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Abstract:
This paper emphasizes the public policy management process in the Brazilian rural environment in recent years, focusing on the emergence of specific arenas and forums aimed at the preparation, discussion and/or implementation of policy instruments, also looking at the different scales at which governmental programs are applied and the role of policy-makers in carrying out the process. The Sustainable Development of Rural Territories Program will be used as a reference to illustrate the questions proposed for the analysis of this issue. With the creation of the Rural Territories /Citizenship Territories programs in Brazil a set of possibilities were opened for state intervention at a supra-municipal spatial scale that directly implied the redesign of the public policy sector, both in terms of implementation instruments (policy issues) and the institutional context (polity issues), particularly following the creation of new arenas of governance. This paper examines the limits and scopes of this initiative, based on a significant set of cases, analyzing different processes of territorialization (public policy, governance and development process), in light of the Brazilian experience of policy decentralization mechanisms and the institutional articulation of governmental programs on a regional and national scale.
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Introduction

In Brazil the current debate about rural development, and more recently about territorial development, is based on, amongst other aspects, the observance of the persistent interconnection of rural poverty and social and regional inequality, and is part of a broader discussion of economic development and sustainability. To a certain extent the concept of territory (understood as the scale of action appropriate for the implementation of differentiated public policies) is inserted in this context, reflecting existing disputes between distinct strategies, such as those which accentuate the process of economic growth with a strong export orientation in the agricultural area, or those that valorize sustainable development processes linked to the idea of justice and/or social equity.

Since the beginning of the century, rural territorial development in Brazil has been the subject of growing political attention, leading to an active process of defining innovative programs with distinct backgrounds. In these cases it can be seen that decision making arenas and institutional public spaces have to be considered not just as the locus for the representation and participation of actors in the policy process itself, but also as forums for the articulation of existing policies. As a result the analysis of the existing obstacles for the articulation of policies and institutions, the construction of development strategies, as well as solutions that can be found to overcome them, can be explored by taking into account three components: (a) governmental programs with distinct backgrounds; (b) decision making arenas and existing public spaces in the territory; (c) the empowerment of various actors and institutional agencies present in these spaces and their impacts on articulation possibilities for policies and institutions and on the design of strategic projects defined in a scale that goes beyond exclusively local dynamics.

This article seeks to analyze the recent Brazilian experience of the implementation of territorial development policies in the rural environment, examining the institutional arrangements constructed to make the performance of public actions of this nature feasible. Dimensions related to the social management and governance of these structures are highlighted, with governance being understood not as a way of achieving good government through the creation of an appropriate social and economic environment, as has been widely publicized by multilateral agencies, but rather by approximating this concept to the idea of governmental
capacity, as defended by Santos (1997: 4), which goes beyond the specific questions associated with the administrative and managerial aspects of the State to understand the game of relations between different actors operating in a determined context and the political and institutional arrangements derived from this.

This paper is divided into three parts followed by a conclusion. The first part outlines questions related to the public policy decentralization process in the Brazilian politico-institutional context of the last three decades and its impact on the emergence of territorial development programs and their governance strategies. Following this we return to the national experience in the implementation of rural territorial policies, highlighting the management and articulation instruments created in this area, with special attention being paid to the arenas where these processes take place. Finally, in light of some results achieved by ongoing programs, we will problematize questions that seem relevant to us for the examination of the governmental capacity of policies and processes operated at a territorial scale.

1. Rural territorial development, public policies and governance: clues for an interpretation

Rural territorial development and the policy territorialization process refer to the treatment of administrative dimensions (deconcentration) and policies (decentralization), as is noted by various authors, including Perraud (2005: 290) and Sencebé (2007: 2). The articulation of these instruments and policies is not trivial and demands, as highlighted by Echeverri (2007), both horizontal (the articulation of sector policies in the same region) and vertical foci (the articulation of differentiated spheres of power – national, regional, state, territorial, local, etc.), implying institutional arrangements between governmental bodies, non-governmental organizations and the beneficiary public of policies, which conditions the governmental capacity of the territorial development program, to borrow the term used by Santos (1997). It is worth noting that territorial policies were structured with the purpose of offering innovative solutions for sector policies in relation to both old and new challenges from society and the Brazilian economy, such as poverty, regional inequality, as well as the emergence of the environmental question and its compatibility with economic and social development.

We can thus speak of a movement of the territorialization of governance, which seeks to use
the concept of territory as a privileged spatial and socioeconomic locus to implement
decentralization processes in governmental activities and in the relations between state and
society, which played a significant role in the political re-democratization of Brazil which began
in the mid 1980s. This leads us to highlight the institutional arrangements designed in recent
policies, such as the territorial development program, presupposing a not inconsiderable series
of negotiations, articulations and conflict resolution. In other words, drawing on Bebbington et al.
(2008: 7), in the treatment of the co-production processes of these arrangements and
capacities. As the authors emphasize: “working from the concept of ‘co-production’, this paper
argues that territorially-based rural development can be understood as the product of
negotiation, interaction and conflicts among a range of social actors each of whom operate with
distinct ideas about the nature of ‘development’ and the place of rural areas within national
growth and distribution strategies”.

For our purposes, it is worth highlighting the emergence of new arenas represented by territorial
forums and/or collegiates (such as the Territorial Development Collegiate - CODETER,
Colegiados de Desenvolvimento Territorial in Portuguese) as the result of institutional
arrangement and practices of governance experimented by the programs examined in the next
topic. There is a reasonable literature about the experience of these public spaces in policy
implementation\(^3\), from which we will draw on two citations from Leite et al. (2008:8). The first of
these points out that these new spaces, derived from the decentralization process of public
policies, have reinforced the local-municipal dimension: “[...] although public participation
spaces have been created as a part of a new democratic institutionality that seeks to fill the
existing space between civil society and state authority, seeking to expand the concept of
public, divide power with state agencies and favor the construction of a democratic culture, its
real effectiveness was limited and faced numerous obstacles due to the fact that municipalities
were the places where not only could the ‘people’ or ‘civil society’ be found, but where the
power and political regimentation capacity of traditional oligarchies was ingrained. The central
figures of the municipal political system where the power of oligarchies was manifested were
the mayors and councils, in such a way that, from the point of view of democratic governance,
conquering the autonomy of public spaces of participation in relation to these agencies of state

\(^3\) For the Brazilian agrarian policy context see Abramovay (2001), Azevedo et al. (2005), Favaretto and
power came to be a fundamental political struggle. In this aspect [...] the conflicts that were found in almost all the cases studied of local public spaces were related to the effective sharing of state power by representatives of local civil society”.

The other passage stresses the innovative and potentially democratic character of these arenas, which by ‘dislocating’ their scale of functioning – from the municipal to the territorial⁴ – can get around the above problems, opening a new political composition in the structure of territorial power. As we state above: “[...] decentralization was associated with the creation of public spaces or public spaces, as they were more commonly called, understood as social arenas in which the presence of new actors, usually social movements and organizations, from outside the traditional political system sought to expand the field of politics by trying to redefine the relations between state and (civil) society in accordance with the perspective of the latter. [...] From this viewpoint the resumption of politics and the reconstruction of democracy should not be restricted to the (indispensable) reactivation/redefinition of traditional democratic institutions – parties, parliament, judiciary, free elections, etc. –, but rather should imply the creation of new public spaces that, once the inclusion of new social actors and the emergence of new practices of interlocution between the state and society have been made feasible, give strength to the attempt to live the democratic transition as a process of the democratization of an authoritarian and exclusionary society, in the sense of transforming the predominant political culture and the search for greater compatibility between the public sphere and the political system, as the necessary requirements for the implementation of democratic governance⁷ (Leite et al., 2008: 6-7).

In the Brazilian case the territorialization of governance linked to the administrative deconcentration and decentralization process, by considering the municipality as its ‘location’ par excellence, produced a concomitant proliferation in municipalities, both in public participation spaces and in fragmented public policies (Abramovay, 2001). On the other hand, the restriction of the coordination capacity of the national state, caused by its institutional crisis and by the guidelines emanating from the neoliberal creed, stimulated a considerable fragmentation of decentralized public policies (both economic and social), as well as making

⁴ In other words, from the previous experience of the Municipal Councils of Rural and Sustainable Development (CMDRS), which were created due to incentives initially contained in the Infrastructure and Services Area of the 1997 National Program for Strengthening Family Farming (PRONAF), and in the
even more difficult the historically limited articulation capacity between policies originating from
different levels of governmental administration. As a result the peculiarities of the
transformations that occurred in the economy, in society, in politics and in the conditions of
governance in Brazil since the 1980s, run the risk of not being perceived if we do not take into
account the dialectic of the convergence between the neoliberal project, on the one hand, and
the democratizing project, on the other (Abrucio, 2006; Dagnino, 2004).

In this sense it is important to highlight that public spaces of participation are not ‘magical’
instruments of territorial governance, structurally orientated towards the construction of some
type of harmonization of state and civil society actors in territories. In authoritarian and
exclusionary societies such as Brazil, the opposite is more frequent. They have become places
of conflict, in which the sharing of power between the representatives of various social spheres
in public policy decisions is one of its fundamental objectives. As Manzanal (2007: 33) states,
“the ‘territory’ appears associated with the exercise of ‘power’: the territory synthesizes
spatialized relations of power, relations between differentiated capacities to transform, produce
and impose actions and wills, whether resistance is low or not, whether there is conflict or not.
And this is nothing other than recognizing that the social production of space is a result of the
exercise of the relations of power”.

In a large part of these spaces these conflicts are manifested through various concepts of the
significance of participation. On the one hand, governmental actors understand participation as
a model of public policy management based on the recognition of the principle of subsidiarity,
submitted to the logical of technical rationality. On the other hand, actors from civil society tend
to consider it as a public policy democratization process guided by the logic of communicative
rationality and of learning, as well as an open opportunity for the social control of the
implementation of governmental programs by the actors involved (Cordeiro et al., 2007). As a
result of this many public spaces are immobilized by the impossibility of equating these
conflicts, or by their own deterioration (Leite et al., 2008).

The recognition that the construction of a democratic institutionality is quite conflictive and that
territory is not simply a social space where ‘political’, managerial and social harmony can be
easily obtained, refers to the fundamental question of the need for hegemonic construction

CODETERs from 2003 onwards.
within the territory and the existence of participatory and democratizing political projects that can be shared by state and civil society actors. Without this effort, it is very difficult for the tension between management and democratization to be channeled in a positive form, while the opportunities for articulation with different institutions and public policies will be considerably narrowed (Dagnino, 2002; Delgado e Limoncic, 2004).

Given the above scenario it is not easy to construct an analysis that can take into account the complexity of conceptual debate about the use of categories such as territory, empowerment, and entrepreneurialism, amongst others, and the praxis of the social, political and economic processes that cause tension in these new spaces for the articulation of actors and public policies. Araújo (2007), for example, presents a ‘typology’ of public policies based on a territorial cleavage, which predicts four possibilities. In the first, sector policies are territorialized – involving an articulation between the national, state and municipal spheres, as is the case of the Single Health System (Sistema Único de Saúde - SUS) –, or there is a ‘territorial reading’ of these, as is the case of some programs in the area of Education and Science and Technology. The second corresponds, according to the author, to programs constructed on specific territorial bases, as is the case of the Programa de Desenvolvimento Sustentável dos Territórios Rurais (Program for the Sustainable Development of Rural Territories - PRONAT) run by the Secretariat of Territorial Development (SDT) from the Ministry of Agrarian Development (MDA), or the Política Nacional de Desenvolvimento Regional (the National Regional Development Policy - PNDR) and Promeso from the Ministry of National Integration (MIN), and the Arranjos Produtivos Locais (Local Productive Arrangements - APLs), from the Ministry of Development, Industry and Commerce. The third classification refers to the construction of specific territorial plans as spaces for the planning of governmental action (via Planejamento Plurianual - PPA – Multi-Year Planning, for example), which has been gaining space in specific state contexts (Sergipe, Bahia, Rio Grande do Norte, Ceará, Pará etc). Finally, a fourth possibility is related to actual territorial policies, privileging a endogenous development focus, or a bottom-up movement, as appears to be the case of some inter-municipal consortiums or the planning experience in Seridó (RN).

In this way the public policy territorialization approach is part of the administrative  

---

5 There is a vast literature about these questions. See, amongst others, Abramovay (2000, 2003 and
decentralization process of governmental activities, which gained importance between the middle of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s, in the context of the experience of the confluence between political democratization and the adoption of neo-liberal policies. It, thus, reflects a dual influence: on the one hand a democratizing intent regarding national development and the reduction of existing inequalities between and within its different regions and, on the other, a search for territorial reordering based on a national state which at the time was intended to reduce its capacity for intervention and for the formulation of strategies and national development projects (Leite et al., 2008).

The result was the multiplication of agencies and programs – federal, state and municipal level – concerned with the territorialization of public policies without the existence of a national territorialization policy with its own institutional mechanisms capable of stimulating coherent dialogue and articulation between agencies and programs/actions in the various ‘territories’, defined on the basis of different criteria. Furthermore, without a national policy the isolated attempts at the territorialization of public policies often led to fiscal ‘conflicts’ between states and municipalities. Abrucio (2006) estimates that the aspect that most contributed to the limitation of decentralization was the weakness of strategic vision during the 1990s, when the efforts to transform the administrative machine were limited to adapting them to the standards and requirements of the liberal democratic project. Recent developments, however, seem to indicate that this scenario – absence of the strategic project, shrinking of the state, extreme liberalization of policies, etc. – may be changing, perhaps representing a ‘slow return of strategic planning’.

Generally speaking, it can be said that the public policy territorialization approach has been implemented in Brazil from two perspectives. On the one hand is a perspective of territorial reordering that seeks to update traditional regional development policies, ranging from an emphasis that prioritizes the large administrative regions of the country, to another one that emphasizes the relevance of a less encompassing scale, as is the case of the micro or meso-regional scale. On the other hand, there is a perspective that emphasizes the territorialization
of specific public policies, usually with a sector-based, differentiated or universal focus, with the aim of achieving greater efficiency and effectiveness in the implementation of the decentralization of this type of program.

However, the great diversity of the territorial foci existing in Brazil still figures as an important complication in the establishment of a national territorialization policy. It also makes more difficult the consolidation of a public policy territorialization process that could count on a greater transversality, lower fragmentation, a more coherent and effective institutionalization, and greater potential to stimulate the possibilities of territorial development in the country. Nevertheless, it also cannot be forgotten that the existence of this diversity of territorial foci is also the consequence of disputes for power and for existing resources, both under the ambit of federal institutions and between federal, state and municipal agencies. Perhaps this is the principal reason for the permanence of this situation, the enormous resistance encountered to overcome it and the impossibility of implementing a national policy, even when ‘everyone’ appears to support the rhetoric of territorialization.

On the other hand, it is agreed that territorial development has to be conceived taking into account the economic, social, political and cultural dynamics endogenous to the territory. In fact, this is one of the reasons why the territory is preferred to the municipality as a unit of intervention. The fact that territory is a social construction and not simply a political and administrative constructive, and that it possesses a broader scale, favors the perception and the emergence of more complex and promising economic, social, political and cultural dynamics, capable of involving rural-urban articulations and collective proposals for actions on the part of the existing actors with a greater capacity to impact on the characteristics and the sustainability of development processes (Leite et al., 2008).

Within the diversity of endogenous dynamics that can be considered, we would like to call attention to one aspect in particular: the fact that these dynamics and the type of governmental action capable of impacting them are influenced by the characteristics of the chosen territory. In other words, from the intervention perspective are we considering territories where there profoundly transformed as the result of economic, social, cultural and political changes promoted by processes, including those of development, that may be implemented in the territories. The unaltered maintenance of supposedly original identities can be much more a ‘fantasy’ of research and/or specialists that the demands of the social groups existing in the territories: the hybridness of a social identities is one of the most notable characteristics of contemporary times (Hall, 2003; Bhabha, 2003, Machado, 2006).
already exists a reasonably structured economy, a minimally articulated social fabric and social actors relatively capable of collective action? Should we choose territories where some attributes usually highlighted in the ‘success’ of territorial development, such as social capital, territorial identity, etc. are present, at least incipiently? Or will we privilege territories where the economy, the social fabric and the capacity for collective action of actors still have to be constructed or discovered? This is the case of situations in which economic poverty is predominant, due to a large extent to the incapacity of the existing populations to have access to resources and rights.

Two problematizations result from these observations. The first is related to the concept of territorial development that will be used. If we adopt the concept of Schejtman and Berdegué (2003: 1), according to whom rural territorial development is “a process of productive and institutional transformation in a determined rural space, whose aim is to reduce rural poverty”, the selected territories should be those of the second type. Here the objective of territorialization of development is fighting rural poverty. However, if we use a broader perspective, according to which the objective is not exclusively fighting rural poverty, but rather the dynamization of territorial society and the strengthening and consolidation of family farming, then the first type of territories mentioned above are more relevant. In this case the objective of the territorialization of development can be the consolidation of family farming in the rural environment. The recent experience observed in the Brazilian rural environment can provide important subsidies to the questions dealt with here. In the next section we will briefly look at current rural territorial development policies.

2. The recent experience of rural territorial development in Brazil: a brief overview

Under the responsibility of SDT/ MDA, territorial development policy applied to the rural sector in Brazil has accumulated a significant set of cases (involving more than 160 territories), which have allowed a more accurate treatment of the limits and scopes of this experience of public intervention. PRONAT was at the core of the formation of SDT, which occurred in 2003 at the beginning of the first Lula government. This program started to operate in a regulated form in July 2005, when it obtained its formal seal following the publication of Edict. No. 05, dated 18/07/2005. This SDT edict controls the selection, alteration and administration of Rural
Territories and guarantees legal support for Citizenship Territories (Territórios da Cidadania - TC), an additional program which effectively commenced in 2008.

The concept of territory officially adopted is based on “a physical space, geographically defined, generally continuously, comprehending urban areas and the countryside, characterized by multidimensional criteria – such as the environment, the economy, society, culture, politics and institutions – and a population with relatively distinctive social groups, which are internally and externally related through specific processes, where one or more elements that indicate identity and social, cultural and territorial cohesion can be identified” (Brasil, MDA/SDT, 2005).

According to SDT the territorial approach is justified for various reasons, namely: a) the rural cannot be reduced to the agricultural; b) the municipal scale is too restrictive for the planning and organization of efforts aimed at promoting development, while the state scale is excessively broad; c) the need for the decentralization of public policies; d) the territory is the unit that best dimensions the ties of proximity between people, social groups and institutions, establishing initiatives aimed at development.

The intention of these programs is to guarantee that development processes involve multiple dimensions, each of which contributes in a determined manner to the territory in different areas, such as the economic, socio-cultural, political and institutional, and environmental.

In the Rural Identity Territories approach it is not uncommon to also refer to the ‘cultural’ dimension. In other words Rural Territories are based on the existence of a specific body of norms (whether symbolic or not) in the local society, in other words the idea of a ‘territorial identity’ (Echeverri, 2009). Nevertheless, the construction of this ‘identity’ is attributed to some – but not to all – territories. Among the criteria used by SDT to identify Rural Territories are: i) a set of municipalities with up to 50,000 inhabitants; ii) a set of municipalities with a population density lower than 80 inhabitants/km²; iii) a high concentration of MDA priority public (family farmers, families settled under agrarian reform, farmers benefitting from agrarian reordering, settled families, who characterize the greatest intensity of social demand); iv) a set of municipalities already organized in rural identity territories; v) a set of municipalities integrated with the Ministry of Social Development’s (MDS) Food Safety and Local Development Consortiums (Consórcios de Segurança Alimentar e Desenvolvimento Local - Consad) and the Ministry of National Integration’s Meso-Regions.
Until the present date 164 Rural Territories have been identified (see Figure 1), which are linked to MDA through SDT. Proposals for new territories or the modification of established territories can be made by local bodies and have to be forwarded to State Councils for Sustainable Rural Development (Conselhos Estaduais de Desenvolvimento Rural Sustentável - CEDRS) for analysis and for a recommendation to be made, which is then forwarded to the SDT. Similarly, development projects for rural territories can be proposed by local forums, CODETERs, and are supported by SDT, through the intermediation of CONDRAF (Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Rural Sustentável – National Council for Sustainable Rural Development).
During the identification process of rural territories some territories were found to be more fragilized than others, and as a result needed emergency attention with more articulated actions. This perception led to the launch of the Citizenship Territories Program in 2008. Although this has the same conceptual reference as the Rural Territories and is also covered by the same Edict, its management is much more complex. In summary, and in a general form, Citizenship Territories were selected from the set of Rural Territories. The priority was to assist territories that had low access to basic services, stagnant income generation indices and a lack of integrated and sustainable policies for mid-term economic autonomy.

The Citizenship Territories program is one of the actions aimed at reducing inequality proposed as part of the Federal Government’s Social Agenda. Its objective is the “overcoming of poverty and the generation of work and income in the rural environment through a territorial sustainable development strategy”. Specifically the Program aims to promote the productive inclusion of poor populations in territories through planning and the integration of public policies. It is also proposed to expand social participation and to guarantee the universalization of basic
citizenship programs. Until the end of 2008 the Program covered 60 territories, but in 2009 it was expanded to 120 Citizenship Territories (see Figure 2).

The criteria used in the selection of Citizenship Territories were: i) low HDI (Human Development Index); ii) high concentration of family farmers and people settled under agrarian reform policies; iii) high concentration of quilombola (descendants of escaped slaves) and indigenous populations; iv) high number of recipients from the Family Benefit Program (Programa Bolsa Família); v) high number of municipalities with low economic dynamism; vi) high social organization; vii) at least one territory per state in the Brazilian federation.

Under the scope of PRONAT the institutional management of the program is shown in a summary form in the following flowchart (Figure 3):

![Figure 3: PRONAT Management Flowchart](Image)

A tripod structure was established for the management of the Citizenship Territories Program (Figure 4): the National Management Committee, State Articulation Committees and State Collegiates. The National Management Committee originally consisted of 19 (and currently 22) ministries, with MDA being responsible for general coordination. This committee is responsible for approving directives, adopting program implementation measurements, program evaluation and the definition of new territories. It is coordinated by MDA, but articulation is carried out directly by the Casa Civil (Presidential Office), while the monitoring of the program is the responsibility of NEAD (Núcleo de Estudos Agrários e Desenvolvimento Rural – Agrarian Studies and Rural Development Group).
The State Articulation Committees are consultative and can also make proposals. They seek to articulate federal and state bodies and representatives of the municipal governments involved in the territories in question. They seek to support the organization and mobilization of collegiate bodies, stimulate the articulation and integration of various public policies in the territories, monitor the implementation of the Program, assist in publicizing it and present suggestions for new territories and actions.

The Territorial Collegiates consist of representatives from the three spheres of government and society in each territory. In comparison with the composition of Rural Territories the structure of collegiate territorial bodies is broader. They have an executive coordination whose composition is based on equal representation, unlike the composition of the PRONAT CODETERs in which the representatives of civil society are in a majority (generally holding 2/3 of the positions in these arenas).

Among the attributes of the Territorial Collegiates are: i) publicizing Program actions; ii) identifying local demands for the managing body to prioritize assistance (in accordance with criteria, the pre-established management system, legal specificities and existing participatory bodies); iii) promoting the interaction of public managers and sector councils; iv) contributing with suggestions for the qualification and integration of actions; v) systematizing contributions for the Integrated Territorial Action Plan; vi) exercising social control of the Program.
In the case of the PTC, Figure 5 summarizes the management and planning process operated in the different Citizenship Territories chosen. It indicates that the actions arising out of the Collegiates feed the matrix of territorial debate which, in turn, provide the Executive Plan with information about relevant activities, which subsidize their monitoring and follow-up, serving as raw material for the Matrix of Governmental Actions, which again supports the construction of local/regional efforts.

Despite being excessively normative, the above presentation is important to comprehend the changes involved in the formatting of guideline policies for rural territories and in the way the social management process for the same policies is conceived. This reformulation in the institutional policy arrangement (reinforcing its polity dimension) has direct impacts on how different actors become involved in the program (which effects social participation processes, the constitution of consultative and decision making arenas, the monitoring, follow-up and public control of actions implemented, etc.). In the case of the Citizenship Territories, unlike the Rural Territories, the challenge becomes greater because it involves different sector actions carried out by distinct ministries, the articulation of which effectively takes place on the territorial scale, complexifying the social management process. Much more than the mere sum of actions and budgetary allocations of ministries in relation to the same social space, it involves thinking about the logic of territorialization and governance of policies from a meeting of bottom-up actions on the part of local actors – now not necessarily agrarian– and top-down actions, also not necessarily sector based.
Before we move forward with these questions, we will look a little further at the landmarks that have laid the foundations for the public intervention process in the area, taking as a reference the institutionality operated under the scope of PRONAT\(^7\).

According to the specific SDT document (Brasil, MDA/SDT, 2005b), the “adoption of the principles and practices of social management" integrates alongside the “organization and strengthening of social actors” and the “promotion and integration of public policies”, a set of three principles that guide the institutional mission of the Secretariat, which are later developed and materialized in specific tools and spaces, such as Planos Territoriais de Desenvolvimento Rural Sustentável (PTDRS – Territorial Plans for Rural Sustainable Development) and the Collegiate Bodies at the territorial level. According to the same document, social management is understood as a “certain manner of managing public subjects, particularly in this case the policies and initiatives aimed at the promotion of development in rural areas. For this to occur in an effective manner, it has to be supported by decentralized systems based on strong participation, with greater fluidity and density of information, and the establishment of network partnerships and articulations. In territorial development this requires the construction of social harmonization pacts [...] the detailing of the pact in a negotiated development plan, the construction of institutionalities that represent spaces of the sharing of power and responsibilities, and finally, mechanisms of social control in relation to the actions stipulated in the plan” (idem, ibidem: 11).

Thus, from the perspective of policy normatization two processes stand out: the decentralization of public policies and the empowerment of local actors. Both attributes are identified as central to the logic of public action, to the extent that it is understood that their effective implementation will strengthen social participation processes (linked to mechanisms of democratic governance and transparency and/or territorial policy accountability). In this sense social participation guarantees the enforcement of principles that mark the difference between the ‘old’ experience of rural development planning (much in vogue in the 1970s and 1980s, and to a great extent encouraged by programs financed by multilateral agencies) and recent planning and territorial development initiatives. Thus, it is proposed in the governmental document, as we showed

\(^7\) As is well known PRONAT is not the only public policy territorialization experience in the recent Brazilian context. The work of Senra (2007) and Araújo (2007) deals with these questions in a very appropriate form.
above in reference to PTC, to implement a social management cycle, to a good extent ballasted by the policy analysis dedicated to the examination of policy cycles (Flexor and Leite, 2007; Frey, 2000).

**Figure 6 – Social Management Cycle – PRONAT**

Planning – Organization – Coordination/Direction – Social Control

The scheme presented in Figure 6 identifies the different phases of the social management cycle in rural territories in Brazil. Governance, planning, organization and social control stand out as the elements that guide the dynamics of the functioning of the cycle in question. As a result actor mobilization, policy articulation, the offer of information and the guarantee of democratic decision making mechanisms are crucial aspects for the success of the performance proposed by SDT. Despite the attention given to the mobilization and participation of various actors, the protagonist role of the state is evident, which, apart from the interventionist character of the 1950s and 1960s, has structured its actions to offer the initial conditions in relation to which policies and processes are organized, or also to reinforce the basic principles that can allow that the process develop with some guarantees. This is what

---

*The resumption of the planning capacity of the state during this decade has meant that the management policy of territories has been inserted in a differentiated institutional outline, not just in relation to the new bodies created, but also involving a change in the referential framework that informs the exercise of public policies at the international level. In relation to the idea of referential framework, mediators and the*
Evans (1995) calls the *Midwife State* and the *Husbandry State* respectively.

As stated in the SDT document mentioned above, it is expected that at the end of the cycle the following results will have been obtained: the social capital of the territory will have been recognized and mobilized; the territorial development diagnosis and plan will have been prepared; the planning of the implementation of the initiatives will have been prepared or improved; institutional arrangements for implementation will have been negotiated and established; specific projects will have been prepared, negotiated and will be in the process of being implemented; objectives and targets will be systematically monitored and evaluated; a social management system with feedback will be operating; and local agents will dominate the social management process of the territory.

For this it is expected that policy implementation will involve the following stages, in what is called the ‘*macro-process of social management*’: i) awareness raising and mobilization; ii) vision of the future; iii) diagnostics; iv) planning; v) institutional arrangements; vi) organization of plan implementation; vii) management of plan implementation; viii) monitoring and evaluation.

These stages, also according to the document (p. 24 and following) aim to achieve the following results: improvement of process integration agreements between mayors and defined local institutions; expansion of logistical support and formalized participation commitments; mobilization of civil society organizations to participate in the process; holding the population co-responsible for the definition of guidelines, commitment of local actors to the development process; collective interests duly expressed, with the respective groups and segments duly represented and committed; consolidation of data collection and analysis regarding the territory, with the identification of potentialities and difficulties; establishment of agglutinating vision of the future and axes to be followed; definition and structuring of plans, programs and projects of action; better articulated public policies and territorial development plans constructed in a participatory form; design of institutional arrangements, establishment of active partnerships; fully functioning information flows; definition of monitoring and evaluation strategies with collectively constructed indicators; monitored cycle including feedback.

In relation to what is of interest to us in this text the implementation of the policy requires the constitution of specific arenas to achieve the objective proposed in PRONAT. It is worth noting analyses of public policies, see Muller (1995 and 2004).
that the construction of public spaces for the exercise of dialogue and decision making, as is the case of territorial collegiates, consists of a governmental intervention directive which authors such as Frey (2000) would call constitutive policies (alongside distributive, regulatory and redistributive policies), redesigning the public-governmental framework for the practice of political instruments (policies) derived from this new political institutionality (polity) which in turn results from the policy negotiations (politics) which give sustenance to the new framework on top of which the program is operated.

The implementation of these spaces at the territorial level thus consists of a strategic element for the practice of social management and territorial governance policy. In effect, CONDRAF Resolutions 48 and 52 already show that the ‘effectiveness and democratization’ of councils is a mechanism for ensuring the social participation process and for proposing an effective development policy “eliminating interference from political parties and local oligarchies in the decision making process” (Condraf Res 48, sub-section “d” in the initial considerations). As a result these public spaces should contemplate the representativeness, diversity and plurality of the actors involved (idem, ibidem, Art. 1)\(^9\), paying attention to two among the various recommendations existing under the scope of the resolution: a) aim to normatize the councils (especially in the form of laws – municipal, state and/or federal), ensuring the continuity of their actions; b) guarantee that at least 50% of places in the councils are held by representatives of civil society organizations linked to family farming (the other 50%, or less, of positions will be for representatives from the public sectors, para-governmental organizations, and other civil society sectors not linked to family farming).

In the normative proposition of the SDT document, these territorial arenas shape three differentiated spaces, though their effective denomination and functioning are the object of the specificities of each of the territories created: plenary (involving the participation of all collegiate representatives), executive or managerial group, with a proportional nature and responsible for the implementation of the actions of the plenary body and the territorial plan, and the technical group, with the mission of subsidizing the functioning of collegiate bodies, providing knowledge

---

\(^9\) According to the first paragraph of the Resolution in question: “I – representativeness is understood to mean that the base of the social organizations are represented by these entities; II – diversity means the representation of different social actors involved in the sustainable rural development process, whether these are young people, women, quilombolas, family farmers linked to different communities and/or productive arrangements, small entrepreneurs, etc.; III – plurality presupposes that the different organizations (associations, trade unions, cooperatives, etc.) from the same category are represented, as
and expertise about specific areas and issues.

Another instrument related to the issue being discussed here concerns the social control of territorial development processes and policies, directly impacting on the governance capacity of public policies. According to the official definition, social control is understood as the “element of the process of the social management of development that allows a set of social actors access to information about actions and projects being implemented in the territory at the same time that the actions are analyzed to see if they are happening as planned and agreed and if the actions are actually contributing and creating the desired results and, if they are not, deciding which measures should be taken to return to the desired direction” (idem, ibidem: 7). From this perspective monitoring and evaluation, especially of PRONAT, are the two instruments stipulated as social control mechanisms. Stressed in the official text was the idea that control, operated as a management and territorial governance instrument, would have the objective of guaranteeing greater efficiency in the use of public resources, aiming at meeting the observed development indicators. It should be stressed that the monitoring (whether at the actual territorial development scale or the scale of specific programs and project) and evaluation instruments operate on the basis of participatory processes, are supplied with relevant information and are based on indictors that reflect the aspirations and expectations involved in the territorial development perspective.

In addition to the official SDT documents, the paper presented by Echeverri (2009) offers some additional parameters that can add to the understanding of what we call the normative dimension of the social management of territories. According to the author the latter is guided by the observation of four objectives of the territorial development policy, which are: a) the strengthening of territorial organizations and the recognition of interlocutors qualified to operate with the demands that emerge at this level; b) the development of political and technical managerial capacities; c) the establishment of public policy articulation processes; and d) the economic dynamization of the territory. Meeting these objectives is helped by the strategic actions of SDT in carrying out the social management cycle of the territory, as well as institutional strengthening and investment policies.

Despite the sophisticated technical and instrumental design that informs the context in which
the social management mechanisms of territories are produced and implemented, it is interesting to highlight, to return to the original SDT document, that all these policy documents only make sense when fully used by actors who are the object of the policy, which leads us to widen the examination of this experience in light of the questions raised in the first topic.

3. Governing capacity, social management and institutional arrangements: reflections and challenges based on PRONAT

As noted by Sachs (2009) territorial experiences and institutional arrangements differ among themselves and it is necessary to take precautions in exacerbating good practices, identifying mechanisms that allow the expansion and reproduction in other territories of processes that have had positive results in a specific territory without this determining, however, homogenization or the loss of the richness of the specific character or the ‘mark’ of each of the territories involved. The search for solutions and outcomes capable of being generalized and universalized becomes tempting, in particular in relation to public administration and international agencies. Nevertheless, in monitoring the different processes put into practice by territorial policy in their areas of operation, it is important to recognize that certain traits of these territories are specific to them, resulting from their construction trajectory. In certain cases, these particularities are responsible for the success or lack of progress of a territorial policy (conditionalities), and therefore have to be reinforced or corrected by policy. Nevertheless, this does not prevent the construction of articulations between experiences in different territories. For example, the institutional baggage acquired by social actors (through a trade union, association of settled farmers, etc.) in the process of constructing the Citizenship Territory of Borborema in Paraiba, certainly constitutes one of the determining elements of the solid character that the territorial collegiate has acquired in that location. Even if we cannot identify this trajectory in other cases, this experience suggests that one of the paths to the strengthening this policy in territories in which this institutional framework is not present is the implementation of specific actions aimed at the stimulation and strengthening of the social actors existing there (Leite et al., 2009).

Returning to Hirschman (1984), we believe that the mechanisms of social management and governmental capacity for these spaces can assume distinct configurations and times, and
specific development processes and movements that do not follow the same sequences, with what the author calls the process of inverted sequences differentiating them. This type of statement implies the problematization and linearity of the social management cycle of territories to the extent that, due to their particularities, the order and the velocity of stages may not follow the same sequencing. This does not invalidate the attempts of public administration to normalize, or to homogenize procedures, intervention policies and territorial management. Nevertheless, between normatization and practice it is necessary to maintain a certain amount of flexibility, adapting these parameters to the historical, social, economic, political and cultural context in which the different experiences of rural territorial development take place in Brazil.

As Abramovay (2007: 21-2) points out, one of the problems of analyses of rural territorial development is their strongly normative character, at times obstructing a more concrete understanding of effective territorial dynamics: “the first of them [the problems of area studies] is the normative character in which they are frequently dressed. One of the most frequent approaches of studies about territorial development consists of comparing regions which have similar objective resource factors, but which nevertheless differ considerably in relation to their economic dynamism and their social and environmental results: these are works that seek to find in intangible factors (amongst which social capital stands out) explanatory factors for differences between certain regions. These comparisons give rise to sets of attributes characteristic of virtuous situations which are transformed into recommendations for public and private organizations. The description of the elements that supposedly explain the better development of some areas ends up being taken as something that it is not: an explanation of its causes, since because in this description what are highlighted are elements of a subjective and organizational nature, it is not difficult to reach general conclusions such as, by way of example, that successful regions are those that have more dynamic organizations, are more open to social horizons different from the one in which they are immersed, have a greater rooting of their traditional cultures, in short a set of attributes that are certainly noble and desirable, but which only with great difficulty can manage to explain the situations in question. To a certain extent the criticism outlined here also applies to studies which find in social capital the root of the better performance of certain regions”.

A more accurate examination of the praxis of territorial social management requires the observation of some more critical aspects in light of the PRONAT experience, which will be
dealt with below. A document prepared at the request of CONDRAF, taking as a reference a systematization of various studies on institutionality, policy management, and agencies concerned with rural development in the country (Brasil, MDA/CONDRAF, 2005), contains a topic related to the “territorial and institutional bases of the different spheres of social management”, subdivided into four aspects. In the first (“scope and interaction of actions”), it was found that the studies examined converged to the fact that: a) the interaction between the various social actors in the CMDRs was still very low; b) the definition of types of action (centered on agricultural activities) and the management of work plans is the responsibility of the technical team of the public agencies involved; c) the interaction observed between the municipalities of a determined region occurs more through competition that the establishment of partnerships, while articulations between the municipal, state and federal public bodies was also precarious. In the second aspect (‘amplitude and focus of debates’) the systematized convergences showed that the PMDRs possessed more of a ‘shopping list’ than an actual development project, as while the actions of the councils were essentially directed to resolving pressing problems, losing strategic sight of the mid and long term, and preventing a more profound diagnosis of policy impacts on local economies. In the third aspect (‘continuity and discontinuity of actions’), the documents analyzed agree that CMDR actions are limited to the use of PRONAF resources, creating a dependence on the actions of councils in relation to a given public policy, which oscillates from government to government. Finally, the fourth aspect highlighted (‘support mechanisms for the functioning of institutionality’) observed the lack of infrastructure and support for the functioning of councils, and as a result their dependence in relation to the installations and environments offered by municipal governments.

Other studies highlighted that the inheritance of political culture manifested in the centralization of decision making processes and in the clientelism of relations constitute a central obstacle to the shaping of an institutional environment capable of planning territorial development, coordinating and integrating a diversity of social actors, strategic actions and specific projects. As a result the most privileged and/or empowered segments are favored, creating distortions in policy objectives, discontinuity of actions and the centralization of decisions in a limited number of agents. Many of these old practices were not eliminated and are transposed to territories, segregating municipalities and social groups that do not have representative force (Couto and Rocha, 2006: 9). This point has already been raised as a warning by Favareto (2008:11), when
he counterpoised management and social control processes to the (im)balance in the relations of force present among territorial actors: “[...] the great challenge at the end of this decade is to move from a model which gave greater empowerment to the social movements of farmers regarding the social control of public investments, to a model capable of moving the coordination of social forces towards a style of territorial development that is inclusive, sustainable and sustained [...]”.

In a considerable part of the processes aimed at expanding participation in public policies, conflict is underestimated or ‘avoided’ as a form of preserving ‘harmony’ among the different groups that make up the decision making arena and, therefore, its political stability. Nonetheless, the clash of opinions and positions and the (not always possible) resolution of conflicts is a constituent and non-transferable stage in the participatory process and reinforces the importance that mechanisms be included and guaranteed that can encourage participation and ensure the representativeness of social groups and the transparency of decision making processes. In the territory of Serra do Brigadeiro (Minas Gerais state), with the aim of minimizing conflict, and under the penalty of discouraging the leaders of the forum, criteria were set for project prioritization and implementation body definition. The strategy of using the sharing of resources as a form of conflict resolution had the consequence of blocking the creation of a resource investment process based on a strategic vision of planning territorial management (Favareto and Schröder, 2006). The Estrada de Ferro territory (Goias state), despite the presence of family farmers and large grain and milk producers in the region, who normally have differentiated interests, has an institutional arrangement with a low level of conflict. Joint efforts take place in relation to pragmatic themes, albeit less innovative ones, focused on agricultural production, although there exists a consensus about the strengthening of family farming through productive diversification, the expansion of quality and the opening of new channels of commercialization (Brasil, MDA/SDT, 2007).

The recognition and confronting of conflicts, even those existing within groups aligned with family farming interests, constitutes a fundamental element for the territorial governance dimension (Hirschman, 1984). The elimination of conflict often blocks the emergence of new dynamics and compromises the expansion of democratic channels of participation, to the extent that it tends to privilege those social groups which have a privileged position in the local power structure. It is relevant to consider that the difference in the level of representativeness of
various actors (depending on their political articulation capacity and their knowledge of the functioning of bureaucratic processes regarding access to public resources) can come to generate distinct forms of participation and intervention of these social groups in the management process, producing specific configurations at the moment of the investment of the resources made available at the territorial level (Couto and Rocha, 2006: 11).

Thus, in the case of Planalto Catarinense (Santa Catarina state), although a large part of the members of the council stated that they sought to stimulate activities considered to be fundamental for the economic strengthening of the most vulnerable rural population, this was not always reflected in practice. According to Cazella and Búrigo (2006), the majority of the resources invested in the region (both from the former Pronaf Infrastructure program or other programs) ends up privileging family farmers of an intermediate economic size, a segment that although it suffers from some deficiencies in its living conditions and productive activities, does not constitute the most excluded segment of the rural population.

However, the success that the SDT policy has achieved has to be acknowledged, especially in relation to expanding the visibility of certain social groups (particularly those organized in representative bodies) which until then were not (or only marginally) considered in rural and territorial development processes. The investments made in training leaders and in mobilization activities have contributed to the expansion of channels of access to information. In addition, territorial policy resulted in the effective recognition of these populations as a strategic policy for territorial development, making them even more visible and raising their political capital, since they become more capable of influencing development policies.

The experience of the territory of Borborema (Paraiba state) appears to us to be illustrative of the changes caused by territorial management policy in the application of existing resources: from an initial situation where these were concentrated in groups of actors articulated by trade union groups it moved to another more distributed situation, now including the forum of settled farmers and actors close to the semi-arid region (Bonnal and Piraux, 2007).

On the other hand Favareto (2008) has defended that there needs to be a substantial change in the range of actors who should be incorporated in the territorial dynamic, avoiding the risk that the empowerment of more organized actors signifies a disproportional appropriation of financial resources, and taking into consideration the finding that the consolidation of an effectively
territorial project cannot be restricted to the eminently agricultural project. This perspective is perhaps most evident in the case of the experience of Citizenship Territories. The expansion of actors, according to the author, should include the most disorganized ones closest to the base of the preferential public of MDA policies, as well as non-rural segments and local entrepreneurs. A little caution is necessary here, since political processes imply some construction of hegemonic fields and it is almost impossible for us to think about the emergence of consensual territorial proposals with such a differentiated range of interests. As a result if it is necessary to reconfigure fields of power, the instruments available for this have to be evaluated (such as the strengthening of local organizations) and the profile of strategic actors with whom the management process will be developed. Giving visibility to the most vulnerable actors who expect access to a range of policies (and resources) is very different from attributing more significant spaces to a group of actors historically characterized by conservative postures in relation to the spheres of democratic governance and whose actions essentially take place on the basis of the concentration of assets (political, economic and landholding).

On the other hand, it should always be kept in mind that the validity of territorial management processes and policies has to involve a recovery of the historical baggage on which they have been constructed, the active nature of the participation of actors and in particular the actual intervention of the state. Brandão (2007: 49-50) helps us move forward in relation to this point: “the need for the ‘territorialization’ of public intervention is taken to be a panacea for all development problems. It is asserted, both explicitly and in a veiled form, that all social, economic and political actors are increasingly more embodied, ‘diluted’ (subsumed), in a determined territorial focus. Actually there seems to exist an option to substitute the state (‘which has gone’), with a new condensation of (abstract) social and political forces that comes to be called territory. Structural questions are often absent or ‘badly abstracted.’ General recipes are proposed, neglecting, for example, the specificities of the context of an underdeveloped, continental and peripheral country that has a very peculiar historical formation at the local scale. Well catalogued repertoires of good practices, the fruit of research efforts in the creation of inventories of territorial development experiences are ignored. The territory comes to be seen as a large repository element that is condensing and at the same time an automatic regulator of relations, and has the ability to synthesize and embody social and political projects. [...] Public action is only responsible for animating it and making it aware,
constructing long-lasting trust and consensus. It is worth remembering that this consensus emerged as a supposition and not as a proposal to be constructed. For example the role of the state in the provision of infrastructure, both hard and soft, is clearly neglected, which I think is still an important factor in the structuration of dynamics. [...] Territory which should be seen as a politicized environment, in conflict and in construction, is seen as a passive and marketable entity, a mere receptacle. What is the fruit of social relations appears as a relation between objects. There is a reification and the territory appears to have its decision making power transformed into a collective subject”.

Reinforcing the criticism of the ‘neutrality of scales’ and returning to the meaning of the experiences of territorial policies, the author also argues that: “it is necessary to construct an analytical locus for the measurement of relations, an interpretative filter for relations with a determined focus on territorial analysis with different spatial scales. [...] However, the complexity of analyses that do not take territory as a passive entity [...] is enormous: a problem can be manifested on a certain scale, but its determination is on another. Intervention instruments for a localized reality can be on another spatial scale, political arena, level of government, level of power, etc. Therefore, I argue that thinking of territorialized public policies involves duly articulating scales, arenas, levels and bodies which are interconnected” (Brandão, 2007: 57). In other words, it is necessary to think of the territorial dynamic in a non-administrative form, even if the endogenous development procedures of these experiences are valorized. This implies more complex management and governance intra and inter territories, as well as between the different levels where actors circulate.

In this way the process of social management and governance involves two aspects that should be better examined in relation to the limits and reaches that this perspective assumes in territorial development: a) it is necessary to think about in what institutional arrangement the management experience is developed. If the perspective offered emphasizes territorial policy as an anti-poverty policy, the instruments and practices related to social management will certainly assume a more different performance when the emphasis is centered on the construction of productive chains disposed in determined localized arrangements; b) the other point refers to what Favareto (2008) correctly remembered, i.e., the form through which actors are mobilized and the participating social segments are chosen is crucial for defining the functioning of
Conclusions

The territorial development policy in the rural environment represented a considerable advance by expanding the capacity for the social participation of actors in the dialogue, negotiation, design and planning processes of public policies, adding what we can call one of the attributes of governmental and social management capacity of development processes. Obviously this accumulation was presented in a completely unequal form in the various existing experiences, both in relation to its degree of coverage (the capacity to include the most different local actors), and in relation to its organizational level (the form through which the effective constitution of the spaces and procedures used in the different stages of the social management cycle occurs) and their degree of social effectiveness (the representativeness and the scope of the results achieved with actions operated by policy – both in relation to the instruments adopted and regarding the form that they are used). It appears to us that the diversity of situations and solutions found in each case, despite the existence of standardized normative procedures, is revealed to be a rich instrument for channeling the accumulated, constructed and/or reconverted social energy towards projects that in one form or another obtained some territorial status, surpassing the limits of interests circumscribed to specific groups and/or determined municipalities. This relative autonomy of the actors present in the territory allows the emergence of various propositions, molding the excessive normativeness of the administrative tools designed for the program.

The creation of territories, in particular those implemented in the rural environment, collaborated to establish the conditions necessary for the creation of a constant dialogue between local social actors who until then traditionally ‘did not talk’. This process contributed to the better ‘working’ of the conflicts existing between the distinct actors who constituted the territory, stimulating them to implementing joint actions, whether or not in dialogue with the state, aimed at development. This experience allowed, under different circumstances, the construction and

---

10 Even disagreeing with a generalization related to this point, Favareto’s reminder (2008: 6) is pertinent: “CODETERs were not created as an expression of local social forces in relation to a territorial development project, to the contrary, the availability of resources was communicated and they were told to prepare a plan to gain access to these resources”. 
legitimation of a new operational institutionality that aims to make the discussion, comparison and selection of concrete and collective local development projects feasible, surpassing the electoral or opportunistic interests of some local governments.

Nonetheless, there are various challenges that territorial development faces in Brazil. Even though some PRONAT experiences have been successful, and others are ongoing as part of the Citizenship Territories Program, there are numerous cases in which the results have been modest and reduced: in various territories the forums or collegiates have not been representative of all the social segments of local family farming, in addition while collegiates instead of representing spaces for expanded participation have figured much more as structures imposed by determined public policies so that local actors will have access to federal resources. In this way it is not rare for these spaces to exclude from their dynamics the least articulated and most needy segments, reproducing the same structure preexisting in local power and privileging some segments to the detriment of others. Also recurrent are cases in which the suggested ‘development’ approach is mostly limited to sector and productive projects, excluding from its formulation the articulation of family farming with other important social segments.

On the other hand the territorialization that emerges from public sector actions gave rise in some regions and/or states in the country to a fertile negotiation about the delimitation and recognition of these new spaces of articulation, as, for example, was the case of the state of Bahia. This experience – we are referring here particularly to the case of rural territories – has allowed the exercise of other policies and/or programs that validate the territorial scale for their planning strategies. A improvement of these initiatives would certainly contribute to the reinforcement and the legitimacy of actions that seek to establish a common spatial base for their operation.

In relation to the articulation of public policies, it is important to highlight that territoriality integrates the concerns of the agenda of the state and social organizations (on the most differentiated scales), even though the effectiveness of this articulation is still quite incipient, though promising. This result is the fruit of a long and dual promise that is related to the crisis of the centralized state and the subsequent decentralization on the one hand, and the struggle for the redemocratization of Brazilian society on the other.

Under the influence of international experience, the idea of territory, even incurring the risks we
pointed to in the previous topic, has been strengthened as the most appropriate level for the appreciation of development and local governance. Territory is consolidated as a social construction on a broader scale, which facilitates the perception and the emergence of more complex and promising economic, social, political and cultural dynamics, capable of involving rural-urban articulations and proposals for collective action on the part of existing social actors, with a greater capacity to have an impact on the characteristics and the sustainability of development processes.

Nonetheless, there is a clear necessity to improve how the state operates in these territorial bodies, strengthening the process of the ‘professionalization’ of the territorial management activity, collaborating for a more robust bureaucracy in these instances. It is necessary not to confuse an increase in the participation and social control of actors with the loss of responsibility for functions which should be typical of the state (in particular mobilizing the most fragile actors, giving the territorial scale the infrastructure and resources necessary for its functioning, having state employees with the time available to direct and implement actions, etc.). On the other hand, an increase in qualified bureaucracy does not – and should not – exclude the effective participation of actors from the decision making process of territorial actions.

Additionally, it is fundamental to rethink how territorial projects are financed in relation to expenditure with investments (infrastructure). Effectively the management of resources should suppose a higher level of autonomy of territorial bodies in relation to the receiving and investment of these resources in activities that are part of the various PTDRS. However, this perspective clashes with the judicial and legal framework on which the experience of policy territorialization is based and also with the lack of experience of governmental managers (especially in sector policies) in submitting their projects and budgets for analysis in broader arenas. It is necessary to harmonize instruments that allow greater agility in financing processes in the territorial projects operated with PROINF resources. In part this involves the greater qualification of the projects themselves. However, in relation to social management the effective capacity of the Collegiate to exercise social control over the application of resources, accompanying the implementation of project activities (whether these are related to costing or investment) is the nodal point.

The primordial level for the articulation of policies and the exercise of social management is the
collegiate. However, how can CODETER be strengthened? First, through the recognition by the government of these arenas as spaces for the planning, implementation and evaluation of public policies. Second by guaranteeing the permanent functioning and qualification of these structures, which gives greater legitimacy/quality to CODETERs and to the actions of their members. Third, by stimulating the local social base to act in these spaces. To the extent that they are (reasonably) open arenas, they are not constituted as a *locus* of dispute between different segments and strategic projects. The challenge is to make these forums visible and legitimate with projects and actions that pervade local and regional spheres.

In summary an experience with the caliber of the existing territorial policy in the recent Brazilian context presents windows of opportunity for institutional innovations and mechanisms of participatory governance and management that should not be neglected. The accumulation observed until the moment confers on the supra-municipal scale an important space in the design and implementation of policies that, on the one hand, do not eliminate municipal initiatives and, on the other, reveal the capacity that determined projects possess in reaching a broader sphere, guaranteeing their continuity to the extent that they legitimate their actions in regard to the social actors involved, and possessing a certain amount of autonomy in relation to local political humors.
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