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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The reviewers’ main task was to evaluate MINGA’s effectiveness by assessing the extent to which the program is meeting its main goal of “enhancing the capacity of all sectors of society to develop and implement effective decisions regarding natural resource management in fragile eco regions in Latin America and the Caribbean.”

MINGA’s objectives remain consistent with its main research projects and strategies aimed at supporting a multidisciplinary and multi-stakeholder approach (MSA) to sustainable and equitable natural resources management (NRM), including organizational principles and approaches to managing conflicts. The lessons derived from project as well as the tools and methodologies developed are being synthesized, disseminated, communicated and integrated into institutional frameworks for improving NRM and environmental governance.

The program is addressing the main suggestions made following the 1999 review, and the PI has adjusted second-phase project planning and corrected and developed methodological guidelines for tool-kits and evaluations. Gender mainstreaming has become an integral part of MINGA’s programming as reflected in project selection criteria and the emerging research priorities on gender equity and access to natural resources. Programs currently in their second and third phases are adopting the lessons learned and applying them to new situations as project up-scale their activities, as seen in MANRECUR in Ecuador. The MINGA supported projects are playing key roles in the promotion of social learning and capacity building processes. Training programs on social information systems and the development of “Learning Alliances,” integrated into the project strategies, as reflected in the IDRC-CIDA collaborative project Pro-Mesas, demonstrate the up-take of lessons learned.

The development of strategies for comparing and assessing tools and methodologies is also being addressed through the support that has been provided for projects involving more than one country or localities, such as in up-scaling projects. The research exchanges and debates through international seminars, workshops, and conferences, also provide opportunities for discussing lessons learned and strategies for applying tools and methods in different contexts. Internal reviews and evaluations have been integrated into MINGA’s programming in order to build in-house capacities and involve partners in research efforts on gender equity in NRM.

The program’s outputs represent a very well balanced set of products, including state of the art work on resource management strategies and advanced comparative research on conflict resolution and institutional learning. The integration of biodiversity, traditional knowledge, improved agro-processing technology, and local markets in the development of culturally adapted rural agro-industry projects provides lessons and training material appropriate for larger rural audience in several countries. Participatory action research has been adopted in many of the projects to ensure the integration of local social actors and relevant local knowledge in keeping with the program’s goals, as seen in projects on water management and water rights, mining, community forestry, and coastal resources. Inventive outputs that reach broader audiences include e-conferences and debates. Canadian academic community and international donors area also adequately integrated in the program’s strategy.

Innovative approaches have allowed the impact of some programs to go beyond partner institutions, as reflected in the strategic use of Small Grant Programs (SGP’s), which allow for training and capacity building while integrating a variety of experiences of partners of MINGA’s partners. Reviewers perceived an increase in the integration of synthesis and lessons derived from projects on key programming areas such as improving the living conditions of the rural poor, conflict and
collaboration, and community-based coastal resource management. The SGP’s are a useful way of improving synthesis and contributing to transfer monitoring and evaluation tools to partners.

MINGA’s reach includes community and local stakeholders such as NGO’s, local governments, government agencies, academic and research centres, regional development consortia, national coalitions, policy makers, and international development institutions. The program provides an opportunity to explore and adopt new methodologies for enhancing partners’ planning capacities, such as outcome mapping, which was adopted by CONDESAN, the Arrow-root project, the Peace-Building and Reconstruction Program, CGIAB in Bolivia, CIDA’s Pro-Mesas Project in Honduras, MANRECUR III and the Management of Natural Resources in the Southern Highlands of Peru project (MARENASS).

Mentoring, thesis support, documentation of experiences, methodology sharing, cases studies and networking are enhancing MINGA’s gender programming capacities.

Participatory research approaches are building capacities and social capital that can be used to influence decision-making on NRM at the local level and to support recent decentralization efforts, as demonstrated by several projects in Bolivia and Ecuador. Several of the projects reviewed have contributed to decentralization while building social capital at local level.

Technological innovations such as those introduced by the agro industry project and up-scaled agro ecological practices provide new opportunities for strengthening knowledge, encouraging the work of research networks in the area of integrated production systems, and increasing employment and income opportunities for the rural poor. The reviewers have noted the need for an evaluation of MINGA’s influence on specific policies.

The introduction of MSA on research applied to NRM has not been easily adapted by all of MINGA’s partners. A multi-disciplinary perspective on development research on natural resource management still requires extensive training and debates among development practitioners and researchers including the participation of local governments. The specific evaluation of mainstreaming MSA to NRM on local governments’ policies and practices is not mentioned in the prospectus or evaluation plans with the exception of productive municipalities, and its impact on national policy-making bodies is not evident. Economic and social analysis are not yet comprehensively integrated into project design and evaluation.

The program’s influence on policies and/or technologies can be appreciated in the policy changes that are taking place in specific contexts, as seen in Ecuador’s Carchi Program. While the program is up scaling to watersheds in other municipalities, a major replication is being implemented through the CONDESAN consortia with the financial support of other donors. Influence on policies is also reflected on the evolving dialogue and coordinated efforts with CIDA and members of its “powerful international community” such as UNEP, GTZ, IFAD and World Bank.
1. INTRODUCTION
The external review of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) Managing Natural Resources in Latin America and the Caribbean (MINGA) Program Initiative (PI) is an integral part of the effort to analyze six Environment and Natural Resources Management (ENRM) PIs, three Social and Economic Equity PIs, and two corporate projects. This report describes the review objectives, topics to be addressed, the methodology used, and findings, and questions to be considered by Program management.

MINGA’s program in Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) supports a multidisciplinary and multi-stakeholder approach (MSA) to sustainable and equitable natural resource management (NRM), including organizational principles and conflict management approaches. The synthesis of lessons learned and tools and methodologies developed are central to its capacity building activities and the promotion of MSA to NRM by its partners and other development agencies in LAC.

2. REVIEW OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS
The purpose of this exercise is to improve the program’s effectiveness through an independent, external performance review that can be used to inform programming decisions. The review is designed to meet three main objectives:

- To assess the extent to which the Program is meeting the objectives and goals set out in its prospectus and identify any change in program objectives
- To document the results of the Program (i.e. products, progress made, and results)
- To consider the strengths and weaknesses of the Program’s thematic approach and strategies used in the field(s) to which it contributes

The review is based on the following questions:

- How effective is the Program in terms of disseminating and using the results obtained?
- What is its contribution to building the capacities of researchers and institutions?
- What influence has the Program had on policies in related areas?
- How has it contributed to the inclusion of a gender perspective?
- Have the results obtained been affected in a positive way by changes in the relationships, actions, or behavior of project partners and other project stakeholders?
- What is the importance of the work carried out and whom does it benefit?
- How has the Program contributed to the development of technology in related fields?

3. REVIEW DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY
The design of this review and the methodological approaches used were developed by the reviewers, the Program team, and the Evaluation Unit and are in keeping with the review framework discussed at the Orientation and Methodology Workshop held in Ottawa on 14 of April 2003. Although it does not cover the full spectrum of MINGA programming, the review team has made every effort to include some comments on projects that received little attention.

Reviewers tools included program reviews and project evaluations, documentation, interviews with Program team members, project leaders, and resource persons and in-depth analysis of selected projects.

3.1 Selection of Case Studies
This overview covers a limited number of projects due to time constraints. Projects were selected for review in consultation with the MINGA program leader and the Evaluation Unit. The programs/projects were clustered according to their expected results, which are listed below:

a) A built-in dialogue process designed to foster MSA to NRM;

b) Approaches that can be used in MSA to conflicts and collaboration in issues of governance;

c) The creation of components that address issues of gender in NRM;

d) Up- and out-scaling international projects in order to increase their impact;

e) Advanced research cycles with a trajectory that has been tested prior to the second phase;

f) Unique projects

Table 1 in Appendix Iii shows the selection criteria. The projects selected: (i) were at the second phase or beyond; (ii) could demonstrate synthesis, use of communications, and dissemination; (iii) demonstrated up- or out-scaling; and (iv) featured unique approaches. Projects selected included those that were at an advanced stage of development or in the second phase of their research cycle in order to study their applicability to other contexts and the creation of learning processes and networks. The review also included projects that addressed critical situations like water management during serious social conflicts in order to analyze the potential of MSA to NRM. A prime example of this is the Regulation of Rights in the Water Law in Bolivia (101423).

3.2 Activities

Reviewers analyzed documentation and interviewed Program leaders from the following projects:

- Community-Based Coastal Resource Management (Caribbean) Phase II (101156)
- Collaborative Watershed Management of Natural Resources (Ecuador) Phase II (100996)
- Small Grants Program: Fondo Min'ka de Chorlavi (100730)
- Regulation of Rights in the Water Law in Bolivia (101423)
- Andean Water Vision from an Indigenous and Peasant Perspective (101689)
- Coastal Area Monitoring Project and Laboratory (CAMP-Lab III) Nicaragua (100494)
- Scaling-up of Successful Agro Ecological Experiences in LAC (100183)
- Agro Industries and Outcome Mapping (100918)

Reviewers visited Bolivia, Peru, Mexico, Nicaragua, and Chile, and held several meetings with Program Officers and evaluation staff in Ottawa. They also participated in a workshop held in Mérida, Mexico as part of the Community-Based Coastal Resource Management-CBNRM (Caribbean) Phase II project, the Consortium for the Sustainable Development of the Andean Ecoregion (CONDESAN) Board of Directors meeting in Cochabamba, Bolivia, and a workshop held by CGIAB in La Paz. A site visit to the CAMP-Lab III project in Pearl Lagoon, Nicaragua and El Angel, Ecuador allowed reviewers to interview various stakeholders, including local authorities. Two of the Small Grants Programs (SGP) and gender-related activities were reviewed.

4. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND PORTFOLIO REVIEW

The program objectives were clearly articulated in the Request for Board of Governors Approval to Proceed to Phase II, which was submitted in May 2000.

4.1.1 Evolution of Program Objectives

A brief description of the prospectus and current programming priorities is provided below.

Summary of Lessons Learned in Phase I

The experience gained indicated that there was a need to:

- Focus on MSA to NRM in Latin America
Encourage individuals and institutions to adopt more inclusive approaches to negotiating access to, use of, and rights over natural resources at local, eco-regional, and national levels.

- Demonstrate that participatory approaches are better than top-down ones
- Clearly identify the types of changes that can be effected
- Develop a systematic monitoring and evaluation plan

In view of the lessons learned during the implementation of Phase I, MINGA objectives were adjusted to include the following four specific goals:

- To summarize the lessons learned about MSA to sustainable and equitable NRM, including organizational principles and ways to manage disputes over natural resources;
- To identify and generate effective tools and methodologies for promoting MSA to NRM;
- To develop strategies and apply lessons learned from MSA to NRM to new contexts;
- To promote the adoption of MSA to NRM in organizations by analyzing and demonstrating their effectiveness and benefits.

Yearly reports are submitted to the Board and contain outlines of new approaches to and reports on PI implementation, which allows it to assess the need for changes. In the 2001 Annual Report to the Board, the Director of Environment and Natural Resource Management (ENRM) Program Area indicated that the Program was relatively stable and that progress was being made in all areas according to the plans included in the prospectus. Special mention was made of: (i) the creation of an experimental partnership with the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) in Honduras in order to promote a knowledge-based learning approach to development; (ii) the success of MINGA-supported SGP’s as tools for training, exchanges, mentoring, and devolving management responsibilities to Southern partners; (iii) the development of a strategy for introducing gender perspectives; (iv) success in bridging institutional boundaries in order to resolve water conflicts and plan better water management in the context of the Collaborative Watershed Management of Natural Resources project in Ecuador and; (v) success in developing a community-level decision-making process as part of evolving agro industry projects as in the Arrowroot project in Peru.

In regard to future strategic approaches, the report pointed out that one of the region’s priorities would be establishing partnerships with donor agencies that are active in international development and private-sector foundations and organizations. MINGA would research strategies for addressing growing social deficits and values, culture, and social changes and their role in governance in LAC.

4.1.2 Previous External Review

The external review conducted in 1999 stated that the PI was well conceived and well suited to its Latin American context and that its objectives provided a coherent and systematic framework that could be used to guide relevant research initiatives. The review stated that the Program had generated a sound framework for dealing with complex issues related to resource degradation and poverty and identified unique strengths, such as its approach to LAC ecosystems in benchmarking projects, methods/tools, conflict management, and consortia networking. The PI’s institutional ability to bring together different actors and perspectives in all Program initiatives was emphasized, as was its ability to work in different settings and at different institutional levels. Reviewers did recommend that:

- More energy be dedicated to researching how to institutionalize the lessons learned
- The concept and implications of Program and project cycles be clarified
- Researchers develop strategies for comparing and assessing tools and methodologies
- Attention be paid to baselines in each project and in the Program as a whole
Reviewers also noted several problems at the project level including:

- Difficulties incorporating MINGA concepts and strategies into pre-PI projects
- A lack of interdisciplinary focus in the conceptual framework
- Insufficient multi-stakeholder participation in networks and consortia
- Weak links between information gathering, analysis and use of data by decision-makers
- Relative absence of gender perspectives and related methodologies

Reviewers recommended increases in training, paid sabbaticals, academic and local government involvement, and the integration of support from Canadian researchers in the field of regional analysis and planning.

Most of these recommendations have been acted upon, and the PI has adjusted second-phase project planning and developed methodological guidelines for tool kits and co-evaluation. Current programming and resource allocations demonstrate that the concerns described above have been taken very seriously.

Reviewers also recommended that more attention be paid to the preparation of research reports and publications in order to implement a peer review process, which would lead to better quality projects and a move away from excessive gray literature.

The volume of high quality publications, manuals, project reports, training materials, and research papers that have been generated by the programs reviewed suggests that this situation has been remedied. The review team feels that these concerns have been integrated into the PI’s programming strategies. For example, the lessons learned have been incorporated into training manuals such as the Centro de Promoción Minera- CEPROMIN manual on mining conflicts, and the agro industries series published by the Consortium for Sustainable Andean Development-CONDESAN and the Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical- CIAT; training workshops, such as the Outcome Mapping, Gender Mainstreaming, and Stakeholder Analysis training and regional exchange workshops on conflict and collaboration; summaries of the lessons learned from SGP’s; and a sizable amount of quality publications in English, Spanish, and French, including Websites, databases, and working papers.

Project and program research cycles have become more evident as the PI initiative has clearly identified the need to up- and out-scale programs and projects in areas where social learning and the development of tools and methods provide opportunities for broader dissemination of information and networking, thus expanding the relationships between MINGA and other cooperation agencies and local governments. One example of this is MANRECUR in Ecuador’s Carchi watershed and the CONDESAN’s “Rural Sustainable Agro industries” project.

The previous review stated that the links between the information and lessons derived from MSA to NRM and the use of this research by decision-makers were weak. This is related to ongoing structural problems in LAC, which are manifested in instability and poor development of democratic institutions at the local and national levels, and in a legal framework that is not conducive to public participation. MINGA and its partners have targeted decision-makers at several levels in spite of these institutional restraints as is reflected by the progress made in regard to Bolivia’s water conflicts, which have scaled from local to national initiatives that involved governmental agencies, local water associations, urban users, indigenous people’s organizations, and research and university staff. A similar situation was observed in a network of mining initiatives in Bolivia, which included projects organized with the Centro de Estudios y Cooperacion Internacional (CECI) on “Sustainable Dialogue: Managing Mining Conflicts in Bolivia,” a program that integrates a gender perspective through the inclusion of the Red Internacional Mujer y Minería.
While the previous review noted the relative absence of gender perspectives and related methodologies, current reviewers observed that gender mainstreaming has become a more evident approach in the PI's efforts to provide tools and methodologies to its own staff and Southern partners, as reported in Abra's report. MINGA has generated a clear strategy for addressing these concerns and creating tools for integrating a gender equity perspective in PI programs and projects.

Some of the projects/programs reviewed are partially addressing the lack of baseline studies, while others have included comparative perspectives in their research initiatives. For example, indicators and baseline data have been developed for the four countries included in “Scaling-up Successful Agro-ecological Experiences in LAC.” Baseline data is also being integrated into Coordinadora para la Gestión Integral del Agua en Bolivia- CGIAB” initiatives to model and monitor the impact of new water legislation in Bolivia. Comparative perspectives are frequently applied as criteria for project selection in SGPs, as is the case with Minka’ de Chorlavi, which is administered by the Red de Investigación en Metodología de la Investigación en Sistemas de Producción -RIMISP in Chile.

4.2 Program Implementation: Background and Overview
This section discusses the prospectus, fulfillment of the PI's overall objectives, the progress that has been made, and verifies critical assumptions.

4.2.1 Salient Elements of the Current Prospectus
Program development was based on an initial assessment of the overall economic, social, and environmental situation in LAC. In general, it was noted that:

- Policy and research communities are frustrated by globalization, structural adjustment, and democratization processes, which limit the State’s role in directing development
- Development of democratic institutions lags behind the process of economic change
- Most rural populations continue to be affected by resource degradation and inequity
- Resource management decisions are increasingly influenced by large resource users
- Conflicts and poverty remained a high priority

The PI’s stated objectives address these issues (see section 4.1.1). The MSA to NRM that characterizes MINGA’s research in LAC is oriented towards furthering the search for equity and sustainability principles. Current research initiatives are focused on improving local communities’ negotiating capacities in emerging conflicts over resource use and access. The creation of effective tools and methods for enhancing MSA to NRM is another key objective, as is the development of strategies for applying the lessons learned to new contexts and ensuring equity and governance.

The prospectus also provided several guiding principles for program implementation, including (i) promoting the development of local solutions; (ii) undertaking gender analysis; (iii) enhancing management skills; (iv) drawing on specialized skills; (v) strengthening communication and networks; and (vi) developing indicators of successful NRM.

The prospectus’s geographical focus included four eco-regions –the Andean highlands, the hillsides of Central America, the Amazonian lowlands, and coastal zones-, but the Program Initiative-PI has modified its focus in order to pay special attention to the Andean region, Central America, and coastal areas. As the team leader put it “demand has more of an influence on programming than deliberate planning.”

The prospectus stated that the issue of gender was to be understood as: (i) equal and effective participation in consultations and decision-making processes; (ii) equal access to and control over natural resources, including land and water rights; (iii) equal access to the benefits of natural
resources; and (iv) equal access to appropriate technology, services, and information associated with the sustainable use of resources.

4.2.2 MINGA’s Strategies in LAC

The program’s intervention strategies were diversified in order to reflect its central goal, namely:

a) **Knowledge creation and capacity building.** Every MINGA-supported program and project includes the creation of knowledge and capacity building to ensure that stakeholders are prepared to participate in decision-making processes at the local, eco-regional, or national levels. The synthesis of the lessons learned strengthens MSA to NRM by building new capacities. For example, the SGP’s provide opportunities for the exchange of ideas and help strengthen networks of learners while providing training and guiding principles to create a new synthesis based on social experiences. Conflict and Collaboration Projects bring together local practitioners, communities, and researchers from NGOs. One example is the interaction between universities from different parts of LAC and their Canadian counterparts.

MINGA’s capacity building strategy is to create networks of learners (“learning alliances”) and learning systems in order to improve the design and planning capacities of future programs and projects (“social learning systems”). The use of customized workshops and technical support helps MINGA’s Southern partners to develop new capacities. For example, the training and adoption of outcome mapping methodologies have allowed partners to improve their project design, as seen in CONDESAN’s Arrow-root project.

b) **Devolving research initiative responsibilities to southern counterparts.** The identification and implementation of full-fledged research programs is complemented by three SGP’s designed to further improve the capacities and responsibilities of MINGA’s Southern counterparts. These SGP’s have been designed to “devolve” responsibilities to institutions in LAC while providing unique opportunities for identifying critical research needs and evaluating and synthesizing technology in key areas of NRM and poverty alleviation in the region.

c) **Scaling-up successful local experiences** is a critical step towards ensuring that the lessons derived from very specific local contexts can be adapted, expanded, and applied to other contexts and realities. It allows for comparisons of social, cultural, economic, and political situations, which can be used to derive lessons for the application of tools and methods. Examples of this include CONDESAN’s agro industry projects, MANRECUR and SANE.

d) **Gender Mainstreaming** is an integral part of MINGA’s strategy for enhancing equity in MSA to NRM. The PI must increase its ability to include gender perspectives in project and program cycles and address its partners’ efforts to integrate gender mainstreaming into their own project planning and implementation activities. The strategy includes supporting existing networks and devolving gender mainstreaming to partner institutions.

e) **The synthesis and dissemination of project findings and lessons learned** is central to research activities. Although the design of every MINGA project includes synthesis and dissemination, specific mechanisms have been developed to facilitate the creation of these capacities through ‘dissemination and communication projects.’ This is reflected in seminars, workshops, international conferences, working papers, Websites, publications, etc. Tools, methods, a Website, and multimedia system designed to enhance the capacities of MINGA’s partners in the area of MSA have been created through the project “Doing Stakeholder Analysis,” which was led by J. Chevalier of Carleton University. These efforts strengthen the potential for developing new social information systems, which are underdeveloped in most countries in LAC.
The prospectus also provided an evaluation plan, which includes proposals for: (i) assessing the SPG’s contribution to the NRM research process; (ii) systematizing lessons learned; (iii) evaluating and institutionalizing the gender perspective in the PI; (iv) evaluating the institutionalization of research results on mining; (v) assessing indigenous participation in NRM; (vi) creating and using inter-sector research partnerships; and (vii) monitoring municipal governments’ ability to cope with change.

Finally, the prospectus anticipated several risks, including: (i) the possibility that IDRC initiatives will challenge political trends; (ii) a possible lack of suitable partners in the region; (iii) a possible lack of direct government support; and (iv) possible conflicts with official Canadian policies.

4.2.3 Internally Mandated Evaluations

This external review has benefited from an analysis of SGP’s and a formative evaluation of mainstreaming gender in the context of the PI. The Small Grants Program review included an analysis of three main projects:

- Monitoring and Evaluation in NRM, administered by RIMISP in Santiago, Chile
- Cooperation and Conflict in NRM, by Universidad para la Paz in Ciudad Colón, Costa Rica
- Community-Based Coastal Resource Management in the Caribbean, which was administered jointly by the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Fisheries Unit in Belize City, Belize and the International Ocean Institute (IOI) at the Universidad Nacional in Heredia, Costa Rica

The evaluator concluded that: (i) the organizations met the funding centre’s expectations; (ii) the project selection process was accurate, budgets were prepared in a serious manner, and the products met high standards; and (iii) new actors and new management practices were incorporated.

It was noted that the Monitoring and Evaluation in NRM project made an important contribution to improving assessment methodologies and the use of indicators, and that the project had had a significant leverage effect by mobilizing additional resources. The RIMISP was recognized for taking on a leadership role by orienting projects and institutions and introducing new research perspectives.

With respect to the Conflict and Collaboration in NRM project, it was recognized that IDRC has a complete and coherent position on conflict and collaboration in NRM and that wide dissemination of the Centre’s Cultivating Peace: Conflict and Collaboration in Resource Management publication could inspire other organizations working in this field.

The reviewer noted that the Community-Based Coastal Resources Management Program in the Caribbean was the only SGP benefiting the Caribbean region. It was also observed that many participating organizations did not understand the concept of community based management and that introducing interdisciplinary research was a major challenge.

Regarding this evaluation, the MINGA Program Leader noted that it was probably too early to judge the contribution of this mode of Program delivery vis-à-vis others such as networks or traditional projects. However, it was concluded that SGP’s: (i) are highly successful in laying the ground for broadening a network of partners in the region and building critical masses of institutions working on common issues and in similar contexts; (ii) are not a substitute for well-funded medium to long-term research projects, which are essential to effecting change and encouraging experimentation and social learning in broad areas of human-environment relations; (iii) are not relevant when research capacity is very low or highly variable.
The analysis of gender mainstreaming in the PI included a review of all approved project documents since 2000. Special attention was paid to the following projects:

- IDRC Gender Training for ENMR Program Staff
- Gender Research and Training Support for MINGA Partners
- Support to Master's Thesis Research on Gender and NRM
- Document Research Experiences in Gender and NRM in Latin America

The analysis concluded that: (i) MINGA had approached gender mainstreaming in a very flexible, iterative, and thoughtful way and had treated mainstreaming as a learning process within the PI and with its partners; (ii) the use of a Gender Monitoring Tool had encouraged an internalization of the gender mainstreaming process within the PI and individual Program Officers and been useful in documenting and monitoring progress; (iii) the database of contacts with expertise in gender-related issues in Latin America had not been used by team members because it did not provide sufficient information and Program Officers did not recommend the contacts provided to partner organizations; (iv) while capacity building measures had enhanced understanding of gender concepts and approaches, the ability to put concepts and approaches into practice with partners remained weak; (v) time and capacity constraints limited the Program Officers' ability to develop proposals in a systematic way; (vi) the Program Officers' ability to monitor the progress made by partners in integrating gender issues was also limited by time and capacity constraints; (vii) projects and Programs had made training materials available to partners, but they remained underutilized; (viii) the support given for thesis research was a significant achievement in efforts to mainstream gender and played a role in the development of young professionals with the understanding and experience necessary to carry out interdisciplinary gender-sensitive research.

A number of recommendations were made in order to further mainstreaming efforts, including inter alia: (i) strengthening the use of the Gender Monitoring Tool and including more IDRC staff in order to broaden the range of experiences and ideas available to the team; (ii) creating spaces for learning from practical experience; (iii) ensuring that crucial elements such as methodology and an assessment of the partner organization's ability to carry out the gender analysis were addressed prior to project approval; (iv) preparing an annotated bibliography of gender tools and methods; (v) modifying the approach to linking partners to gender resource persons by promoting networking and exchanges; (vi) developing a set of questions or guidelines regarding monitoring; (vii) linking projects at the country or sub-regional level for project-to-project monitoring; (viii) targeting MINGA support for regional case studies of gender analysis in NRM; (ix) developing a strategy for assessing institutions' readiness to mainstream gender and identify entry points to support this process with partner institutions; (x) carrying out a needs assessment among partner institutions; (xi) defining and systematically implementing a monitoring strategy on capacity building measures and resource needs throughout the project cycle and; (xii) devolving responsibilities to regional institutions.

The MINGA team has not offered a specific response to this “formative evaluation” on gender mainstreaming, but the results have been discussed within the team and the report is now being circulated in order to elicit additional comments. As Philippa Wiens argues, there is a need to support local spaces for endogenous thinking grounded in the historical, social, cultural, political, and economic realities of the different Latin American contexts rather than risk a Northern-bias that predominates on the scholarly analysis in the literature.
4.2.4 Portfolio Review

The Program’s current cycle includes 21 approved projects to be carried out in 2000-2002 and 9 projects to be implemented during the first six months of 2003 for a total budget of CDN$6,303,567. Appendix II classifies the projects approved by: (i) year, (ii) type of project, (iii) implementation status, (iv) administrative unit responsible, and (v) total amount of resources approved.

There are two types of MINGA projects: Research Support Projects (RSP) and Research Projects as understood by IDRC. The latter includes SGP’s and stand-alone research projects. Projects have been grouped according to their main focus and area(s) of intervention in order to further explain the allocation of resources: (i) Watershed Management; (ii) Coastal Management; (iii) Conflicts and Conflict Resolution in NRM; and (iv) Gender Dimensions of NRM.

MINGA projects can be grouped according to the resource issues that they address as follows:

a. **Agriculture and rural development** projects, including projects on agro-industries and agro-processing. This is the case of “Diversified Livelihoods Through Effective Agro-enterprise Interventions,” which is the result of twenty years of collaboration with CIAT in the area of post harvest and agro business. Another example is "Rural Sustainable Agro- industries, including a focus on traditional Andean crops such as arrow-root, " which builds on 15 CONDESAN-supported projects covering a range of agricultural products in Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru. The SANE network is composed of successful agro-ecological experiences and sustainable farming systems in four LAC countries. The “Scaling Up of Successful Agro ecological Experiences in LAC” project studies how local experiences can be up-scaled through institutional and market linkages, the systematization and sharing of knowledge, capacity-building (including university education), and the identification and elimination of constraining factors. The forestry projects supported include training programs on community forestry management and publications. MINGA has also supported land tenure and access systems projects in Bolivia and the documentation and analysis of local-level conflicts using MSA techniques. MINGA’s partner, Fundación Tierra in Bolivia, has explored access and use of land, water, and forest resources in the inter-Andean valleys. Municipalities’ role in managing communal resources and engaging in productive activities has been addressed in Guatemala and Bolivia.

b. **Coastal resource management and fisheries** projects have been the center of MINGA programming for some time. The current review focuses on the “Coastal Area Monitoring Project and Laboratory” (CAMPlab II), a participatory action research project involving 12 communities in the Pearl Lagoon of Nicaragua, which is currently at the end of the second phase. The SGP on “Community-Based Coastal Resource Management” administered by the International Ocean Institute (IOI) in Costa Rica and CARICOM’s Fisheries Unit (CFU) in Belize and supported by Yves Breton from Laval University is also entering its second phase. Other projects include “Managing Small Scale Fisheries,” in conjunction with the University of Manitoba, and “Towards fishery co-management in the Sao Francisco River Valley,” with the Universidad Federal de Sao Carlos in Brazil.

c. **Managing conflicts over natural resource use** is addressed in the SGP “Conflict and Collaboration in Natural Resource Management” (currently in its second phase), as well as in several workshops and training programs on conflict and collaboration and the financial support that has been provided for the “International Conference on Environmental Conflict and Organizational Change” program being organized by the University of British Columbia (UBC).

d. **Growing conflicts over water resources** are well represented. The “Collaborative Management of Natural Resources in Andean Watersheds” (MANRECUR) project in Ecuador is entering its third phase, which involves up-scaling and out-scaling into the Mira hydrographic system. The explosive conflicts over water in Bolivia have generated a unique opportunity for the application of a MSA to water access and use through the creation of a “Commission on Integrated Management Water in Bolivia”–CGIAB, which will inform the development of a new water law in Bolivia. CONDESAN developed the “Andean Water Vision from an Indigenous and Peasant Perspective” as an alternative to the “World Water Vision,” which has been criticized for having a negative effect on the water
rights of traditional users. The “Virtual Information Centre on Water in the Altiplano” was developed by Peru’s Centro de Investigación, Educación y Desarrollo (CIED) and its partners, and led to the creation of a comprehensive Website on water resources in the high Andean Altiplano region that features databases on water legislation, flora and fauna, socioeconomic indicators, and basic maps.

e. The impact of mining on the livelihood of local communities. MINGA has supported a series of projects dealing with conflict, collaboration, and training in order to improve local communities’ negotiating capacities, including the project “Negotiating and Decision Making for Mining Communities in Latin America.” The project was implemented by research partners CoDevelopment Canada (CoDev), the Nicaraguan Movimiento de Mujeres Trabajadoras y Desempleadas (MMTD), and the Bolivian Centro de Promoción Minera (CEPROMIN). The project “Sustainable Dialogue: Managing Mining Conflicts in Bolivia” was carried out in collaboration with the Canadian Centre for International Studies and Cooperation (CECI) and CEPROMIN. The North South Institute is developing “Exploring Indigenous Perspectives,” a project on mining and policy implications with the National Organization of Indigenous Peoples of Colombia (ONIC).

f. Gender and social analysis are an integral part of capacity building programming, as reflected by a series of projects aimed at building a knowledge base on gender perspectives in MSA and NRM. To this end MINGA has created a SGP “Support for Masters Thesis Research on Gender and Natural Resources,” which is administered by the Fundación para la Investigación Estratégica (PIEB) in Bolivia, the Fundación Ecuatoriana de Estudios Ecológicos (ECOCIENCIA) in Ecuador, and the Seminario Permanente de Investigación Agraria (SEPIA) in Peru. The program provides scholarships and mentoring to young professionals who are conducting interdisciplinary thesis research on the social and gender dimensions of NRM. The project was designed to complement “Confronting the Challenge of Gender Equity in Environmental Management in Latin America,” which involved creating a virtual clearing-house for gender-related resources. The International Union on the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) is coordinating this project in collaboration with NGOs in Costa Rica, Ecuador, Brazil, Cuba, Peru, and Mexico. The project “Gender Research and Training Support” is similar in that it provides funding for training on gender and NRM and support for partners interested in developing case studies that illustrate the application of gender analysis.

5. PROGRAM OUTCOMES, REACH, AND CONSTRAINTS

5.1 Program Outcomes
The reviewers concluded that the PI is making progress in the area of desired outcomes, but that more in-depth analysis is required in order to determine the extent to which MSA to NRM and program tools have reached and impacted target audiences. Further analysis is also needed to identify the institutions that do not receive support but do participate and the agencies that adopted MSA.

This section presents the results of four outputs: (i) synthesis of approaches; (ii) development and use of tools and methodologies; (iii) lessons learned applied to new situations; and (iii) institutional up-take of approaches and partnership building. The PI’s contribution to changing the actions, behaviour, and relationships of program partners is illustrated below in relation to how they integrate a multidisciplinary approach and participatory action research and how they generate learning processes and synthesize new applications of knowledge.

5.1.1 Outcome Groupings
Synthesis of Approaches: The implementation of conflict and collaboration projects has created an opportunity to synthesize the lessons learned through projects that involve a variety of funding sources and social actors. The extensive network of researchers and institutions that participated in these undertakings has created a unique opportunity for collaboration and for summarizing the underlying principles of adaptive conflict resolution, as was demonstrated during the Vancouver Conference on Institutional Learning for Adaptive Conflict Resolution. The multidisciplinary approaches discussed and extensive debate among peers created opportunities to generate new
knowledge and strengthen the potential for collaboration between Latin American and Canadian scholars. However, the progress made during the Conference has not been discussed with the other institutions that participate in the PI’s conflict and collaboration projects. The evaluation of this SGP stated that the wide range of views expressed indicated a certain lack of conceptual perspective.

Furthermore, reviewers observed a great potential for synthesis on alternative dispute resolution using Jean Chevalier’s valuable work on stakeholder analysis, which was developed in collaboration with MINGA team members and has led to new possibilities for improving the frames of reference for managing water conflicts in Peru.

Synthesis efforts have also been supported by an extensive exchange of ideas between researchers as a result of a call for proposals for SGP as part of the RIMISP project “Collective action and improvements in the living conditions of rural populations,” which encouraged debate among researchers during e-conferences and chats. Over 650 individuals and organizations from several regions participated in the debate, which was followed by a comprehensive effort to systematize the data. These efforts are well documented on the RIMISP Website. The second call for research proposals concentrated on territorial perspectives on resource use and the third on synthesis of lessons and experiences on decentralized environmental governance in rural areas of LAC. It can be concluded that the implementation of initial calls for proposals helped to create a research network and provided orientation and methodological support for systematization efforts.

Fundacion Tierra’s synthesis work on access to and use of land, water, and forests in the inter-Andean valleys of Bolivia is another example of using research to increase access to resources.

Other synthesis efforts have yielded valuable information for capacity building and training programs on several issues, such as community managed forestry resources, the role of municipalities in production processes and the eradication of poverty, managing conflicts in communities that are affected or influenced by mining operations, coastal resource management, improved planning and evaluation tools through outcome mapping, and new approaches to agro industry and local participation in rural communities managing traditional Andean crops.

Development and Use of Tools and Methodologies for improving the analytical capacities of institutions, organizations, and networks requires the type of sustained institutional effort that MINGA has always promoted. As explained in the prospectus, research for development is a very rare activity in most of LAC, as many governments have withdrawn funding because of new structural adjustments and market-led policies. As evaluation of the methodological advancement on development research does not seem to be a priority for the “international development community” and is viewed by many informants as an activity that is being abandoned by many development practitioners. Hence, MINGA’s contribution is highly valued by counterparts, local governments, and international development institutions.

SGP’s have also made valuable contributions to the development and transfer of monitoring and evaluation tools and methodologies. The team members and RIMISP officers interviewed for this review underscored the role that SPG’s played in publicizing the tools created as a result of the RIMISP-sponsored call for proposals. This approach has included methodological orientation, training, and post-systematization debates, which led to improved capacities for developing and applying research methodologies and tools.

The development of training tools has played a valuable role in improving projects’ quality, as seen in the integration of outcome mapping methodology in the “Arrow-root project” and others.
New tools and methods are being developed in the areas of water management and integrating gender and intercultural perspectives on irrigation projects. This is reflected in the methodologies developed by Agua Altiplano project. New approaches were applied in order to increase the visibility of alternative points of view on resource use in projects such as the “Andean Water Vision.”

**Applying the Lessons Learned to New Situations**

The evolution of development research on MSA to MNR is reflected in up-scaling, out-scaling, and mainstreaming projects. The fact that many projects have expanded their coverage and scope reflects long-term commitments that go above and beyond MINGA’s financial and human resource support. Several of the projects reviewed are ready to put the lessons learned into practice, including the “Scaling-up Successful Agro ecological Experiences in LAC” project. Chile’s project leader has developed institutional linkages in order to involve a broad range of regional institutions in a collaborative effort to consolidate and expand the project base in the region and its links to an international network on sustainable agriculture.

The MANRECUR project is another example of the role that changes in organizations and institutions’ actions and commitments play in the development process. It is consolidating its approach and expanding to other localities. The integration of MSA to other nearby watershed management programs not only reflects the validation of the approach, but also demonstrates the internalization of the concepts and tools developed through this project.

The lessons learned in the implementation of the first Community Based Coastal Resource Management (CBCRM) SGP were taken into account during the definition and development of a program on conflict and collaboration and developing a Caribbean-wide coastal resource management network. The project looks to increase the involvement of women and indigenous groups who depend on coastal resources and to strengthen the decision-making and planning processes. The reviewers feel it could be useful to evaluate the project further once it is completed.

**Institutional Up-take of Approaches and Partnership Building**

While some progress has been made in regard to promoting institutional up-take of the PI’s approach to MSA in NRM, difficulties remain. The institutions participating in the SGP’s seem to have had an easier time adopting the approach, as demonstrated by Minka de Chorlavi and the Conflict and Collaboration SGP’s. The initial difficulties encountered in CBCRM are being corrected during the project’s second phase.

Institutional up-take is reflected in some of the second and third phase projects, and the organizations involved have responded to emerging conceptual approaches, tools, and methodologies in a variety of ways. In the case of MANRECUR, SANE, agroindustries, and the Productive Municipalities projects in Bolivia, the evolution of the research cycle supported by the PI signals a positive up-take of the research approaches and methods by both the institutions that were originally involved and new organizations working at different decision-making levels. While this is a positive trend, it is too early to state that it represents the consolidation of MSA to resource use.

Institutional up-take may also be limited by a lack of resources and coordination with other cooperation agencies. For example, a MINGA-supported institution and a Dutch cooperation group created management plans for the CAMPLab II project in Nicaragua, which only confused local authorities. Though it did improve the negotiation capacity of 12 communities in the Pearl Lagoon of Nicaragua, the project was undermined because of this lack of coordination. This might be a unique situation as other projects reviewed showed well coordinated efforts.

It is also important to consider institutional up-take among partners and the organizations that they support. The results of a joint MINGA - CECI project on “Sustainable Dialogue: Managing Mining Conflicts in Bolivia” led to institutional capacity building, training programs, and enhanced capacities on conflict management. The project, which is designed to compile lessons on conflict management
and lead to the development of a training program for government, businesses, and civil society organizations, features the participation of several Bolivian NGOs, including CEPROMIN. MINGA’s support of CEPROMIN’s project, “Negotiation and Decision-Making in Mining Communities,” involves testing a training guide, conducting additional research, helping local organizations work together, and training local leaders in negotiation. These projects reflect a focus on collaborative process and up-take in an environment of deep social unrest and confrontation. Institutional uptake and emerging partnerships are also demonstrated in the “Productive Municipalities” projects, which seek to apply lessons from 14 pilot municipalities throughout Bolivia.

Institutional uptake has been elusive in some projects. The SGP evaluation revealed a certain difficulty in transmitting the IDRC/MINGA message on NRM at the projects level, partly because the MINGA research agenda on NRM was not well known. Several project evaluations revealed that staff had little or no knowledge of the approach’s main principles. One evaluator said that it was important to have a common point of departure in order to establish a set of projects based on a common understanding of NRM and the various objectives that had been identified for SGP’s.

Similarly, it may be difficult for partners to grasp the concept of internalizing gender mainstreaming. A NRM gender approach could provide new insight into unequal access to resources, the lack of collaborative practices, and the inclusion of a gender perspective in NRM. These aspects were not sufficiently covered in the first phases of the three SGP’s. It is, however, important to note that some progress is being made through the introduction of innovative methods and research tools aimed at promoting equity and gender perspectives, as reflected in the Agua Altiplano and Arrowroot projects. An extensive array of thesis work and mentoring on gender mainstreaming is evolving in the PI, but its impact and up-take by specific projects needs to be evaluated.

This review can certainly testify to the fact that MINGA has had an extremely valuable influence on a broad range of development institutions in the region, including Swiss Cooperation for Development (COSUDE) in Bolivia, CONDESAN’s partners, CIDA’s Pro-Mesas project in Honduras, UNDP, the German development agency GTZ, and, to a lesser extent, the World Bank Institute. Other international agencies are willing to complement MINGA’s efforts to develop methodological approaches and tools to improve the effectiveness of development initiatives in most of the projects reviewed.

Partnerships and networking have proven to be extremely useful approaches that imply a willingness to incorporate other social actors and institutions and uncover the relationships between stakeholders in order to reach common goals. Sustained efforts to synthesize and publish the experience gained by the PI are critical to expanding coverage and engaging others in new experiences. The reviewers were not able to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the mechanisms and means by which project leaders internalize the web of relationships, potential, and effects that networking implies because of time constraints. Creating partnerships, which is essential for up-scaling the project’s scope, is still a challenge for many of the organizations. The Honduran Pro-Mesas partnership for learning alliances could provide valuable lessons for future program development. Understanding the keys to building partnerships and networks may become an important area for future programming.

MINGA’s previous experience building partnerships through consortia in the Andean region has had unexpected results yet the inclusion of a large number of stakeholders in the Carchi project and the CGIAB institutional coalition in Bolivia facilitates constructive and complementary research efforts that are in line with the PI’s priorities in the region.

The PI’s main objective in terms of coordinating its efforts with consortia can be summarized as promoting the changes that will enable the consortia to develop technical and policy interventions for sustainable development, and to mainstream participatory approaches to research for ENRM.
Over-time, and with IDRC and CONDESAN support for cross-site visits, important learning has taken place around water management issues, scaling for policy dialogue, and pro-poor business development. These developments signal a move away from the traditional disciplinary perspectives that characterized the initial benchmarking strategy for these consortia. It should, however, be noted that complex structures like CONDESAN continue to place a great deal of emphasis on the leadership and synthesis capacity of their coordinators. Several of the resource people interviewed hinted at a lack of flexibility and an excessive focus on disciplinary approaches, and some even questioned the lack of participation of local and grassroots organizations in decision-making processes and the strong influence of traditional research centers. Others mentioned a lack of sensitivity to cultural and territorial issues and a lack of flexibility when it came time to validate alternative options and learning by doing approaches.

Carter’s review of CONDESAN pointed to a general lack of participatory and action-based research. The need to emphasize social learning systems and the undervalued role of social scientists limited dialogue on the issues that MINGA has been trying to address.

The reviewers feel that CONDESAN could significantly improve its up-take of tools and methods for MSA to NRM and interdisciplinary approaches and develop clearly defined mechanisms for exchanges with new members and associates. This is particularly true of the opportunity that was created as a result of the recent change in the composition of the Board of Directors and the attempts to debate new strategic directions. Given its experience and the participation well-established research institutions such as CIP and CIAT, CONDESAN is in a unique position to nurture exchange and networking, and to influence policy. The consortia have clearly established a well-grounded and diversified financial base, and continue to place a great deal of stock in the dialogue and exchange that their relationship with MINGA has made possible.

5.2.2 Changes in Partners’ Relationships, Behaviours, and Actions

Over the past few years, the PI’s contribution to the consolidation of applied development research information systems on natural resources, agro-processing, water management information, conflict management and stakeholder analysis information systems, and gender mainstreaming in LAC has produced a broad array of outcomes that led to changes in the behavior of MINGA’s partner institutions. MINGA’s strategy allowed for the creation of new opportunities for capacity building at different levels, the devolution of the research agenda to its partners, as observed in the SGP’s, and the integration of a wide range of stakeholders.

The PI is providing support to the NRM decentralization processes by participating in the development of new social learning systems based on locality-specific projects, including the Pro-Mesas joint project in Honduras, the establishment of a shared water vision along with the systematization of water management experience by Andean communities in the Altiplano, and the Carchi basin management program. The validation of local knowledge and learning systems has changed the relationships between stakeholders and government institutions, as demonstrated by the CGIAB Consortia’s water legislation project in Bolivia.

Complementarity and cooperation between MINGA, CECI, CIDA, GTZ, and Dutch cooperation agencies as seen in RIMISP, CONDESAN, and World Bank-supported agencies, demonstrate a new desire to coordinate efforts to confront the deterioration of livelihood and resources in rural areas of LAC.

Mainstreaming gender perspective by MINGA’s partners point to substantive efforts to develop a gender perspective on water accessibility and use through collaboration and action research. For
example, the Instituto de Promoción para la Gestión del Agua (IPROGA), which combines the expertise of Peru’s academic and NGO communities, was created as part of the process of identifying water resource disputes and the need to create human resources to bridge the knowledge gap. Aguas Altiplanos, which brings partners from Argentina, Peru, Bolivia, and Chile together in a virtual information centre, is another example of this type of approach, as are the women’s networks that have been formed in communities affected by mining contamination in order to perform action research and develop training programs aimed at reducing the risk of water contamination in Bolivia.

Overall, the program is demonstrating an increasing level of cooperation among partners and development agencies, but this trend is not yet consolidated.

5.3 Program Reach
The individuals and groups that participate in and are affected by MINGA programs include a) policy makers; b) local governments; c) other research organizations; and d) local NGO’s and CSO’s.

The interviews conducted and documents consulted suggest that the Program had several effects on those who were involved, including:

- The creation of opportunities to explore and adopt new methodologies designed to enhance partners’ planning capacities, as in the case of outcome mapping, which was adopted by CONDESAN, the Arrowroot project, MANRECUR, the Peace-Building and Reconstruction Program, CGIAB in Bolivia, CIDA’s Pro-Mesas Project in Honduras, MANRECUR III, and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) supported project on NRM in the Southern Highlands of Peru (MARENASS).
- The development of culturally appropriate concepts and methods for gender analysis as an integral part of the development of a research agenda and equity perspective in several of the research networks.
- The creation of learning processes for partners and collaborators as an integral part of the Mink’a de Chorlaví SGP, the Conflict and Collaboration SGP, the COSTAS II Program, and Pro-Mesas in Honduras.
- Exchanges between Programs and workshops, which have become tools for enhancing learning and promoting the adoption of common approaches and research perspectives.
- New institutional capacities for developing alternative visions of water resource management from indigenous perspectives as reflected in the CONDESAN-sponsored Andean Water Vision.
- Endowing the CGIAB coalition with an increased ability to engage in discussions about policy with government and decision-makers as part of the national debate on the regulation of rights that has emerged as following the passage of Bolivia’s new water law.

The MSA to NRM that is currently in its third phase in Ecuador involves up- and out-scaling and demonstrates social institutions’ readiness to adopt the learning process set in motion by MANRECUR. New social actors, including local authorities, are getting involved in up-scaling exercises, which include casting the project in a supportive role in learning processes. Team leaders explained that they expect to influence governance processes by combining system approaches with social networking ones. The project proposes the use of short-medium term outcome mapping. A longer-term vision will be developed through the social learning processes initiated during this phase.

The collaborative projects with SANE have sparked new institutional arrangements that support a worldwide sustainable agriculture network. The “Up-scaling of Successful Agro-ecological Experiences in LAC” project is creating opportunities for dialogue and collaboration between local practitioners and local government and national institutions, which will enable them to establish
market linkages at the local and sub-regional levels. It has also attracted new institutions, and its synthesis and capacity building have led to opportunities for academic exchange and training. The incorporation of agro-ecological principles and practices in academic curricula in local universities in Southern Chile, for example, may provide fertile ground for training, research, and services on the identification and elimination of obstacles to the creation and maintenance of an agro-ecological production system.

5.3.1 Involvement of Local Governments
Fourteen municipal governments played an active role in mobilizing local and regional resources in order to promote poverty eradication programs, which led to the creation of the “productive municipalities” program. Using a MINGA grant for “Systematizing the Bolivian Experience in Productive Municipalities,” the Federación de Asociaciones Municipales de Bolivia, Government of Bolivia, and the Atlantic Community Economic Development Institute (ACEDI) organized workshops and debates on municipal government’s role in promoting economic activities at the local and community levels. Both national and municipal governments are currently evaluating opportunities for enhancing the potential of productive municipalities and community participation in poverty eradication.

MINGA supported the Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales FLCASO-Guatemala project on “The Role of Municipalities in Managing Communal Land,” which involved a comparative analysis of the municipal governance structure and natural resource endowment of 11 ejidos, as well as the needs and perspectives of different social groups, incentives and disincentives for sustainable resource use, and methods for reaching consensus on resource management.

Several municipalities are up- and out-scaling activities in the larger Mira hydrographic area in Ecuador and are integrating MSA to basin management through the Carchi project.

5.3.2 Other Institutions and Networks
The “Internet-based Community Forestry Management Training Program” developed by the Centro Boliviano de Estudios Multidisciplinarios (CEBEM) has led to new academic perspectives and training opportunities. The virtual Master’s degree-level program for community forestry practitioners has integrated new MSA to forestry resources, some of which feature the participation of municipal governments. The course is hosted by the Red de Desarrollo Sostenible y Medio Ambiente (REDESMA), a virtual resource centre.

The International Conference on Adaptive Conflict Resolution: Lessons from Chile and Canada brought together researchers, business community, activists, and policy analysts. A follow-up conference to be held in Chile in 2004 will bring together policy analysts, members of the business world, scholars, NGO representatives, and government officials. Its purpose is to generate policy debates and evaluations of existing legal instruments for public participation in decision-making processes involving large-scale projects affecting NRM and the environment.

The gender mainstreaming program is also affecting institutions, researchers, and projects by providing methodologies for capacity building, networking, and documenting experiences including master thesis research and mentoring opportunities. This grant program is administered by three influential centers: Fundación para la Investigación Estratégica (PIEB) in Bolivia, the Fundación Ecuatoriana de Estudios Ecológicos (ECOECIENCIA) in Ecuador, and the Seminario Permanente de Investigación Agraria (SEPIA) in Peru. A recent network has been established, Managing Ecosystem and Resources with Gender Emphasis (MERGE), which included an electronic network, a course on concepts and tools for gender-sensitive planning, small research grants with peer mentoring, and a comparative analysis of local-level workshops has increased the reach of PI’s gender mainstreaming program.
The Pro-Mesas project has integrated learning alliances and social learning systems with CIDA, GTZ, several Honduran government agencies, academic institutions, and UNDP. The application of outcome mapping methodology and development of the Social Information System for Regional and National institutions is supported by Carleton University through J. Chevalier’s work.

The collaborative efforts of CONDESAN, CIP, CIAT-CALI, and several NGOs and research institutions are influencing approaches to rural agro industries through workshops, training manuals, and the innovative research techniques.

MINGA’s experience and international reputation has allowed for the creation of several collaborative efforts that attest to its importance and influence in LAC. These include a joint project with the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), which is being pursued in the context of the MARENASS project and CIDA’s Pro Mesas project in Honduras. The SGP fund, which is administered by RIMISP, is being co-funded by ICCO in the Netherlands. CONDESAN is pursuing MSA to watershed management and is currently negotiating with several agencies and the World Bank to apply MSA to NRM in over 50 watersheds in Latin America. Partnerships with other Canadian institutions in Bolivia such as CECI and the North South Institute and the agreement reached with CIDA in Honduras are further examples of collaboration and the application of results.

5.3.3 Canadian Researchers’ Involvement in PI Work
The following are examples of the valuable cooperation of members of the Canadian academic community at various stages of PI program/projects:

- Researchers from Laval and York University have supported both the Costas SGP and the CAMPLAB project in Nicaragua. Yvan Breton of Laval has provided strong leadership and advice and is defining a core orientation for the new publication that has been planned for the results of the second phase of this project, which will help correct some of the shortcomings found in the publication of results of Phase I. Mark Hostetler of York played an active role in introducing participatory action research and the use of communication tools and approaches in the context of the Pearl Lagoon project. 15 projects are being supported, with increased emphasis on networking and capacity building in participatory research and communication. Several partners are presenting at the IASCP Conference.

- Jean Chevalier of Carleton University has developed tools and methods for analyzing power relations among interest groups and organizations (Stake Holder Analysis) and has created a support system for several MINGA project involving MSA and Conflict and Collaboration. The training workshop involves several partners and institutions, and links academic training programs and research in Canada with concrete applications in the field. It may lead to the creation of distance-learning courses at the University for Peace in Central America and, according to one MINGA document, “has attracted the interest of various donors, including CIDA, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and the World Bank Institute.”

- The University of British Columbia UBC has been the focal point for coordinated efforts to incorporate several university research units into the research initiatives that will be carried out ahead of the “International Conference on Environmental Conflict and Organizational Change.” CIDA and CSSRC have built a network of social science researchers, and Professor Alejandro Rojas of UBC has played a key role in bringing together researchers, activists, and businesspeople.

- The research and networking efforts and findings of the North South Institute with indigenous people in Colombia, Guyana, and the Amerindian People’s Association’s project “Exploring Indigenous Perspectives” have been presented at the World Summit in Johannesburg and at the WB meeting in Norway. The WB funded the Forest People’
Program researchers’ independent and participatory review of case studies on WB-sponsored projects. The review is part of a larger review of the Bank's role in the mining sector (see “The Extractive Industries Review” www.eir.org).

5. 4 Program Constraints
This review has confirmed some of the main findings reported in the previous evaluation, the statements made in some projects’ final reports, and the comments that were made during interviews.

The following conditions emerge as constraints:

• The lack of public funding for development research based on participatory approaches to NRM limits the long-term perspective of decentralized and localized research initiatives. The severe financial constraints that national governments are facing limit the amount of resources that are provided to the institutions of higher learning where the research is most likely to be carried out, while private research is still embryonic in LAC and tends to focus on other issues. Development research is not a priority for most funding agencies. Interviews with university authorities in Nicaragua indicate that funding for research limits the capacity of regional branches of universities to tackle regional problems, as can be observed in coastal areas of Nicaragua. The centralized nature of research facilities in Central America limits the ability to focus on isolated and marginalized areas.

• There is a need to strengthen the links between research networks, which create innovative approaches to rural development with a strong equity and sustainability perspective, and the institutionalized research and academic community. This limitation is due in part to a broader societal phenomenon observed during the 1990’s and to its own specialization, both of which have led the academic institutions that address rural issues and NRM to focus on market-led initiatives and to use applied research to increase productivity, improve the quality of export products, and favor systems that are more in line with new market economics. This has reduced the amount of research being carried out on rural livelihoods, resource management and governance, participation, and culture in some countries to a very limited number of specialized NGO and academic projects. The production-led drive has led to a greater need to focus on the environmental and social impacts of the productive transformation. The disciplinary perspective and the production-led drive have difficulties integrating research that is based on participatory action research or on MSA to NRM. Multidisciplinary approaches are still elusive in most research institutions in LAC and are a recent development in Canada.

• The relationships between investment projects and the research establishment must be strengthened. Interviews with team members and development agencies indicate that attention must be paid to the links between research networks, the existing research establishment, and programs financed by international donors. For example, an IFAD project that is being formulated in northern Ecuador could benefit from the research available through the MANRECUR project. CONDESAN consortia have been playing a more active role in this area and have influenced some multilateral funding agencies’ investment decisions, such as FAO and the Inter American Development Bank (IDB).

• The use of multidisciplinary research approaches is limited. The final report of Phase I of the Costas SGP clearly identifies this as a limiting factor, though interviews held during the Costas workshop confirmed that researchers are working to introduce these concepts.

• There is a lack of formal opportunities to debate research findings and their relationship to policy issues. Opportunities for sharing experiences are currently limited to international meetings. Interviews with RIMISIP staff confirmed that these instances are rare, although IDRC and a few other agencies do provide funding for regional exchanges, workshops, and seminars and offer participants travel stipends. Exceptions include the long-
standing SEPIA exercise in Peru, which provides extremely useful opportunities for policy dialogue (this ongoing seminar has recently held its 20th annual session).

- **There is a need to bridge the disciplinary divide between the social and natural sciences.** As Weins observed in her analysis of obstacles to promoting equitable and sustainable NRM in LAC, the socio-political dimensions of the issues being addressed are rarely considered.

6. Program Effectiveness

6.1 MINGA’s Main Concerns and the Dissemination and Use of Research Results

The PI’s has developed a dissemination and communication strategy that is reflected upon a “conceptual framework grid” that identifies that has linked the degree of engagement of its dissemination and communications activities with a strategic audience. The strategy identified at least seven strategic groups (peers, IDRC senior management, general audience in the field, research and academic community, powerful international community, research partners, and partners of MINGA’s research partners, including governments, communities, etc.).

MINGA’s programs, projects, and partners are developing new methods, tools, and social learning systems designed to increase local communities’ participation in NRM while improving their quality of life and the quality of the natural resources. The synthesis of those processes and research initiatives is an integral part of the effort to disseminate and use research results among partners and peers. The comprehensive list of results and outputs including books, essays, conference papers, seminars, workshops, Websites, electronic conferences, and training courses shows that this is occurring regularly and that different audiences are being targeted with specific information.

There is adequate use and dissemination of the information that is being generated. CEPROMIN, in Bolivia, is a good example of the use of the results and an excellent showcase of well-documented activities. The impressive number of courses and workshops conducted by CEPROMIN in coordination with other partners like Red Mujer y Minería demonstrates the effective use of research results and training materials. One of the reviewers attended some training sessions and can attest to the use of multidisciplinary and culturally sensitive approaches to building the capacities of women in mining communities. The translation of researchers’ complex language into educational materials would not be possible without partnerships between researchers and organizations like CEPROMIN. New knowledge and capacity building taking place at the local level were also demonstrated by other projects observed by the reviewers. Also, mining information derived from assessments of the impact of extractive industries on native communities is informing World Bank policies and processes as in “Extractive Industries Review”, for example.

The results of conflict and collaboration research initiatives, and the tools and methods in particular, are being used in several projects and countries (e.g. “Negotiation and Decision-Making in Mining Communities” in Bolivia, and “Exploring Indigenous Perspectives” on mining conflicts in Colombia and Guyana). The participation of a Canadian university researcher has improved opportunities for disseminating stakeholder analysis tools. Many researchers, local leaders, and policy makers have attended international seminars on collaborative NRM, and the analytical framework discussed at those events may have created unique learning and capacity building opportunities. This is clearly the case in several projects involving mining and local communities. The SGP on Conflict and Collaboration has been instrumental in reaching researchers throughout LAC. The initiatives address both social and institutional learning and are reaching an audience that goes beyond MINGA’s partners, including Canadian and the “powerful international community”.

A network of researchers and institutions in four countries is documenting information and research on water use in Andean communities and the specific role that gender can play in decision-making
and resource use. The material being produced is used regularly in workshops, seminars, and training programs at several locations. The reviewers could not get a sense of how many people are using the published material and Websites, but the large number of events and increased concern over the fragility and scarcity of water resources in the Andean highlands contribute to the importance of this information. Some interviewees indicated that it is not clear how the information is being used in social as well as academic settings.

In the case of SGP’s, exploration, synthesis, and networking seem to flow easily as a result of a sharper research focus on the areas in which grant recipients have considerable empirical expertise. SPG’s therefore can be used as a tool for scouting the field of participatory research, monitoring, and evaluation. There is no doubt that SGP’s are a very efficient and effective way of broadening the scope of MINGA’s partners while providing highly valued support to researcher’s efforts at systematizing and sharing experiences. Several hundred NGOs and research centres have participated in the SPG’s.

CONDESAN’s research is disseminated in a variety of ways, including presentations at meetings and conferences, training seminars, and workshops, publications, and training manuals, including the “Infoandina” Website. CONDESAN members such as CIAT and the Centro Internacional de la Papa-CIP have long histories as research institutions and training centres with diverse approaches to information dissemination and training and a clear profile of information users. The information that CONDESAN generates has the potential to reach a broad audience of professionals, researchers, students, policy analysts, and practitioners from NGO’s and local governments. This is a result of the role the consortia plays in regional research, promotion, and development centres and regional universities.

CONDESAN could play a more active role in supporting and strengthening multidisciplinary approaches and MSA to NRM, but the disciplinary influence of specialized agricultural research facilities tend to overrule other initiatives, as Sonia Salas, leader of the Arracacha project, has noted. Innovative approaches to research methodologies that integrate action research, gender perspectives, and ethnic components are still fairly new. The Arrow-root project was therefore a significant contribution on MINGA’s part, as well as an opportunity to reach a wide range of people, from local “arracacha” producers in Ecuador, Bolivia and Peru to researchers in several fields, including economic and market experts, and local government departments and development agencies. Yet this project does not link up with national level organizations of producers involved in organic production and its links to other networks could not established adequately.

MINGA programs and projects also reach and integrate well-established networks of researchers that focus on specific issues, including the International Association for the Study of Common Property (IASCP), which is based in Vancouver, or the World Bank Institute in Washington. Other examples include the World Resources Institute in Washington, York University, Laval University, Carleton University, and UNDP. Various high quality publications have been published as a result of joint conferences and workshops and comprehensive research initiatives. Many of the topics and research approaches include new methodologies that challenge mainstream research orientations. The results also provide opportunities for questioning the role that markets play in natural resource allocation and privatization drives led by policies inspired by late structural adjustment programs.

MINGA’s team also plays an active role in synthesizing and disseminating research results, as is reflected in the many ground-breaking discussion papers that are being circulated through IDRC programs networks, as is the case of recent reviews on gender issues.

The interviews that have been conducted with a broad range of institutions, project research leaders, development practitioners, and cooperation agencies demonstrate that MINGA’s research approach
is highly valued. Interviewees stated that MINGA stimulates the creation of new methods and tools that can be used to build knowledge and social learning while helping to place development research at the service of practitioners, project planners, and monitoring and evaluation teams.

In regard to the issue of whether or not MINGA could do more to strengthen capacity building and policy analysis, it is important to note that new methodological tools such as outcome mapping and stakeholder analysis of conflict and collaboration should be mainstreamed, and that there is a need to create more training opportunities. One approach is creating a network of MINGA-trained researchers and consultants.

RIMISP’s synthesis and dissemination efforts, which have taken the form of e-conferences and e-debates, are extremely valuable because they have created new opportunities for networking using Internet interaction among users in many countries. There is a need to explore opportunities to pass on this expertise on to the other SGP’s.

MINGA’s research results and publications provide important opportunities for designing and implementing development research courses at the post-graduate level. These may include courses that could be sponsored through a network of universities in LAC with support from Canadian academics. Courses on community forestry are already being offered, but some of the central issues addressed by the PI, including environmental governance and gender mainstreaming, perhaps could become useful training and capacity building tools.

6.2 Influence on Policies and/or Technologies
Before drawing any conclusions, it is important to recall some basic premises on the application of social research to policy analysis and changes. According to Weiss (1977)xviii social research is not always relevant to policy decisions, but exerts its influence by altering the language and perceptions of “policy-makers” and their advisors as an “enlightenment” that percolates over a long period of time. It has also been argued that research and research institutions moderate policy. Both arguments are useful and complementary in understanding how research and analysis can influence policy-related decision-making processes. Furthermore, the concept of a community or network of decision-makers better reflects the social forces and conditions driving a given process. It is therefore difficult to find immediate and direct connections between research results and policy formation.

One of the first questions that should be asked about MINGA’s influence has to do with its own research priorities, the research approaches of its partner organizations, and their areas of influence. Some of its central questions are influencing research institutions, local governments, local agencies, and institutions at the sub-regional, national or regional levels. Although mapping the areas of influence would require extensive and in-depth evaluation, some of the evidence gathered and the information reviewed is outlined below.

The decentralization trends observed throughout the region provide unique opportunities for applying and learning from participatory research. If participatory research is a useful approach to build capacities and social capital in order to influence decision-making on NRM, it can influence decision-makers at the local level and beyond. Similarly, the introduction of MSA to NRM could lead to improved opportunities for the most vulnerable sectors of rural societies in the region and reassert individual and collective rights vis-à-vis external forces and influences. Several of the projects reviewed have bearing on decentralization while building social capital at local level.
The MINGA PI identified Coastal Resource Management as one of its key focus areas. The deterioration of small- and medium-scale fishery resources has created conflicts between resource users, local authorities, regulatory agencies, and private businesses. The application of the MSA to CBRM seeks to illustrate and provide methodological tools that could be used to tackle structural problems in the Caribbean while demonstrating its benefits to policy makers and national and regional institutions. Research approaches have been revised as result of the extensive research that has been conducted and the publication of proposals for alternative approaches to small-scale fisheries management. This in turn has influenced the research policies and priorities of the CARICOM Fisheries Unit in Costa Rica, the International Ocean Institute in Belize, and universities like the Universidad Nacional de Costa Rica, as well as those of other research and development projects.

The Program’s influence on policies and/or technologies can be appreciated in the contexts in which the projects carried out have radically changed institutional policies, such as Ecuador’s Carchi Program. The implementation of two phases of the watershed management program has helped to create an emerging inter-institutional and multi-stakeholder watershed management body, which works closely with government departments and authorities and has had an effect on other national agencies and departments. Other municipalities and associations are expanding (up-scaling) project coverage to include a broader hydrographic basin with several watersheds. CONDESAN itself has noted the project’s success and negotiated the expansion of the approach to several dozens of watershed in several countries with several funding agencies. Funding agencies and multilateral bodies are paying attention to the out-scaling exercise, and the results are being adopted and adapted to new situations, which has led more institutions to commit to using MSA to basin management.

In Bolivia, up-scaling of local conflicts resulted in what was referred to as a “water war,” but the ensuing negotiations between the government and the social organizations that led the opposition to the water privatization process furthered the creation of a coordinating body and several pilot initiatives on water rights regulations. The application of MSA to the negotiating process is influencing the creation of a “New Water Law” in Bolivia and the coordinating body is influencing members of parliament and other experts. The involvement of other social actors has clearly created new challenges to existing hierarchies, as the scale and scope of the project, which now reaches the country’s highest authorities, is expanded.

Research objectives always focus on the exchange of ideas, the creation of new questions, or the improvement of analytical capabilities. In MINGA’s case, the purpose of the research is to provide information on specific experiences that can demonstrate the potential for reducing the gap in resource distribution and accessibility, balancing human needs, and protecting a natural resource base that provides the material needed support to present and future generations.

Although MINGA is having an impact on the region’s development research agenda, no comprehensive evaluation has been undertaken to study this impact on its partner institutions and other institutions in the region.

6.3 The Inclusion of Gender Perspectives.
MINGA’s progress on gender mainstreaming is being monitored through a set of criteria and guiding questions, which have been integrated into project assessment and approval, project review, and project monitoring and evaluation. Workshops and training programs have been created in order to facilitate this process.

Several documents and internal reviews demonstrate the continued effort to sustain gender mainstreaming (see Wiens, 2002 and Adamo, 2003). MINGA’s Website also contains well-
documented and updated material. The influence of this part of the project on other IDRC programs is not clear.

MINGA’s partners have become involved in specific initiatives related to “Gender and Social Analysis,” including training workshops, Master’s thesis support, mentoring, and the integration of several institutions (e.g. PIEB in Bolivia, Ecosciencias in Ecuador, and SEPIA in Peru). Two other projects complement support for gender mainstreaming (“Confronting the Challenge of Gender Equity in Environmental Management in Latin America” and “Gender Research and Training Support”), which feature participation of international organizations such as IUCN and several organizations from Costa Rica, Ecuador, Brazil, Cuba, Peru, and Mexico.

The international conference “Gender perspectives and the role of women in the management of water resources in the Altiplano” held by the “Virtual Information Centre on Water in the Altiplano” with the support of IPROGA in Peru and the World Bank’s Water and Sanitation Department, demonstrates the sustained effort to systematically engage local and national institutions in the ongoing over gender equity in NRM in the region. Applied research and participatory development initiatives are also being integrated in several projects, including projects on water management in Bolivia and Ecuador. Initiatives to integrate a gender equity perspective in all projects, including mining, conflict and collaboration, and the three SGP’s are clearly visible.

6.4 Changing Other Stakeholders’ Relationships, Actions, and/or Behavior.
Representatives from other cooperation and development agencies felt that MINGA’s research agenda was critical to providing a multi-stakeholder platform to develop common strategies on complex and controversial issues, such as new water legislation in Bolivia. CONDESAN is another example of how the coordination of thematic, geographical, and institutional agendas can bring together a wide range of expertise and opportunities for sustained institutional collaboration. MANRECUR also provides clear lessons of how programs can change other stakeholders’ relationships, behaviors, and actions. New partners and increased influence on other organizations, was perceived, including the local government, CONDESAN’s future planning, and several basin management initiatives in highland regions.

MINGA’s experience with social learning systems and networking has been integrated into its new planning strategy for the sub-program “Building Learning Systems for Honduras Development,” which is part of CIDA’s Pro-Mesas project in Honduras. The project will reach regional and national organizations, research units, and Sector Tables, and will provide opportunities for collaboration with other agencies, such as GTZ and UNDP. The transfer of its previous experience will integrate outcome mapping methodologies and the development of an SGP, an approach that may prove extremely useful during the second phase of MINGA’s programming. Building learning alliances with Bolivian NGO’s, academics, government departments, and other international cooperation agencies may also prove extremely useful in order to complete the cycle of social learning on water regulations and management in Bolivia. MINGA’s technical and networking capacities have been praised by several international cooperation agencies and are regularly used to coordinate efforts such as “Regulation of Rights in the Water Law in Bolivia.”

The SGP’s have generated closer relationships between networks of researchers and have brought in additional resources from other donor agencies, thus increasing coverage and the potential for future funding opportunities. Systematization efforts and the dissemination of information are enhanced by the opportunities provided by MINGA itself, as in the case of RIMISP.
The integration of other stakeholders, such as universities in Canada and LAC and research facilities including CIAT, CIP, and the Ocean Research Institute, demonstrates the relevance of and growing interest in confronting the challenges of NRM from a multidisciplinary perspective.

There is no doubt that MINGA is providing ample opportunities and support for building new research capacities in the region. The reviewers are not, however, clear on how they are being integrated and what priorities and resources will be assigned to strengthen the networks of young researchers that are emerging from the SGP’s. The lack of sustained efforts to integrate multidisciplinary and sustainability perspectives on development research in the region could very well justify the need for coordinated efforts, such as those involving MINGA, UNDP, and other agencies.

6.5 Training and Capacity Building

Capacity building is a central strategy of MINGA’s program. All MINGA projects and programs focus on the generation of knowledge, tools, and methodologies, and capacities. The research strategies used in many localized projects include participatory research with local communities. The knowledge generated is also transferred to a broader audience through workshops, seminars, conferences, radio programs, Websites, electronic conferences and books. Training manuals are also used, as in the case of CEPROMIN’s manuals on managing mining conflicts, or CONDESAN’s series on agro-industries, or training workshops as in Stakeholder Analysis and Social Information System –SIS developed by J. Chevalier of Carleton University, as well as training on outcome mapping methodologies.

SGP’s provide opportunities to build the research capacities of many NGO’s and researchers by providing clear guidelines and opportunities for exchange and debate. Workshops on conflict and collaboration, training on gender, social information systems, and the use of outcome mapping methodologies have been held as part of this effort.

The SGP’s are an important part of MINGA’s strategy in training and capacity building in the region. They not only stimulate efforts to synthesize ongoing experiences on NRM from a multidisciplinary perspective, but also serve as valuable tools for devolving the research agenda and administrative capacities to the region, as demonstrated by projects like RIMISP in Chile. SGP’s for gender mainstreaming and the research fund for the Honduras Pro-Mesas can also benefit from this experience as well.

Capacity building includes support for academic thesis research on gender and NRM, academic mentoring and meetings through the “Master Thesis Research on Gender and NRM” project, and mentoring for the researchers that carry out case studies on “Confronting the Challenge of Gender Equity.” Networking among the institutions that administer the gender mainstreaming initiatives in the region is also an integral part of capacity building.

Training and capacity building have been the focus of some of the scaling-up initiatives, including “Scaling-up Successful Agro-ecological Experiences,” which forms part of a larger initiative sponsored by the UNDP. Other examples include the CONDESAN’s agro-industry project, the MANRECUR project, and the “Productive Municipalities” in Bolivia project.

MINGA’s synthesis and dissemination efforts are still not clearly oriented towards promoting the use of valuable information and methodologies through university courses. With the exception of a few programs, including CEBEM’s “Internet-based Community Forestry Management Training Program” (a Master’s-level course for practitioners), few efforts have been made to support the development of the post-graduate courses that practitioners may require. A good example is the
creation of a regional Master’s degree program at the Universidad Católica in Temuco, Chile, which offers a training program for practitioners and incorporates agro-ecological knowledge developed in the region. The gender and stakeholder analysis methodologies develop by Carleton University could become part of a network of courses offered in LAC.

7. PROGRAM CONSISTENCY AND RELEVANCE

As stated in MINGA’s prospectus, globalization trends have increased the intensity of resource use, while governments’ regulatory capacities have been seriously limited by structural adjustment programs and an external debt crisis. In this context, MINGA’s agenda continues to be relevant in LAC as it supports development research on alternatives to growing inequities and resources over-exploitation, environmental deterioration, and social and environmental conflicts.

MINGA has adequately identified problems affecting the sustainability perspectives of natural resources and societal structures, particularly in the case of vulnerable sectors such as the rural population, indigenous groups, and women. Its partners have an opportunity to develop alternatives and activate learning processes that can help counteract social and resource decline.

The review team was able to ascertain the relevance of the IDRC’s support to its LAC partners. Many academics feel that IDRC’s research support and orientations provide exceptional and unique leadership and promote independent thinking. The PI’s support to its partners’ networking capacities helps them approach key issues from a multidisciplinary perspective. This is not only true in areas that have traditionally attracted specialists, such as natural resources, forestry, and fisheries, but also in fields like learning systems and gender analysis.

7.1 Program Consistency

The PI is consistent with its main goals to support local, national, and international researchers in the analysis, synthesis, and extrapolation of key experiences with MSA to NRM. This is being achieved by integrating PI’s research activities with other research initiatives, such as those promoted by the World Bank Institute, UNDP, and other multilateral organizations, and by generating research networks, tools, and methods. Conferences and symposia further contribute to international exchanges and support. An example of this is the “International Workshop on Collaborative Management of Natural Resources,” which was organized by the World Bank Institute, IDRC, and the Ford Foundation and provided policy-makers, professionals, and researchers from over 60 countries with the opportunity to review lessons emerging from conflict and collaboration in NRM.

The activities undertaken also confirm the Program’s consistency with building institutional capacities and providing training on multidisciplinary approaches to MSA to NRM while supporting better design of projects, programs, or intervention strategies. This is reflected in the evolving expansion and adoption of MSA to watershed management emerging from MANRECUR and the agro-industry projects led by networks in several countries that are affiliated with members of larger consortia like CONDESAN. The SGPis also fulfill the Program’s development goals by generating short-term opportunities for new researchers who seek to initiate relevant projects.

The Program is achieving its development goals by:

- Identifying the main research challenges to sustainable natural resource use in LAC in the context of accelerated resource and environmental deterioration.
- Providing support to the research establishment under socio-political constrains of still fragile democracies, which have not allowed governments to deal with growing inequalities and poverty conditions in a consistent manner.
• Focusing resources on promoting MSA to NRM in critical areas of the Andes and coastal resources in Central America and the Caribbean rather than maintaining its initial focus.
• Mainstreaming lessons learned, as reflected in the creation of fruitful cooperation among local, national and international organizations and the integration of local and regional networks of researchers from local NGO’s, universities, and local agencies into well established national and international research institutions (CGIAR).
• Furthering gender mainstreaming by integrating this approach in a flexible, iterative, and thoughtful way and viewing it a learning process for the PI and its partners.
• Expanding and improving projects’ potential impact by integrating new human and financial resources following the examples of projects such as “Exploring Indigenous Perspectives on Consultation and Engagement in the Mining Sector for LAC” and “Approaches to Mining Related Conflicts.”
• Including comparative perspectives for comparing and contrasting results following the example of the workshop that was recently held in Mérida Mexico in order to assess the progress made in implementing the Costas SGP and the Conflict and Collaboration Conference organized by UBC.

7.2 Program Relevance
Given the current context in LAC, the PI is relevant to:

• **Stakeholders involved in conflict management situations.** Early identification of important issues affecting the rural poor such as control over and access to critical resources (like drinking and irrigation water) has helped engage a broad range of organizations in collaborative networks created to confront complex issues. In anticipation of future conflicts over fisheries in coastal areas in Central America and the Caribbean or around water resources in the highlands of Argentina, Chile, Bolivia, and Peru, as well as around mining, forestry and land tenure. Conflict and collaboration projects demonstrate the opportunities to apply the tools and methods of MSA to NRM.

• **Policy-makers at the local and central level.** The main challenge for MINGA and its partners in LAC is the development of capacities for integrating micro-level experiences on MSA into NRM at the macro level and their application at policy formulation. This may seem like a major task given the issues, locations, and resources involved, but projects in their second and third phases demonstrate that progress is being made (e.g. MANRECUR III).

• **Other international development agencies.** The relevance of MINGA’s work is broadly recognized by a wide range of national and international development organizations, which creates opportunities for combining resources and out- or up-scaling pilot initiatives, including joint initiatives with CIDA in Honduras, CECI, Co-development in Bolivia, and work with the UNDP in Chile, Cuba, Honduras, and Peru. The PI has been careful when leveraging financial resources for development research. Its partners in LAC recognize that MINGA has provided valuable advice that allowed organizations to appreciate long-term risks and opportunities. MINGA is recognized as a valuable and reliable partner in LAC.

7.3 The PI and State of the Art Research in the Region
The debate over what is relevant and state of the art in development research is influenced by the urgency to reduce poverty conditions and rate of deterioration of natural resources. Development research in the region is localized and scarce and there are few initiatives that test and expand lessons learned in specific contexts. MINGA is well ahead of its peers in this respect. Its capacity to bring together researchers from LAC, Canada, and other regions have provided unique opportunities for reviewing state of the art development research while providing opportunities to test the relevance of the work that is being done.
It can be concluded that participatory or action research in conflict situations in NRM in LAC is highly relevant in that it places the program in a unique position to understand social change and new perspectives on emerging conflicts over natural resources. This is one of the primary reasons for MINGA partners’ appreciation of its support to research in critical areas, as reflected in the land tenure studies in Bolivia and the SGP-supported research on conflict and collaboration and on local environmental governance.

Future research projects to strengthen the tools and methods that can be used to track and evaluate changes in behaviour (such as “outcome mapping”) while deepening the understanding of how the poor are affected by economic growth are an essential part of reducing the inequalities that exist in LAC.

Another key research area is community-led innovations in rural agro-industries, which is due in part to CONDESAN’s experiences and interventions in three countries since it provided unique opportunities for carrying out comparative studies on technological innovations and adaptation in rural agro-industries. A closer review of the economic impact and opportunities generated by the agro-industry research and development projects may provide further information on the reduction of poverty and improve access to technology and markets.

Though research on local environmental governance is still limited, it can be stated that MINGA is developing mechanisms to convene and select case studies through its SGP. It is also drawing lessons from well established programs in Central America and Ecuador. The importance of this type of research has not only been recognized by multilateral institutions, but also by leading Canadian institutions, including the Liu Center for Global Issues. The Canadian Plains Research Centre (CPRC) and the University of Regina have also recently focused on institutional learning, local environmental governance and the emerging vulnerabilities associated with climate change in areas that are already suffering from water stress and resource deterioration. Many MSA to NRM concepts, tools, and methods will be applied to the comparative analysis of a new project being designed.

New research is being conducted on territorial development (which was the focus of a previous SGP), and international financial institutions are moving in this direction, as exemplified by IFAD’s new project in Ecuador. The goal of this project is to develop the Central Corridor Project in order to reduce poverty, empower local communities, and enhance their ability to manage natural resources while overcoming the limitations of market accessibility. Many agencies are undertaking research on the social impact analysis of macro economic policies and the ways in which these policies affect the day-to-day lives of large segments of the populations of developing countries.

MINGA has achieved a very specific niche in the development research agenda through its actions, benchmarks, tested approaches in several areas, and the growing maturity of its research.

8. QUESTIONS/ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

This section builds on the review findings. The reviewers describe some of the areas where the program could benefit from revisiting some of the underlying approaches and principles of the MINGA as whole.

8.1 The PI may wish to discuss the weight of social and economic analyses in the design of new projects and the review of partner proposals.

The reviewers have taken note of previous reviewers’ recommendation that social and economic analysis be included in the design of funding interventions. This is particularly important in decisions regarding future funding of this PI. An important element in the reduction of rural poverty is
improved asset management, which requires a full social impact analysis and well established baseline data.

8.2 The PI may wish to revisit the institutional analysis methodology for selecting partner agencies in order to avoid making changes during later phases of a project.

Previous reviews and evaluations have underscored the importance of deepening the analysis of partner agencies’ institutional capacities, including their ability to mainstream multidisciplinary research and gender aspects. Changes in implementation arrangements between phases of projects in execution suggest that difficulties were encountered during the previous phase. In the case of MANRECUR, the changes could not be avoided. Previous external reviewers have also suggested that Canadian partner institutions could provide the economic and social sector analysis mentioned earlier. Some institutions’ ability to follow through with the initial research agenda has come into question, and it may be necessary to consider new institutions that maybe better suited to implement the project. The Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados’ in Merida, Mexico interest in playing a larger role in the Costas project is a case in point. New capacity building strategies and learning processes as designed for Pro-Mesas are good examples of responses to the weaknesses found in some countries.

8.3 The PI may wish to consider including other actors in its projects and programs.

Project documents define reach as the extent to which stakeholders, including researchers, NGO’s, policy- and decision- makers, and the teachers and students who participate in MINGA programs generate knowledge and apply information. Recent developments in LAC point to the increased importance of municipal governments as a result of decentralisation programs, but the prospectus does not identify these institutions as important stakeholders except as policy-makers. Nor does it promote the specific evaluation of mainstreaming MSA to NRM in local government’s policies and practices with the exception of productive municipalities. Members of parliament and government research offices have not been identified as important constituents despite the impetus that the legal framework for NRM has acquired in Latin America in recent years with the public debates and passage of important pieces of legislation on land, water, forests, biodiversity, and protected areas. As new regulatory bodies have been created, interface between social movements, NGO’s, and members of parliament has become the focus of policy debates, as seen in Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia in recent years.

8.4 The PI may wish to consider analyzing the up-take of outcome mapping in the region and the need for further training.

The prospectus provides an evaluation framework and plan, but there is no indication of the baseline situation for a given set of activities. The external reviewers feel that there is some confusion regarding who will use the evaluation and when and how this will occur. In some cases these questions involve outcomes and in other cases the questions to be answered refer to actions to be taken by partners. MINGA has carried out several outcome-mapping exercises, but the reviewers cannot comment on the value of this approach as a whole. Some partners have indicated that introducing outcome mapping requires more time and will involve a great deal of further training.

8.5 The PI may wish to explore the institutional potential of regional policy research initiatives.

The adoption of the lessons learned from pilot projects and their integration into policy initiatives requires the development of specific strategic capacities and coordinated efforts among institutions and social organizations, a condition that few researchers and practitioners have developed. Unless specific tools and methods are developed to build these capacities, pilot experiences and social learning may fail to influence policy-makers, a process that requires the ability to engage these individuals in regular debates with researchers and practitioners. At this point the institutional capacities for administering and coordinating the information exchange seem to be scattered or
precarious. The emerging networks created by the SGP’s and coalitions are still weakly bonded, while only one consortium maintains a well-established policy analysis capacity from a predominantly disciplinary perspective. Furthermore, political instability acts as a limiting factor for the institutionalization of lessons derived from MSA to NRM. There is also a need to address strategies for consolidating emerging research networks.

8.6 The PI may wish to consider incorporating the impact of emerging market integration trends in its research agenda.

The development of tools and methodologies for socially acceptable NRM strategies will increasingly confront the challenges of economic integration processes. External forces are already reshaping power relationships between different sectors of society and affecting decision-making structures and the region’s productive culture. The role and future impact of economic integration processes are barely mentioned in the prospectus and documents reviewed despite the large volume of public, multilateral, and private investments that are oriented towards strengthening an export-led model. The Puebla Panama Plan and the FTAA will no doubt have a profound effect on the region and on how natural resources are redistributed and used as external private investors increasingly become relevant forces at local, eco-regional and national level. These issues need to be reviewed with partner organizations and institutions, as they will influence the opportunities for and barriers to sustainable management of resources and equity issues. They will also lead to a need to bridge the rural-urban divide that characterizes most rural development projects.

8.7 The IDRC may wish to reassess MINGA’s staffing capacity.

The evolution of programs and projects and new research areas may impose a heavy burden on the PI’s staff. As MINGA engages in expanded joint ventures with regional and international agencies such as CIDA, IFAD, IDB, and GTZ, its capacity to provide support to its partners may be hindered as training demands increase in gender mainstreaming; strengthening social learning networks; improving capacity building on policy research and policy influencing; improving the social and economic analysis; improving outcome mapping and monitoring tools among other activities.

The PI may consider sharpening its definitions of its research priorities and issues in order to make the most of one of its most valuable assets, the regular exchange between PI’s team members and its partners in the South and the time and space for collective reflection. Program Officer’s ability to monitor progress made by partners in integrating multidisciplinary and gender perspectives is limited by time and capacity constrains. Staff time will also be required to maintain institutional support and learning processes even if Canadian researchers and other development institutions do participate more actively on key areas, and the expansion of various projects will require a revisiting of MINGA staffing capacities. The internalization of gender mainstreaming and the ability to put concepts and approaches into practice with partners will require further definitions and the systematic implementation of a monitoring strategy. Also, capacity building measures and resources will be needed throughout the project cycle if devolution of responsibilities to national or regional institutions is the final goal.

Notes

1 A list of persons interviewed is provided in Appendix II.

2 See Annex I, Table I below


A list of approved projects is provided in Appendix III.

Silke Reichrath developed another classification system in her paper “Review of MINGA Programming, Partners and Strategies,” October 2003. She also proposes the use of Agriculture and Rural Development, Coastal Management and Fisheries, Conflicts in Natural Resource Management, Gender and Social Analysis, Strengthening Communities in Mining Context, Water and Governance, Multi-stakeholder Methodologies for NRM, including SIS and Outcome Mapping, and Alternative Programming Modalities, including Building Learning Systems, Learning Alliances, and Small Grants Programs.

See Mujica, Martin, “Assessing the Contribution of Small Grants Programs to Natural Resource Management”.

For a summary of these discussions, see Hhttp://www.fondominkachorlavi.org/ac/documento_final.htmH.


It is difficult to find an academic department linked to sociology or an agronomy department carrying out joint research on ownership and access to land, water, and forests in the Bolivian valleys. Consortia work between Fundación Tierra, CIPCA, ACLO, CEDLA, QHANA, which is financed by IDRC, ICCO (Holland), and EED (Germany), is beginning to move in this direction. Similarly, the review of social and environmental consequences of mining throughout LAC is taking place outside of the framework of universities and formal research facilities.


As one of CEPROMIN’s team members explained, only a decade ago it was almost “…impossible to think that gender issue would be a central point in institutional work. Given the emerging movement of women ‘palliris’ working in the mines, women’ access to NRM has taken on a whole new dimension and we need to be prepared if we want our project to continue to be relevant.”
Annex I

Table 1. Project Selection Graph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster of outcomes</th>
<th>Projects in Phase II or beyond</th>
<th>Projects promoting synthesis, communications, and dissemination</th>
<th>Projects demonstrating up-scaling and/or out-scaling</th>
<th>Unique Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Annex II

List of People Interviewed

**Peru interviews**

Jose Cetraro  Executive Director  Centro Ideas- (on SANE-, agroecology. SEPIA-CONDESAN and learning networks)
Fernando Alvarado.  Board member, Centro Ideas (on agroe-ecology, public policies, SEPIA and on social learning systems)
Lorenzo Castillo  Director  Junta Nacional del Café (on policies and agro-processing)
Luis Gomero Osorio  Director RAAA ( on agro-ecology and rural production policies)
Carmen Felipe  Former Dean of Facultyb of Agricultura, Universidad Agraria de La Molina (On Water and Agro-ecology- social learning networks)
Sandro Chavez  Director Foro Ecológico del Peru. (on Agro-ecology and water issues)
Julio Benítez,  Director Instituto Jorge Basadre, Cajamarca (on Agro-ecology and regional development strategies)
Mario Tapia,  Independent Consultant (Former Board Member of CONDESA- on agro- processing and resource conservation strategies)
Ricardo Clavería,  Director of CIED (Aguas Altiplano and Gender Issues)
Yenny Melgar  Coordinator of Aguas Altiplano-CIED Project
Elías Mujica  CIP-CONDESAN
Sonia Salas  CIP-Proyecto Arracacha
Edgardo Caceres  President National Ecological Producers-ANPE (On Agro-ecological production, training and markets)
Etienne Durt  Independent Consultant (CONDESAN and MINGA)
Sylvia Wu  Ecologica del Peru (On agroprocessing and agro-ecology, markets and training program)
Alfonso Cotera,  GRESP, Lima (rural enterprises and rural economies)

**Bolivia interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender perspectives in natural resource management</th>
<th>Support for Masters Thesis Research on Gender and Natural Resources (100997)</th>
<th>Confronting the Challenge of Gender Equity in Environmental Management in Latin America</th>
<th>Gender Research and Training Support for MINGA Partners (100841)</th>
<th>Support for Masters Thesis Research on Gender and Natural Resources (100997)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution/Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freddy Beltrán</td>
<td>Directorio de CEPROMIN (Conflict and Mining Projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Gomez</td>
<td>CEPROMIN (Conflict and Mining Projects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Quiroga,</td>
<td>Ayuda en Acción and CICDA (Agro-industry and Rural Enterprises)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Choque.</td>
<td>Cooperativa Campesina de Coraca Irupana (On Rural Enterprises)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Carlos Iturralde</td>
<td>Director CGIAB (Water Rights Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leticia Miranda.</td>
<td>Red Mujer y Mineria (Gender and Access to Water and Mining)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar Fernández,</td>
<td>Presidente de la Junta de Regantes, miembro del CGIAB Project, Coordinadora del Agua de Cochabamba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar Olivera,</td>
<td>CGIAB Project, Coordinadora del Agua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raúl Delgado.</td>
<td>Coordinator PROMESA. Proyecto Racacha Centro (Arroz-root Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charly Crespo</td>
<td>CESU-Universidad de San Simon (CGIAB Project-Conflict and Collaboration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Mendez</td>
<td>Director PROMIC Cochabamba ESU Universidad de San Simon, Cochabamba. (Arroz-root Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel Urioste</td>
<td>Director Fundacion Tierra, La Paz (Land Tenure Project in Bolivia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joachim Voss</td>
<td>CIAT-Cali, CONDESAN Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubert Zanstra</td>
<td>CONDESAN.CIP Lima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Héctor Cisneros</td>
<td>Coordinador CONDESAN; Lima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Laflamme</td>
<td>Director Andes CECI-La Paz (Conflict and Mining)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Castillo</td>
<td>Programa Nacional de Riego UCEP-PRONAR La Paz (CGIAB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando Carpio</td>
<td>Programa Nacional de de Riego UCEP-PRONAR-La Paz (CGIAB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debora Pereira,</td>
<td>Consultant, Cochabamba Regional Authority Advisor (CGIAB project)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chile interviews**

Julio Berdegué,  
Director RIMISP, CONDESAN Board Member (CONDESAN and SGP Mink’a de Chorlavi)

Andres Yurjevich,  
President of Centro de Educación y Tecnología- CET, Latin American Consortium on Agroecology and Sustainable Development - CLADES Board Member (SANE)

Sara Larrain,  
Director Chile Sustentable (Aguas Altiplano and SANE)

Carlos Venegas,  
Regional Director, CET Chiloe (SANE)

Jose Aylwin  
Research Director at the Institute for Indigenous Studies at Universidad de la Frontera in Temuco (Conflict and Collaboration)

Luis Peralta,  
Director of the Institute for Sustainable Development of the Catholic University, Temuco (SANE)

Francisco Sabatini  
Instituto Estudios Urbanos, Catholic University in Santiago

Nancy Alanoca,  
Corporación de Desarrollo Arica y Parinacotas (Aguas Altiplano Network and gender issues)

**Pearl Lagoon-Nicaragua interviews**

Denis Williams,  
Central American University

Bertha Simmons,  
Coordinator CAMPlab
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oswaldo Morales</td>
<td>Community Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo Tinkman</td>
<td>Community Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Tinkman</td>
<td>Consultant NORAD-the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Allen</td>
<td>Radio producer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adler Britton</td>
<td>Community leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Downs</td>
<td>Mayor Pearl Lagoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodolfo Julius Cayazo</td>
<td>Community leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillermo Ingram Rigby</td>
<td>Community Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara Medina</td>
<td>Grant recipient Cuba. Universidad de Cienfuegos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph.A. Palacio</td>
<td>Grant recipient Belize. University of the West Indies School of Continuing Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo Hidalgo</td>
<td>Grant recipient Guatemala , Fundación para el Desarrollo y la Conservación -FUNDAECO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Fraga</td>
<td>Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilo Coral</td>
<td>Gran recipient Panama Fundación Dobbo-Yala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yvonne Arias</td>
<td>Grant recipient Dominican Republic. Grupo Yaragua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciro Marcano</td>
<td>Grant recipient Venezuela. Fundación Claudio Perna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia Salas</td>
<td>Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorge Euan</td>
<td>Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis Ovares</td>
<td>International Oceans Institute, Costa Rica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Poats</td>
<td>Project Director Grupo Randi Randi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauricio Proaño</td>
<td>Project Director Grupo Randi Randi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ecuador MANRECUR**

Susan Poats Project Director Grupo Randi Randi
Mauricio Proaño Project Director Grupo Randi Randi
### ANNEX III. List of Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACEDI</td>
<td>Atlantic Community Economic Development Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMP LABIII</td>
<td>Coastal Area Monitoring Project and Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARICOM</td>
<td>Caribbean Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBCRM</td>
<td>Community Based Coastal Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEBEM</td>
<td>Centro Boliviano de Estudios Multidisciplinarios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDLA</td>
<td>Centro de Estudios para el Desarrollo Laboral y Agrario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEPROMIN</td>
<td>Centro de Promoción Minera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGIAB</td>
<td>Coordinadora para la Gestión Integral del Agua en Bolivia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CECI</td>
<td>Canadian Centre for International Studies and Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAT</td>
<td>Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIED</td>
<td>Centro de Investigación, Educación y Desarrollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Centro Internacional de la Papa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>CARICOM’s Fisheries Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDESAN</td>
<td>Consorcio para el Desarrollo Sostenible de la Ecoregión Andina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSUDE</td>
<td>Cooperación Suiza para el Desarrollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINESTAV</td>
<td>Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAT</td>
<td>Centro Internacional de Agricultura Tropical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIPCA</td>
<td>Centro de Investigación y Promoción Campesina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoDev</td>
<td>CoDevelopment Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPRC</td>
<td>Canadian Plains Research Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSRC</td>
<td>Canadian Social Science Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOCIENCIA</td>
<td>Fundación Ecuatoriana de Estudios Ecológicos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EED</td>
<td>German Service for Development of the Evangelic Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENRM</td>
<td>Environment and Natural Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLACSO</td>
<td>Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit GmbH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agricultura Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCO</td>
<td>Inter-Church Organization for development Cooperation-Holland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDRC</td>
<td>Internacional Development Research Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOI</td>
<td>Internacional Ocean Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASCP</td>
<td>International Association for the Study of Common Property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>International Union on the Conservation of Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANRECUR</td>
<td>Manejo de Recursos Naturales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARENASS</td>
<td>Manejo de Recursos Naturales en la Sierra Sur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERGE</td>
<td>Managing Ecosystem and Resources with Gender Emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Multi-stakeholder approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRM</td>
<td>Natural Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONIC</td>
<td>Organización Nacional Indígena de Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPA</td>
<td>Online Proposal Appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Program Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIEB</td>
<td>Fundación para la Investigación Estratégica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Program Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDESMA</td>
<td>Red de Desarrollo Sostenible y Medio Ambiente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSP</td>
<td>Research Support Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIMISP</td>
<td>Red de Investigación en Metodología de la Investigación en Sistemas de Producción</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANE</td>
<td>Sustainable Agriculture Networks and Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPIA</td>
<td>Seminario Permanente de Investigación Agraria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>Social Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGP</td>
<td>Small Grant Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBI</td>
<td>World Bank Institute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>