

MIDTERM REVIEW OF THE RURAL TERRITORIAL DYNAMICS PROGRAMME

External Panel Assessment

, Dr. José Emilio Guerrero (Coordinator), Dr. Gonzalo De la Maza, Dr. Rosa Gallardo and
Dr. Francisco Rhon

May 2011

IDRC project:
RIMISP Core Support for Rural Development Research (Latin America and the Caribbean) -104513

Table of Contents

The Rural Territorial Dynamics Programme.....	3
Midterm Evaluation and External Panel Assessment	8
General Aspects of the Quality of the Self-Evaluation Report.....	10
Key Questions.....	11
Is the programme generating a body of doctrine that allows DTR to become a policy option for Latin American rural development?	12
To what degree is the Programme creating conditions for achieving policy and practical changes at the territorial, national and regional levels?	14
How is the work of the entities involved (CU, partners, AB, ME, etc.) helping or hindering progress towards programme results?	20
The Added Value of the Programme.....	26
Suggestions and Conclusions	28
APPENDIX 1: PROTOCOL FOR VISITS TO THE TERRITORIES	32
APPENDIX 2: MIDTERM EVALUATION VISIT SCHEDULE: Interviews	35
APPENDIX 3. Terms of Reference Mid-Term Review of the Rural Territorial Dynamics Program.....	39

This document contains the External Panel Assessment Report, which was conducted for the Midterm Evaluation of the Rural Territorial Dynamics (DTR) Programme. The assessment was performed between September 2010 and May 2011 by the members of the external panel, **Dr. José Emilio Guerrero (Coordinator), Dr. Gonzalo De la Maza, Dr. Rosa Gallardo and Dr. Francisco Rhon**, and benefitted from the support of Dr. Melchor Guzmán.

The text is organized into six sections. The first contains a description of the programme and its objectives and main activities. The second describes the methodology used by the External Panel to complete the Assessment. The third section presents a discussion of the quality of the Self-Evaluation Report carried out by RIMISP, which is one of the basic elements of this Report. The fourth section presents information on the key questions posed to the External Panel in the Terms of Reference (see Appendix 3). The fifth section highlights the areas that the Panel found to be most relevant in regard to the programme's added value. The final section presents the panel's suggestions for the next stage of the Rural Territorial Dynamics Programme.

The Rural Territorial Dynamics Programme

The Rural Territorial Dynamics Programme is a multi-disciplinary effort that combines research and mobilisation of stakeholders. It is supported by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), the New Zealand Aid Program (NZAP) and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). It is a policy advising and capacity development programme that is based on research, and its purpose is to contribute to the design and implementation of more comprehensive, transversal and effective public policies that can stimulate and support rural territorial dynamics that lead to economic growth, poverty reduction, increased equality and responsible environmental governance.

The **specific objectives** of the programme are:

1. To support the policies of national and sub-national governments and international development agencies with strategic, research-based analysis of rural development dynamics and their determinants.
2. To strengthen the capacity of public and private development agents (especially at the level of provinces and municipalities, and with an emphasis on organisations that represent or benefit the poor) in order to support policy design processes and the implementation of programmes that affect rural territorial development.
3. To facilitate dialogue and interaction between rural development professionals, those responsible for formulating policies and researchers in Latin America and their counterparts in other regions of the world in order to promote global assimilation of the lessons of Latin American approaches to rural territorial development.

4. To strengthen the capacity of select graduate programmes at universities in Central America and the Andean Region to train specialists in rural territorial development.

5. Using this programme as a point of departure, to strengthen the position of RIMISP as a leading centre of knowledge on rural development that can serve as an effective platform for the articulation of a vision and strategy with multiple partners for revitalizing rural societies in Latin America with social justice.

Programme activities are organised into six **components**:

1. *Applied research*: This component supports multidisciplinary research projects that look to inform those interested in policy and strategies for rural development. It has adopted a three-step strategy. The first is an analysis of census data and national household surveys for 10,000 municipalities and 400 million individuals in 11 countries at two points in time and the use of that data to develop maps of dynamics of economic and social change. The second step was the implementation of four exploratory projects focused on the dynamics of specific territories in Nicaragua, Ecuador, Peru and Chile. The research questions, hypothesis and methods were tested during these projects and the inter-project collaboration system was developed. The third step was the implementation of 15 research projects called “regular” projects as well as six complementary studies on gender and territorial dynamics and five complementary studies on natural capital as a determining factor in territorial dynamics.

2. *Capacity development*: This component looks to contribute to capacity development for public, private and social agents in order to influence rural territorial dynamics so that they will lead to results of economic growth, social inclusion and responsible environmental governance. The main emphasis of this area is the development of the skills needed in order to improve the quality and effectiveness of collective action, networking, innovation and a capacity for entrepreneurship. Special attention was paid to strengthening the representation of the poor and socially excluded in order to influence rural territorial dynamics. This component was launched in June 2009 and is operational in six territories in six different countries (Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Ecuador and Chile).

3. *International networking*: The purpose of this set of efforts is to facilitate dialogue and interaction among professionals from Latin American countries who formulate policy and rural development researchers with their counterparts in other regions of the world. It is meant to open channels for communication and South-South learning, particularly with sub-regions and nations that are undergoing important rural transformations that will probably have global impacts such as India, China and South Africa.

4. *Graduate training*: This component is directed at strengthening the capacities of select graduate programs in Central America and the Andean Region in areas directly linked to rural development. The main strategy of this component is to support the improvement of the curriculum (contents and methods), developing a critical mass of professors and providing them with opportunities to interact with colleagues and teams from leading international universities (including countries in Latin America).

5. *Organisational development of RIMISP*: The implementation of this programme will benefit RIMISP's development as a world-class centre of knowledge on rural development that can serve as an effective platform for the articulation of a vision and strategy with multiple partners for revitalizing rural societies in Latin America with social justice. This component is not subject to the self-evaluation.

6. *Communications*: The final component is transversal in that it is present in every process and cycle of the programme, directly supporting all of the components and activities. It helps meet the needs and objectives of the DTR programme through various mechanisms and functions including the identification of audiences, construction of messages and creation of communications products that respond to the components' specific needs. The goal is to involve the main stakeholders with whom the programme works in the design, implementation and evaluation of communications products and activities in accordance with their level of participation and involvement and their function.

The **hypothesis** at the core of this programme is that the multi-dimensional heterogeneity of rural Latin America is (partly) promoted by territorial dynamics that occur above and beyond the processes of differentiation at the level of individuals, families or social groups. As a result, rural territories present quite disparate results, and this has led researchers to seek out the dynamics behind successful rural territorial development.

This necessarily multi-disciplinary approach centred on the interaction between stakeholders, institutions and the distribution and use of goods and resources makes room for an analysis of the varied results achieved, including economic growth, social inclusion and environmental sustainability.

The following are the expected **programme effects** (revised in June 2010):

1. *Collective stakeholder*: Coalitions that develop and promote strategies and policies (with a DTR approach). They may include intellectuals, political figures at the territorial/base level such as governors and members of Parliament, leaders of professional organisations, entrepreneurs with a territorial base, opinion leaders and the media in dialogue with similar circles (decentralisation, environment, industrial policy, social policy, etc.).
2. *Vision and strategy*: The rural dimension positioned in public strategies and policies based on the recognition of rural societies and the rural environment as an asset for development rather than a problem and delay.
3. *Public action*: The programme influences public policies and private strategies that stimulate and support processes of economic growth with social inclusion and environmental sustainability in rural Latin American societies.

The programme began in July 2007 with resources procured through a donation from the International Development Research Centre (IDRC, Canada) and was extended to cover a five-year period. Over time, new resources and complementary contributions have been secured, the most important of which comes

from the New Zealand Aid Programme (NZAP), which provided two years of support (2008-2010) for work in Central America. This report is the Midterm Evaluation of the programme financed by IDRC and a final programme evaluation for the NZAP initiative. The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) also made a contribution that is meant to reinforce actions linked to political incidence.

The programme's **organisational structure** is determined by a Coordination Unit, Advisory Board, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit and a network of partners and collaborators.

- The Advisory Board (AB) advises the Coordination Unit on matters related to the focus of the programme's work and the quality of the methods and results. It is composed of representatives of the academic and political spheres, social organisations and the business sector as well as representatives of donor agencies.
- The Monitoring and Evaluation Unit is handled by the company Learning by Design, which was hired in July 2008. Two part-time employees were hired: a Unit Coordinator who is based in Holland and a person who supports the design and implementation of the programme, who has been based in Chile since 2009.
- The network of partners and collaborators is composed of a wide range of institutions that execute or support the execution of the research and other activities linked to the various programme components. There are currently 54 partners and 120 collaborators.

The Programme is meant to serve as a functional network. The centre of the network is 19 rural territories in 11 countries that have activities fully or partially funded by this initiative. Research and capacity development activities are supported in each territory, as are communications activities that involve researchers, organisations and social movements such as organisations of rural women, private companies, national and sub-national government agencies, NGOs and cooperation agencies for development.

Table 1. Territories in which the Rural Territorial Dynamics Programme has a presence.

	País	Territorio	Superficie Km ²	Población
1.	Bolivia	Chaco Tarijeño	13.072	225.366
2.	Brasil	Cariri Paraibano	7.075	119.430
3.	Brasil	Costa de Santa Catarina	15.000	1.500.000
4.	Brasil	Valle de Jiquiriça, Bahía	12.414	309.192
5.	Chile	Chiloé Central	3.412	89.000
6.	Chile	Secano interior de la Región de O'Higgins	2.153	20.093
7.	Colombia	Cuenca del Suárez Alto y el lago Fúquene	483	35.337
8.	Ecuador	Loja	10.793	404.835
9.	Ecuador	Tungurahua	3.369	441.034
10.	El Salvador	Rivera Norte del Humedal Cerrón Grande	570	70.048
11.	Guatemala	Territorio suroriente, Jutiapa y Jalapa	570	70.000
12.	Honduras	Olancho	1.009	36.375
13.	México	Región mezcalera de Oaxaca	18.220	490.745
14.	México	Región Centro Sur de Yucatán	628	29.900
15.	Nicaragua	Macizo de Peñas Blancas, La Dalia	462	126.209
16.	Nicaragua	Región lechera	546	16.404
17.	Perú	Cuatro Lagunas, Cusco	954	35.000
18.	Perú	Sierra de Jauja, Junín	2.100	60.000
19.	Perú	Valle Sur de Cusco	3.749	88.926

Source: Annual Programme Report, 2009.

País- Country	Costa de Santa Catarina- Coast of Santa Catarina
Territorio- Territory	Valle de Jiquirica, Bahía- Valley of Juquirica, Bahia
Superficie KM2- Surface Area (Sq. Km.)	Chiloé Central- Central Chiloe
Población- Population	Secano... -Inland areas of the O'Higgins Region
Brasil- Brazil	Rivera...- Northern Bank of the Cerrón Grande Wetlands
México- Mexico	Territorio- Southeastern Jutiapa and Jalapa
Perú- Peru	Región mezcalera...- Oaxaca (Mezcal Region)
Reemplazar puntos con comas	Región centro... -South-Central Yucatán
	Región lechera- Dairy Region
	Valle Sur... - Southern Valley of Cusco

The cycle of territorial studies has concluded and a crucial step has been taken in the gathering of data and information for review, analysis and synthesis in order to seek out keys to understanding territorial dynamics.

Midterm Evaluation and External Panel Assessment

The **main axis** of the External Panel's Assessment has been the Self-Evaluation Report of the midterm review of the DTR programme, which was prepared by the Programme's Coordination Unit in October 2010. The goal of this exercise is to evaluate its relevance, reach and usefulness and to establish the programme's added value based on interviews, field visits and document reviews in function of the main questions listed in the Terms of Reference.

It is important to note that the external panel has based its work on the terms of reference and considered what RIMISP and the donor agencies consider to be important through the critical examination and validation of the Self-Evaluation Report. The panel has made note of the questions and issues that are key to the development of the activities and especially the proposed objectives.

As per the Terms of Reference, this Report covers activities implemented between 1 July 2007 and 31 December 2010, and special attention is paid to two projects. The first is the main IDRC contract project, which has one third of its project life left and is subject to the midterm evaluation. The second is the NZAP (formerly NZAID) contract. This is the final evaluation for the latter project.

For various reasons including the evaluation system established in the Terms of Reference ("self-evaluation report" and the evaluation of that document by an external panel), the flexible and adaptive management of the programme during its execution (which was approved by the donor agencies), the lack of a baseline or an ex ante evaluation that would establish monitoring indicators for each action and phase and the resources and time available for the work to be conducted by the external panel, traditional evaluation methodologies such as quantitative and generalised comparison of the results or measurement of indicators have not been utilised.

The phases of the evaluation process are described below:

- 1) Preliminary description of the programme and the context in which the External Panel is to carry out its work;
- 2) Analysis of the Self-Evaluation Report;
- 3) Analysis of a large number of programme documents and interviews with programme component directors as well as members of the Monitoring Unit and members of RIMISP's staff;
- 4) Discussion of the analyses carried out among panel members;
- 5) Planning of field work, which consisted of visits to a sample of territories and interviews with different levels of interlocutors: partners, local stakeholders and stakeholders linked to public policy;
- 6) Development of questionnaires and interview guides for field work;
- 7) Field work;
- 8) Analysis of information gathered through field work;
- 9) Sharing of information gathered and field work conducted by members of the External Panel;

- 10) Development of a draft of the external panel review;
- 11) Presentation and discussion of the draft with the Programme Coordination Unit;
- 12) Presentation of draft to the Advisory Board;
- 13) Sharing of report with members of the panel;
- 14) Drafting of the final report by panel members.

The main sources of information for the external evaluation were the Self-Evaluation Report and evidence collected in the programme documents and through interviews with component directors, the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit and RIMISP's staff. The interviews were carried out individually and in groups and were based on the following questions:

- Can you provide a detailed description of the dialogue between the components?
- Can you describe the day-to-day relationship with partners and collaborators?
- Are you familiar with the territories and whether or not there are concurrent programmes in the territories that are the object of this Programme?
- Can you explain the added value of the network of partners?
- Is there a typology of partners? Do they have different responsibilities?
- Can you evaluate the efficiency of the meetings with partners and your daily relationship with them?
- Can you explain the basis for and reach of the “median reach theory”?
- Can you list the coalitions and/or platforms with which you have had a relationship or contact?
- What are the unique contributions of RIMISP to knowledge of issues of agriculture and DTR?

In regard to the **field work** carried out by the external panel, we have considered the following:

- The analysis of the information gathered in the field has served as a complementary element that allows for contrasts to be conducted with the results of the self-evaluation process. The territories visited by members of the external panel belong to the following countries: Chile, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Peru.
- Three levels of analysis have been defined: global (covering the entire programme), national (including programme partners and individuals linked to public policy in this area) and territorial (stakeholders linked to the territories upon which the Programme acts). For the global and national levels, interviews have been conducted with programme directors and key partners and collaborators. Respondents are selected from a list developed by RIMISP and proposals made by the partners in each case. The list of interviews held in each territory is presented in Appendix 2. An open guide with questions/issues related to the programme's relevance, networking, self-evaluation processes and the effectiveness of the measures implemented has been developed. At the territorial level, two areas have been established: local programme

managers/administrators and the beneficiaries of the actions. Appendix 1 presents the protocol utilised by members of the external panel during visits to the field.

General Aspects of the Quality of the Self-Evaluation Report

The self-evaluation process has allowed for the production and systematisation of a large amount of information and for progress to be made in the exploration of the visions of different groups and their comparison as well as the assessment of Programme “components.” We consider these aspects to be sufficient and useful for the work that the external evaluation panel has had to conduct, though we estimate that a more detailed self-evaluation report would have facilitated the panel’s work.

The Self-evaluation Report prioritizes and is limited to specific areas: the process of self-evaluation, the management of the programme, a list of the components, the progress made through the programme, lessons learned, etc. It does not include other important aspects, such as the process by which territories were selected; prior discussions and agreements that led to the creation of a shared conceptual framework; operational matters related to the territories; selection and dialogues, meetings and disagreements between the partners; detailed information on the contents of the research; and coordination mechanisms for components, territories and partners. The discussion of the theoretical-methodological, instrumental and operational adequacy of the network of individuals and institutions that form part of the programme was not sufficient.

There are many correlations between the observations of the external panel and the statements included in the Self-Evaluation Report. This information has been compared to the interviews, document reviews and field visits, though some aspects are not sufficiently appreciated in the Self-Evaluation Report. These include the goals of the partners, their recognition at the local level, their empowerment, their increased response capacity and their predisposition to participate in and strengthen a true network.

The Self-Evaluation Report has followed a methodology that is adequate given its purposes and is sufficiently comprehensive. However, it is excessively self-critical in some areas and minimizes others that have been important. An example of the former is the section on the Master’s Degree Programme Network and its impact in various areas. An example of the latter is the excessive focus placed on progress such as that which was made regarding the “median reach theory.”

The structure of the Self-Evaluation Report, which is organized by components, reproduces some of the problems that this structure has caused in the programme itself given that they are actually contingent upon the programme and do not reflect a territorial vision. Other lacks are discussed in the report, including a lack of synergies among the components and aspects related to the external systems and the partners’ vision, which is not detailed properly. More attention should be paid to the description of the relationship between research and capacity development. Furthermore, the project timeline requires

more analysis, that is, a more detailed discussion of the amount of time required to achieve objectives compared to the time that has passed during the execution of the project.

As we have noted, the project did not include a baseline or conventional indicators for an intervention project. As a result, the self-evaluation does not include criteria of impact, effectiveness, efficiency and adequacy.

Key Questions

Before addressing each of the key questions posed to the External Panel related to programme results, some general questions can be presented that we consider substantial and which will be explored further later.

The first general element is the potential of a network with a territorial vision. Though in some cases it is hard to determine the added value that corresponds exclusively to the programme, we do not consider this to be a problem and have been able to determine that the programme has been a fundamental factor in effecting change in territorial dynamics independently of the influence of other factors. Conditions are being created to move in the direction of the objectives that have been set.

The Programme is relevant and timely and seeks out answers to the question: What do we do to grow with social inclusion in rural territories? The basic logic has been to test the initial hypotheses in territories in which economic growth is observed, as this may be accompanied by a decrease in poverty and/or a decrease in inequality. To this end, a strategy is designed that is supported in the network of partners and the selection of territories. The implementation of the network and selection of the territories was performed with a focus on the economic growth variable even though not enough progress has been made in the elaboration of a set of conditions that could explain or provide a context for said growth and thus make possible the learning that we are seeking. For example, one could begin with the inverse question: What makes certain territories fail to grow and maintain inequalities and poverty? Are only institutional factors involved? What happens with structural factors? What happens with malnutrition, low potential salaries, demographic changes, permanent or temporary migrations, the development of technologies and their effect on the reduction of the local need for a labour force that occurs in populations with high male migration, which are called “all female towns”? These factors are not yet sufficiently incorporated into the theory and practice of DTR in their current form and limit their reach.

The effort to make a substantive contribution to knowledge about territorial dynamics, which the programme calls “Median Reach Theory,” is timely as a goal, but in our opinion it still has to travel a long road in order to produce satisfying results. Though progress has been made on the conceptual front, we cannot yet speak of a new theory if this is to be understood as the general proposals regarding systematic variations in a set of variables that can be applied in order to understand different empirical contexts. The diversity of the territories studied in terms of the dynamic of poverty and inequality has positively

broadened empirical knowledge. However, we have not appreciated a systematic variability that would allow for the classification and/or comparison among the territories, facilitating the development of the above-mentioned theory in the terms presented. The question that emerges in regard to the territories and their diversity is thus: How does that which has been discovered in the territories enrich the initial hypothesis. The key here would be synthesis, which should be oriented towards: 1) theoretical advances and lessons and 2) leading to the formulation of good strategies and instruments for action.

Is the programme generating a body of doctrine that allows DTR to become a policy option for Latin American rural development?

This question contains two parts that must be treated separately: 1) the body of doctrine and 2) the matter of a policy option. The search for a substantive contribution to the understanding of territorial dynamics that also serve as the basis and inspiration for the design of territorial policies has allowed for an important accumulation of information and knowledge in the right direction: a good reading of territorial dynamics in Latin America and reasonable initial synthesis. The work that has been conducted in regard to synthesising the information is the most important part of the second phase of the programme as has been the plan since the outset. It is likely that this will be an important opportunity to expand on key questions in order to understand territorial dynamics.

The programme has made progress towards the generation of knowledge about Rural Territorial Development, testing a research hypothesis in order to further a proposal that would have an impact. Valuable contributions have been made to the research process, but there is a need to continue to work on their synthesis, and the groundwork is being laid for that. Important work has been done including very useful maps of economic growth, dynamics of poverty and inequalities in the distribution of incomes, and there are valuable findings that can explain some of the processes. The programme is contributing and will continue to contribute in a more significant manner later in its life to developing a response to the basic question: What factors determine progress, stasis or steps backwards in the processes of improving the quality of life of their inhabitants? However, we have not been able to identify a theory if we understand a theory to be a conceptual formulation of a more general level that can be applied to other territories.

We believe that it is necessary to revamp the effort that has begun to systematise the knowledge management processes in order to extract consistent analyses and conclusions that allow the programme and RIMISP to be situated on the front lines of the territorial discussion in Latin America. It is a matter of maintaining the programme's flexibility while developing a systematic approach that allows for processes that can be extrapolated to be shared and evaluated. To some extent, more attention has been paid to operational matters –that is, ensuring the execution of the actions that have been scheduled-, and a high level of completion and progress can be observed in that area. The next stage must involve prioritizing synthesis processes and evaluations of shared assets.

The work that is undertaken in the area of constructing knowledge is complex and faces limitations associated with factors such as the robustness of the statistical sources, the universe of

subjects and the limited consideration of external systems and concurrence with other projects, programmes and policies; the policy dimension of the construction of territories; interaction among territories; the sustainability of the institutional construction; and the importance of private and public relationships and the environmental issue.

It is important to note that the environmental aspect has emerged as the main motivator for many stakeholders and shows enormous potential for inter-territorial action, which will in turn require significant amounts of research. The fact that the approach selected is too ambitious and generic has stood as an obstacle to moving forward in this direction, and it may be best to seek out “sufficient evaluations.” The work carried out in territories such as Chaco Tarijeño is very illustrative of the potential of this approach.

It is important to mention that the synthesis was planned to be carried out mainly during the second stage and that the proposal of synthesis projects could be an important step in the right direction.

We agree with the statement included in the Self-Evaluation Report (p. 4) that “the form in which the gender aspect was integrated into the research project is particularly positive. We moved beyond the approach to gender as a matter of relationships of domination within households and communities to propose an integration of territorial approaches to development and systems of gender as a determinant of the territory’s dynamics.” This statement is pertinent and true for the five specific studies in territories such as Yucatán-Mexico, Cerrón Grande-El Salvador, Loja-Ecuador, the South-East Region of Guatemala and Chiloé-Chile. However, it would not be prudent to generalize the conclusions reached to all of the territories due to their important differences. We can note that a significant number of the documents developed by the Programme contain scant references to the matter of gender as an area that can explain territorial dynamics. The gender approach was not adopted as a transversal element in all of the studies carried out in the territories selected in DTR, and we agree with the observation from the Appendixes (p. 52) of the Self-Evaluation Report that “the gender aspect is invisible in most of the research reports and proposals.”

However, our evaluation of the methodological effort of the team of researchers that worked on the gender approach is highly positive. Each study had a team of individuals from the University of Lund and experts and agents from the country and territory in which the cases were analysed. Existing methodologies (including those developed by FAO) were considered for the gender focus, and a series of preliminary results contributed to the synthesis report developed by the Coordinating Unit. For example, on p. 16, the authors state that “the studies reveal the empirical and theoretical richness and depth that the gender perspective contributes. An initial general conclusion is that no rural territorial dynamics are exempt from gender dynamics. It has been observed that gender systems can facilitate or stand as obstacles to economic dynamics...” Furthermore, data presented by the Coordination Unit has shown that five graduate programmes on gender studies have been completed at the University of Lund by students from Brazil, Peru, Colombia and Sweden.

To what degree is the Programme creating conditions for achieving policy and practical changes at the territorial, national and regional levels?

The objective of incidence on public policy has always been at the centre of the programme. However, this goal has evolved as it has been implemented. While the basis of the programme is the generation of knowledge through research centred on the territories, RIMISP leaders note that they find that adequate dissemination of those results among policymakers is not sufficient. They see incidence as being a more complex challenge given the region's political variability, the newness of the territorial approach in public policy, the weak connection between local dynamics and national policy decisions and the difficulties related to dialogue between those who work in the academic arena and those who work with policy, which we have observed to a greater or lesser degree in all of the territories visited.

The most difficult aspect of incidence work is not fully reflected in the initial design of the programme, and the team gained clarity in this regard as it developed. We therefore agree with the observation contained in the Self-Evaluation Report (p. 24) that "early on, we realised that our approach had its limitations, but it has taken us two years to develop the conceptual and methodological tools and financial resources required to develop a more sophisticated and, we hope, more successful and effective strategy." In other words, the importance of this aspect of the work also increased as the programme was executed. One key aspect of this is that incidence as a process is not only played out in the field of national policy. It also is seen at the local level and in international agencies that influence the discussions held and decisions made in countries and territories.

The purpose of political incidence could be addressed more effectively during the second phase of the programme, which should focus on seeking out the added value of the knowledge and information in theoretical contributions, the development of methodologies and tools and, given the complexity of incidence, the difficulty of and number of factors that influence the construction of political power and the various universes, times and interaction with the external system. It has been observed that the conditions for political incidence improve to a different extent in the various countries, but that in order to move in this direction, there is a need for a greater connection between the knowledge that is being generated and the levels of policy decision-making.

There is a need to establish a strategy for this incidence based on a policy analysis that allows for reflection on how power is built in the territories. To this end, there is a need to identify the specific decision-makers with whom interaction should be maintained.

Some of the incidence results that have been achieved are mentioned in the Self-Evaluation Report and others are taking place during the evaluation period. New projects have been formulated as specific instruments to strengthen this area at different levels. They were not included in this report because they have only taken place recently. The former include direct participation of RIMISP members

in national advisory agencies (Ecuador, Peru) and international agencies such as the Andean Territorial Development Council of the Andean Community of Nations. Ideas proposed by RIMISP have been included in programming documents regarding rural development (rural development policy in Peru, programme to support producers in Argentina), and the Programme has been present in international conferences as a result of the work of donor agencies (FAO, IICA, Finnish Cooperation). In addition, there is evidence of use of the materials produced by the programme (maps) in decisions regarding targeting and action in this area; the creation of working groups with government participation as a result of RIMISP actions in the context of the project supported by IFAD (El Salvador, Mexico, Nicaragua, Ecuador and Colombia); and the incorporation of curricular contents and the reformulation of graduate programs linked to DTR. Finally, Programme materials have been used by other stakeholders for regional and local actions (Chile, El Salvador, Nicaragua). (See Table 2 of the Self-Evaluation Report for further information).

In other words, there is evidence of a broad spectrum of agencies and levels in which a certain degree of presence and influence has been achieved, which leads to the reorientation, enrichment or broadening of DTR based on the specific contributions of the programme and, more broadly, those of RIMISP. The incidence is direct in some cases and in others it is the result of the virtuous coordination of actions and efforts motivated by RIMISP and other network partners, which increases the work's impact.

The Programme's leaders have identified the need to strengthen the area of incidence on various levels, developing projects that generate instruments that can be used to implement it beginning in 2010. One of the first initiatives was the Incidence Fund, which is currently being implemented within the DTR Programme in order to support partners' work in the territories. For example, an alliance was proposed to the salmon organization in Chile (part of the territory's main economic activity) in order to jointly develop a capacity development program for local stakeholders in order to promote sustainable development. In the area of strengthening sub-national governments (provinces, *departamentos* and regions), a special project was developed with funding from the Ford Foundation. Another example in this context is the signing of agreements with coffee producers in the municipalities of Macizo de Peñas Blancas in Nicaragua for the promotion of sustainable production in this area and the territory's Management Plan and Environmental Plan. Finally, the project "Knowledge and Change in Rural Development," which was funded by IFAD and implemented in four countries in the region, was implemented in order to address incidence processes in national public policy. The goal of this effort was to provide more and better tools for achieving incidence. (Progress has been made on the formation of Working Groups on rural policies and investments with capacity for incidence.)

One could say that the programme has deployed increasing actions in the context of the search for incidence in public policy that have begun to take shape and should be strengthened during the final stage. The efforts that have been made thus far have produced important results and given RIMISP and the programme itself tools for increased development during the final stage.

Now, we will examine some aspects that are seen as having greater importance for converting incidence actions into a powerful strategy linked to the relevance of the knowledge generated and the positioning of the network of partners in the region.

One crucial aspect of the programme at the theoretical and practical levels has been the identification, description, stimulation, consolidation and, in some cases, creation of multi-stakeholder/agent platforms with a territorial base and the analysis of their potential and praxis for the generation of supply and demand in territorial dynamics. These are local base coalitions that vary from one territory to the next. It is important to note that the IDRC and NZAP projects for Central America have a great deal in common, and it has been key to have them be implemented at the same time and complement each other in order to allow the organisation to work with a single conceptual framework. The dialogue sustained with stakeholders linked to those platforms (municipalities in Chile and NGOs in Peru, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Honduras) generates an interesting transformative process as a result of the programme in terms of stakeholders' consideration of the dynamics that are experienced in the territory and their vision of the territory itself. The analysis of the territory is more clearly oriented towards a perspective of development, alliances with others are valued and more complex strategies are formulated. This "appropriation" on the part of local stakeholders of a DTR agenda or approach is, in our opinion, a very important indicator of incidence.

It is, however, clear that the dynamic that has developed in the local context faces several limitations as a result of larger processes, and this also must be considered. Some of the most important aspects are presented below:

- The rural context is not currently a priority in the region, and it must be included in a broader dialogue (decentralization, clusters, innovation). In the case of the O'Higgins Region of Chile, for example, the association of municipalities of the province of Cardenal Caro formulated a project to create a productive development agency with the Programme's support. The initiative, which is based on rural tourism, is being negotiated with the regional government in the context of existing regional development funds. In Guatemala, an explicit and urgent demand for diversification of the local economy, the search for value in the food chain and job creation was made. In Nicaragua, the Programme allowed for the reactivation of the Association of Municipalities of Peñas Blancas (AMUPEBLAN), which included representatives of the central government and led to the approval of an inter-municipal organisation plan.
- Administrations lack the belief and structure that would allow for the emergence of conditions for the multi-level governance necessary for the design and implementation of territorial public policies. This should be a gradual process that involves the progressive incorporation of elements with a territorial vision in the various policies. This is a significant challenge given that the coalitions are not institutionalised and in some cases have a limited number of interlocutors at

other levels of government. This is the case when the regional level does not exist (Nicaragua) or lacks sufficient autonomy (Chile), or when there is an environment of distrust among local and national leaders, as is the case of the territory visited in Guatemala.

- The diversity of the set of territories is also a difficulty because it forces the programme to develop very specific strategies, which makes it more difficult to generalise or repeat the experiences. For example, a significant amount of reticence was detected among local stakeholders in Central America when they were to approach government agencies. The region's governments also have very different capacities in terms of the availability of resources, management capacity, the orientation of the development, the quality of local professionals, inter-sectoral development and/or sectoral policy, etc.

There is also diversity in terms of the capacities and willingness of the programme partners to link to policy incidence actions and promote specific transformations in the territories. For partners like GRADE, this is mainly a research effort. In other cases, the partner has a weak position in the country's current political climate (e.g. Honduras), which decreases its potential capacity to impact public policy. The next phase will be geared towards trying to capture the installed capacities for the network, thus favouring synergy in this area. On the other hand, there is also a need to expand the ways in which stakeholders link up with other entities. In terms of a general definition, we believe that the programme can play a role of developing and disseminating applied knowledge as a base for incidence given that this has been found to be a lack in the area of governmental action and policy. It also could be used as a basis for efforts to accompany a wide range of stakeholders and create a space for responding to the political demands of municipalities and other entities. We believe that the clarification of that role is decisive for achieving incidence and should take precedence over considerations of the need to raise the visibility of RIMISP and the network.

It is important to expand knowledge of local political systems and their relationships with sub-national and national governments given the importance and permanence of the relationship between macro decisions and sub-national spaces. These issues have not been taken up in the concept that has been developed thus far and are also absent from the Self-Evaluation Report, which means that we cannot explore the political advances and institutionality that impact sustainable public policy. This also makes it more difficult to identify the best way for this programme to accompany the local stakeholders, government officials, multilateral agencies and NGOs involved.

There is a need to strengthen incidence actions in current programme actions and the actions necessary to achieve conceptual development and its objectives. An effort must be made to identify stakeholders and involve policymakers. Several elements must be highlighted:

- National governments have a logic that is so sectoral that it makes it difficult to effectively implant any element of territorial logic. The added value of the programme is precisely its capacity to

favour that impact from and with local stakeholders. There is a need to dialogue with sub-national governments and make them counterparts, as has occurred in Tunguragua, Ecuador. Nicaragua recently saw the organisation of efforts to impact the participation of policymakers. It is also crucial to have social movements with a territorial base and territorial professional organisations linked to economic activities like the experience developed recently in Chiloé, Chile. Finally, there is a need for joint action initiatives with different municipalities like the case of the transoceanic corridor in Guatemala or the inter-municipal organisation plan in Nicaragua. Both cases involved important stakeholders in processes of this nature. While achievements have been made in some territories such as the Business Chamber in Cuzco and the Associations of Municipalities in the O'Higgins Region of Chile and Peñas Blancas in Nicaragua, this does not yet seem to be a common strategy for the Programme that is deployed in different territories.

- An additional limitation is the lack of consideration of political motivations and power dynamics within the territories. This dimension is highly influential in the course of the developments and must be considered in an incidence strategy. The analysis conducted through the research is stronger on productive, economic and development variables and less so on variables such as understanding of political developments, assessment of the forces at play and identification of elite groups, conflicts and social demands, a "micro" history of the processes, or coalitions and consensuses that have been developed at different points in time.

In some territories, plans for improved interaction with governments have been developed in order to promote territorial policies, strengthen governance and increase the capacities of governments that have expressed an explicit demand regarding crucial issues. These include the environmental aspect in El Salvador, Nicaragua and Honduras and the development of statistics and related tools in Guatemala. We understand that strategies like those presented in the project financed by the Ford Foundation move in this direction. The research developed on territorial dynamics may be quite useful because it has created the conditions that can aid in some emerging regionalisation processes, like that of Honduras. This complementarity could help true territorial policies to emerge.

In regard to intervention in the territories, important progress has been detected in the conditions necessary for effecting tangible and intangible changes, but there are doubts as to their sufficiency and sustainability. In other words, some of the effects observed in the territories are immediate responses to the work of increasing dynamism and raising awareness, but there are doubts as to whether they are sufficient to deploy the territorial construction processes that the programme proposes. The lack of coordination among the territories stands as an obstacle to the demonstration effect and thus the opportunity to implement changes that go beyond the territory. The absence of cases of other funding programmes also makes it possible to give continuity to these processes.

Changes at the national and regional level are limited and diverse at the moment, though an important effort is beginning to be made with projects formulated in the context of the programme (FORD and IFAD projects), which allows us to be optimistic about the future. At the local scale we have observed cases in which the municipal perspective has been overcome, allowing us to think that territorial strategies may be useful. One example of this is the inter-municipal organisation plan in Nicaragua.

In general, one can infer that important conceptual progress is being made and that this has generated knowledge, which is impacting spheres in which public policies are considered and selected. It is also impacting local stakeholders, which is very important. However, as we have already mentioned, this seems to be insufficient in regard to the goals for the programme in terms of impact on the design of territorial public policies. The programme's impact should be considered at different levels. It is most difficult to achieve macro and more long-term impact, but important impacts have been observed in the territories in the form of the empowerment of local stakeholders. Multi-agent platforms have played an important role in this context.

The programme's communications strategy has played an important role in its added value and will do so even more in the future. This is particularly true of incidence at the various levels. We have found the initial proposal for the Programme's communications strategy to be reasonable, adequate and integrated into the whole of what we could call RIMISP's "corporate image." However, the time lost over the replacement of the director of the communications team, the difficulty of the challenge and lacks in the culture of communication have led to a delay in this area as compared to other Programme components.

The communications strategy is meant to support and complement RIMISP's overall communications strategy in three areas of action: i) influencing the definition of public policies; ii) supporting the creation of a culture of dialogue; and iii) communicating each specific project to the media and the stakeholders. Though these comments are specific to the midterm evaluation and the work done during the evaluation period covered by the External Panel, we can recognize the effort that has been made in the area of communications, which includes overseeing and supporting their components; social communications; development of Programme reports; and the development of more intense connections with partners and collaborators. There is still a great deal of work to be done, and it will take time to reach the level of development of the other components.

At any rate, dissemination of successful actions (such as "Crisis and Rural Poverty") has allowed for the improved flow of interaction with partners and credibility of communication. It is likely that this is a key aspect for the synthesis document and so that the programme will be recognised as generating knowledge and adding a good example of how to incorporate information. To date, the exploration of the potential of social networks is incipient, and we believe that there is a need to develop a strategy in this area. Work is being done on aspects of internal communication, and progress is being made, albeit slowly. It is becoming clear that communication is an essential aspect, and the "spokesperson" system is progressing, and there is a protocol for empowerment of the communication team. But the work that lies

ahead is important, particularly in regard to feedback, increased participation of researchers and partners in this work, progress in the culture of communication and the realisation that communication is a key aspect of the project. Furthermore, progress has been made in regard to viewing communication as a key ally for incidence, strengthening and the efficiency of the network of partners and territories as well as the possibility of moving away from institution inertia and daily pressures.

One key result of the communications strategy is that which has been achieved on the Internet and Intranet, which we consider to be excellent. Related areas include efforts linked to storage and maintenance; work based on virtual machines; the use of tools that allow for information management, analysis of consultations, management of downloads, an internal search engine and alerts service; the publication of news; the management of experiences; and the opportunity to carry out surveys. The use of these tools is as yet limited and most are only used to house documents, which is still very important.

The Programme has generated a significant number of ideas, hopes, actions, documents and response capacity, and is required to apply them to communications internal to the network as well as external contact with opinion makers and shapers. One aspect that may require further work is publication of the conceptual progress that the Programme is making in scientific journals given that the scientific community is an important indicator of decisions with significant capacity for incidence.

Based on the above, the search for interaction with cultural institutions at different levels and preparation of information for specific groups also are important and have proven to be very interesting mechanisms in the Programme with an enormous potential for incidence.

How is the work of the entities involved (CU, partners, AB, ME, etc.) helping or hindering progress towards programme results?

THE PARTNERS

One of the programme's most important assets in this panel's judgment is the network of organisations and individuals that it has managed to coordinate around reflection and work on DTR. It is the programme's will that they work as a network, which will undoubtedly broaden the impact of the work completed. However, there is a need to analyse the characteristics and dynamic of this network in order to determine how much progress has been made and how much potential there is for achieving the programme's objectives. First, it is a group of stakeholders with very diverse characteristics, participation and, perhaps most importantly, forms of linking to the programme and its objectives. Adequate management of this diversity will determine the potential and sustainability of the programme under analysis to a great extent.

The network of stakeholders is at the nucleus of the programme, and its main proponents include individuals and institutions who have worked with RIMISP in the past. The group of individuals who have made an intellectual contribution to the study of DTR in Latin America is very significant and is recognised throughout in the region. We believe that this group provides important intellectual support and wide-ranging links to its work due to the value of the contributions of each of them (given that they are leaders in the field) and the mutual trust and shared experiences that have linked them for many years. However, it is not an “epistemic community” given that it covers diverse ways of thinking and approaches. Nor is it an institutionalised group or formal network. However, everyone works around a common topic, influences various fields with their thoughts and actions, and the links and opportunities to move forward in this area are expanding. It is our opinion that the prestige of the DTR Programme and broad, diverse and rich response to the meetings that have been held depend a great deal of the recognition of this “intellectual nucleus” of the network. We determined this based on the testimony gathered in the programme’s territories as well as the observation and dialogue sustained at the Bogotá and San Salvador meetings.

The programme’s network of partners is complemented by another group of individuals and institutions that make it possible to implement its work in the selected territories (which they themselves helped select). In each case, we found these institutions and individuals to be competent and experienced. We also saw that many had some previous direct or indirect connection to RIMISP, though new members have been added. The partners’ selection criteria seem to be timely given the characteristics and objectives of the programme. Partners have been selected based on their level of competence and mutual trust. These also are partners who already had capital; in some cases it was theoretical capital and in others it was operation in policy action.

The formal links between partners are created through the contracts that are signed between them and RIMISP for the execution of diverse project actions. However, these are not contracts in which RIMISP “hires” the partners. The reports and testimony of those interviewed suggest that there is instead a dynamic of “negotiation and agreement” based on the lines of action that should be executed where the relationship of the “partners” outweighs that of the “hiring body” when it comes time to define the contents, rhythms and specific forms of the implementation process. In regard to the sustainability of the programme results, it is important to distinguish between actions that only depend on funding (operationalised by RIMISP through contracts) and those that are based on the “partners’ network.”

The realisation of the programme actions involves another broad and equally diverse group of stakeholders that includes a diverse set of individuals and institutions that participate in the actions that are deployed. In the case of the territories in which only research has been conducted, this group is not very broad. However, in the territories in which the capacity development component, incidence projects or links to other RIMISP projects (such as that of development with identity) or projects of other partners have been implemented, local networks have been created and existing ones have been strengthened or redirected. The actions financed by NZAP in Central America are noteworthy in this context. The sub-

region has public and private actors, civil society organisations, etc. that coexist. The final “outer ring” of the network, consists of individuals who have participated in the meetings that have been held over the life of the programme, allowing even more individuals and groups to be linked to it.

During the field visits and the San Salvador meeting, we have observed that these are “competent stakeholders” in relation to the programme’s objectives and topics. The added value that is the focus of a network is not mainly located in its breadth or diversity, but in members’ previous experience in the area of specific interests that motivates them to participate in programme actions. We place a very high value on this group. However, we also noted that the programme had not developed an adequate approach to the management of this network in accordance with the Theory of Networks, but that it does have a great deal of force as a meeting space with significant reach. Participants attend meetings and share their knowledge or take part in the tasks or research projects, serve on advisory boards and establish diverse strategies that help to strengthen the work that is to be done. As a result, members cannot benefit completely from the network that they have joined and helped create. For example, there is a list of individuals who have participated in meetings and mailing lists of those involved in each country, but we do not have evidence of more precise descriptions and analysis of the “organizational and political capital” that the network represents, or a clear vision of the modalities and intensities of the links between the members and the network. RIMISP’s team is aware of the diversity of components and the different levels of intensity of the links and importance of the same for each member. But we did not observe a systematisation of that knowledge in practice or the design of objectives and management approaches that were appropriate for the network that had developed.

Gabriela Sánchez’s study of the network of partners represents an initial effort to understand and evaluate it, but its reach is limited to formal project stakeholders and the perspective is still very general in regard to the usefulness of the network for each of them.

On the other hand, as we have observed, the partners are very diverse institutions and it is not possible to require the same of them in terms of their ability to develop all of the components. The partner type may explain why greater or lesser progress has been made with the components in the various countries. For example, most of the partners bring significant amounts of knowledge to the table, but not all of them have a capacity for incidence. This can stand as an obstacle to the creation of the conditions necessary for the program to move towards its goal. In other words, the diversity of the partners in regard to their capacity for political incidence could stand in the way of the necessary instrumentalisation and operationalisation of the conceptual progress made, which is an important aspect to consider in the second stage of the programme.

In summary, we could say that while the network of partners is an essential input for the implementation of the programme, the richness and breadth of the links has not yet been incorporated into a strategy for the sustainable development of the same as a broader network that is capable of having a larger impact in the region. There is a need to work intensely on both the partners and the links between

them in order to promote their strength, functionality, sustainability and recognition. We identified partners with different levels of cohesion. There is a central nucleus that shares a great deal in terms of the discourse, approaches and joint activities. Some partners have much more lax connections through a programme, bilateral agreements or spaces for developing links. Though it cannot be seen as a mature network at this point, we have identified the way in which work on it must move in the future and have noted the key leadership and encouragement role played by RIMISP. The advantages of RIMISP include its partners in Latin America, as we are unaware of an equivalent network in the region. In order to move forward and strengthen the network, the counterparts must be strengthened and significant coordination efforts must be made.

Given the heterogeneity of the partners and their importance and contribution to the programme, there is a need to manage their diversity by developing variable geometry mechanisms, insisting on the aspects of involvement and promoting an open space for different and natural dialogue among politicians, academics and other agents. It would be very useful to “map” the links and potential alliances of each partner –inside and outside of the programme-, in order allow partners to promote their expansion and strengthening with other agencies within the countries such as universities, research centres, the media and businesses. The goal would be to build a system of “open innovation” that considers the different strategic and/or tactical role of the diverse network components.

In general, the programme has created the conditions necessary to capitalise on the experience accumulated by the partners. This has been particularly timely for the programme’s progress and results. The network must work in an interactive manner to expand the appropriation of the progress that has been made in the territories, facilitating incidence in the area of multilateral agencies, international donors, national officials, etc. The programme meetings in Bogotá and San Salvador were very important milestones in the progress that has been made in the promotion of belonging, the quality and intensity of the work performed, shared reflections, contacts and a space for plural dialogue.

However, the network –and here we are referring especially to the partners- are not fully taking advantage of their true potential. There is a need for further involvement and commitment on the part of the partners and for the use of the many network members that can offer encouragement. It would be interesting to promote more involvement in the network among the members while broadening a space for proactivity and polynuclear development, multilateral connections and the partners’ capacities for response. The experience of the network of graduate programmes allows for interesting reflections on the role that can be played in encouraging participation in a network. In this case, RIMISP’s accompaniment allowed for the generation of autonomy and the existence of solid nuclei of university action. The network should be a space in which partners feel comfortable and enjoy RIMISP’s support.

STRUCTURE AND MANAGEMENT OF THE PROGRAMME

One difficulty in the methodology has been the conflict between the logic of the components upon which the programme organisation and its lead teams rest and the logic of territorial action that is promoted. This conflict has restricted progress towards programme results, though there has been an important connection between the components at the territorial level, and this has developed naturally. The intra-component relationships, need for specific reports, work dynamic, etc. have stood as obstacles to the development of synergies among them. This was observed in the territories and in responses to questions regarding day-to-day relationships.

Why is a territorial programme structured according to components? We understand that the answer is linked to ease of programme management and administration. The level of progress made in the various components differs, which slows the programme's overall progress. We have not detected sufficient coordination mechanisms among the components. It is likely that the intensity of the work that is carried out on a daily basis has led to the search for achievements and benchmarks in each component, leaving less space for synergies.

We would like to note that the evidence obtained by the external panel regarding programme management, the organization of meetings, scheduling of trips, signing of contracts, etc. is excellent and an important strength of the programme.

The component-centred structure also has hindered the development of relationships between the partners and RIMISP. Each component director is linked to the partner, but without the necessary coordination with the other directors. The territorial vision also has been diluted because there has been no explicit mechanism that integrates the results of the different components.

The timing of the coordination among components also has been difficult. The incidence component began to work even before there were research results. In some cases (such as Nicaragua), funding was secured for other projects, which facilitated incidence.

In some cases (Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala) we have detected a separation between the Research and Capacity development components, though its magnitude varies. The component with the most weight has been Research, while Capacity development has yet to fully become part of the programme nucleus. A great deal of effort has been made to create conditions that allow for this, and stakeholders in the territories are appreciated through the express recognition of their contributions.

We believe that the decision to structure the programme by components has generated some conflicts between this logic and the territorial one, though it probably also contributes advantages at the operations level. We have yet to identify a functional and sufficiently justified diagram of the organisation. We understand that an effort is being made in the synthesis proposals and we only suggest that progress be made in that direction. It also is important to note that the component logic does not necessarily imply

separating actions in practice. For example, consolidating activities could have helped bring different components together in a single project for a specific territory with a single budget.

THE TERRITORIES

The selection criteria for the territories corresponds to the agreements reached between RIMISP and the partners based on the research hypotheses, previous knowledge, the importance given to the “economic growth” variable and existing capacities and interventions. The statistical information that was initially available was insufficient. This was particularly noteworthy in the case of Honduras, though it has occurred to a lesser extent in other territories. The weakness was corrected through work with primary and secondary sources including a household survey and comparisons drawn with other statistical sources. The selection criteria do not consider the environmental piece. Efforts are being made to remedy this, but there is as yet no adequate conceptual base.

In regard to the actions that have been implemented in the territories, the strategy implemented depends on the partner’s profile and not so much on the territorial reality, though the development of the programme demonstrates symptoms of convergence related to the participation of partners in the territory. This has been a very important part of the efforts to reach the programme objectives.

In regard to the work in the territories, there is a need for mechanisms for involving medium- and large-sized companies, social innovation mechanisms (inclusion) and alternative mechanisms for funding projects. The opportunity to work with multiagent platforms is a very important aspect of the process. These platforms have generated a current of optimism, action and opportunities, but there is a need to continue to move forward in the inclusion of new stakeholders who play a key role for the territories. We believe that there are reasonable doubts regarding the future sustainability of these platforms. The doubts are associated with the need to make concrete progress, the absence of strong leaders and the programme’s “dependence.” In the case of Chiloé, the environmental crisis of the salmon industry created special conditions for a dialogue that incorporates local stakeholders. At the same time, Chile’s insufficient decentralisation makes regional government interlocutors particularly weak. The importance of the work has led to the production of unprecedented dialogues on territorial development, but their progress towards the construction of stable platforms (coalitions) is still a challenge. In the O’Higgins Region of Chile, a province-wide association of municipalities has been created as the territory’s main coordinating force. This agency is trying to become a valid interlocutor for large companies that invest in the area, producing negative externalities, and the regional and national governments. To this end, an important alliance has been developed with the local tourism companies, all of which has been favoured by the programme actions, though they did not originate there. In the cases of El Salvador and Guatemala, the work done with platforms and local officials has led to a fluid relationship that allows more complex challenges to be addressed. The potential of the reactivation of the Association of Municipalities of Peñas

Blancas (AMUPEBLAN) for making progress in the area of construction in this territory also is noteworthy in that it has turned environmental matters into the structuring axis of this process.

The Added Value of the Programme

RIMISP's previous efforts and theoretical contributions in the area of territorial development have played a key role in the proper development of the programme. We note the success with the **approach to the territorial synthesis**, which identifies diverse indicators, and the **potential of a networked programme with a territorial vision**. Special mention must be made of the importance of the **confluence of donor efforts** in function of a programme and the promotion of the development of skills that the NZAP contribution has made possible. In the cases of Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala, this has been key to the theoretical progress made and very especially to the incidence achieved at different levels, especially the local one.

The programme has allowed for the creation of the conditions necessary to **capitalise partners' accumulated experience**, and this has been particularly important for progress made towards the results. The development of **knowledge of territorial dynamics** is of great interest and importance in the territories that have been impacted, but it is difficult to identify it solely with the programme due to the innate complexity of processes of territorial change that make it difficult to establish causality, and the presence of other programmes and/or institutions that act on the same territories and in the same direction of the PDTR in cases like Peñas Blancas, Nicaragua. This is not a problem for the programme on its own, because it is not necessary to isolate the progress that can be attributed to it. The important thing is that RIMISP and the Rural Territorial Dynamics Programme are making contributions. In general, we can state that the projects that have been carried out are relevant and important to the programme objectives. We have begun to observe structural effects and patterns that are repeated, which is the potential advantage of a network. It is clear that the conditions for making important progress for the knowledge and management of territorial dynamics have been set.

The **partners** and RIMISP has been empowered by the knowledge and interpretation of territorial dynamics. One can appreciate a profound involvement of partners in the territory, which has been a very important added value. As we have mentioned previously, one part of the Programme's added value is the above-mentioned **Network of Partners**. The initial nucleus of partners has worked in a very cohesive manner, incorporating other partners that have complemented aspects with different levels of involvement, commitment, knowledge and lessons. The diversity of the partners is a potential source of richness for the network though, as we noted above, there is a need to work to manage this potential adequately.

On the other hand, the Programme has allowed for the creation of systems that allow individuals and stakeholders that had never done so before to sit at the same table and has allowed for groups that have traditionally been invisible to have a voice and an opportunity to express themselves. This important

aspect was observed in the majority of the territories visited, including Olancho, Honduras. The **coordinated work** and the **potential for alliances to address territorial problems** have been recognized as important in the territories. In this context, the impact that the pluri-municipal territorial vision has had in Peñas Blancas, Nicaragua for the management of water resources and for addressing environmental questions in general is notable. We also note the importance of the coordinated work and alliances promoted by the Programme for the logging sector of Olancho, Honduras. The training and strengthening of alliances is an asset, and efforts to raise awareness of their importance are as well. One important achievement for the work that has been done in this regard is the creation and reactivation of municipal associations (Olancho, Peñas Blancas, Chiloé, Guatemala).

The Programme has shown evidence of the **importance of the business force** for developing possible virtual dynamics in the territories. Though this is not in any way the responsibility of the project, one must be conscious of the need to create opportunities for employment, organisation, efficiency and the added value of production in the territories. It is also important to make use of the increased guarantees and stability associated with advances in the construction of institutions in order to facilitate the creation and/or redirection of companies, grow opportunities for responsible business activities and promote the establishment of companies in alliance with local stakeholders. In addition to its “per se” value, the latter has a large potential for credibility for local stakeholders and national agencies.

Another highly important aspect is the **development of indicators and geographic maps**. The amount of data utilised, the effort to systematise it and the use that it has had for the analysis of the territories and questioning of reality has been substantial, allowing for an important and useful methodological development and essential tools for understanding territorial development processes across Latin America. In addition, these elements can be understood by a significant and diverse number of stakeholders. The Programme has offered pertinent and solvent information to the territories.

Despite the difficulties encountered, the work that has been done in the territories by the **capacity development** component is valued very highly. In general, we can state that there has been a real process of empowerment of local stakeholders. The stakeholders know the territory best and are aware of the potential of a territorial project. The conditions have been created so that groups of key stakeholders will appropriate the territorial discourse, which we believe to be a significant achievement. Important progress has been observed in the level of commitment of local officials, and local governments have acquired a greater capacity to coordinate their actions. Progress has been made in overcoming the municipal focus, and there are incipient but interesting processes of pluri-municipal territorial construction (such as those observed in Peñas Blancas, Nicaragua and Ecuador). Progress has been made in shared territorial planning, and the effort to combine PRTD interests with territorial interests is noteworthy.

Finally, the added value of RIMISP in the **Graduate Programme Network** lies in the work that it has done in the area of accompaniment. Note that the network has become autonomous and developed

two solid nuclei, FLACSO Ecuador and FLACSO Costa Rica, as well as the valuable participation of researchers in courses and seminars.

Suggestions and Conclusions

The following conclusions are presented based on the evaluation process completed by the external panel in order to help with the reflections necessary to orient the programme during the next phase and with the understanding that a large number of actions have not been analysed because they came about after the evaluation period established for the “external panel.” This section presents comments that reflect the opinion of the panel members regarding the explicit questions posed by the RIMISP team in regard to how the synthesis process was to be carried out, how the network of partners can be strengthened, how incidence projects can be developed and how communication can be handled. Some of these comments are directed at the programme team, while others are merely reflections that involve other territorial stakeholders and transcend the period in which the programme is to be executed but that the panel feels are important as references.

Below, we outline the main aspects that should be considered during the second stage of the programme from a strategic point of view. We then enter into more detail regarding some of the tasks and actions related to the strategic programme areas.

Strategic lines:

-**The synthesis process** is the most important and necessary task and is also most likely the one that allows for progress to be made in the development of knowledge of territorial dynamics. Independently of the importance that of the efforts that are already being made in this regard, we would suggest that the Programme focus on this even if no new evidence is generated.

-**The improvement of incidence**, differentiating between the areas, expanding upon their sustainability and focusing on the development of mechanisms for accompaniment for the various agencies.

-**The network of partners**, working on their empowerment and sustainability as a priority, sharing knowledge and results, promoting multilateral and intense connections among the partners, proposing joint actions and sharing the progress made in all of the territories.

-**The search for added value in communication** should be one of the essential elements in the next stage of this programme in order to try to transfer the knowledge generated on the operation of territorial dynamics in Latin America that allows for policy and practical changes to be promoted and implemented at the territorial, national and regional levels. There is a need to improve effectiveness and efficiency in

internal and external communication and allow RIMISP to position itself strategically in the field of Rural Territorial Development in the region.

Proposed Tasks and Actions:

THE SYNTHESIS PROCESS

We believe that the synthesis should mainly focus on:

- Understanding the mechanisms of the territories' response capacities;
- Developing reflections, tools and procedures that allow accompaniment processes to be sustained for the construction of policies in the territories and the incorporation of transversal elements such as gender, the territorial vision and sustainability.
- Methodologies for valuing externalities and being able to utilise them as an element of dialogue;
- Research directed at understanding and optimising relationships between the "micro" and the "macro." It is especially important to delve into the importance of external systems in the dynamic of the territories and mechanisms for connecting the m with the new local institutions.
- Improving ongoing dialogue with other theories and specialisations that are relevant and inherent to the issue of territorial development including local wellbeing, ecology, demographics, coalitions, local power, political culture and technologies of local information. There is a need to continue to work through methodologies that allow for useful environmental assessments, simplifying and defining the goals at different scales in view of their connections depending on the available information and incorporating tools that allow for work to be done on "interoperability." There is probably a need to promote the construction of a node of "infrastructure of spatial data" given that this would substantially aid in the assessment and analysis of the environmental attributes of the territories and the synthesis work.

MOVING TOWARDS IMPROVED INCIDENCE

The panel suggests that an effort be made to seek out incidence in different areas. It may be useful to expand efforts to develop a "typology of incidence," both tangible and intangible, in terms of universes and procedures and to balance actions with potential results.

The sustainability of the multi-agent platforms in the territories requires that work continue to develop more profound knowledge of the motivations, interests and ideologies of the various agents; the ways in which political power is constructed; and interaction with the external system. There is a need for theoretical bases and methodologies for moving from the first stage of agreements towards the construction of coalitions, and to base the process on overcoming nascent disputes and political and ideological positions that have ceased to develop in a strong manner. In this regard it also would be

important to expand upon mechanisms for quantifying and establishing reasonable transfer functions among territories and actors with the understanding that the programme has not moved far enough in this direction as of yet.

It is equally necessary to continue to research procedures for optimising the selection of stakeholders and natural leaders who attract followings and coordinate some elements of continuity of the platforms.

It is important to develop procedures that allow for greater involvement of the business world and its alliances with the territories and the local, national and international levels.

Given that policy construction is a matter of day-to-day work, disputes, negotiation, etc., efforts must be focused on the study of the relationships of local political systems with sub-national and national ones and the exploration and implementation of mechanisms for accompanying political powers.

We suggest that emphasis be placed on plans for impacting national policies, the importance of the network as an entity that can have an impact, connections to and joint action with international agencies, the participation of and commitments with strategic and high-level groups and fora and complicity with certain governmental actors that are willing to train public employees and develop innovation processes, new technologies for territorial management, etc.

One goal in the medium-term could be to think about the territories that have projects and high response capacities in which participation could be replaced by the commitments of various stakeholders and the encouragement and complicity of international, national and sub-national stakeholders. These “territorial contracts” could become an essential element of the sustainability of the multi-stakeholder/multi-agent platforms. Though this method far exceeds the programme’s current responsibility, we suggest that work be done in this area in order to move forward conceptually for when it is possible to take part in the construction of “territorial contracts.”

IMPROVING THE NETWORK OF PARTNERS

The network must interactively expand the appropriation of the progress that has been made in the territories, accompanying the incidence in the area of multilateral agencies, international donors, and national and sub-national officials. The strength, capacity and image of the network are a good alliance for empowering national partners.

The point of departure for the strengthening of the network (the partners, their connections in the territories and networks that go “beyond” the programme) is a much more precise recognition, description and analysis of it. Specifically, there is a need to provide a better description of the agents involved and their capacities; their different modes of connection, participation and interest in DTR; and a proposal for

managing the links that mainly points towards strengthening the sustainability of the programme's effort through the network.

COMMUNICATION

The Programme has generated an important number of ideas, hopes, actions, documents, and response capacities that it is obligated to communicate internally in the network and externally with different centres in which opinion is made and shaped.

There is a need to propose and execute a broader communications strategy that considers the various areas and encourages partners to make an effort to communicate with one another, increasing their capacities and sustainability in this sense at the partner level and in the case of multi-agent platforms.

During the next stage, at which synthesis and management of the knowledge generated will be key, it will be even more important to select the message, language, channel and recipients of the message.

The panel suggests that communication be used and that "messages" be prepared as a useful and natural mechanism for monitoring the Programme's progress and the motivation of its partners.

We believe that this is a good opportunity to design and accompany a strategy of "digital reputation" and viral communication via social networks, submitting the information to specific groups and institutional cultures, professional groups, young people, the general public, politicians, etc. We would suggest that the initial approach would be to explore and prepare messages for the following networks: LinkedIn, Wikipedia, Facebook, Digg, Youtube, Flickr, Twitter and blogs.

APPENDIX 1: PROTOCOL FOR VISITS TO THE TERRITORIES

INTRODUCTION

Keeping the “explicit” programme objectives in mind is a good point of reference.

Contributing to sustainable and socially just development through:

- a. Creating coalitions and collective action
- b. Developing DTR as a policy and programmatic vision
- c. Influencing public policies that allow for economic growth, social inclusion and environmental sustainability in the Latin American context.

It is important to remember at all times that this is a midterm report, not a final evaluation (with the exception of the part that corresponds to the project funded by NZAP). During the field visits, we seek out elements that seek to answer the following general questions:

- Are we moving down a road that leads to something that makes sense?
- What should be added?
- What should we stop doing?

An effort also has been made to seek out possible answers to the following question: What has RIMISP been able to achieve with the resources that it has received in a context of great flexibility?

Specifically, the external panel has asked us to use the evaluation report, the documents produced and the interviews and visits to the territories to evaluate key questions set out in the Terms of Reference for the self-evaluation process:

1. Is the programme generating a body of doctrine that allows DTR to become a policy option for rural Latin America?
2. To what degree is the programme creating conditions for effecting political and practical changes at the territorial, national and regional levels?
3. How is the work mode of the bodies involved (CU partners, AG, Me) helping or standing in the way of progress in regard to the programme results?
4. Lacks, concerns and problems related to achieving programme results.
5. Lessons learned and implications to be considered: questions such as lacks of evidence, lacks in expected results, failings of the theory, failings in the implementation, questions for future programming, recommendations and emerging issues. The Self-Evaluation Report should contribute lessons learned.

These key questions must be crossed with the two questions that the Terms of Reference present to the external panel:

1. Quality of the self-evaluation (validity)
2. The added value of the programme (achievements and strategic leadership)

SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW SCRIPT

GENERAL ASPECTS

Offer a brief introduction to the objectives of the external evaluation:

- Panel members
- Self-evaluation process
- Importance of evaluation process. Methodological contribution to the culture of the evaluation, mandate of donor agencies, opportunity to give added value to programme results and redirect it where necessary.
- The external panel is asked to make recommendations directed at orienting the next stage of the programme and to identify goals in order to propose new programmes.
- Work conducted by the external panel: review of documents, interviews with RIMISP leaders (both board members and component coordinators), interviews with monitoring unit members.

PARTNERS/MANAGERS

This section presents potential questions that are considered to be pertinent to the external evaluation. They may or may not be valid depending on the circumstances.

- It is recommended that an initial meeting be held with the local programme group (45 minutes) as well as a final meeting (approximately 1 hour) in order to share first impressions of the in situ evaluation in the territory.

TPOLOGY OF QUESTIONS:

- Level of knowledge and participation in the design of the programme at the global level and the territory in question.
- Description of the territory in question and its links to the external system. Why was this territory selected? What was the previous assessment?
- Describe the group, components, capacities, etc. Why were you chosen as a programme partner?
- Assessment of the connection to component leaders, type and frequency of communication, communication tools, etc.
- Which stakeholders have played a key role in the programme? Describe their role and explain why this was the case.
- Evaluation and change of actions designed initially, noting characteristics, timeline, adequacy, etc. where possible.
- Can you evaluate the administrative and financial aspects?
- Can you provide a detailed assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency and adequacy of the actions implemented and the relationships?
- What other actions would have been appropriate?
- What recommendations would you make for redirecting the programme?
- What goals should be considered in order to orient the development of new programmes?
- To what degree has the network's work improved your work? Are there stable alliances? Can they be used to address new challenges and the impact in decision-making centres? This network could be configured as a mandatory reference for DTR in Latin America.
- How could one valorise the effect of the work performed at the scientific, political, territorial, institutional and other levels?

- In regard to the methodological contribution, can you comment on some aspects and the theoretical-practical relevance of the results?
- Gathering documentation, articles, testimonies, etc. that are pertinent to the evaluation.
- Describing the main positive and negative aspects of the programme in general and specifically in the action implemented in the territory.
- What has this programme contributed as compared to others in which you have participated or with which you are familiar?
- What indicators were used and how were they monitored throughout the programme?
- How have decision-making centres been approached?
- What is your opinion of the dynamic of the territory in the context of the external system? Who are the key stakeholders? Will they change after the work is implemented?
- What aspects have been proposed that have been accepted and incorporated in other territories and/or actions?
- Do you think that the implementation of certain actions and proposals have been more difficult due to the lack of coordination with component directors?
- What would the network of leaders need in order to achieve greater success?

POLITICIANS/ TERRITORIAL REPRESENTATIVES/ BENEFICIARIES

The suggested duration for interviews with national, regional and local officials and beneficiaries is one hour.

POTENTIAL QUESTIONS

- Level of knowledge of the programme at the general level and specifically in regard to the territories in its area
- Relationships with the generating group, characteristics, frequency, assessment, etc.
- Can an assessment of the appropriateness of the actions implemented be performed?
- What recommendations would you offer for redirecting the programme?
- How do you view the effects of the programme in your areas including policy changes, governance, equity, wealth, expectations?
- In your opinion, what are the essential aspects that would explain territorial dynamics in your area?
- What do you feel would be the optimal result of the programme?
- How could a territorial public policy be implemented?

APPENDIX 2: MIDTERM EVALUATION VISIT SCHEDULE: Interviews

GUATEMALA January 27-29, 2011

Partner Institution: IDIES-URL Contact: Victoria Peláez
Telephone: (502) 24262592 / 55165179, Email: vpelaez@url.edu.gt

Date	Time	Location	Respondent	Position	Institution and Link to DTR	Email and Phone
26	5:00	Guatemala, URL-IDIES	IDIES Team	Researchers	URL-IDIES DTR Executor	vpelaez@url.edu.gt 55165179
27	06:00	Depart for Jutiapa				
27	8:30	Jutiapa	Edwin García	Director	URL Regional Office in Jutiapa	ergarcia@url.edu.gt 54570315
27	10:00	Monjas	Juan Orellana / Mayra Flores	Mayor/ Municipal Women's Office	Municipality of Monjas	m_floresmujer@hotmail.com 45722430
27	11:30	San Carlos Alzatate	Henry Gómez	Mayor	Municipality of San Carlos Alzatate	45505117
27	1:00	Asunción Mita	Jorge González Peñate	Director	Fundación Arco Iris	losamatesalfa@hotmail.com 59781920
27	3:30	Santa Catarina Mita	René Osorio	Mayor	Municipality of Sta. Catarina Mita	78883112
27	4:30	Return to Guatemala City				
28	8:00	Guatemala, URL-IDIES	Miguel von Hoegen	Director	URL-IDIES	mvhoege@url.edu.gt
28	11:00	Guatemala	Carlos Mancia Chúa	Survey Coordinator	National Institute for Statistics/ Government	cmancia@ine.gob.gt 40289325
28	2:30	Guatemala, IICA	Keith Andrews	Resident Representative	IICA (Inter-American Institute for Cooperation for Agriculture)	Keith.Andrews@iica.int 23865900
28	4:00	Guatemala	IDIES Team	Researchers	URL-IDIES DTR Executor	vpelaez@url.edu.gt 55165179

References:

	Executor/ coordinator partner		National and sub-national official
	Partner official		Technician
			Other

El Salvador

Date	Time	Individual	Institution
Monday, 24	8:30 - 11 a.m.	PRISMA Leadership and Research Team (SK, NC, IG, EE, RC, WM, OD)	PRISMA
	2:00 p.m.	Néstor Herrera Isac Bonilla	MARN
Tuesday 25 Chalatenango	8:30 a.m.	Misael Chavarría	CENDEPESCA
	9:15	Cecilia León	ASOCTISO

	10:00 a.m.	Deysi Cierra	CACH
	11:15 a.m.	María Gladis Alas	Environmental Unit, Las Vueltas Mayor's Offices
	12:00 m	Juan Félix Quintanilla	Environmental Unit, Chalatenango Mayor's Office
	1:30 p.m.	Rodolfo López (Mayor)	Mayor's Office of San Francisco Lempa
	2:30 p.m.	Mauricio Landaverde	Cooperativa Altina (San Luis del Carmen)
	3:30 p.m.	Luis Antonio Henríquez	CIHCG – ARDM
Wednesday 26	9:00 a.m.	PRISMA Leadership and Research Team	

NICARAGUA

Partner Institution: Nitlapán (Universidad Centroamericana de Managua)

Date	Location	Respondent	Position	Institution
1/24	Nitlapán	Arturo Grigsby	Executive Director	Nitlapán-UCA Managua
1/24	Managua	Ligia Gómez	Director of PRTD Nicaragua	Nitlapán-UCA Managua
1/24	Nitlapán	Francisco Pérez	Director of the Capacity Development Component	Nitlapán-UCA Managua
1/24	Nitlapán	Oscar Danilo Barrera-Lilian Flores	Directors of PRTD Nicaragua Tourism	Nitlapán-UCA Managua
1/24	La Dalia	Ivania Mesa Rodríguez	Representative of INAFOR in the territory	INAFOR
1/25	Ayuntamiento de La Dalia	Maryan Ruiz	Mayor	Municipality of La Dalia
1/25	Ayuntamiento de La Dalia	Carlos Zamora	Environmental Technical Unit Director	Municipality of La Dalia
1/25	Ayuntamiento de La Dalia	William Antonio Castro	IDEAL-URBAL Programme Director	Municipality of La Dalia
1/26	Peñas Blancas	Orlando Cruz	President of Cooperativa Guardianes de la Naturaleza	Cooperativa Guardianes de la Naturaleza

HONDURAS

Partner Institution: Sustainable Development Network (Red de Desarrollo Sostenible, RDS)

Date	Location	Respondent	Position	Institution
1/27	RDS Honduras headquarters	Raquel Isaula	Director of RDS Honduras	RDS Honduras
1/27	RDS Honduras headquarters	Manuel Villa	Technician from RDS Honduras	RDS Honduras
1/27	RDS Honduras headquarters	Pedro Quiel	Technician responsible for PRTD in Honduras	RDS Honduras
1/27	Municipality of Campamento	Francisco Amador (Community President) José Triviño (Consultation Board President) Santos Bienvenido (Community President, member of the environmental movement) Estela Madariaga (Civil Society, CAN, MAU, environmental movement) Fernuli Banegas (Coordinator of the Environmental Unit of Campamento, Human rights network) Cristóbal Granados (Municipal commissioner, President of the Water Boards, Founder of Caja Rural)		Local stakeholders and municipal leaders
1/28	Municipality of Concordia	Community representatives (3), environmental committee (1), Director of the Concordia Environmental Unit, Tax Chief, Water Board Administrator, Water Board President		Local stakeholders and municipal leaders
1/28	Municipality of Salamá	Gerardo Giménez (Vice Mayor of Salamá) Mariano Valladares (President of ASOPLANO-Association of Grain Producers) Toribia Castro (Association of Community Services-Caja Rural)		Local stakeholders and municipal leaders

CHILE

Partner Institution: RIMISP

Date	Location	Respondent	Position	Institution
12/22	RIMISP Headquarters	Francisco Aguirre	Director of Capacity development and Work in Chile	RIMISP
1/15	Municipality of Litueche	Bernardo Cornejo	Mayor of Litueche, President of the Association of Municipalities of the Interior of the Region of O'Higgins	Municipality of Litueche, Capacity development Component
1/15	Municipality of Litueche	Bartolomé Salazar	Municipal Administrator	
1/15	Peralillo	Fabián Guajardo	Former Mayor	Local executor of DTR study
12/29	RIMISP Headquarters	Eduardo Ramírez and Rodrigo Yáñez	Directors of the Territory of Chiloé	Executors of DTR study

PERU

Partner Institutions: Institute for Peruvian Studies (Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, IEP); GRADE

Date	Location	Respondent	Position	Name of Institution
1/24	Lima	Carolina Trivelli	Researcher	IEP/Partner
1/31	Lima	Javier Escobal and Martín Benavides	Director and Researcher	GRADE/Partner
1/31	Lima	Carolina Trivelli and Raúl Hernandez	Researchers	IEP /Partner
2/1	Lima	Ricardo Vergara	Expert in development and decentralisation	No direct link
2/2	Lima	Javier Azpur and Eduardo Ballón	Executive Secretary of Propuesta Ciudadana and Researcher	Grupo Propuesta Ciudadana / DESCO (No direct link)
1/26	Cuzco	Jaime Urrutia Fritz Villasante Werner Medina	Director and Researchers	CRESPIAL /UNESCO
1/27	Cuzco	Magda Mateos – Jenny Lazo	Technicians	Asociación Jesús Obrero Provincia de Quispicanchi – Andahuaylillas (CAIJO)
1/28	Cuzco	Martín Moya	Technician	CAIJO
1/28	Cuzco	René Bonet	Planning Manager	Regional government
1/28	Cuzco	Jean Paul Benavente	Former Director of Social Development	Regional government

APPENDIX 3. Terms of Reference Mid-Term Review of the Rural Territorial Dynamics Program

Summary

A joint Mid-Term Review (IDRC grant) and Final Evaluation (NZAP grant) will be undertaken of the DTR Program that is being implemented by Rimisp. It will be initiated in September 2010 and lead to a final report to be submitted by May 31st, 2010. It will involve a two track process, a self-evaluation by the Coordination Unit, to be followed by an external review panel that comments on the validity and rigour of the self-evaluation and comments on the relevance of the work to date. The overall budget of the MTR is estimated to cost 59,000US\$ for the external input and an estimated 4 to 5 days of Coordination Unit staff time, each, with additional days for the program director and the coordinator of the internal assessment process.

Purpose and Significance of the MTR

The Program on Rural Territorial Dynamics started in July 2007, funded initially by the IDRC, with additional funding from NZAP for Central American work between 2008 and 2010. As of 2010, the DTR Program has been active in 11 countries, 19 territories, and internationally through over 170 organizations. At its heart, the program is seeking to contribute to rural development policy and programming in Latin America that stimulates a kind of rural territorial dynamics, which enhances, simultaneously, economic growth, poverty reduction, greater equality and sound environmental governance.

The program seeks to contribute to socially just and sustainable development this by: (1) stimulating the formation of coalitions and collaborative actions that develop understanding of DTR and give rise to DTR policies and strategies; (2) developing an understanding of DTR as policy and programmatic vision and strategies, based on rigorous empirical evidence; and (3) influencing public and private policy and practices with an understanding of DTR so that they can engender economic growth with social inclusion and environmental sustainability in rural Latin America.

Two features of the DTR program are critical in order to understand the focus and intention of the MTR: the timing and its programmatic nature.

At this moment, the Program is in year 3 of a 5 year IDRC grant and heading towards the end of its 2 year NZAP grant. In terms of the IDRC grant, the MTR will emphasize the processes and products that are laying the foundation for the *results* (see Box 1). Regarding the NZAP grant, the focus must be, given the nature of a Final Evaluation, on achievement of results (adjusted slightly in March 2010) and their contribution to *objectives* (see Table 1).

Therefore, for the MTR process, it is more useful to refer to the list of (component-specific) results for the IDRC and objectives for NZAP grants to reduce the risk of focusing on the longer-term outcomes, which go beyond the MTR focus.

Table 1. IDRC Results and NZAP Objectives

IDRC Results (revised June 2010)	NZAP Objectives
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coalitions that construct and drive strategies and policies (with a DTR focus), which include academia, territorial level politicians (e.g. governors, members of parliament), entrepreneurs, opinion leaders, media, in dialogue with related themes (decentralization, environment, industrial policy, social policy, etc). • Position the rural dimension in strategies and public policies, based on a recognition of rural societies and rural areas as an asset in development and not as a problem or as backward. • DTR influences public policies and private strategies that stimulate and support processes of economic growth with social inclusion and environmental sustainability in rural societies of Latin America. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Characterize and understand rural territorial development dynamics</i> in the four countries [sic Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala and Nicaragua]. • <i>Strengthen territorial development processes</i> leading to economic growth, social inclusion and environmental sustainability, including: building up multi-stakeholder platforms that are inclusive of the poor; developing territorial development strategic plans; developing investment project proposals based on those strategic plans and initiating contact with public and private donors; and strengthening the organizations of the poor to participate in all of the above. • <i>Develop communities of practice</i> that will document, assess and promote innovative policies and practices for rural territorial development characterized by economic growth, social inclusion and environmental sustainability. • <i>Inform and influence rural development policies and programs</i> in the four countries through systematic communication and dialogue with mass media, key public opinion shapers and public policy makers.

Hence **this MTR focuses on the processes, networks, quality of relationships, and other conditions considered important for moving towards desired results (IDRC). However, for the NZAP grant, objectives will be discussed explicitly as the MTR is the final evaluation for that grant.** For the IDRC grant, the results will also be included, to the extent these are emerging or present, in order to comment on the extent to which outcomes are on their way to being realized. The results themselves will be the focus of the final evaluation of the IDRC grant in 2012.

A second key feature is its programmatic nature. The DTR program is not a large project with multiple activities. It is an emerging program with an evolving set of activities that are identified and made operational as understanding shifts about what is needed in order to move towards progress. There is, of course, an overall theory of change that guides the choice of efforts, some of which is explicit and some of which is implicit. Being a program has given the Coordination Unit and its Advisory Committee considerable leeway to reorient emphasis and enable an evolving set of activities that respond to emerging needs, both conceptually and practically.

Hence the MTR will focus on what has emerged to date in terms of key processes, products, structures and relationships and how this appears to be contributing to programmatic outcomes. In December 2009, the IDRC outcomes were modified slightly and in March 2009, the outputs for NZAID were adjusted slightly. The MTR is not an accountability exercise that uses a strict reading of the original outcomes to ascertain worth or not. Given that research for development is often complex and outcomes can rarely be predicted in precise terms,

activities may fall short of intended outputs. Hence looking at successes and failures as integral parts of a programmatic effort is critical to enable learning about responses to shortcomings.

The MTR for the DTR program is of critical importance for three reasons.

1. A critical review of the entire program will enable a more focused, impact-oriented allocation of efforts and resources for the remaining 12-18 months of the IDRC grant and further contribute to shaping the IFAD grant that builds on the 2007-2012. S
2. The NZAID grant closes at the end of May 2011. Hence the MTR and final evaluation of the NZAID grant coincide and serve both purposes. It is critical to understand how well the NZAID grant has been used for the intended purposes.
3. The DTR Program is simultaneously the largest program of work undertaken by Rimisp and the largest external grant by IDRC. Understanding how Rimisp is dealing with the program is, therefore, of great relevance for both the organization and the main funding agency.

Given these needs, the main audiences of the outputs are: IDRC, NZAID, the UCP and Rimisp's senior management. The partners are both participants and audience of the MTR. The MTR outputs are expected to influence resource allocation for the last phase of the program and follow-up funding options with both IDRC and NZAID.

Core Questions and Issues

1. To what extent is the program starting to generate a rigorous body of understanding on DTR as a concept and a policy/programmatic option for rural Latin America?
 - Is the *understanding* (conceptualizations, specific dynamics) about rural development that is emerging from the applied research relevant, appropriate and innovative? Include observations about crosscutting themes of gender and environmental sustainability.
 - What explains *results*, particularly in relation to program efforts (of the partners and of Rimisp) and the quality of program *outputs*?
 - Were the *choices* made by the program so far appropriate, given the evolving contexts in which it is operating?
2. To what extent is the program creating conditions for concrete policy and practice changes at territorial, national and regional levels in Latin America, in ways consistent with the emerging vision of rural development (see question 1)?
 - What processes are (being) put in place at which levels? Are these relevant, innovative, and coherent with program intentions? Are these sufficient to contribute significantly to feasible concrete policy/practice changes?
 - What *changes* are starting to take place, where, and in relation to which policy and practice issues? Include observations about crosscutting themes of gender and environmental sustainability.
 - Are these relevant, appropriate and significant changes, in relation to what would have been the likely situation without the DTR process? What other processes are in place that might explain the current emerging outputs/outcomes?
 - What seems to be the emerging added value of the efforts? What would have been other pathways for moving towards concrete policy/practice changes – and how do these compare with the DTR program's efforts?
3. How is the *way of working* – CU, partners, AG, M&E unit – helping or hindering progress towards programmatic outcomes?

- Partner choice, profile, expectations, support given/needed (content/quality)
 - Communication flows (content, timing, style, responsiveness)
 - Coordination/governance structures and processes (clarity of roles, decision-making, transparency, rigour of thinking)
 - Linkages between components and emerging processes (eg *Fondo de Incidencia*)
 - Relationship with funding agencies
 - Monitoring and evaluation
 - Adaptive management – responsiveness and flexibility (timely, appropriate, rigorous, transparent)
 - How has progress with component 5 (strengthening of Rimisp as an entity¹) contributed or hindered, especially the appointment of the new director?
4. Explain the gaps, concerns and problems in relation to laying the basis for achieving programmatic outcomes – or adjusting these, if necessary.
- What gaps exist between what has been achieved and what is needed to come to intended results?
 - Are problems that are signalled a result of theory, project design, and/or implementation failure?
5. What has been learned strategically/operationally that has implications for what must be kept, changed, added and stopped in terms of activities and/or processes by Rimisp and by partners, in order to move towards desired outcomes? Note that the internal evaluation will focus on ‘strategic lessons’ and the external review panel will focus on ‘issues for consideration’.

<i>Strategic lessons (self-assessment)</i>	<i>Issues for Consideration (external team)</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The main strategic lessons that can be drawn from the experiences of the program (both opportunities and challenges, successes and failures). • Less operational, more focus on program strategy – how/why it wants to get to programmatic effects. • With solid evidence (from where/ how derived) and based on significant reflection. 	<p>Any issues that the UDC and/or CAP must consider, particularly in terms of niche, gaps in evidence, gaps in outcomes that could have been expected, whether problems stemmed from theory or implementation failures, issues for future programming, recommendations linked to findings, emerging questions.</p>

Approach and Scope

The MTR will be undertaken as a two track process, modelled closely on IDRC’s new program evaluation approach². This process entails a self-evaluation by those closely involved in programmatic direction setting; and a review by an external team, each with a report: (1) a report that is the result of a self-assessment and analysis process and (2) an independent, external review, which takes the ‘internal’ report as its basis and provides an external comment on the content, its validity and plausibility.

Six or seven countries will be included in the field visits: Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala, Chile, Ecuador, and Peru (to be confirmed in the methodology workshop with the

¹ Bebbington, A. 2010. Final report. Review of Progress with Rimisp’s Organizational Development Change Process

² Scope of Work for External Reviews at IDRC: revised process. February 9, 2010. Prepared by the Evaluation Unit.

external panel). These represent a diverse cross section of contexts in which the work is being undertaken, where NZAID funding is being concentrated, and where multiple activities are taking place. Additional visits might be possible in the country of origin of the external team members, if these are different from this list.

Self-assessment process

The *self-assessment report* will involve all staff of the CU (and including an ex-colleague who only left recently), with input and verification by a wider group of partners. The CU needs to further define how selected partners will be included in the process (see below under 'Partners').

The CU and partners collectively have a solid and detailed knowledge (not all of it documented or widely shared) of the program's accomplishments and difficulties, and can draw out significant learning based on its experiences. The CU will outline the program's strategy and its evolution, the research process (content/quality), key structures and processes put in place to achieve program outcomes and the main lessons that can be drawn from experiences to date. The self-assessment report will be prepared based on *existing* documentation and knowledge with minimal additional information collection and where necessary some evidence harvesting/organisation.

The UCP will prepare a 20-25 page report focusing on what the program has done, what has it accomplished, and what has it learned. The proposed outline for the self-assessment report can be found in Annex 1³.

The internal process will be headed by a new UDC member, who together with the M&E unit, will be responsible for the documentation process in particular. Annex 2 illustrates the details of the timeline for the self-assessment process.

External review

The *external review* is conducted by a panel of four team members. The role of the external panel is to question and critically reflect on progress towards programmatic effects (IDRC) and the objectives (NZAP). The panel will verify the content of the self-assessment for evidence and reasonableness. By focusing on implementation, the external review team can evaluate choices that were made initially and en route (what emerged, what was dropped and why) and outputs/processes that have been enabled.

The review panel will undertake activities to ensure it is informed about the program in order to enable the panel members to assess the validity and content of the self-assessment report. It will also enable the panel members to assess the achievements to date and strategic directions in terms of their relevance for development in Latin American. Panel members are expected to gather evidence via: document review (including the self-assessment report), key informant interviews and/or focus groups, meetings with the program team, (team leader) interaction with the Advisory Group, and visits to two countries each.

The external panel will use as its guidance for evidence gathering and analysis, as well as for structuring the document, the core MTR questions as defined above. It will essentially develop two lines of questioning and responses.

³ IDRC's approach was developed for final program evaluations and has been adapted for an MTR application.

1. Assessing the quality of the self-assessment.

- Was the self-assessment focus comprehensive, doing justice to the work or did it have significant gaps?
- Was the self-assessment sufficiently self-critical? Is the evidence given sufficient to lead to the assessment given by program staff?
- Is the quality of the analysis adequate? Are there other possible ways to interpret the information that would lead to different conclusions?
- Is there coherence between the panel's own observations and what has been written?

2. Commenting on the program's (likely) added value.

- Knowing the DTR theme and issues related to (rural) development in Latin America, is the work undertaken useful, linked to core problems, and relevant – and therefore of significant added value?
- Issues for consideration to improve likelihood of strategic impact.

The independence of the external panel is essential. This independence will be safeguarded by ensuring the self-assessment report is finalized prior to any comments from the external panel, and bounded interactions with the CU in relation to the external report. The panel's report must fulfil basic standards used within the evaluation profession (see Annex 3).

To ensure the task is clearly delineated, the external panel process will focus on the analysis of the evidence provided by the self-assessment and answering the stated questions. This stands separate from any possible support by external panel members to operationalize the issues for consideration.

Both reports, of which the external report is a full draft, are submitted to the CAP for discussion in March. The external report is then finalized by mid May 2011.

Role of the M&E Unit

The M&E Unit has four key roles:

1. guardians of the MTR process in terms of timing, content and quality of the process (notably ensuring the external panel has all information needed to undertake their work and remain independent) and of the output (by commenting critically on the draft self-assessment report and the external panels report)
2. contributing substantively to the assessment of the M&E function as part of the self-assessment process;
3. facilitate key discussions between the CU and the external panel;
4. providing methodological guidance to all involved and ensuring the external team has the conditions it requires to accomplish its tasks;
5. contributing to the evidence gathering required for both parts of the exercise through secondary sources, interviews/surveys (as mutually agreed with the CU) among partners on policy influencing and research process.

The M&E unit will provide a focused set of documents (with livelink or internet location) to help contextualize the program and its work over the course of its implementation. It will also seek to provide an overview of policy/practice influencing efforts, a list of research outputs, and an overview of the research process followed to date.

Additionally, the M&E Unit with input from the UCP will provide a list per outcome of key documents and key informants (with title, organization, complete contact information, and a brief explanation of the relationship of this person to the program/outcome and why they have been suggested as a key informant). These documents and people will provide the starting point for the external review panel to review and verify the self-assessment report.

Calendar of Activities

The final report must be shared with the funding agencies by **May 31st, 2011**.

In August 2010, the ToRs need to be finalized, the self-assessment process initiated, the team members invited/selected/contracted. The M&E Unit is responsible for ensuring these tasks, in close discussion with the program coordinator. Table 2 outlines critical timings for the process.

Table 2. Timetable for the MTR

Month	Self-assessment	External team
16 Aug	Meeting to clarify process; divide tasks	
Sept	Collect data; undertake initial analysis	Read background document
mid/end Sept	Workshop to analyse	First meeting in Santiago to prepare methodology; first interviews
Oct	Write report	Read selected program documents.
Nov		Read and discuss self-assessment report. Develop external evaluation plan.
Week of 13-17 Dec	<i>Need to clarify type of desired interaction</i>	<i>Need to clarify type of desired interaction</i>
Jan		Interviews; trips to selected countries. Submit initial full MTR report to the CU and selected partners
First two weeks of Feb	Read/comment on draft	
End of Feb		Send edited report to CAP and selected partners
mid March (Annual Meeting in El Salvador)	Workshop(s) with CAP/selected partners for feedback	Team leader attends workshop(s) with CAP/partners for additional input
mid/end May	Submit final self-assessment report and online	Submit final external comment on self-assessment report and online

External Panel

Three/four people will be involved in the external team, one of whom will be invited by the program coordinator to be the team coordinator. The team will divide the work required between them, in close consultation with the program and M&E coordinators.

The team as a whole must have:

- Long term and detailed knowledge of development in Latin America (all team members)
- Detailed understanding of rural development (two team members)
- Experience with the territorial development concept (all team members)
- Experience with evaluation processes (all team members)
- Knowledge and experience in development political and policy processes
- Willingness and ability to engage in constructive and critical dialogue with the DTR program.

One team member without rural development has been explicitly included in the team to add a question on the usefulness of emerging outcomes for those active in territorial development that is not necessarily rural, and focusing on governance and decentralization aspects.

Each team member will be expected to invest 38-43 (team leader) days in the MTR to read extensively (program documents and outputs), interact with the CU and M&E unit to verify findings and inform about progress, have panel team meetings, undertake field visits, conduct additional interviews, and write the document.

In addition, the team leader will get an additional 5 days. The external panel team leader will ensure that the ToRs for the external panel will be met, will manage the external team process, will be main author of the report, and will be present at the discussions with the CAP in March 2011.

Partners

- The partners will be involved in several ways:
- providing evidence via topical inquiries initiated by the M&E Unit
- provide detailed opinions and insights through interviews with the external panel
- participate (by invitation) in December workshop
- comment on the draft report
- participate (a selection of partners) in a workshop March 2011 with team leader.

Budget

The external panel will require 59,000 USD for their work: fees US\$ 29,750; travel US\$ 13,000; and board/lodging US\$ 16,200. All travel and board/lodging, communication expenses incurred by the external team related directly to the MTR will be covered on an invoice basis (travel/other costs) and per diems for board and lodging. Rimisp is responsible for organizing travel and itinerary, in close consultation with the external team.

Documentation

The self-assessment document will be authored by the CU and will be finalized (no revisions allowed) prior to the external panel starting its work.

The external assessment will have as main author, the team leader, with the other members as co-authors. The external panel report is given to the CU with feedback requested on three issues: factual errors, supplementary information related to a specific point, clarification requests. The external panel then edits what they feel is needed and responds to the UCP with a table indicating how they have responded to each of the feedback points.

Both documents will be written in Spanish with English translations prepared immediately on receipt of the final documents.

Both the self-assessment and the commentary of the external panel are the final outputs of the MTR/Final Evaluation to IDRC and NZAID. The main report is the self-assessment, with the external panel constituting an auxiliary comment on that.

Both documents are public documents that will be placed on the DTR website as soon as they have been received by the funding agencies.

Criteria for what constitutes a good internal report need to be identified. The M&E unit to draft and discuss with the CU.

Evaluation Quality

Evaluation standards that the MTR will adhere to through the process and in its outputs are that it should:

- serve the information needs of intended users and be owned by stakeholders (utility);
- be realistic, prudent, and frugal (feasibility);
- reveal and convey technically adequate information about the features that determine the worth or merit of the program being evaluated (accuracy); and
- be conducted legally, ethically, and with due regard to the welfare of those involved in the evaluation as well as those affected by its results (propriety).

By implication for the DTR program, the MTR must also:

- be the product of multiple perspectives and thus constitute a collaborative process;
- be shaped by rigorous, systematic analysis of diverse perspectives that are imbued with solid scepticism and constructive intentions; and
- be pursued by technically competent individuals who not only have detailed knowledge of rural development in Latin America and policy influencing but can also act as constructive dialogue partners with the program.

Annex 1. Proposed Table of Contents of the Self-Assessment Report

1. Background (2-3 pages)

- Describe the overall program, its objectives, and rationale
- Map the activities (thematically and/or regionally)
- Methodology of the MTR
- Describe and explain any *significant* evolution(s) or adaptation(s) the program made in its strategy since approval of the grants. Changes could have been the result of a range of factors: changing contexts, opportunities, constraints, or risks (operational and/or programmatic). The report should also include, if appropriate, *significant* ideas that were considered but were rejected or discarded by the program and explain the rationale for these decision(s).

2. Processes, products and results

- Knowledge production: DTR concept, territorial capacity development, and incorporation of gender and environmental variables
- Program management, capacity to work as a network, and learning capacity
- Dissemination and communication
- Influencing
- Monitoring and evaluation

For each topic, contemplate:

- What are emerging insights/methodological innovation? Why is this potentially important or not? What lies ahead (briefly)? If applicable, highlight any particularly innovative scientific/research outputs, methodologies, publications, etc. and explain what makes them significant.
- How has the above emerged? What were constraining / facilitating factors to date?
- What was the program's role in making this possible? Include any evidence that the program was an influence – partial or total, intentional or unintentional. To the extent possible for a MTR, quantitative and qualitative evidence of the outcomes should be specified.

3. Progress towards effects⁴

For each, describe:

- What are the key emerging/actual outcomes?
 - Are these in line with the desired changes?
 - How are the processes and systems in place/being funded/enabled contributing or not to the desired outcomes?
- a. Collective actor
 - Network of partners and collaborators
 - Problem of a small, non-porous network
 - b. Vision and strategy

⁴ For each result include an annex with: 1) a preliminary list of key documents (with livelink or internet location); and, 2) key informants (with title, organization, complete contact information, and a brief explanation of the relationship of this person to the program/outcome and why they have been suggested as a key informant). These documents and people will provide the starting point for the external review panel to review and verify the observations. The documents should be limited only to those that provide the best evidence of the outcome. Similarly, only the most pertinent people should be included in the list of potential interviewees. These can include but need not be limited to: project leaders; researchers; key research users/those influenced by the research; representatives of other donors/organizations with whom the program has partnered; thinkers/academics/consultants the program has worked with on strategy, communications, evaluation, research quality, etc.

- Body of knowledge about territorial dynamics, their effects, variables and key determining factors
 - Experience about how to do territorial development in practice, insufficiently elaborated
- c. Changes in public action
- How to interact with public decision-makers, associations, provincial governments
 - Emerging policy-influencing strategy, with links to local, intermediate, national and multilateral levels
 - Developing capacities of partners in the territories
 - Masters (curriculum) work

4. Lessons and Conclusions (2-3 pages)

Identify the main strategic lessons that can be drawn from the experiences to date of the program (drawn from opportunities and challenges, successes and failures). What aspects might be improved?

These lessons can be operational but are intended to be more strategic/programmatic. They should be significant enough and sufficiently well analyzed to warrant presentation to the Advisory Group and shared with the funding agencies. This should not be a laundry list of generic 'lessons learned' but should include quality lessons that emerge from a deep reflection on the program's experience and should provide specific evidence of the lesson: from where and how was it derived?

Addendum for section 3 of the report. See table below for ideas on what examples of (emerging) outcomes to which reference might be made. Note these are directly from IDRC's document that focuses on program evaluation, not MTRs.

Capacity Development (IDRC)	Influencing Policy (IDRC)	Emerging Outcomes
<p>The process by which individuals, groups, organizations, institutions and societies increase their ability to identify and analyze development challenges, and have the ability to conceive, conduct, manage and communicate research that addresses these challenges over time and in a sustainable manner.</p> <p>The good practices that have been identified as supporting sustained capacity development include: 1) a programming approach that is persistent, flexible, resilient, and sensitive; 2) building partnerships and relationships; 3) harnessing existing capacities and building of strategic intelligence; and, 4) ensuring the relevance of the program by supporting a locally driven agenda.</p>	<p>Policy influence is broad and a strategic evaluation at IDRC found that it includes building the capacities of both researchers and decision-makers in using knowledge to make policy, and broadening the conceptual boundaries of the whole research-to-policy process.</p> <p><i>* Expanding policy capacities.</i> Research can support the development of innovative ideas and the skills to communicate them, and develop new talent for doing issues-based research and analysis.</p> <p><i>* Broadening policy horizons.</i> Research can introduce new ideas to the agenda, ensure that knowledge is provided to decision-makers in a form they can use, and nourish dialogues among researchers and decision-makers.</p> <p><i>* Affecting policy regimes.</i> Research findings can modify the development of laws, regulations, programs, or structures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • high quality research findings representing significant knowledge generation, field building, etc.; • the effectiveness of the program at promoting the dissemination, communication, and utilization of research findings; • the contributions of the program to building or strengthening capacities of researchers, organizations, research users, and institutions; • the contributions of the program to influencing policies; • the influence on technology development, adoption or adaptation; • changes in relationships, actions or behaviours of project partners and other project stakeholders (individual, organizations, groups, etc.), including any relationships that the program effected which contributed to development results (e.g., formation of networks, involvement of stakeholders, collaboration among researchers, etc.), changes in state (e.g., improved health status of a group of people, environmental conditions, etc.) • any contributions of the program to a greater understanding and consideration of inclusion of gendered perspectives in research and research processes (amongst program partners and within the field of research)

Appendix 2. Draft timetable of UCP self-assessment process

Activity/Description	Responsible Party	Deadline/Timeline	Expected Result
Initial UCP workshop; Launch of the self-evaluation process, exploring the processes, products and results obtained that the UCP considers to be key and/or most relevant.	UCP, Moderated by R. Iturralde	Thursday, September 2, 2-6 p.m.	Initial evaluation document that describes 4-5 processes, products and results
Gathering and review of secondary materials - Work plans - Monitoring spreadsheet - Budget - Selected products	Ignacia Fernández Everyone contributes information and writes sections	First half of September	Observations formulated during the initial workshop contrasted with the secondary data generated by the programme
Intermediate UCP Workshop	UCP	Tentative date: Tuesday, September 21	Consensus regarding the initial arguments reviewed in function of the secondary evidence
In-depth interviews with component leaders and partners who offer to participate (Skype)	Ignacia Fernández Roberto Iturralde	September 21-4	Additional evidence generated (partners) Arguments reviewed and cross-checked (UCP)
Transcription of the material	Professional to be hired	September 21-30	Interviews transcribed and available for review by UCP
Analysis of results, processing of interviews and integrated analysis of this information and the secondary sources consulted	Ignacia Fernández	October 1-15	Preliminary version of final document
Final UCP workshop	UCP	Friday, October 18	Consensus reached on final arguments of self-evaluation (responses to evaluation questions)
Writing of evaluation	Ignacia Fernández	October 18-30	Final self-evaluation

Annex 3. Overall Assessment of the External Review Panel – Acceptable or Non-acceptable?

Rating	Description
I. Report's utility: Does the report adhere to the terms of reference that were designed to support the external review's intended uses by its intended users?	
High	Satisfactorily addresses all of the review objectives
Medium	Satisfactorily addresses most of the review objectives
Unacceptable	Satisfactorily addresses few or none of the review objectives
II. Report's feasibility: Was the design of the external review realistic, practical and adequate to respond to the evaluation questions?	
High	The report describes a design that responds to most of the evaluation questions.
Medium	The report describes a design that responds to some of the evaluation questions.
Unacceptable	The report describes a design that responds to only a few or none of the evaluation questions.
III. Report's accuracy: Did the application of the tools and methods generate rigorous, valid and credible evidence that is presented in the report? Does the evidence substantiate the conclusions/ recommendations?	
High	Mostly uses appropriate tools and methods, and provides evidence to support its findings, conclusions and recommendations
Medium	Sometimes uses appropriate tools and methods, and provides evidence to support its findings, conclusions and recommendations
Unacceptable	Uses few or no appropriate tools and methods, and rarely provides evidence to support its findings, conclusions and recommendations
IV. Report's propriety: Did the external review raise ethical concerns (pertaining to the rights of human subjects; respect for human dignity; the completion of a fair evaluation; disclosure of conflicts of interests, etc.)?	
Acceptable	The report raised no serious ethical concerns.
Unacceptable	The reports raised one or more serious ethical concerns.