenas Productivas de Tungurahua”, pages 1 and 2.
Identify the socio-organizational situation of the chains of producers of Tungurahua to reflect upon the local “popular organization” (organización popular) and find mechanisms with which to strengthen it.

Analyze the economic situation of the chains of producers in Tungurahua with regards to production, distribution, commercialization and consumption, in order to determine proposals that improve and strengthen their activities.

With regards to the on-the-ground accompaniment process Edwin Sánchez has continued working with three value chains—potato, dairy and agro ecological products. He is working primarily with producers in the west of the province, which tend to be the groups with more economic difficulties, transportation challenges, problems with market access, etc. The accompaniment is designed to improve market access, production processes, and business quality standards. Pablo offers a pair of examples of Edwin’s accompaniment work:

“With potatoes Edwin is supporting the improved use of varieties of native potatoes that the market normally doesn’t demand—it normally only demands bigger, artificially “improved” varieties. One activity is to find ways of using native potatoes to make industrialized products such as potato chips, with sanitary registrations and all.

“Another recent activity was the debate that emerged from a design session for a new proposal to the complementary investment fund being offered by RIMISP. The types of things the producers demand are bags for potato chips, or improvement of delivery arrangements with hotels for milk—things of that nature. In that discussion we combined their priorities with priorities of our own, such as an evaluation of the associative process of each chain. It is important to combine these specific demands with the more general needs such as evaluation and territorial-level discussions, particularly in intervention processes involving peasant producers”.

Supporting the provincial competitiveness agenda

The main project activities in this area have concluded and the agenda has been approved. Since then the project team developed a proposal to the RIMISP advocacy fund to support the first phase of implementation of the agenda. The objectives of this project proposal are to:

1) Evaluate the results and the mechanisms utilized to promote associativity in the agricultural commercialization processes of Tungurahua, and make recommendations so that it may comply with its objectives of simultaneously promoting improved productivity and social equity; and

2) Support the initial installment and functioning of the technical team charged with implementing the competitiveness agenda... This systemic approach is necessary, as Pablo notes:

“The main problem with the agenda was never really what productive chain to support; rather, what institutional support and social commitment would permit that the agenda wouldn’t simply remain on paper? This is essentially the focus of our proposal to the RIMISP fund”.

30 Taken from the document “Apoyo al desarrollo de capacidades en Tungurahua, proyecto complementario”, page 3.

31
**Supporting a provincial land use planning process based on territorial criteria**

Pablo shared that the delays with the third area has a lot to do with the national political process. At the provincial level there is a consolidated Tungurahua Agricultural Strategy (EAT) team as well as a completed competitiveness agenda. “But the territorial theme is a much more thorny issue because of the changes that the national government wants to include in the legislation”.

**Momentum and challenges**

Overall Pablo expressed that the project team is very consistently executing the concrete activities that they set out to do, and in some cases even more. They initially proposed accompaniment of two value chains but are actually supporting three after having added the agro-ecological products (PACAT). This has turned out well also because the technical leaders from the PACAT chain are currently very active and adding value in the training program. Pablo is also pleased with the way his team his following through on project responsibilities. “We meet monthly and put together a serious planning and discussion session each time”.

With regards to challenges, and considering the political and social changes in Tungurahua, Pablo feels the team’s reflection and accompaniment are not sufficiently constant, and he gives two examples:

“There is a new balance of power of interventions between local governments and the national government. Before the national government was essentially absent—local governments and regional governments in particular were much stronger. Now, central government programs have increased at the provincial level... and this has caused somewhat of a division in participation, and the provincial priorities don’t always generate the same level of priority.

“Another example is with the restructuration of the technical teams of the agricultural strategy for the entire province. Now there are many more technical workers than before, when earlier there weren’t enough. This is a positive development that reveals more interest and depth, but on the other hand it makes coordination difficult between the different staff and teams... and technical leadership is not always clear”.

With regards to issues that are more within the realm of control of the project, Pablo expressed another challenge in the form of a question.

“How can the leaders that participate in the formation process replicate and share their...learning... with their own organizations? At this moment we don’t have tools or materials to give them that they can use immediately in their own communities at a farmer level—we only have materials for leaders. So, how can we generate a multiplier effect from this course? This is a challenge within our field of action but which I am not very sure if we are going to be capable of confronting”.
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El Macizo Peñas Blancas, Nicaragua

Background

At the time of the interviews in January Nitlapán had not begun CD activities and the applied research component was also at an early stage. Even today the two components are moving forward in a parallel manner (Edgard). Water was and remains the key territorial issue, as demonstrated by the project hypothesis: “The economic, distributional and environmental changes observed in the territory, and which will increase in the future, have been based on the competition for the use and control of land and water”. This was leading to a macro project strategy of “generating evidence for debate between key actors on key themes such as access to water, poverty and rural employment”, and advocating so that the “municipal governments of the territory [would] incorporate the management of the ecological Reserve and its consequences into their agendas”.

Potential issues at the time included protection of the Reserve as an important provider of environmental services for the neighboring municipalities, regulation of “dirty” coffee production and providing incentives for cleaner coffee production, and ecotourism as an alternative for increasing economic opportunities. Nitlapán was also actively looking for opportunities to incorporate the poor and other marginalized groups into territorial project activities.

The main actors being targeted in January were the three municipal governments that adjoin the Macizo—Cuá, La Dalia, and Rancho Grande. Additionally, there were two potential multiactor spaces that the project team was considering working with. The first, “the Association of Municipalities for the Management of the Macizo Peñas Blancas” is an active association in which the mayors, technical staff, and other personnel from the 5 local governments that make up the association participate. The second space was the Inter-municipal Committee for the Protection and Sustainable use of the Macizo Peña Blanca (“The Committee”), a currently inactive space but which remains open and has a history of participation from community representatives, the environment ministry (MARENA), NGOs, the police and other government ministries. MARENA was formally in charge of reactivating the committee. Ligia Gómez mentioned in January that the project was open to participation in both multi-actor platforms, but that reactivating the Comité seemed more feasible because the Association was seen mostly as a political space exclusive to governmental actors—i.e. probably not open enough to serve as a broader convening mechanism. Ligia further added that a desired outcome of the project would be that the Comité would come to be seen as an active and legitimate space—similar to the CACH in El Salvador—for convening actors and attending to the territorial development issues around poverty, water and land use.

“If we are able to generate this space and get it to work it would be a great contribution for the people that don’t have anywhere to go. When the big coffee or cattle producer has a problem he goes straight to the minister—he has somewhere to go—but the majority of the population no. The local governments do serve as a space for listening to the poor. But there are many themes in which there is confrontation that requires a multiactor platform to generate dialogue; and which could also serve as a mechanism for citizen oversight” (Ligia, January 2010).

31 These references taken from the document “Situación actual por territorio para el componente desarrollo de capacidades (actualizado hasta enero de 2010, compartido por Francisco Aguirre)”. This document is included as annex 3
In January it was still premature to have specific strategies and project activities. The details were expected to emerge in the following weeks.

**Current activities**

The project is currently working on activating discussion spaces in the three municipalities of project focus, and more intensively in la Dalia. The project is also working at a Comarca level—a territorial division smaller than municipal government. Initially the plan was to work with the three municipalities at the same time, in addition to the Comité, but local institutional factors were much more conducive to focus collaboration with la Dalia.

“For this reason we opted for the generation of a “mirror mayorship” in which the other two municipalities could see the advances that can be achieved via multiactor coordination” (Francisco). “From there we could advance with the other two” (Edgard).

In La Dalia earlier this year a negotiation process was facilitated between the municipality, local NGOs and central government institutions in order to generate a common environmental plan for the period May through October. The plan identified resources and geographic areas of focus for each institution, as well as a training plan. Training was important in order to take advantage of the offer by NGOs to offer training in important themes, including technical training on reforestation.

 Besides the activation of discussion spaces Nitlapán is currently working with neighborhood and Comarca leaders on environmental sanctions in the urban areas and reforestation in the rural areas. There are three components to the rural reforestation program:

- Training in environmental rights and infractions
- Technical training on reforestation
- Reforestation activities

With regards to urban environmental sanctions and awareness Nitlapán is working on a house to house campaign to reduce urban pollution and reward good practice in clean neighborhoods. This is part of a broader process that includes common activities between the municipal government of la Dalia and local NGOs. This discussion mainly takes place in an active municipal “cabinet” made up of municipal authorities, central government representatives, NGOs, youth organizations and other civil society organizations—primarily representing the coffee growers. This process will eventually include a territorial event (to include other municipalities, such as Estelí) to discuss municipal environmental ordinances. Common ordinances are needed because there are several municipalities that share the same ecological reserve (el Macizo). Specific communications products associated with the campaign include a local radio program and a brochure containing the main environmental laws and articles in the territory.

The project is still in a phase of identifying priority themes and is keen to find processes that are already ongoing to support. For example there is a youth network focused on sexual and reproductive health, as well as environmental themes. On the environmental side of things the project is supporting them in their own urban cleaning campaign. They also have a radio program and a theatrical group, with possibilities of having a local television program.

---

32 The Comarca is a territorial division smaller than the municipal government: Municipio → Comarca (made up of various communities) → villa (community) → houses
“We have been helping them more at the conceptual level and with more global information in order to broaden their horizons. We are also strengthening their technical capacities in communication, radio and theater. And we have agreed to provide video materials that they can then distribute through local television” (Edgard).

Edgard also shared that the project is supporting La Dalia with strategic communications on economic development and territorial identity issues.

“We’re helping to communicate sustainable options for economic development. The idea is to communicate the norms that regulate and the relationships that exist between inadequate use of soil and people’s wellbeing. We’re trying to package the linkage between the people and their mountainous Macizo as well; the advantages of living here, the relationships between the environmental services and people’s wellbeing… But we also focus directly on water and the pride of having clean water that provides to other areas as well, and grows crops. Our communications area is working on slogans and short messages”.

**Multiactor platforms**

Up until now the project team has opted for working within each individual municipality and the multi-actor spaces within, such as the Environmental Cabinet in la Dalia. As Edgard explains:

“Within each municipality there is a diversity of spaces. Many of the spaces have different names but they are essentially the same actors—convening spaces between public and private actors at the municipal level”.

“El Comité” has not yet been convened because MARENA has not prioritized doing so until now. Edgard speculated that this is in part because their activities are heavily dependent on development cooperation funding (particularly from DANIDA) which has been significantly reduced, and has therefore not prioritized this activity. The project has not engaged with the Association of Municipalities for the Management of the Macizo Peñas Blancas because it has not presented itself as a feasible option and it is unlikely to be considered in the remainder of the project period.

**Momentum and challenges**

Francisco perceives that the relationship with la Dalia is going well overall and that the project activities—including coordination with other institutions—has broadened the municipality’s vision to focus more on rural activities. One unifying factor in the relationships in La Dalia is that many of the project participants, both in and out of the government, went to the same National Agrarian University.

Edgard feels that the work with the youth network, project communications activities, and the overall C2 integration with the broader institutional dynamics have gone well. He thinks this is remarkable given that they have had logistical difficulties (high transportation costs) now that they are focusing on intervention at a municipal level (as opposed to a territorial level reached through a territorial multiactor platform). Another thing that is going well is the ongoing articulation between the emerging C1 results and the C2 team, considering it is being done simultaneously.
A challenge the project is facing is with its lack of connection to the other two municipalities, in which it has not yet been able to establish itself. In La Dalia the municipal government is aligned with the central government, which makes coordination easier, but in Cuá and Rancho Grande the situation is different. The central government has generated parallel institutions—the citizen power cabinets for example. “Everything requires a lot of negotiation, which complicates things” (Francisco).

In La Dalia money has always been available for activities, but what was most lacking was a clear territorial vision and distribution of tasks between different actors. This presented a convenient starting condition for the RTD project. Another challenge is time—to be able to achieve the project results in such a short time period. “We’re going well but it is a real challenge” (Edgard).

Olancho, Honduras

Background

At the time of my interview with Pedro Quiel in January the project was immersed in a complex national political standoff and was essentially on standby until after the dust would settle following the swearing in of the new government later in the month. The research questions that would guide the work were as follows:

- Who are the actors and social coalitions that [could] promote innovative institutional frameworks that stimulate the RTD of economic growth with social inclusion and environmental sustainability?33
- Who are the actors and social coalitions that [could] promote forms of distribution and use of natural resources that are favorable to successful RTD?
- Are large amounts of assets necessary for innovative social coalitions to emerge?

With these questions an underlying assumptions was that innovative social coalitions that influence institutional frameworks and favorable distribution and use of natural resources do not currently exist, or at least not in that capacity. The project is essentially asking what is needed for them to emerge, and would that require huge amounts of assets?

The project had also put forward the following hypotheses:

1) Agricultural activities have generated a positive and equitable economic growth dynamic because in the municipalities (geographically speaking) local social actors have had the capacity to mobilize resources to legitimize their own life strategies.
2) To strengthen these local actors a certain basic amount of assets are needed. Without these assets organizations and actors will not assume territorial leadership.
3) Local natural resources can provide these assets.

Project activities are focused on the municipal governments of Campamento, Concordia y Salamá.

33 In other words, who are the key actors that promote sustainable dynamic and influence key institutions to support this? Broken down into even more simple language, who are the actors that can advocate for change?
**Update on current activities**

The C1 researchers identified the key territorial actors and the C2 work began from there—carrying out outreach activities to get to know these actors and better understand their interests and motivations. From there the project team from the Red de Desarrollo Sostenible (RDS) began organizing a process to develop a new multiactor platform that would be the main space to debate territorial themes (also see Box 3) through this project. The Consultative Committee for Territorial Development (CCDT) has now been created and has three working groups—forestry, agriculture and water. Pedro restates the importance of having created this platform:

“We arrived at this territory where it is true that local organizations and public and private institutions exist, but where there is no space or actor with the convening power to generate dialogue and consensus on projects that benefit the entire territory’s population. We have done a lot in spite of the fact that many told us it would be difficult, but we have done a lot”.

The RDS considers that the CCDT is the territorial level entity that is in charge of convening key actors so that together they can generate, share and prioritize ideas, which eventually become project profiles or proposals.

Francisco Aguirre visited the RDS team in April and encouraged them to focus on actors that would really have a chance of impacting in the three themes they had identified as project focus (forestry, water and agriculture). For that reason the RDS decided that the CCDT should be made up first and foremost of representatives of the three project municipalities—these actors were definitely those with the best chance of advocating for public policy change.

In the three working groups of the CCDT (forestry, agriculture and water) the RDS is currently focused on designing project profiles. Pedro highlights that although these proposals are a project result, the process used by the RDS for facilitating the development of these profiles is essentially a capacity development process:

“We are convinced that when development is managed through processes, the local actors who participate in these processes are strengthened”.

Participants in the CCDT and its working groups include small producers, farmers, members of local organizations, etc. They participate on a representative basis and the RDS pushes for equitable participation—including encouraging local organizations to allow other people from their organizations to participate. Assemblies and working group meetings are held on a rotational basis in different municipalities and towns.

Besides the project profiles the RDS team has reviewed previous municipal development plans and is now working—through CCDT—on a regional development plan. Pedro notes that the idea to review the municipal development plans (MDP) is to try to see the difference between a municipal and a territorial focus. For example the MDPs are more focused on developing health, education and road infrastructure, but very little in creation of small business, productivity, and socio cultural and environmental concerns.
The RDS is effectively the facilitator of the entire process, including the main conveners and organizers of major meetings. As Pedro notes: “This is the only way to be aware of what’s going on, supporting the participants and supervising. And at the same time as they begin acquiring capacities we can see where to strengthen them”.

**Momentum and challenges**

Glenda feels that the CCDT is very conscious and knowledgeable of territorial issues, and with a clear vision about what is needed. She also highlights the high level of motivation that participants have had. Pedro adds as positive the fact that “the people work at different things, but that in a certain way they relate to each other; they sit at a table together to dialogue and search out solutions to problems that affect them”.

I asked Pedro and Glenda what conditions were in place that allowed them to generate such momentum with the multiactor platform, taking into account that in general it was a risky strategy to undertake in such a short period of time. They noted the following items:

- Knowing to align ourselves with the local governments was key. We developed a certain level of empathy and similar thinking with each of the three mayors.
- In two of the three municipalities the mayors were reelected and in the third, the new mayor is from the same political party as the other two.
- RDS policy of doing things with the people and not forcing our own vision helped
- There is a demand for the type of technical assistance that will come through the platform
- We were very straightforward, honest and transparent about our plans

With regards to challenges Glenda shared that there is a group of powerful actors that are not aligned with the interests of the municipality, much less the territory. Many do not even live in the territory and it is hard to get them to participate. An example would be the large lumber companies, who are not particularly concerned with water issues in Salamá or Campamento, or pine deforestation in Concordia.

“We have invited them to the meetings but they are not interested in listening. We have had a small win when the manager of a sawmill from the company Indema participated in a meeting in Campamento recently, but this is the exception” (Glenda).

Pedro added that another challenge is the fact that this is a region with little history of collaboration, and much less so with people with vested economic interests. Another challenge is the low legitimacy and capacity of many of the civil society organizations (NGOs and others) in the area.

**O’Higgins, Chile**

**Background**

At the time of the interview with Eduardo Ramirez in January, the C2 activities were just about to begin. The plan was to develop a multiactor platform that could be used to identify territorial needs

---

34 Eduardo Ramirez stated that he did not have time for an interview, and instead emailed a half page of responses to my interview questions. I have translated his responses directly in this section.
and eventually present demands to the regional government of O’Higgins. Some key known territorial themes at the time included problems with unregulated, industrial overuse of groundwater, industrial contamination, and problems with reinserting seasonal workers into the economy. Specific capacity strengthening activities in the construction of the platform would include internships, consultancies, diagnostics, meetings, etc.

As noted in the following section, the February earthquake created an interruption in plans; much of which seems to be back on track.

**Update on current activities**

With regards to how the CD work was progressing and what activities they were currently focusing on, Eduardo responded as follows:

“In our case the work plan started more slowly than expected due to the change in government in Chile, and the effects of the earthquake of the 27th of February. Both elements obligated us to rethink our intervention. After a process of consultation and work with local actors to establish new priorities, we have resumed our activities. To date we have conformed a territorial working table, defined a concrete demand on behalf of the local actors, and we are jointly elaborating a capacity building work plan for this territorial instance (O’Higgins).

“We are currently focused on the definition of a concrete territorial demand. [In other words], elaboration of a proposal that makes clear the demand for capacity development and seeks out resources for implementation”.

**Momentum and challenges**

In response to the questions what is going well and what challenges, if any, they were experiencing, Eduardo responded as follows:

“[Going well is] the conformation of the territorial space with representatives of the local governments and social actors. It is also interesting how our proposal has been received by the new governmental authorities”.

[With regards to challenges] the strengthening of territorial actors that incorporate representatives of the private sector who are relevant for the territory. The private sector is averse to these types of instances. Unfortunately, if we are not able to get relevant private sector actors on board the work will be truncated.

**6.3 Emerging and desired CD outcomes for each territory**

In the different contexts the participants shared some common desired outcomes closely related to the project outcomes, along with some more territorial specific outcomes. Interviewees from the experiences in El Salvador, Chile and Nicaragua expressed the vision of having the multiactor platforms working effectively and playing a more protagonistic role in the management of the territory. This includes having committed coordination that is able to consolidate the capacity for dialogue in the different territories, including with private sector and other actors that do not often participate in these spaces, but which are nonetheless relevant to territorial dynamics.
In Nicaragua and El Salvador desired outcomes focused on the environment, including the hope that environmental management units in the municipal governments would become better positioned, and that municipal territorial ordinances would become clearer and shared across municipalities with common resources such as the Macizo. Very specific environmental outcomes were also expressed—e.g. the expectation that the Comarcas in La Dalia comply with environmental management categories, or in the seasonal wetlands of Chalatenango, that the CIGHC multiactor platform achieves an integrated wetlands proposal.

In Honduras and El Salvador the interviewees highlighted the importance of awareness raising on territorial issues, from helping people see that development has to do with a territory and not just a municipality, to generating more specific changes in behaviors on planning, and broadening consultation processes to include traditionally marginalized groups. In Nicaragua a specific goal was to actually reach a second marginalized group by project end.

And in Ecuador the urgent aspiration was expressed to translate high quality research results from the investigation in terms of concrete public policies, and to develop spaces for debating and processing the research further to increase the possibilities that it will be used as an input for public policy. These discussions should include a deeper problematization on how to keep equity front and center in territorial discussions on associativity.

In the rest of this section I present more detail on the emerging and desired outcomes for each territory.

### Chalatenango

In Chalatenango, Wilfredo stated that he sees some change of vision in the project participants so far:

“For example last month MARN representatives initially designed the training program for the UAM technical managers before we had even consulted with the managers. After our workshop they realized that...you first need to consult people’s specific needs in their territory. For tomorrow’s meeting they have gone about it differently and are going into it knowing that it is open to debate before validation. That didn’t usually happen in the past”.

Elias gave a similar example of project attempts to change top down approaches that are typically used for wetlands management planning, with someone simply writing the plan at their desk and producing a meaningless document. Now he states the CIHCG is looking for broader participation in these processes, including from mayors, ex mayors and other territorial leaders.

With regards to desired outcomes for the end of the project Wilfredo and Elias shared the following complementary visions:

“For me the most significant achievement that we could hope for in relation to the UAM and CACH is that they remain well-established as local spaces for territorial management, with facilitation by the technical managers of the UAM, and with participation of the communal organizations of the municipalities and other cooperation agencies found in that micro-territory. And that they manage the territory from their own expanded view of reality—within the framework of territorial dynamics and based on local development needs.
“And I hope the technical staff remains convinced of the immense importance of their role as facilitators of these spaces, and that they continue to function. We don’t aspire to see more concrete results because that is not possible with the time that remains or with the resources we have available. But we do aspire to see these spaces—where territorial priorities are planned, where decisions are made, where endogenous development proposals are put into action, and where responses are generated to people’s felt needs and uncertainties—continue to work” (Wilfredo).

“For the CIHCG we have started an institutional strengthening process of this important convening space, which leads to the validation of an integrated wetlands management proposal...representing all of the sectors. In this proposal we would see the farmers in the seasonally available lands, the fishermen and the small scale tourism initiatives, all fighting to reduce wetlands contamination, in addition to increasing productivity” (Elias).

Wilfredo offers a concluding thought:

“In general, all of this would be occurring within the PADEMA strategic framework through CACH. If we were to generalize I would say that we aspire that the major protagonism for territorial management comes from the CACH, from the local UAM convening spaces, and from the CIHCG. In other words, that these citizen participation spaces play a more protagonistic role in the management of the territory”.

**Tungurahua**

Pablo first expressed a worry and then an aspiration to overcome that worry. The worry is that in order to translate research into public policy, engaged processes of debate and discussion with key actors are necessary. While he feels that the team now has much more specific ideas and learning with regards to territorial issues, he is worried that that the process and the results are not well debated nor disseminated:

“My aspiration is that by the end of this year we will have been able to really translate our results from the investigation in terms of concrete public policies. We have a very profound investigation, very detailed, very sophisticated, but these results don’t give us policy orientations immediately. Additional work is needed to convert it into guidelines for public policy. How can we support the concrete intervention of key institutions, and in particular, the provincial government”?

He adds that more spaces are needed for processing the results, for debating them in a more organized and synthetic manner with key actors—both technical and social leaders.

“I aspire that by the end of the year we have been able to construct these spaces where processing of our research be done more collectively. That it not only be done by an external team such as us, but also by local teams”.

Another area that Pablo hopes to move forward by project end is the discussion on associativity with productive chains. Expressed as a question, “how can we achieve that this new phase of economic development of Tungurahua that is currently being promoted isn’t done at the expense of
weakening the equity that has been such a valuable and important part of the territorial dynamic in the province”?

**Macizo Peñas Blancas**

The main institutional contribution thus far is the functioning of the environmental cabinet of La Dalia which has entered into a period of continual work with established dates—something that was not working before the project began (Francisco).

Francisco aspires that the issues around municipal territorial ordinances will be clearer and functional in the territory. At the local level he would like to see that the Comarcas operate within a management plan—not independently of the management categories—in relation with the municipalities and with more presence and interaction of local actors. He feels that this is already being achieved to some extent in La Dalia, with the other two municipalities open as well.

Francisco would also like to see shared ordinances as they relate to the Macizo. And lastly, he would like to see improved positioning of the municipalities and their environmental units in all territorial dynamics.

For Edgard the biggest achievement would be to be able to strengthen two marginalized groups and to dynamize the multiactor spaces at the municipal level. As an achievement in the making, he mentioned how the C1 investigation and C2 process are providing key information to the Fondo de Desarrollo Local (FDL) of Nitlapán, to improve its own policies and financial products.

**Olancho**

Glenda shares that one of the biggest achievements so far has been that the participants have become aware that they have common problems and that united they can do more that separately. Also, the willingness and interest that the project has awakened in the participants is seen as significant. For Glenda an important outcome for the end of the project would be a committed self-managing platform that carries out territorial actions, articulates with other organizations, groups and sectors, and motivates a broad social participation. This platform should be able to really achieve needed strategic changes in the territory and achieve an integrated management of the remaining territorial natural resources.

“If we were able to have a CCDT that is capable of proposing, of planning, of creating spaces for social participation, of fighting, and of proposing policies and strategies for the strategic management of natural resources, we would be satisfied” (Glenda).

Pedro agreed with Glenda with regards to platform and added the following commentary with regard to long-term impacts:

“We are convinced and clear that that we can achieve these things, but for now it is like we are planting the seed. The development not of a municipality, but of a territory isn’t something that is done in 4, 5, 6, 7 months. These can be processes of 4 years or more.

---

35 The FDL is the second largest MFI in Central America with a credit portfolio of close to 70 million dollars.
where after several years you can hear the people say: “I live in the Jaguares region and when we started there were 12 municipal governments each just worrying about their own government and the people just worrying about themselves. Now after 4 years of capacity strengthening and better resource management there are real changes...”. This is a process that we can’t achieve in the short term, but of which we are convinced that we are going to leave the seed planted in the people—to see that development has to do with a territory and not just a municipality” (Pedro).

**O’Higgins**

Eduardo expressed the following aspiration:

“We have a funded work plan that attempts to consolidate the capacity for dialogue in the territory with the extra-territorial business representatives that are relevant to the territorial dynamics”.

### 6.4 Strategies for inclusion and participation of traditionally marginalized groups

The different project teams are employing a range of strategies to make sure that they are actively working with traditionally marginalized groups. The most common strategy is intentionally seeking out and working with organized\(^{36}\) marginalized groups. For example in Chalatenango Prisma’s work with the fishing sector is an intentional strategy to work with traditionally marginalized. Similarly in Tungurahua two of the three associations—PACAT and potato value chains—are highly represented in their membership by traditionally marginalized indigenous people. Additionally, the project has made decisions on geographical emphasis within each of the chains to focus on the less fortunate within the chains. And in La Dalia Nitlapán is working with a youth network as a traditionally marginalized group in urban environmental management, while at the same supporting the network’s own initiatives that go beyond environmental foci.

Another strategy being used is to broadly identify marginalized groups and make a strong effort to get them to participate in the activities of the multiactor platforms. For example in Olancho, the RDS has identified key groups from the outset and has done a lot of follow through on whether they will attend. In O’Higgins as well, a large effort has been made to get them to the table, although Eduardo notes that the challenge then becomes strengthening the capacity of these actors to actively participate and propose alternatives.

In Chalatenango, Prisma is also employing another strategy by strengthening the municipal environmental units to become convening spaces where territorial discussions can be addressed from more relevant local issues, and closer proximity to marginalized groups. This could be thought of as a strategy to “bring it local” and increase the chances of participation of traditionally marginalized.

Interviewees from Ecuador, Nicaragua and Chile expressed the structural and practical difficulties of working with these groups, including emphasizing that the incorporation of marginalized groups requires a very strong and specific effort that needs significant time and resources. But as Pablo

---

\(^{36}\) By organized I do not mean to insinuate that these groups are highly effective or well positioned; simply that they are self identified and exist in an organized form.
points out, “the easy thing is follow the current way things are done, even when we know that things are done in a way that always excludes these groups”.

In the rest of this section I present in more detail the different strategies that the interviewees shared for social inclusion in their specific contexts.

Chalatenango

In Chalatenango the work with the fishing sector is a good example of working with traditionally marginalized groups because “this is a sector of people that do not own land and generally work in very difficult circumstances. Complicating factors further fishing production has recently gone down by 50%” (Elias). All of Prisma’s work with this sector would fall under work with traditionally marginalized. Elias also added that in the workshops they conducted on identifying needs and analysis of means of survival they placed an emphasis on the participation of women.

Wilfredo reiterated that the UAM strategy in large part is an attempt to move decision making, linked to territorial dynamics, closer to where marginalized groups live and work (see section 4.3 for more detail). This is intended to reduce geographical (i.e. distance) and cultural barriers, as well as increasing the chances that issues that are relevant to marginalized groups will be addressed.

Tungurahua

Pablo stated that—at an overall level—the project has not had much influence with marginalized groups. However, in the specific accompaniment processes the project has made a big effort to include farmers and producers from the more impoverished areas—particularly the high mountain areas from the eastern part of the province. Additionally, for the selection of participants for the training course the organizers insisted on a higher participation of women from the associations, including directly lobbying with association leaders to send more women. “In the end we have about 10 out of 15 women participants” (Pablo). Lastly, the project team specifically sought out (as one of the important considerations) work with the PACAT chain, which is made up of traditionally marginalized indigenous from the province. Pablo added some commentary on the structural nature of the problem:

“With this theme you really have to have to be constantly vigilant because the easy thing is to follow the current way things are done, even when we know that things are done in a way that always excludes these groups. There are structural restrictions that that have to do with time, but also with the team—we would need teams much bigger to be able to work in the most forgotten areas, and we would need to have a more constant accompaniment because these groups have a lot of difficulty in participating”.

Macizo Peñas Blancas

The target marginalized groups for this territory are youth (ages 18-30), women, agricultural laborers (local and migrant) and adolescents (ages 13-18). As mentioned earlier the project is currently working with youth, which made sense because the political will to work with these groups already existed at the municipal level. The challenge is to be able to work with at least one more marginalized group, and ideally with the agricultural labor syndicates. These syndicates tend to be
related to the large landholders with many issues existing around their working conditions. There are specific complaints regarding food, payment dates, exact measures of harvested products, etc.

“We had wanted to highlight a few examples of large landholders (that had been identified by C1) that could serve as examples of good practice for others. We would then highlight and communicate what practices, policies, strategies, and business model contribute to these differences. We would also reward these cases with public recognition in order to show others what was possible.

“But it is a challenge because there isn’t a strong tradition of syndicates in the area. And the initiatives that do exist are quickly disarticulated because the worker that makes a complaint is promptly fired, and the labor ministry doesn’t do its job. It’s also a challenge because we haven’t yet sat with these actors to figure out what to do. But there is an interest in forming syndicates” (Edgard).

Francisco mentioned two more strategies that the project is utilizing: 1) Promote labor rights through the use of positive examples of certified businesses; and 2) Incorporating the participation of the Comarca at the municipal level. In the Comarca marginalized groups already have a voice which can get broader attention at the municipal level.

Olancho

Both Glenda and Pedro emphasized that the project has been very intentional about identifying marginalized groups and targeting their participation in the CCDT. This has included follow through to make sure people are actually going to attend, in spite of the difficulties in doing so.

O’Higgins

“We have achieved the participation of the civil society and the marginalized by making an effort to integrate them into the working tables. We still need to strengthen their capacities so that they may improve their capacity to make proposals within the territorial instance” (Eduardo).
6.5 Some emerging lessons learned regarding the relationship between capacity development and rural territorial dynamics

In this section I present some lessons that project teams are learning with regard to the relationship between capacity development and rural territorial dynamics. I have organized these lessons under the following categories:

- Basic assumptions on CD and RTD
- Territorial dynamics and change
- Institutional infrastructure and enabling conditions
- Time, effort and resources

6.5.1 Basic assumptions about CD and RTD

Wilfredo, Pedro and Elias make the basic case on how knowledge and capacities are inextricably linked to the possibility of stimulating virtuous dynamics. Wilfredo notes that one’s reaction to a given situation is always conditioned by his or her capacity to respond. People with high levels of capacity may see an opportunity, while people with fewer capacities may end up as victims. Elias focuses on the importance of knowledge and awareness as a starting condition for influencing dynamics:

“For example with public consultations on environmental impact studies, if the people are unaware of climate change issues, or the effects of heavy metal mining on water resources, there is very little they can add... much less offer alternative proposals. The key question is how can we develop the capacities to manage and enrich the territory with territorial proposals” (Elias).

And Pedro extends the assumption to capacities:

“‘To develop a territory considering the dynamics that influence its development you need people with certain capacities to foment those dynamics. The processes involved in figuring out what to do, how and when to do it, and with what resources might be very clear. The thing is you need human resources with certain capacities to promote, make decisions, engage in dialogue, and generate consensus. CD isn’t only in relation skills and abilities, rather in the capacity to have knowledge to share, to make decisions, to offer that things might be done this way or another, to volunteer to do things one’s self, or to contribute. We can’t speak of inclusive and sustainable territorial dynamics if there aren’t capacities developed in the actors present in the territory” (Pedro).

Edgard echoes the importance of these intangible, dialogical and relational capacities in highlighting a lesson on the importance of working in alliance, which he feels Nitlapán has done so far throughout this process.

6.5.2 Territorial dynamics and change

Eduardo stated that he has learned more about territorial conceptualizations expressed as questions such as: what is the territory?; how does identity cross with economic, administrative, and political territorial views?. “At the end of the day in Chile the administrative view is very relevant” (Eduardo).
In a similar vein Pablo clarifies that a territory is not a homogenous unit and that there are real geographical challenges to territorial dynamics, and therefore to policy influence:

“Another lesson learned is with regards to the need to be sensitive to territorial difficulties and differentiations. There are areas that have worse conditions and fewer opportunities, and which have experienced a level of territorial relegation—not only social. In other words there are areas that have less infrastructure, fewer services and are generally found off the beaten trail. There is a special or geographical component to policy, to which I hope more sensitivity is generated” (Pablo).

And Glenda and Eduardo highlight the practical challenge of getting key powerful actors to the table when those actors only stake is economical. Eduardo’s example:

"The relevant private sector actors for rural territories in general don’t live in the territory. This, combined with the fact that they normally don’t have historical or family ties with the territory, makes their participation very difficult in spaces of dialogue and territorial planning. So we have the paradox that they are the most important actors for the territory, but the territory lacks the capacity to convene them. This is one of the knots that we are trying to untie” (Eduardo).

6.5.3. Institutional infrastructure and enabling conditions

Pablo brings up the difficulty of maintaining a focus on equity in economic development—even when equity has been a fundamental condition of Tungurahua’s virtuous territorial dynamics:

“One lesson learned so far is that it is relatively easier to generate economic growth and poverty reduction policies, than policies that preserve and promote equality… Equality is the first sacrifice in economic development processes. The case of Tungurahua is one in which this value, this capacity to maintain a certain level of equality and actively and consciously focus on preserving that value; this is something I aspire to for the RTD project—that we learn to link this to public advocacy” (Pablo).

Francisco brings up the problematic nature of institutional structures, that even if influenced, lack capacity to support or enable change:

“What do you do when the institutional structure that ought to be regulating territorial social processes is dysfunctional? MARENA at the end of the day is two people. It exists more on paper than in reality. I ask myself, to what extent—once the municipalities and MARENA are able to delegate certain legitimacy to the local and Comarcal committees for protection of the Reserve—can the negative impacts of unsustainable production actually be reduced and sustainable processes fomented? To put it another way, how can we move from the current dysfunctional institutional structure to a functional decentralized structure in the Comité, that even though it is not legally constituted, has certain territorial-level legitimacy—derived from MARENA and the municipalities” (Francisco)?

And Pablo shares enabling conditions that make advocacy impact in Tungurahua a real possibility, even with limited time and resources:

“With regards to the idea you suggested in your draft report, about focusing more on learning than on practical advocacy and impact (assuming a short, relatively low funded C2
project), I think that that is probably appropriate for areas in which there haven’t been ongoing processes of development of public policy such as Tungurahua. If the UA had had to carry out a public policy advocacy project in a region in which this participatory process wasn’t already in motion, with its local technical teams, and priorities already moving in the same direction, evidently it would have been difficult to focus on “practical” advocacy results. For example in Loja it would probably have been impossible. But in the case of Tungurahua all the conditions were there so that our interventions—even tele-directed and with the limitations of little time and money—could have some significant impact. We could make a small difference in a process that was already taking its course without us. I think for Tungurahua your recommendation does not apply so much, because of these exceptional conditions. But I think that probably in other regions where these conditions don’t exist—and I imagine it must be the case in many territories—the idea of focusing on learning about RTD could be interesting.

“Within this line of thinking I aspire that our reports in December be reflexive, where, for example, this question that you raise could be developed further, discussed, debated, better thought out and elaborated. I aspire to have some more about what we have leaned in this relation between CD and RTD in these months—it’s a good challenge for these six months”.

I followed up by asking what these exceptional conditions that Tungurahua had were. He responded as follows:

- You have a government which has unleashed a participatory process in which a large part of the traditionally marginalized actors were included, and the process focused on economic development—something that local governments usually don’t do.
- It is a process that is at the same time participatory, inclusive, preoccupied with social equity, and with economic development.
- It had high quality technical teams specifically dedicated to this, in constant dialogue on political and programmatic themes with cooperation agencies and the central government...

“I think that this was a case where the institutional conditions were very appropriate and receptive for this type of focus”.

6.5.4 Time, effort and resources

As in the first round of interviews in January, all 5 of the project team interviewees expressed concerns with the practicality of achieving significant capacity development and advocacy impact at a territorial level with quite limited resources and a relatively short time-frame of up to 12-18 months37. At the same time all expressed confidence in some of the changes they were seeing on the ground, the direction the projects were heading and “the seeds that were being planted” for longer term harvest. First, two comments from Edgard and Wilfredo expressing the difference with this type of approach:

“To incorporate oneself into existing dynamics is not immediate and takes a lot of time. The typical thing is to do everything from scratch, propose new activities. To work within existing territorial dynamics is another focus and takes much more time” (Edgard).

37 At the time the common time frame cited was between 9-18 months.
"We’ve learned that CD, changing paradigms and development of self-esteem are all processes that take a lot of time... In these circumstances one should have realistic and moderate expectations so that we don’t fool ourselves and become frustrated after a short period of time... The lesson is that for these processes to really crystallize it takes time, and we can’t pretend that we can resolve the world in a year or year and a half. Perhaps with a reduced budget and limited time we ought to concentrate our efforts on a smaller territory and extend the time period" (Wilfredo).

Eduardo adds how working with traditionally excluded groups makes this endeavor even more complex:

"The incorporation of marginalized groups requires a very strong and specific effort that needs time and resources. In general the spaces for participation in the territories are few and far between and lack representativity. Therefore the inclusion of these types of sectors in the working groups implies a strong effort at this level" (Eduardo).

And Edgard expresses the how logistical limitations might sacrifice depth of response in dynamic environments:

“To manage this work from afar you would really need to have a permanent local team that is closer to the local actors..., and even more so with 3 municipalities. If the team is 4 hours from the place that it wishes to do CD or advocacy, that makes things difficult. Because many of the most important processes are in the day-to-day and the work plans don’t always coincide with the dynamics—a series of processes... may happen today or tomorrow. You can also use other strategies such as creating instruments, but if you really want to develop capacities and influence in a more efficient manner I believe you need a team focused on that in the territory” (Edgard).
7. Conclusion

When I requested edits of the interview transcripts of interviewees from the four teams that I interviewed for this update, I also requested that each team provide me with a short phrase explaining how they were currently conceiving of capacity development\(^3\). Pablo offered the following conceptualization for RTD Tungurahua:

“At this moment of the project we are conceiving of capacity development as a process of mutual learning about the political challenges that are implicit in territorial economic development. It is a mutual process in which learning derived from the scientific investigation is intertwined with practical knowledge from the technical workers and local actors”.

And Wilfredo and Elias shared the following conceptualization for RTD Chalatenango:

“At this moment of the project we are conceiving of the capacity development component as a process of accompaniment and facilitation of the exchange of pertinent and meaningful experiences, that allow for improving the capacity to organize, generate development proposals, and advocate for change, while at the same time developing individual and group self esteem of the key actors in the territory”.

I start with these conceptualizations because they provide solid ground on which to conclude this report. They are based on real activities and on-the-ground lessons learned, taking into account real political challenges and human sensibilities. When I presented emerging conceptualizations of CD in February they were almost entirely based on each team’s speculation about how they were going to go about their work in the coming months. The lack of concrete activities in most cases at that time, I believe, exposed more worries and frustrations than actual insights into capacity building understanding. Three out of the five projects were well behind schedule then and many of the interviewees expressed frustration and even some level of skepticism about what was being expected. In retrospect, I believe it was premature to be asking the question this report was asking at the time, and I believe the additional material shows more clearly the complex realities and multiple efforts being made by each team to answer for themselves questions such as “how is capacity building being understood and shaped”, and “what are the relationships between CD and RTD”?

Based on the interviews it seems clear to me that all of the project teams are making significant advances in carrying out their proposed activities, including successes in O’Higgins and Olancho in setting up multi-actor platforms where there was none before. Previously existing and functioning platforms in Tungurahua and Chalatenango, combined with the significant efforts of the Prisma and UA teams, seem to be yielding particularly good results. And in el Macizo, Nitlapán has found more local “spaces” in which to concentrate its efforts in la Dalia, in spite of the difficulties with getting a broader territorial multiactor space activated.

Whether it is in convening spaces, incorporating marginalized groups, stimulating debate and advocating on key issues, or simply raising awareness, each team is clearly trying to “make sense” of how capacity development relates to RTD. They are doing this out of necessity and generating significant learning on the subject. They are also encountering significant challenges on all of these

\(^3\) For the full set of conceptualizations please see annex 6.
issues, from structural challenges related to weak institutionality and lack of incentives for powerful actors to participate in territorial spaces, to practical challenges related to a tight project time frame, limited resources, small on-the-ground C2 teams and logistical difficulties in some regions. And there are significant expectations that the different multiactor platforms remain relevant after the project period, which introduces additional complexity.

My concluding thought is to reiterate that important learning on the linkages between capacity development and rural territorial dynamics is happening on the ground at an accelerated and ongoing pace. I encourage the RTD program to dedicate as much time as is possible in identifying and processing this learning in a reflexive manner, “as a good challenge for the next six months” as Pablo suggests. In addition to the significant development impact being supported by each of the territorial teams, this learning will be of tremendous value for future iterations of RTD approaches.

---

39 I know this to be the case in Ecuador, Nicaragua, Honduras and El Salvador. I am unaware of the project structure for C2 in O'Higgins.
Annexes

Annex 1—Review of program documents in order to understand overall program CD intentions

Overall program vision and objectives

The general objective of the RTD program is to “contribute to the design and implementation of more effective and integrated public policies that stimulate rural territorial dynamics in support of economic growth, poverty reduction, social inclusion (“reduced inequality”) and environmental sustainability”. In December 2009, the reference to policies was expanded to include “practices”.

The first half of the objective—effective and integrated public policies that stimulate RTD—broadly presents the unique program “how” (i.e. how the program plans on achieving its goals). The second half of this objective refers to “sustainable development”, i.e. integrated economic, social and environmental wellbeing. The linkages between RTD and the broad sustainable development vision are developed in detail in the program proposals and are beyond the scope of this study.

Paraphrasing this objective would suggest that the program seeks to:

- **Support and strengthen policies that stimulate RTD**, which support sustainable development.

In order to achieve this, certain conditions and processes must be in place, which in the original program proposal are worded as three outcomes:

- **Overall vision and strategy**: A revitalized rural territorial vision and strategies are in place, with social justice and environmental sustainability

---

40 The original program outcomes are consistent with these concise, yet extremely broad outcomes. ‘Collective actors’ may be thought of as ‘diverse change agents who interact in a broad regional and globally-linked network, and collectively advance a theoretically-consistent and empirically-tested vision and strategy on how to achieve rural economic growth with poverty reduction, greater equality and sound environmental governance’ (paraphrased from the original proposal). ‘Public action’ certainly implies ‘engaging effectively in relevant national, regional and international debates on rural development policies and how they are applied in practice’. But it also broadens the concept a bit to include the more local and territorial spaces where the C2 is occurring or planned to occur. The NZAID outcomes also support this vision, although in somewhat more ‘actionable’ language. In relation to the ‘overall vision and strategy’ there is the expectation that program-supported ‘development dynamics…enhance economic growth, social inclusion and environmental sustainability’ (18, italics added). With regards to ‘public action’ there is the expectation that there be evidence of national-level policy changes linked to development dynamics, which goes a bit further than ‘changes that are consistent with a new vision and strategies’.

Additional note—I understand that the NZAID and IDRC proposals are not fully ‘interchangeable’; there are some regional differences as well as thematic differences. Notwithstanding, the geographic emphasis and the particular dynamics are coincidental in 4 of the 6 countries (excluding Ecuador and Chile), and there is enough similarity in overall focus to use the two in dialogue with each other to strengthen our understanding of how capacity development is being conceived within the RTD concept and program’s overall.
Collective actors—Coalitions are in place that construct and promote new rural territorial vision and strategies

Public action—Changes have occurred in different realms (spaces) of public action that are consistent with the new rural territorial vision and strategies

So, new vision and strategies must be in place which use RTD means—such as public policies linked to RTD knowledge—to achieve sustainable development ends. Local, collective actors need to be the ones who construct this alternative vision, and push through real changes in key spaces of public action.

The NZAID proposal further emphasizes—”in selected territories”—the importance of “active and effective” participation of “the rural poor and the socially excluded (with emphasis on rural women and indigenous peoples)... in influencing rural development public policies and programs” (18).

The overall program objectives, which roughly line up with the major program components as per the IDRC proposal, give further insight into program intentionality on capacity development. Although all five objectives and six components have some relation the following objectives give the most insight into the “capacity for what” question:

- “[I]nform the policies of national and sub-national governments and international development agencies, with strategic, research-based analysis of the dynamics of rural territories and their determinants
- [S]trengthen the capacity of public and private development agents (in particular, at the level of provinces and municipalities, and with an emphasis on the organizations of the poor) to engage in policy-making and program-implementation processes that affect rural territorial development” (IDRC proposal, vi.)

Joining these ideas I would say that the purpose of the RTD program is to:

---

41 This general objective represents a combination of the most recent overall program objectives from the document ‘Efectos11.ppt’, and the objective from the NZAID proposal. The outcomes are taken from the document ‘Efectos11.ppt’.

42 There are also capacity development activities occurring through the strengthening of universities, the development of communities of practice, and the strengthening of RIMISP’s own governance and capacity to be a leading rural development knowledge center. These elements were not included in this review of the conceptualizations of capacity development, which is mainly focused on the linkages between capacity, policy and RTD at the country level.

43 There is a nearly identical version in the document, ‘Marco Metodológico para el Componente Desarrollo de Capacidades, May 2009, p3.

44 Again, the NZAID proposal adds some nuances that are worth noting. First, it takes a step back and highlights the uncertain nature of current knowledge on RTD, emphasizing the need to ‘characterize and understand rural territorial development dynamics...’. This is also meant to lead to action, by not only informing but ‘influenc[ing] rural development policies and programs...through systematic communication and dialogue with mass media, key public opinion shapers and public policy makers’. Lastly, the NZAID proposal broadens the focus of strengthening from agents to ‘processes leading to [RTD], including: building up multi-stakeholder platforms that are inclusive of the poor; developing territorial development strategic plans; developing investment program proposals based on those strategic plans and initiating contact with public and private donors’.
Inform, enable and strengthen key public and private actors and groups of actors (i.e. social coalitions) to generate new RTD-informed territorial visions and strategies, and generate policy and practice changes that stimulate RTD towards “sustainable development”. Of particular importance is the active and effective participation of rural poor and socially excluded groups in the policy and practice-influencing process.

**C2 objectives**

The specific C2 objectives only add limited detail of the CD intentionality. Referring to the direct actors in a particular territory—especially the poor and marginalized—the focus is on strengthening the capacities to:

- Collaborate in the design and implementation of territorial development strategies; and
- Inform and influence the formulation of ideas and decision making at the national level related to public action for territorial development.

Besides the nuances added by the objectives mentioned above, one very new objective is introduced:

- “Generate methodologies and work practices in rural territorial development that can be replicated in other territories”.

This learning objective makes sense given the overall learning objective stipulated in the C1 methodological framework document that refers to the overall program:

> After five years of this cycle of continuous testing, refinement and cumulative development of results and insights, we expect to have produced a solid methodological approach for the policy-oriented analysis of rural territorial dynamics, with a focus on understanding how the interactions of social actors, institutions, assets and development outcomes determine the opportunities of economic growth with social inclusion and environmental sustainability. (p. 2)

The methodologies and documented “work practices” seem to form part of an overall learning vision that would ultimately be expressed in a “solid methodological approach” after five years. This leads to what I have noted as a potential area of conceptual tension: the C2-specific results.

**C2 results**

The C2 results from the original IDRC proposal (37, Box 8) focused on (territorial) stakeholder use of C1 results and “new capacities acquired or strengthened with the support of the program” for improving “the design and implementation of their development programs”... Furthermore, “The poor and the socially excluded in the territories that make up the program’s network”—with a “greater voice and participation in key territorial development processes and programs”—are considered crucial program stakeholders. Finally, learning is stressed at two levels: a) for individual

---

45 Objectives are my translations and paraphrased from the document ‘Desarrollo de Capacidades: Conceptos y Metodología—Documento Borrador para Discusión, October 2009, p.3.

researchers to “critically reflect about their research methods, results and products, in the light of the outcomes of their utilization (or not) in the capacity-building activities of the program”; and b) for the program, i.e. “a broad audience or stakeholders in LAC, is informed about those approaches and practices of rural territorial development in the territories that make up the program’s network”.

Hence, the original C2 results emphasize the following intentions (my summary):

- Knowledge and capacities are utilized and applied in RTD-type activities
- The poor and socially excluded have greater voice and increased participation
- C2 is inherently a learning component meant to experiment and document how capacity development contributes conceptually and methodologically to RTD.

The C2 results were later qualified, offering a very detailed view of what informed, enabled and strengthened key actors, who are able to generate territorial visions, strategies and policy changes towards sustainable development, looks like. Specifically, at the territorial level, multiactor coordination mechanisms would be in place, which effectively convene important decision makers, as well as the poor and socially marginalized (“sectors”). The traditionally excluded and poor would actively participate in these mechanisms, which would generate territorial development plans, which identify key bottlenecks and indicate strategies to follow. Public and private investment profiles and proposals would be generated, based on the territorial development plans. Throughout the process the research would deliver fundamental inputs in order to carry out a focused territorial intervention that allows for strengthening (capacity building) those aspects that lend themselves to the greatest influencing. And territorial agents would use a knowledge base for RTD and participate in communities of practice to exchange knowledge and confront practical and concrete challenges in the design and implementation of RTD.

At the country level, communication strategies would be in place that disseminate territorial development experiences and influence in particular spheres of public action. Finally, public and private actors at regional and/or national levels would incorporate lessons from territorial experiences in their areas of focus and public actions.

These more detailed results were offered along with a series of methodological steps for achieving them, which “could be adjusted or modified...based on the internal conditions of each territory, the work plan of each partner organization, and their preferred methodologies for accomplishing each result and product”. It was clarified, however, that the work plans must take into account:

- that “the products, milestones and results are the same for all the territories, in which case sharing and collaboration between teams is desirable” (italics added);
- that “the overall time period...is the same for all, independent of particular team timetables; and
- That it needs to be ensured that the work in the territories follows a common rhythm, because there will be a parallel effort of crosscutting discussion, comparative analysis and synthesis”.

The need for detailed results and methodologies, and their standardization across territories, was explained as follows:

“Given that we are working with territories located in different countries, with very different conditions of economic and institutional development, very unequal social capital, and very diverse visions and perspectives regarding territoriality, it becomes necessary to think about a common work schema, but which is sufficiently open to allow for local adaptation in timing and contents.”

The potential conceptual tension that is caused, in my appreciation, is that it is this predetermination of results might make it difficult to “allow for local adaptation in timing and contents”. This could then make it difficult to design interventions that take into account what is contextually possible, based on the complex nature of how change actually emerges over time in a particular territory.

**Specific capacities highlighted in the documents and original interviews**

The RTD program “define[s] capacity development in rural territorial development as the process in which different actors that are relevant for development processes, acquire new knowledge, capabilities, attitudes and skills to work in a coordinated way and to promote changes that simultaneously lead to economic growth, social inclusion and environmental sustainability” (NZAID, 20). This definition is expressed in a simple flow diagram in Figure 1.

---

**Figure 1—Diagram of assumptions from RTD Program definition of CD**

---

A basic program assumption is that key actors in a given territory are unaware of the determinants of the rural dynamics in their territory (Pers. com Manuel Chiriboga). Research processes, such as those carried out in C1, generate better evidence of the characteristics of territorial dynamics, which enables local actors to improve their capacity to intervene to stimulate those (desirable) dynamics. As such, capacity development links research and action: stronger capacities based on better

---

evidence of territorial dynamics enable more effective action (this paragraph is paraphrased from an interview with Manuel Chiriboga).

The IDRC and NZAID proposals (IDRC vii; NZAID, 20, italics added) highlight the importance of strengthening “those capacities that are needed to improve the quality and effectiveness of collective action, networking, social innovation and social entrepreneurship” (IDRC vii; NZAID 20, italics added). Another clear capacity area mentioned in all the interviews relates to capacities to influence public policies at different levels: local, territorial, national and regional. Finally, as noted in both proposals, “within this emphasis, a main concern will be to strengthen the agency of the poor and the socially excluded to affect rural territorial dynamics” (ibid). This singling out of a particular type of actor highlights the need to think through specific capacities that might support social inclusion of marginalized groups.

The definitions and explanations of specific capacities highlight the following intentions:

- Strategies for generating or strengthening influencing and advocacy capacities are particularly relevant in bridging the gap between better knowledge and sustainable development
- Capacities for networking and collective action are particularly important in the highly complex environments of each territorial context
Annex 2—Key capacity assumptions taken from my review of program documentation

Increased capacities lead to presence, influence, & realigning of territorial priorities & action?

But, capacities are not the main factor that enable or inhibit legitimate participation.

Capacity building strategies analyze whether the broader conditions are present for application of capacities towards positive change

Traditionally marginalized actors can develop the capacities & exercise the power to influence relevant policy processes

Complexity– How we go about strengthening capacities takes into account what is possible based on how change actually emerges over time

Overall vision & strategy: A revitalized rural territorial vision & strategies are in place, with social justice & environmental sustainability

Territorial dynamics provide the common ground for generating territorial visions, beyond, or even in spite of traditional political boundaries;

Opportunities for developing shared vision are explored, as are opportunities for leveraging investment for promoting ‘virtuous’ territorial dynamics

Contextual– Capacity strengthening strategies take into account that meaningful changes are contextual & understood differently by people with different interests & worldviews

Some implicit & explicit assumptions from the RTD documentation

A focus on influencing policies

The importance of power & capacities

The importance of knowledge for development

Better availability of knowledge on territorial dynamics can generate better approaches to development;

C2 is inherently a learning component meant to experiment & document how capacity development figures into RTD conceptually & methodologically

Knowledge & capacities are utilized & applied in RTD-type activities (I’m reading into the term ‘their development programs’).

‘Generate methodologies & work practices in rural territorial development that can be replicated in other territories’.

Key actors for generating RTD are identified & strategies for their inclusion are developed

Collective actors-Coalitions are in place that construct & promote new rural territorial vision & strategies

Capacities for networking & collective action are particularly important in the highly complex environments of each territorial context

Public action-Changes have occurred in different realms (spaces) of public action that are consistent with the new rural territorial vision & strategies

The importance of identifying key actors & spaces, & assuring their participation & influence

Spaces & mechanisms that are important for RTD are researched & strategies for their use are developed

Specific strategies for identifying & strengthening organizations that represent the poor & socially excluded are developed

The poor & socially excluded have greater voice & increased participation

Collaborate in the design & implementation of territorial development strategies

Inform & influence the formulation of ideas & decision making at the national level related to public action for territorial development.

The importance of generating territorial vision

A focus on traditionally marginalized actors
### Annex 3—Current situation by territory for the C2 component, as of January 2010

Anexo 3—Situación actual por territorio para el componente desarrollo de capacidades (actualizado hasta enero de 2010, compartido por Francisco Aguirre)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERRITORIO Y EQUIPO TERRITORIAL</th>
<th>HIPÓTESIS INVESTIGACIÓN</th>
<th>ESTRATEGIA TERRITORIAL CON FOCO (PALANCA)</th>
<th>Plataforma Multiactores</th>
<th>Avances a la fecha</th>
<th>Relación con Desarrollo de Capacidades e Incidencia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TUNGURAHUA (Ecuador)</strong></td>
<td>El fortalecimiento de las cadenas productivas principales será el factor determinante para mejorar la competitividad territorial</td>
<td>Plan de trabajo con eje en la agenda de competitividad, particularmente agropecuaria</td>
<td>Parlamento Trabajo que dispone de una estrategia agropecuaria; una agenda de competitividad y un Plan de ordenamiento territorial</td>
<td>Acuerdo de trabajo entre GPT y UASB Diagnóstico Participativo provincial</td>
<td>Asesoría especializada en cadenas productivas y competitividad (enero 2010). Reforzar relación UASB y desarrollo de capacidades Curso de formación con dirigentes de cadenas productivas SENPLADES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHALATENANGO (El Salvador)</strong></td>
<td>El capital social del territorio, expresado en sus capacidades organizativas, en las coaliciones sociales y en los arreglos institucionales existentes, no ha tenido la fuerza suficiente para incidir en las características y efectos de los mega-proyectos, de tal forma que éstos sean motores de una dinámica de crecimiento endógeno con inclusión social y sustentabilidad ambiental. porque no ha existido voluntad política, para institucionalizar las propuestas surgidas del territorio</td>
<td>Plan Departamental de Manejo Ambiental sería la base de una estrategia de incidencia</td>
<td>Comité Ambiental de Chalatenango: actor social organizado</td>
<td>CACH organizado y funcionando con una pluralidad de actores Mapa de actores bien formulado con análisis PIL Identificación instrumentos de fomento</td>
<td>Taller para la definición de un plan de incidencia Formación de mesas de trabajo Actualización del PADEMA y fortalecimiento de capacidades para la ejecución del plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUTIAPA (Guatemala)</strong></td>
<td>El desarrollo de Jutiapa fue posible por la inversión en infraestructura, que facilitó la diversificación productiva y comercial, aprovechando las ventajas comparativas naturales del territorio</td>
<td>No existe una estrategia territorial</td>
<td>No existe una plataforma que exprese distintas visiones de la</td>
<td>Mapa de actores con análisis PIL</td>
<td>Apoyo a la formación de una plataforma y fortalecimiento de sus miembros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TERRITORIO Y EQUIPO TERRITORIAL</td>
<td>HIPÓTESIS INVESTIGACIÓN</td>
<td>ESTRATEGIA TERRITORIAL CON FOCO (PALANCA)</td>
<td>Plataforma Multiactores</td>
<td>Avances a la fecha</td>
<td>Relación con Desarrollo de Capacidades e Incidencia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAFAEL LANDÍVAR con equipo local</td>
<td>Los cambios económicos, distributivos y ambientales observados en el territorio, y que se acentuarán en el futuro, se basan en la competencia por el uso y control sobre la tierra y el agua.</td>
<td>Avanzar a uno uso ambiental y económicamente sostenible de los recursos naturales del territorio.</td>
<td>No existe una plataforma multiactores. Si existen grupos con un nivel de organización y funcionamiento débiles, pero que pueden ser la base de una plataforma. Esto son: la Asociación de municipios de Peñas Blancas; los Comité de Manejo de la Reserva; la Cooperativa Celestino Saenz; Cooperativa mujeres</td>
<td>Mapa de actores</td>
<td>Generar evidencia para el debate con actores claves sobre temas claves: acceso al agua, pobreza, empleo rural. Incidir para que los municipios del territorio incorporen en su agenda el manejo de la reserva y sus consecuencias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA DALIA (Nicaragua) NITLAPAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLANCHO (Honduras) RDS</td>
<td>Los recursos naturales en los municipios que forman parte del territorio pueden transformarse en un activo de la comunidad local que permita a los actores la consolidación de estrategias locales de desarrollo económico incluyente basado en los recursos naturales y la sostenibilidad de instituciones y coaliciones innovadoras.</td>
<td>No existe estrategia territorial</td>
<td>No hay plataforma multiactores</td>
<td>Mapa de actores. El resto de las actividades se ha detenido por problemas políticos</td>
<td>Pendiente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O<code>HIGGINS (Chile) RIMISP con Gobierno Regional de O</code>Higgins</td>
<td>Para que el territorio fuera capaz de revertir sus condiciones iniciales se requirió de una fuerte inversión estatal centrada en la provisión de bienes públicos y semi públicos, sin la cual no hubiera tenido lugar la profunda transformación productiva que benefició a los hogares del territorio.</td>
<td>No existe estrategia territorial</td>
<td>Se está formando una plataforma a partir de la convocatoria que se acordó con cuatro alcaldes del territorio</td>
<td>Mapa de actores y de coaliciones del territorio</td>
<td>En proceso de elaboración</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4—Program participants interviewed for chapters 1-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Date interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1. Helle Munk Ravnborg</td>
<td>January 14, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ligia Gómez</td>
<td>January 26, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>3. Wilfredo Morán</td>
<td>January 11, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Elias Escobar</td>
<td>January 11, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Ileana Gómez</td>
<td>January 13, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>6. Pablo Ospina</td>
<td>January 18, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Patric Hollenstein</td>
<td>January 18, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Gustavo Guerra</td>
<td>November 3, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Josué Salazar</td>
<td>November 3, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>14. Eduardo Ramirez</td>
<td>January 11, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>15. Pedro Quiel</td>
<td>January 12, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD regional</td>
<td>16. Roberto Iturralde</td>
<td>November 2, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Francisco Aguirre</td>
<td>January 14, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. Manuel Chiriboga</td>
<td>January 26, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 5—Program documents consulted for this study

Overall Program Framing
- RIMISP RTD, Aug 2009, Mid-Year ME Report 2009 FINAL for web word 97
- RIMISP RTD, Feb-2009, Annual_Report_2008_S&E_RTD
- RIMISP RTD, Feb 2008, 2008rimisp_methodological_framework_version2
- RIMISP RTD, May 2007, Rural territorial dynamics version 2May07.1
- RIMISP RTD, N35_Executive-Summary

C2 framing
- RIMISP RTD, Oct 2009, Pauta propuesta de seguimiento y evaluación FA oct 2009
- RIMISP RTD, Oct 2009, Documento INTEGRACIÓN DE COMPONENTES (3)
- RIMISP RTD, Oct 2008, Proposal to NZAID Final 29 Oct
- RIMISP RTD, Mayo 2009, MARCO METODOLÓGICO PARA EL COMPONENTE FORTALECIMIENTO versión 11.05.09
- RIMISP RTD, Jun 2009, Apuntes_TallerdeQuito_22-24junio (2)
- N53_Executive-Summary
Country specific

- RIMISP RTD-Primer Informe Ecuador Tungurahua
- RIMISP RTD, Sep 2009, Plan de Trabajo El Salvador Chalatenango
- RIMISP RTD, Primer Informe El Salvador
- RIMISP RTD, Junio 2009, Componente 2 DTR EL Salvador
- RIMISP RTD, Julio 2009, Plan de Trabajo Ecuador Tungurahua
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipo</th>
<th>Concepción de DC</th>
<th>Traducción</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chalatenango, El Salvador</td>
<td>En este momento del proyecto nosotros estamos concibiendo al componente de desarrollo de capacidades como un proceso de acompañamiento y facilitación de intercambio de saberes pertinentes y significativos, que permita mejorar la organización y capacidad de propuesta e incidencia, desarrollando a la vez la autoestima individual y grupal de los actores claves del territorio.</td>
<td>At this moment of the project we are conceiving of the capacity development component as a process of accompaniment and facilitation of the exchange of pertinent and meaningful experiences, that allow for improving the capacity to organize, generate development proposals, and advocate for change, while at the same time developing individual and group self esteem of the key actors in the territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tungurahua, Ecuador</td>
<td>En este momento del proyecto nosotros estamos concibiendo al desarrollo de capacidades como un proceso de aprendizaje mutuo de los desafíos de política que supone el desarrollo económico territorial. Es un proceso mutuo en el que se entrelazan tanto los aprendizajes derivados de la investigación científica como los conocimientos prácticos de los técnicos y actores locales.</td>
<td>At this moment of the project we are conceiving of capacity development as a process of mutual learning about the political challenges that are implicit in territorial economic development. It is a mutual process in which learning derived from the scientific investigation is intertwined with practical knowledge from the technical workers and local actors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macizo Peñas Blancas, Nicaragua</td>
<td>El DC es un proceso que fortalece de manera prioritaria a las unidades ambientales territoriales para fomentar procesos de regulación-promoción-educación de los temas ambientales, y mejorar con ello su posición en los gabinetes locales. Esto en el mediano plazo llevará a un mayor nivel de priorización de los temas ambientales en la agenda municipal y/o regional. Como efectos de esta priorización de temas ambientales se espera contribuir a cambiar la dinámica de aprovechamiento de los recursos naturales en el territorio, con énfasis en la sostenibilidad ambiental y económica de los territorios.</td>
<td>CD is a process that strengthens the territorial management unit’s ability to foment processes of regulation-promotion-education of the environmental themes, thereby improving their position in the local cabinet meeting spaces. This will improve the prioritization of environmental themes in municipal and regional agendas. This prioritization, it is hoped, will contribute to changing the dynamics around territorial natural resource use, with an emphasis in generating their environmental and economic sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olancho, Honduras</td>
<td>En este momento del proyecto nosotros estamos concibiendo al desarrollo de capacidades como un proceso en el cual participan un conjunto de actores claves en la dinámica del territorio, los cuales cuentan con capacidad para promover espacios de diálogo, concertación, consenso para la generación de ideas de desarrollo que contribuyan a que la población del territorio tenga un crecimiento económico, incluyente y ambientalmente sostenible. Actores con</td>
<td>At this moment of the project we are conceiving of capacity development as a process in which a group of key actors participate in the dynamics of the territory. These actors have the capacity to promote spaces for dialogue, compromise, and consensus, for the generation of development ideas that contribute to and inclusive and environmentally sustainable economic growth for the people of the territory. These actors also have the capacity to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipo</td>
<td>Concepción de DC</td>
<td>Traducción</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Higgins, Chile</td>
<td>capacidad para desarrollar procesos de gestión para el desarrollo de la población del territorio, y de esta manera poder incidir a nivel local, municipal y territorial en los procesos y políticas de desarrollo.</td>
<td>facilitate management processes for the development of the people of the territory, and in this manner, are able to influence development processes and policies at local, municipal and territorial levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Un documento e interpretación de cómo la construcción de capacidades está siendo entendido y abordado al interior del programa DTR.

Autor: Alfredo Ortiz Aragón

Resumen ejecutivo

El objetivo central de este breve estudio específico es "explorar cómo la ‘construcción de capacidades’ (Componente 2), está siendo entendida y moldeada al interior del programa DTR, a dos años de su implementación", para ayudar a entender el futuro potencial y fortalecer este trabajo. De los seis países donde el trabajo de construcción de capacidades está en curso (Ecuador, Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua y Honduras), sólo Guatemala no fue incluido en este estudio. La metodología utilizada implicó una revisión de documentos, dos rondas de entrevistas por equipo (enero y mayo de 2010), y entrevistas con personal clave del programa.

A. ¿Qué se entiende por ‘construcción de capacidades’?

Los documentos del programa no detallan el trabajo del C2 en una única y clara descripción. La integración de sus diferentes elementos nos lleva a una lectura del C2 como generador de una ‘nueva’ visión y acción territoriales que es generada por actores sociales claves y coaliciones de multiactores en espacios legitimados de reunión, bien informados, gracias a una mejor comprensión (basada en investigación) de las dinámicas territoriales y dotados con capacidades fortalecidas para avanzar en su visión. Estos actores y espacios se convierten en puntos de referencia para las actividades de

promoción en el trabajo con gobiernos locales y regionales, representantes del sector privado, y otras fuerzas motrices territoriales para:

a. Reorientar los esfuerzos de desarrollo hacia dinámicas territoriales existentes; y

b. Abogar y desafiar las estructuras de poder existentes para hacerlas más sustentables, incluido, el equilibrio entre las preocupaciones medioambientales y sociales, en particular, la capacidad de actores tradicionalmente excluidos, de participar e influenciar estos procesos.

El programa DTR concentra sus acciones previstas a la generación de conocimiento y fortalecimiento de actores claves para incidir en la política pública y la práctica, incluyendo la movilización de recursos. Asimismo, aspira a la generación de metodologías y prácticas de trabajo en desarrollo territorial rural que puedan replicarse en otros territorios.

Cada territorio tiene un conjunto específico de dinámicas, expresadas en las hipótesis del C1, que apoyan determinadas dinámicas y oportunidades, y que el Componente 2 debe tener en cuenta para sus estrategias de desarrollo de capacidades. Los temas específicos van desde la importancia del fortalecimiento de actores y procesos en las cadenas de valor agrícola, hasta el apoyo a actores para influir en proyectos de infraestructura a gran escala, importantes para el crecimiento económico, pero con serias consecuencias en lo social y medioambiental.

**B. Estrategias para el Cambio**

Es posible identificar cuatro estrategias a través de las cuales se facilita el cambio territorial.

1. **Llevar a cabo investigación aplicada como desarrollo de capacidades**

El componente de investigación aplicada (C1) fue diseñado "para incluir medios de comunicación funcionales, vivaces y efectivos y retroalimentación para con los usuarios de los resultados de investigación" (propuesta DTR: vi). Esto es lo que hace que la investigación sea "aplicada" dentro del componente mismo. Ecuador y El Salvador son ejemplos de esto. Una lección, es que los territorios con procesos avanzados de planificación participativa parecen más propicios para poner resultados de investigación de buen uso, que los territorios donde no existe. Módicos recursos, utilizados estratégicamente, pueden apoyar procesos actuales de cambio con dinamismo.
2. Legitimar y fortalecer "espacios", a la vez que crear espacios necesarios

'Espacios', para el trabajo del C2 del programa DTR, hace referencia a lugares conocidos y legitimados en donde los actores territoriales discuten y toman decisiones respecto de problemas territoriales, visiones y estrategias. Estos espacios pueden corresponder a estructuras formales tales como un foro no gubernamental (ej.: CACH, El Salvador) o bien, un comité patrocinado por el gobierno (Tungurahua). Éstos pueden ser muy activos o latentes (ej.: MMC, Nicaragua). En vista de su potencial para articular amplios intereses y ofrecer una plataforma de convocatoria para actores diversos, no debiera sorprender que el identificar, legitimar y fortalecer espacios sea una estrategia común. Sin embargo, cada equipo territorial se enfrenta a realidades específicas y tiene interpretaciones diferenciadas. El mayor riesgo en esta estrategia es la dificultad para generar un espacio desde la base, dado el tiempo y los recursos.

3. Construir puentes y fortalecer a actores e intereses en espacios claves

Una estrategia recurrente es adicionar DC a un tema prioritario ya existente que tiene apoyo. Por ejemplo, en El Salvador, la ONG ejecutora busca un tema conocido y relevante: el uso de tierras disponibles estacionalmente, y un espacio legitimado, por ejemplo, el Comité Interinstitucional de Humedales de Cerrón Grande, en donde el tema pueda ser objeto de debate. Su plan es ofrecer, a continuación, un estudio técnico que contribuya a reunir a los actores en torno a mejor información, en un proceso de planificación participativa. Este proceso también puede identificar las necesidades de capacidad y factores contextuales más amplios que requieran ser considerados. Si se toman en cuenta los plazos y la complejidad de lo que se está proponiendo, esta idea innovadora debiera ser analizada más adelante.

4. Fortalecer grupos excluidos para su participación en procesos de políticas públicas

En todos los casos se menciona que el foco son los pobres y los sectores marginados porque son una prioridad para el programa. Sin embargo, solamente uno de los equipos intentó sentarse a la mesa de negociación con grupos marginados o tradicionalmente excluidos y fortalecer a este tipo de actores. La excepción es Nicaragua, que posee un trabajo con pobres, integrado a la metodología de investigación. El programa DTR necesita clarificar cómo deben ser fortalecidos estos actores para que puedan desafiar las estructuras de poder que perpetúan su condición socioeconómica. En el caso del programa DTR, esto significa, desarrollar ideas para la inclusión socioeconómica de los pobres y también de aquellas áreas del sector privado que no necesitan alianzas del tipo DTR para sustentar sus negocios.
C. Observaciones sobre la Estrategia a enero de 2010

El estrecho alineamiento entre las directrices metodológicas y las reales estrategias previstas en terreno está determinado por dos factores. Primero, el trabajo del C2 debe basarse en los resultados del C1, incluso en aquellos casos en que los resultados del C1 estén recién siendo procesados cuando el C2 está comenzando. Y segundo, el requerimiento asociado al imperativo de obtener resultados predeterminados dentro de un calendario muy ajustado y un presupuesto limitado (como lo expresan los equipos territoriales en las entrevistas). Independientemente de lo que podría aparecer en el C1, incluso si éste hubiese sido procesado rápidamente, los equipos territoriales fueron enfáticos respecto de las expectativas establecidas por los resultados del C2 a nivel territorial.

El alineamiento entre las directrices metodológicas y las estrategias previstas obviamente no es algo malo en sí, pero tienen que hacerse concesiones entre ambas. Estas directrices pueden ser muy útiles y necesarias al momento de comunicar las intenciones generales, ofreciendo potenciales métodos y caminos, y promoviendo cierto nivel de coherencia entre los diferentes equipos y locaciones. Sin embargo, la, desventaja es que los equipos territoriales pueden no sentirse empoderados para desarrollar sus estrategias basadas en realidades que van surgiendo en terreno.

El concepto DTR es complejo e innovador y existe poco material escrito sobre DC. Por eso, una pregunta útil para el programa DTR sería: cómo debe ser conceptualizado el DC en un marco DTR. Esto posibilita una investigación más amplia sobre qué intervenciones deben seguir a un proceso del C1 en un territorio determinado. Lo que, a su vez, permite al programa DTR liberarse del actual supuesto clave detrás del trabajo del C2, que señala que las capacidades de las personas necesitan fortalecerse con el fin de aumentar su habilidad en el uso de información de alta calidad en el estímulo de dinámicas territoriales positivas.

Actualmente, en el concepto y propuesta del programa DTR, parece haber mensajes contradictorios sobre el propósito del C2, así como de la amplitud y profundidad de su alcance. Algunos lo ven como una intervención de desarrollo, limitada por presupuestos (USD 40,000) y plazos (9 a 18 meses, según se cita) muy ajustados, en contraste con su percepción de la magnitud de lo esperado. Si bien no es incompatible, el énfasis está puesto en el logro de resultados deseados "in-situ, en lugar de investigación-acción. Los resultados se enmarcan en términos del número de pobres involucrados, planes de inversión formulados, plataformas generadas, y no, por ejemplo, en términos de las comprensiones metodológicas sobre la operacionalización del
DTR a través del DC. Sin embargo, la literatura sobre DC está llena de ejemplos y advertencias a fin de evitar resultados prometedores y ambiciosos en plazos cortos, sobre todo cuando la mayoría de los factores escapa al control del programa.

D. Resultados emergentes y lecciones (junio de 2010)

Todos los equipos del proyecto están haciendo avances significativos en la ejecución de las actividades propuestas, podemos mencionar el éxito obtenido en O'Higgins (Chile) y Olancho (Honduras), con la creación de nuevas plataformas multiactores. Por otra parte, las plataformas ya existentes y en funcionamiento de Tungurahua (Ecuador) y Chalatenango (El Salvador), en conjunto con los importantes esfuerzos del equipo, parecen estar dando, particularmente, buenos resultados. Y en El Macizo (Nicaragua) se encontraron espacios locales donde concentrar los esfuerzos en La Dalia, pese a las dificultades del equipo para activar un espacio territorial multiactores más amplio.

Los equipos también se están enfrentando a importantes desafíos en todos estos temas, desde dificultades estructurales relacionadas con una institucionalidad débil y la falta de incentivos para que actores más poderosos participen en espacios territoriales, hasta problemas prácticos relacionados con un calendario del proyecto muy ajustado, recursos limitados, equipos en terreno muy pequeños para el Componente 2 y dificultades logísticas en algunas regiones. Por último, existen grandes expectativas de que las diferentes plataformas multiactores conserven su importancia una vez concluido el proyecto, lo que introduce una complejidad adicional.

• Supuestos básicos sobre DC y DTR. El conocimiento y las capacidades están inextricablemente vinculadas a la posibilidad de estimular dinámicas virtuosas. Estas capacidades intangibles, dialógicas y relacionalmente confirman la importancia de trabajar en alianza en DTR.

• Dinámicas territoriales y cambio. Las conceptualizaciones territoriales son esenciales, particularmente, en el cómo la identidad se cruza con visiones territoriales, económicas, administrativas y políticas. Existen auténticos desafíos geográficos para las dinámicas territoriales, y por lo tanto límites de influencia de la política. Sentarse a negociar con poderosos actores claves, cuando su único interés es económico, es difícil. Del mismo modo, la incorporación de grupos excluidos requiere de un esfuerzo muy grande y concreto.

• Infraestructura institucional y condiciones de habilitación. Mantener el foco en la equidad en el desarrollo económico es difícil, incluso cuando la
equidad ha sido una condición fundamental de las dinámicas territoriales virtuosas. Y aun cuando han sido influídas, muchas instituciones carecen de la capacidad para apoyar o permitir el cambio. Las condiciones iniciales de partida pueden hacer o deshacer la influencia.

- Tiempo, esfuerzos y recursos. Todos los entrevistados del equipo del proyecto expresaron su preocupación respecto de la viabilidad para alcanzar un desarrollo de capacidades significativo y una promoción de impacto a nivel territorial, con recursos limitados y en un plazo de tiempo relativamente corto. Al mismo tiempo, todos expresaron su confianza en algunos cambios que ellos han observado en terreno, en la dirección que estaban tomando los proyectos y "las semillas que han sido plantadas" para ser cosechadas en un largo plazo.