



**CAENTI**  
Coordination Action of the European Network of Territorial Intelligence  
A project funded under FP6 of the E.U.  
<http://www.territorial-intelligence.eu>



# **CAENTI**

## **Coordination Action of the European Network of Territorial Intelligence**

**Analysis of the Application of the Governance  
Principles of Sustainable  
Development to Territorial Research-Action**

**Deliverable No 40**

**Blanca MIEDES-UGARTE**  
WP 5 Leader  
Huelva University

**December 2006, 31<sup>st</sup>**

**SUMMARY**

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1. Objectives	3
1.2. Methodology	4
1.3. Content	5
<b>2. THE PRINCIPLES OF TERRITORIAL GOVERNANCE OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. The concept of territorial governance	5
2.2. The territorial dimension of sustainable development	7
2.3. Principal governance challenges for achieving sustainable development of territories	8
2.4. Components of territorial governance	9
2.5. The principles of the governance of sustainable development	11
<b>3. TERRITORIAL GOVERNANCE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE KNOWLEDGE SOCIETY: TERRITORIAL INTELLIGENCE</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1. Governance in the knowledge society	13
3.2. Governance and territorial intelligence	15
<b>4. RESEARCH-ACTION APPLIED TO THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF TERRITORIES.</b>	<b>16</b>
4.1. New challenges for research in the knowledge society	16
4.2. Participatory research-action as a producer of territorial intelligence	18
4.3. The application of the governance principles of sustainable development to research-action	21
<b>5. CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>6. BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>24</b>
<i>Appendix I: Catalogue of experience - research team document</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Appendix II: Catalogue of experiences – project document</i>	<i>29</i>

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1. Objectives**

The present document, *Application of the governance principles of sustainable development to territorial research-action* (deliverable 40, publishable on CAENTI Website) is the result of the work by Workpackage 5 *Analysis of the application of the governance principles of sustainable development to territorial research-action*, during the first year of implementation of the CAENTI Project (from March 2006 to March 2007).

WP5 is made up of a multidisciplinary and multi-sectorial working group with participating representatives from six universities (Alba Iulia University, Franche-Comté University, Huelva University, Liège University, Pécs University, Salerno University) and CAENTI's seven territorial actors (VALDOCCO, ACCEM, OPTIMA, INTEGRA+, APAPEI, COCAGNE, BARANYA COUNTY). Both the research groups and the actors involved have extensive experience in the field of research-action applied to the solving of socio-economic problems (the fight against forms of exclusion, social integration, local and community development) in very different contexts. Their common link consists, on the one hand, of the confidence the researchers and actors have in research as the driving force for social change, and on the other hand of their defence of the territorial approach due to their conviction that socio-economic problems are due to multiple, entwined factors and dynamics and that the arena where they are to be tackled is the territory where these factors and dynamics are concentrated (where they fall).

As reflected in the CAENTI Working Document<sup>1</sup>, WP5's principal commitment is discussion of the ethical and methodological principles which should be observed by the research protocols of human and social sciences, in such a way that the results favour the governance of sustainable territorial development.

During this first phase the group has set itself the objective of performing an analysis of the research experience of the members who make up CAENTI and, based on the assessment of the results of this experience, to discuss which principles are to inspire the practices of the research activity so that this will really contribute to the development of governance. In order to contextualise this debate, the group set itself the initial objective of reaching a consensus on a basic conceptual framework on the ideas of territorial governance, sustainable development, territorial intelligence and, given the importance of this approach for all the participants, on the concept of research-action. Based on the conclusions of this initial work, in successive phases discussion will be entered into in greater depth and the drawing up of research-action protocols inspired by these principles will be undertaken.

This document gathers together the principal conclusions reached by the working group during this first phase.

---

<sup>1</sup> Consultable at <http://www.territorial-intelligence.eu>

## ***1.2. Methodology***

In reality all the activities that have led to the drawing up of this document have consisted of sharing, systemising and capitalising the knowledge and know-how of the working-group participants.

In order to start with the work, the six universities undertook to draw up a catalogue with commentary on their own experiences in the field of research as applied to sustainable territorial development. It is these catalogues which served as the basis for comparative analysis and the subsequent discussion. The shared criteria with regard to their content and structure were determined at the first scientific meeting held in Huelva in May 2006. In order to give the reports greater homogeneity, two forms were drawn up, one relating to the research teams and another relating to each of the individual experiences, which were to be filled in (Annexes I and II). The catalogues have been published internally using the CooSpace platform and have been discussed at two scientific meetings, the First International Annual Conference at Alba Iulia (September 2006) and the coordination meeting at Liège University in January 2007.

The WP5 activity has resulted in the drawing up of ten working documents presented at the Huelva and Liège scientific coordination meetings and in the communication *Analysis of the application of the governance principles of sustainable development to territorial research-action* presented by the WP5 leader at the Alba Iulia Conference.

The individual catalogues (deliverables D34 to D39 available to the members of the consortium on Coospace) have been drawn up by the teams assigned to WP5 in each University. The following members of CAENTI have taken part in deliberations on the conclusions from the catalogues and the principal conclusions that can be drawn from them:

- Blanca MIEDES UGARTE (WP-Leader, UHU)
- Dolores REDONDO TORONJO (UHU)
- Jean-Jacques GIRARDOT (UFC)
- Laurent AMIOTTE-SUCHET (UFC)
- Serge SCHMITZ (ULG)
- Csilla FILO (PTE)
- Zoltan WILHEM (PTE)
- Mihai PASCARU-PAG (UAB)
- Natale AMMATURO (UNISA)
- Tullia SACCHERI (UNISA)
- Julia FERNANDEZ QUINTANILLA (ACCEM)
- Enrique BARBERO RODRIGUEZ (ACCEM)
- Maria Isabel FRANCO LIGENFERT (VALDOCCO)
- María Concepción MARTÍNEZ MARTÍNEZ (VALDOCCO)
- Jean-Marie DELVOYE (OPTIMA)

The content of the catalogues and the results of the deliberations have been compiled in this document and drawn up and edited by the Workpackage leader.

### ***1.3. Content***

The document consists of 6 sections. The first is this introduction, in which the objectives, the method used for the drawing up of the document and the structure of the work are summarised. In the second section the conceptual framework is introduced, starting with discussion of the concept of territorial governance and its principal components, the territorial dimension of sustainable development is analysed, and the various lists of principles delivered by different instances of the European Union for the development of governance and the drawing up of policies relating to sustainable development are discussed. The third section describes the coordination of the concept of territorial governance with that of territorial intelligence in the context of the knowledge society. The fourth section presents the conclusions of the debates surrounding the principles of research-action introduced by a reflection on the changes the development of territorial governance demands from scientific activity. Here the idea shared by the members of WP5 is raised of the need for research to be inserted in the very dynamic of territorial action and to promote the development of research-action processes. This section concludes with the formulation of the principles which, according to the members of CAENTI WP5 should be observed for this type of research to promote sustainable development governance in the territories properly. The fifth section sets out some brief conclusions and the sixth the bibliography which served as a reference. The two forms which served as a basis for the drawing up of the catalogues accompany the document as annexes.

## ***2. THE PRINCIPLES OF TERRITORIAL GOVERNANCE OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT***

### ***2.1. The concept of territorial governance***

The economic crises of the 70s and 80s in the last century called into question the ability of nation states to provide effective answers to the economic and social problems of the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. During the same period, analyses of the limitation of fossil fuel reserves and the environmental impact of growth called into question the western economic model itself (MEADOWS et al., 1972), precisely at a time when less industrialised countries were struggling to imitate it. The sustainability of the growth model shifted the focus of economic, social and political debates which had centred on the fight against poverty during the previous decade. A few years later, the remarkable increase in the flow of capital and direct investment in foreign countries, stimulated by the development of new information and communication technologies intensified economic transnational integration giving rise to what has subsequently come to be called economic “globalization”. Neither Keynesian policies nor the neo-liberal alternative managed to provide an escape from economic stagnation, high unemployment figures and the growing volume of people and territories excluded from the new economic growth model in the context of globalisation. All this translated into a ***political crisis of legitimacy for national status and a reconfiguration of those spaces in which power was exercised*** (JAÚREGUI, 2000). The consequences are produced in two directions: upward, in an attempt to regulate more and more globalised flows, supranational decision-

making structures are reinforced (the European Union is a paradigmatic example, but also the G7-G8, Trade Negotiations, etc.); downward, producing the emergence or resurgence of territorial identities which are regional or local in character in an attempt by regional and local actors to design their own strategies to find a way out of the crisis.

In this last downward direction, the answer to this crisis of legitimacy takes the form of the *decentralising processes of state power*, which present two distinct dimensions.

- The first of these, the *territorial dimension*, confers greater autonomy on regional and local levels for management (decentralisation) or definition of public policies (transfer of responsibilities), accompanied on occasions by the requirement of some degree of financial co-responsibility.
- The second, the *institutional dimension*, provides greater political space for private actors, both in the decision-making processes (negotiation) and in their participation in the provision of goods and services (delegation). The strengthening experienced by civil society and particularly the resurgence of organisations in the third sector during the crisis years are to be interpreted in this context.

Greater consciousness of mutual dependence and of the need for cooperation among multiple actors and multiple levels to face grave social and economic problems has been translated into greater support for negotiation as a method in decision-making processes relating to territory. From the concept of government, understood simultaneously as an exclusive agent and as the principal result of a *top-down* decision-making process, we pass to the idea of “*governance*”<sup>2</sup> which makes *reference to the need for governments to make room for other agents in the decision-making processes and to the need for all levels and areas of governments to be involved in these processes.*

All this results in horizontal cooperation (among different agents and areas of government) and vertical cooperation (among different levels) which is much more widespread (and also confused) than is produced in the traditional scheme. The result of this greater complexity is a reduction in the regulatory role of the state, with the network of *projects by various territorial actors* acquiring greater importance.

Coherent with this view, the concept of territory which is beginning to prevail in the political and academic media transcends the mere geographical or administrative space to become a space for institutional proximity, which acts as a reference for the actors’ projects and visions of the future. These projects transform the territory, which is presented as a dynamic reality permanently in progress, continually reaffirming and preserving its identity in the face of its physical, political, economic and cultural surroundings, with which it finds itself in eternal interaction.

In this conception, territory is defined, “as an intersection of networks” (physical, human, formal, informal) of strategies and interdependencies among members who are interlinked, a place for production, for negotiation aimed at sharing a common future. The system is based on the geographical proximity of its actors, but also by the shared dynamic that reflects them,

---

<sup>2</sup> An idea inherited from the approaches of the institutionalist economy of the 1970s, which referred to the development of reconciliation mechanisms and the coordination of actors who are institutionally different in nature in order to achieve economic efficacy and efficiency and which converge with the analysis which was being carried out at the same time by the political sciences, in relation to the problems of governability which appear in modern democratic states, in proportion with the growth of their structural and institutional complexity and which is accentuated by the processes of globalisation (JÁUREGUI, 2000).

the actions that result from these relations, the rules, norms and principles that appear together (LELOUP, MOYART & PECQUEUR, 2004:7). Territory appears as a permanent social construct in constant adaptation<sup>3</sup>, as a specialised system of actors with a variable strategic capacity margin for its self-production. This capacity does not result exclusively from politics or the economy, but from a systemic behaviour of organised territory.

In this context, economic and social development comes to be understood as a virtuous “mix” of the self-organisational capacity of the whole social organisation<sup>4</sup>, on the one hand and of the efficiency of “intervention engineering in the territory”, on the other (BOISIER, 1997:43).

It is precisely in this confluence where the concept of *territorial governance* acquires full meaning and significance, alluding to the *set of complex processes through which decisions are made regarding urban or territorial development and which shape the “intervention engineering in the territory”*. In these processes local actors are involved alongside national and global actors present in the territory, whether these are public or private, commercial or social. The relationships between the actors include both relations that are formal and official in nature and informal relations regulated by a local political culture. The participation of multiple actors in territorial development decisions can vary in balance and synergy, based on the actors’ relative powers, and on the presence or absence of common goals (BERVEJILLO, 1998:7).

## **2.2. The territorial dimension of sustainable development**

Analysis of the challenges facing territorial governance requires, in the first place, a precise statement of the concept of territorial development which is to serve as a reference for it. In the context of CAENTI, this reference is *human development*.

According to this approach, the principal aim of development is the generation of life opportunities for human beings to live lives that are worth living. The objective is not only for people to have more and better options, but also to have greater freedom to choose them. It is about satisfying precise, finite human needs which are ahistorical in nature, independent of any type of relativism, whether in terms of culture, class, gender, race, community, and even, hence the current reference to *sustainability*, of generation. It is, therefore, a conception, which places emphasis on the redistributive aspects of development, both *intra-* and *intergenerationally*<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> « On prend donc ici le parti de considérer le territoire (qui est le résultat) ou la territorialisation (qui est le processus) comme une forme particulière de coordination par la création de groupe. Cette forme de coordination est à l’origine d’une modalité particulière de création de valeur et d’émergence de ressources nouvelles ou latentes. Ces « ressources territoriales spécifiques » sont plurielles et débordent dans de nombreux cas la seule sphère productive. » (LELOUP, MOYART & PECQUEUR, 2004: 7).

<sup>4</sup> During the nineteen-sixties A. O. Hirschman had noted that the development processes of specific territories do not depend so much on the volume of resources available (capital, natural, human) as on the degree to which they are used. Hence these processes depend to a large extent on the ability (and also on the discretion) of the various actors (public and private) with regard to the mobilisation of these resources (MELDOLESI, 1997:108 et seq.). As F. Perroux would say, the protagonists will be the actors and not the factors, since it is the former who mobilise the latter and not vice versa. It is the former who connect the various material and mental structures through their activity and the latter which, on the basis of these interactions, can give rise to the emergence of new structures that aid and generate development (PERRROUX, 1984).

<sup>5</sup> See SEN (1992), NUSSBAUM and SEN (1993) and ANAND and SEN (1994).

In spite of the fact that, in the long term, the external limit of human development is given by the planet's capacity for sustenance<sup>6</sup>, as will be argued below, this does not prevent meaningful discussion of "sustainable territorial development". In fact, in terms of ecology sustenance implies the maintenance of the balance in the long term between the population and the resources, but if applied to the human species, when it comes to establishing limits, the pressure introduced by production has to be taken into account, which confers a very significant role on the technology used and the social organization or institutional framework in which the productive processes are developed, which as is known, present a strong territorial dimension. On the other hand, in this approach sustainability is to be found in the means, in the "satisfactors" of human needs, and not in the needs themselves. In this way, the limits, at least some of them, could be overcome as these "satisfactors" are successfully dematerialised. That is to say, the limits of development could be reduced as the means by which current human needs are satisfied are replaced by others which are less intensive in their use of polluting energies and limited natural resources and with lower levels of production of non-biodegradable waste.

Both for specifying and prioritising needs to be satisfied and for achieving the necessary dematerialisation of the "satisfactors", the territorial dimension proves to be especially significant. This is due to the fact that both establishment of priorities and the choice of the means to satisfy them are matters which transcend merely technical decisions. Both require social coordination processes over the mechanisms which would allow the objectives in each context to be achieved, bearing in mind distribution of the results in terms of generation of life opportunities and in terms of freedom of choice for the population. Considering the enormous differences observed in various human groups, these *coordination processes could not be produced more than in reference to specific territories*, depending on the state of satisfaction of the needs of the human groups involved, on the local productive characteristics and the specific institutional frameworks which will condition the possible agreements. These coordination agreements on a local scale would have to be coordinated with those produced within the global framework on a planetary scale, the ultimate sphere of reference of ecological limits<sup>7</sup>. The latter would be indispensable, but would be ineffective without the former. Hence, at least in the field of action, the concept of *sustainable territorial development*, acquires full meaning, although this refers to human development on a planetary scale<sup>8</sup>.

### ***2.3. Principal governance challenges for achieving sustainable development of territories***

In this context, the principal challenge faced by the architects of territorial governance is that of making full use of all the potentiality that present-day society offers to place it at the

---

<sup>6</sup> The capacity for sustenance of a specific territory is defined by ecology for any given species as the maximum number of a population of that species that can be maintained indefinitely, without any resulting degradation in the basic resources, which might lead to a reduction in the population in the future. (ASENSIO, 2004:11).

<sup>7</sup> Just as the pressure exerted by humans from different groups on a world scale is highly unequal, the capacity for sustenance would only make sense as it refers to the whole planet (it would be pointless if the vast majority lived in accordance with the limits if a small group had enormous devastating power).

<sup>8</sup> For an analysis of the idea of territory and a discussion of the optimum territorial unit for sustainable development, see the minutes from the 1<sup>st</sup> International Conference on Territorial Intelligence, *Region, Identity and Sustainable Development* held at Alba Iulia University, Romania from 20<sup>th</sup> to 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2006: <http://www.territorial-intelligence.eu/?file=alba-2006-acts&lang=en#acts>. See also the discussion held in the deliverable summary from the CAENTI project WP4.

service of sustainable territorial development and making sure that greater institutional complexity does not hinder but rather stimulates the exercise of democracy.

This leaves public authorities with the difficult challenge of making the processes which make up territorial governance at least contribute to a double objective:

- on one hand, making sure that the solutions adopted mobilise the resources effectively, by providing relevant answers to territorial needs, both in the short and long terms, i.e. sustainably;
- on the other hand, ensuring that the processes by means of which the solutions are proposed, debated and finally accepted contribute to the development of democracy, in a more complex context in which the traditional systems of representative democracy prove insufficient.

Definitively, territorial governance is presented with the challenge of seeing that “territorial engineering” takes advantage of and effectively stimulates the “organisational capacity of the whole of the social organisation” in order to manage to provide appropriate answers to the democratically expressed needs of the citizens.

#### **2.4. Components of territorial governance**

Already at the end of the 1990s it could be glimpsed that in order to confront these challenges to territorial governance it was necessary to carry out significant transformations in at least three dimensions: the cognitive, socio-political and technological-organisational (Bervejillo, 1998):

- On the *cognitive* plane, the transformation referred to the need to revise the very concept of territory as well as the approaches used in analysis of territorial transformations.
- On the *socio-political* plane, the need to set up new institutional frameworks to promote democratic coordination of actors and their projects on territory was raised.
- Finally, on the *technological-organisational* plane, the need was raised to have available new technological and organisational tools for analysis, monitoring, management and communication on territory (Figure 1).

<b>Dimensions and new components required for territorial governance</b>	
<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Components</b>
Cognitive	Renovation of the paradigms for thinking out territorial development. Renovation of substantive theories on territorial development. Production of new empirical knowledge about contemporary territorial transformations.
Socio-political	New forms of vertical and horizontal coordination. New project territories. Territorial perspective and new collective projects.
Technological Organisational	New agencies and institutional networks for territorial management. New tool kit for analysis, monitoring and territorial communication.

Source: BERVEJILLO (1998).

Today, more than a decade later, the decentralising processes which convert territories into the arena of governance have become universal, and these transformations continue on course, but basic contact with the actual experiences that are currently being carried out anywhere in the field of local, social or community development within the European Union reveals that at present, neither knowledge of territory, nor territorial institutional fabrics, nor the tools used for analysis and territorial management appear to be up to the challenges. On occasions, more than governance, we could talk of territorial “misgovernance” especially taking into account the miscoordinations and the inefficiency in assigning resources applied to territorial development.

We state that we live in the knowledge society, however, the strategic knowledge institutional decision-makers have available to them and, especially the actors who operate directly in the field carrying out their individual or joint territorial projects, continues to be quite wanting, or at least is not adequately distributed. In spite of the scientific and technological advances and despite the amount of energy used in territorial analysis, a large number of territorial actors still do not have the type of knowledge available to them to provide them with comprehensive representations of the territory’s position in the global context. This prevents them forming a critical vision of the future to reveal their different opportunities for action.

Socio-political renovation, according to analyses performed by the OECD (2005), is also proving very complex. Although decentralisation processes are presented in principle as indispensable institutional transformation for socio-economic development and as a reinforcing factor for democracy, their effects do not prove to be automatic. As far as the first point is concerned, economic efficacy and efficiency, decentralisation in itself is not spontaneously producing an increase in administrative flexibility, or greater concentration on the most pressing problems, nor, consequently, the proposal of more pragmatic solutions. Everything seems to depend in each context on the degree of accuracy in the comprehensive diagnostic of territorial problems and on the ability of the politicians in charge to harmonise interests and to coordinate all the actions in the territory, bringing coherence to global action.

As to whether they favour the development of democracy, the empirical evidence is not conclusive. In principle decentralisation appears to give rise to more horizontal, participatory relationships and to favour some *down-top* processes by empowering the most disadvantaged local groups and the development of public deliberation processes. But they are still modest effects and much more significant on a municipal level than on a regional level<sup>9</sup>. The causal link between decentralisation and democratisation appears tenuous in the majority of studies carried out. In reality this depends on the process being accompanied by policies which reinforce compliance with laws, strengthen the development of civil society, ensure equitable investment of resources and which generate effective coordination among levels of government (TULCHIN & SELEE, 2004), all this by assigning responsibilities among the different levels and agents who are to receive the decentralised power based on the functions, abilities and resources of each actor.

To sum up, decentralisation being translated into more suitable solutions for the needs of sustainable territorial development, while at the same time strengthening democracy, depends

---

<sup>9</sup> In this sense it should be stated that the decentralised state is a tapestry of variable configurations, just like the centralised state. The specific crystallisation of power and influence relations among local actors will depend not only on the resources and the local actors’ ability in negotiation, but also on the place the local government occupies in a specific institutional space delimited by central-peripheral relationships, or if preferred, the local system of government where they operate (RAMÍREZ-PÉREZ, NAVARRO-YÁÑEZ, CLARK, 2004).

on the actual form adopted by the processes involved in territorial governance in each case. These processes are affected by a number of factors, among which can be mentioned the territory's position and form of involvement in the global economic and political context; the institutional fabric made up by the formal and informal networks in which the actors from different levels and sectors whose action affects the territory interact; the individual responsibilities, abilities and preferences of these actors, as well as the characteristics of the forums where these actors meet and the methods they use to debate and cooperate, especially as regards the processes of production and exchange of information relating to the territory.

From the above it can be deduced that the success of the socio-political component, i.e., the increase in democracy in the decision-making processes in a complex institutional framework, depends to a significant extent on the capacity the territory has to produce a comprehensive, forward-looking vision of the territory's dynamic in the global context (with new paradigms, theories and cognitive component models), but also on the territory's capacity to create institutional agencies and networks for territorial management such as "territorial partnerships"<sup>10</sup> and new coordination and communication tools which will allow the coherence of strategies and projects in time to be maintained (technological and organisational component).

### ***2.5. The principles of the governance of sustainable development***

All the institutional complexity involved in the processes of reconfiguring the spaces of power alluded to in the previous section was expressly recognised by the European Union in 2001 with the publication of their *White Paper on European Governance*<sup>11</sup>.

With regard to governance, the European Union's principal concern is the huge lack of confidence aroused in citizens by the complex community structure for the management of public matters, reflected in its main symptom: the estrangement of the population from European institutions. As a consequence the main proposal contained in the Commission's White Paper consists of a series of measures aimed at adapting community institutions and reinforcing the coherence of its policies. The ultimate goal is to combat the citizens' negative assessment of the efficacy of community action, by attempting to reduce the gap between institutions and the population, in short, by developing the democratic nature of the decision-making processes. The document refers mainly to institutional changes in the decision-making procedures within the European Union and the coordination of levels of government in the EU and the member countries, as well as coordination of these with their respective regional and local governments. However, although expressly planned for the community context, the White Paper proposes five principles as the basis of good governance which are considered essential for the setting up of more democratic governance in the member states, but also, and this is the important point here, at all levels of government, whether they be on a worldwide, national European, regional or local scale.

These principles are:

- *Transparency*: the institutions must practice active communication about what they do and what they decide. They must use comprehensible language which is accessible to

<sup>10</sup> For specific experiences in this field see OECD (2004).

<sup>11</sup> *White Paper on European Governance*. COM(2001) 428 final from 25.7.2001.

the general population. The aim is to improve confidence with regard to institutional complexity.

- *Participation*: the quality, relevance and efficacy of the policies depend on the full participation of the citizens at all stages, from conception to deployment of policies. Improving participation must increase confidence in the end results of the institutions that produce the policies. Promoting participation is a duty of the institutions.
- *Responsibility*: it is important to clarify the role of each of the legislative and executive processes. Each institution has to explain its action and assume responsibility for it, at whatever administrative level that might be.
- *Efficacy*: the measures must be effective and deployed at the right time; they must produce the desired results, based on clear objectives and assessment of the future impact and of previous experience, where there is any. Efficacy requires that policies be applied in proportion to the problems and that decisions be taken at the most appropriate level.
- *Coherence*: the policies and actions carried out must be coherent and perfectly comprehensible. The challenges faced by the European Union such as climate change or demographic evolution transcend the limit of sectorial policies. At the same time, regional and local governments are becoming more and more involved in the design and deployment of policies. Coherence consists of the ability to forge a political direction and of institutions taking responsibility in order to guarantee a comprehensive approach in a complex system.

The White Paper proposes that each of these principles is important in itself but that they cannot be carried out on their own. It also insists that the application of these principles must contribute to strengthening the now long-standing community principles of *proportionality* and *subordination*. From when policies are conceived until they are executed, the choice of level of action (from community to local) and the tools must be proportional to the desired objectives. The idea is to improve on the linear model consisting of the sum of policies with a virtuous circle based on interaction, networks, and participation at all levels, from the definition of policies right up until they are set in motion.

In reality, stating all these principles of governance serves to complete and make more specific the principles of *multidimensionality, partnership and participation*, which have been promoted by the European Union since the end of the 1980s in the proposal and execution of territorial development projects financed with community funds (Community initiatives, ERDF and ESF) and which have been the inspiration for a large part of the work carried out by the members of CAENTI over the last two decades.

At the same time, at the Brussels Summit in July 2005 the European Union approved another series of principles relating to sustainable development policies<sup>12</sup>. These principles, in addition to the procedures, refer to the contents of these policies and can be stated as follows:

- Promotion and protection of fundamental rights.
- Intra- and intergenerational solidarity.

---

<sup>12</sup> See the document « Conclusions de la présidence – Bruxelles, 16 et 17 juin 2005, Conseil Européen, 10255/1/05 REV 1 29, Annexe I ».

- Open, democratic society.
- Public and private partnerships with companies and social actors.
- Coherence of policies and governance.
- Exploitation of the best knowledge available.
- Principle of precaution.
- “The polluter pays” principle.

The formulation of these principles is substantially less clear than the formulation of the principles of governance and some of them (Open, democratic society; Public and private partnerships with companies and social actors; Coherence of policies and governance) could even have been summed up in one principle, “Observance of the rules of good governance”. In any case, the rest of the principles stated add clarity with regard to the contents of the policies (promotion of fundamental rights, solidarity and responsibility by those who pollute) and the attitude when it comes to tackling them (assessing the risks based on the best knowledge available).

As will be discussed in the following sections, it is precisely in relation to this last principle, taking advantage of the best knowledge available to promote the development of policies with regard to sustainable development in a democratic society, where the work developed in CAENTI WP5-GOVERNANCE acquires full meaning and significance. In fact, putting this principle in practice, in connection with the fulfilment of those which refer to good governance, raises the important question of who should produce, interpret and disseminate the knowledge and also how, in order to manage to design and execute sustainable development policies democratically. This immediately raises a question about the type of research activity that can best satisfy these objectives and about the principles that should inspire it.

The attempt to answer this question, considered in light of the experience that CAENTI research teams compiled in the catalogues that each participating university produced, allowed the articulation of the concepts of territorial governance and territorial intelligence (section 3). And based on this link it has been possible to formulate a series of principles which should be observed by research applied to sustainable territorial development (section 4).

### ***3. TERRITORIAL GOVERNANCE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE KNOWLEDGE SOCIETY: TERRITORIAL INTELLIGENCE***

#### ***3.1. Governance in the knowledge society***

One fact of paramount importance that has not been mentioned more than superficially up until now is that all this discussion of governance is produced in the context of the emergence of what is being called the “knowledge society”<sup>13</sup>. In this globalised society, in which the cost of exchanging capital and goods has been reduced to an extraordinary degree, it is originality in the combination of the resources and technological and organisational innovation that confers the competitive advantage, with the result that knowledge, today more

---

<sup>13</sup> “The idea of the “knowledge society” was first used in 1969 by university professor, Peter Drucker, and in the 1990s it was entered into more deeply in a series of detailed studies published by researchers such as Robin Mansell or Nico Stehr. [This idea arose] at almost the same time as the concepts of “learning societies” and “lifelong learning for all”, which is not exactly a coincidence” (UNESCO, 2005:61).

than ever, is presented as the principal productive factor, the generator of determinant economic value. Perhaps the most significant expression to summarise the role of knowledge in the world today is that attributed to M. Serres: *knowledge is now the infrastructure* (LÉVY: 1994).

The knowledge society goes well beyond the concept of the information society. The latter is an instrument of knowledge, but not knowledge itself. The latter would be the result of the interpretation and critical analysis of the former and of the ability to draw useful conclusions, both for its practical application, and for living lives, which in A. Sen's familiar expression "are worth living" (SEN, 1992). It is at this point that the concept of the knowledge society establishes a link with that of human development, with the twin facets of this understood: creation of life opportunities and development of the freedom of choice. Knowledge proves to be of paramount importance as much for one component as for the other. The information society refers to the technological; the knowledge society affects much wider social, ethical and political dimensions.

As Pierre Lévy explains (1994), the point is that the principal characteristic of knowledge societies is that we have recognised that knowledge is everywhere and intelligence is distributed universally (no one has all the knowledge and everyone has some): the knowledge society is conceived as a society which is nourished by diversity and ability. Lévy bases the concept of "collective intelligence" on this characteristic, explaining that we are not dealing with an intelligence which stems from interchangeable subjects in the way that an ant hill could be considered, but rather with an intelligence based on the knowledge of unique, exceptional individuals<sup>14</sup>.

Another distinctive feature of the knowledge society is that scientific and technological advances, increased by the stimulus of value production and the changing needs of modern societies, and amplified by feedback from new information and communication technologies, are causing the available knowledge to evolve very rapidly. As the process becomes universal, a larger and larger percentage of the population is becoming involved in the use and the production of new forms of knowledge, but not all people, groups, territories participate equally in these, nor is their knowledge considered of equal value. This produces differences (the cognitive gap) which reflect each group or territory's degree of integration into this knowledge society based on its economic possibilities and level of education.

The report *Towards Knowledge Societies*, published by UNESCO in 2005, highlights the need for today's societies to work to avoid exclusion or marginal participation of citizens in the production and use of knowledge. This organisation insists that the problem does not only mean facilitating access to infrastructures. It insists on providing basic education and training, developing cognitive abilities and establishing appropriate regulations with regard to access to the contents, but also and principally on contributing to developing the capacity to generate

---

<sup>14</sup> «L'intelligence collective n'est pas la fusion des intelligences individuelles dans une sorte de magma communautaire mais, au contraire, la mise en valeur et la relance mutuelle des singularités. Actuellement, non seulement les structures sociales organisent souvent l'ignorance sur les capacités des individus, reconnus par leurs seuls diplômes ou position sociale, mais encore elles bloquent les synergies transversales entre projets, ressources et compétences, elles inhibent les coopérations. Pourtant, la multiplication des intelligences les unes par les autres est la clef du succès économique. Ce serait également une des voies du renouveau de la démocratie. C'est, en définitive, le projet d'une société "intelligente partout", plus efficace et vigoureuse qu'une société intelligemment dirigée. "On passe du cogito cartésien au cogitamus"». (P. Lévy, L'intelligence collective, une nouvelle utopie de la communication? : <http://membres.lycos.fr/natvidal/levy.htm>, consultado el 15 de marzo de 2007).

new contents of knowledge. The latter is of paramount importance since people's abilities are not static, but dynamic, and it is a matter of favouring strategies in which people are protagonists in the changes in knowledge (bringing into play their capacities for diversity, participating in the building of collective knowledge) and not mere adapters of a state of global knowledge, which in any case is vast and permanently evolving.

This knowledge society is the breeding ground in which those transformations which affect the components (cognitive, socio-political, technological-organisational) of development of territorial governance are produced. And it is precisely with regard to this last point, the need to promote the ability of individuals to be protagonists in the creation and evolution of knowledge, which permits the coordination of these three components, pointing them towards a single concept, namely: territorial intelligence.

### ***3.2. Governance and territorial intelligence***

The concept of territorial intelligence, like any idea still in progress is a polysemic idea. The approach that we are proposing here is based on different definitions of territorial intelligence which place emphasis on different aspects of knowledge about the territory, whether that be in reference to all forms of knowledge to understand the territory (GIRARDOT, 2002), to the processes of knowledge or self-knowledge of the territory (DUMAS, 2004), or to the processes of transfer of knowledge among the actors from a single territory (BERTACCHINI, 2004)<sup>15</sup>.

In spite of their different approaches, all these definitions conceive of the territory as a self-organisational reality with a capacity for learning (the ability to apply knowledge and expertise and to vary its state or actions in response to different situations based on past experience) hence the reference to territorial intelligence.

The territory's capacity for learning resides, primarily, in the actors, who have, on the one hand, different access to information, and on the other, different abilities to convert it into knowledge. But in turn, learning can be thought of as an emerging property of the system, in such a way that territories can be considered intelligent systems (or groups of systems), able to mobilise their knowledge and to adapt their states and actions to new circumstances, on a different plane from individual actors. The interaction of these two levels (individual and collective) of learning is what produces territorial knowledge. This is a holographic connection such as exists between society and the individual (NAVARRO, 1994). It is important to insist on one point: in the concept of territorial intelligence which is under discussion here, we only refer to intelligent territory in a metaphorical sense; intelligence resides in the territorial actors and individual agents. Territorial intelligence is based on the specific intelligences spread over the territory and which build knowledge in a conscious act of design, creation, collection, analysis and interpretation and mutualisation of the information they have available.

It has been said above that territory is a space with actors in which production and appropriation of resources occur. In the knowledge society the first resource that needs to be the object of this production and appropriation is the knowledge that exists throughout the

---

<sup>15</sup> For a more detailed look at this concept see the texts linked to the CAENTI (Coordination Action of the European Network of Territorial Intelligence) project website, <http://www.territorial.intelligence.eu>.

territory, as well as the processes which contribute to its creation. In particular, knowledge “of the territory” and of the “action developed in the territory” is converted into knowledge of paramount importance for directing the action in favour of territorial development. Therefore, with regard to territorial governance, territorial intelligence can be defined as all knowledge relating to the understanding of territorial structures and dynamics, as well as the tools used by public and private actors to produce, use and share this knowledge in favour of sustainable territorial development.

In this way, territorial intelligence, based on the resources that the information society offers (new information and communication technologies), involves the production of theories and tools to understand the territory (cognitive plane of territorial governance), but also the way in which the members of a society as a whole produce and take in the knowledge available and apply it to solving their problems (technological-organizational plane). As was explained in the previous section, it is these two components which are called on to develop the socio-political component to allow the vertical and horizontal coordination of action on different levels and in different sectors in the territory in favour of sustainable development.

From this perspective, territorial intelligence is a tool for territorial governance; however both concepts have a complex relationship according to E. Morin (1992), since, in their turn the evolution of territorial governance promotes the development of territorial intelligence. The driving force behind this feedback process is the participation of the actors. The intensity and quality of the participation is what determines the way in which both processes feed off each other.

In fact, if good territorial governance basically refers to “sharing what we jointly know and think as a result of our diversity and then undertaking coordinated, coherent action”, territorial intelligence provides feedback for that process by means of analysis and joint evaluation of the action developed through diversity, resulting in new shared knowledge which allows an improvement in the action. In the knowledge society, where learning is shared, both are faces of the same coin.

Nowadays, thanks to the development of new information and communication technologies, there is an enormous amount of information available and a great many very sophisticated tools for collecting, processing and analysing it. The development of territorial intelligence means putting all this potential at the service of territorial action, contributing to the actors involved, not only institutional decision-makers, but the actors most directly involved in the action in the field, incorporating mechanisms in the course of their ordinary activities to facilitate interaction, promoting their individual and joint ability to manage information, to mutualise it and convert it into knowledge which allows them to assess, redirect or design new action. In this sense the design of tools and participatory work methodologies which allow the actors’ abilities to be developed is of vital importance.

## ***4. RESEARCH-ACTION APPLIED TO THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT OF TERRITORIES.***

### ***4.1. New challenges for research in the knowledge society***

At this point, a matter of crucial importance is analysis of the role that bodies which are traditionally specialists in knowledge, especially universities and research centres play or rather have to play in the promotion and development of territorial intelligence.

It was stated above that in the knowledge society no one can be considered the exclusive trustee of learning and that all those who take part in it possess their own knowledge. In addition, the rapid evolution of knowledge means that this is a learning society, where the emphasis is shifted much more towards the protagonists of the process of acquiring knowledge and less towards the trustees of an always partial knowledge with an expiry date in the near future.

It is obvious that this changes the role of the traditional bodies of knowledge. The first aspect to highlight in this sense is that there is a greater consciousness of the importance of knowledge for human development and this is causing greater concern to society, in general, and public authorities in particular, who now wish to establish a system of “accountability” which would allow the social and economic impact of teaching and research activity to be calibrated (in addition to a tighter check on the results in academic terms).

With regard to the first aspect, teaching work, today it is no longer maintained that these bodies have the almost exclusive rights to the creation of knowledge, nor that they are the only or even principal recognised trustees of economically and socially valued knowledge. Hence society demands a change in their function towards becoming facilitators of learning and transmitters of the methods that help to “learn to learn”. In this vein, they are being asked to reduce the transmission of knowledge to basic, essential, fundamental knowledge, concentrating programmes on the transmission of methods and means of acquiring this knowledge (the scientific method, critically detached reflection) and the connection between theory and practice. What is important for people, as they say today, is not the knowledge itself that is available, but how much of it proves useful for acquiring and building new knowledge that allows us to improve the conditions of our existence, or rather, that make it possible to adapt better to the dizzying changes in the environment.

However, in spite of these transformations in the contents and methods of transmission of knowledge, there is more significant demand for transformation in research activity. In essence, the role of research continues to be focussed on discovery of the world around us, innovation (invention as a means to produce economic value or social utility) and critical reflection on problems that affect humanity. *The change is focused on certain elements of the way in which research is carried out in a society in which topics are more and more complex and in which knowledge and information are spread far and wide.*

In fact, today a large number of the topics which interest society such as biotechnology, nanosciences, human genetics, the genetics of populations, research into urban life and territorial dynamics, sustainable management of resources, or global warming, are extraordinarily complex, and their analysis requires the cross-sectional intervention of a number of disciplines. In these cases, the uncertainty associated with causal chains established by models, often due to a lack of information, causes the scientific results to be open to multiple interpretations.

For this reason, today’s society makes two clear demands with regard to the way in which the research is carried out:

- In the first place, the demand is for participatory research, both from the point of view of intervention from different disciplines, and from the point of view of forming teams comprising other professionals and actors from the public sector or civil society. The presence of the latter is indispensable, because although they are not specialised in

research their experience can contribute by supplying or producing information and different points of view to help establish working hypotheses and procedures for assessing the veracity of the results.

- Secondly, society is also demanding greater transparency as regards the dissemination of the results, especially in aspects which substantially affect human life and which have ethical implications, so that the best informed public debate possible can be produced.

Obviously, this cooperative way of tackling research may not make any sense in the field of basic or fundamental research, where results are not immediately applicable, or in topics intended for critical reflection regarding nature and humanity, which try to produce theories with a high level of abstraction. However, this type of collaboration between research and actors directly involved in the subjects under investigation proves very advantageous for both parties in most applied fields in the following ways:

- In one way, the researchers will have more sources of information available to them and a greater variety of points of view to focus the problems; this affects the quality of the results in terms of relevance, rigour and veracity (as they say “a science that examines all arguments is always more and not less rigorous”).
- On the other hand, for non-scientific actors involved, participation in the research will have the advantage of training in scientific methods and values and the ability to establish greater critical distance in relation to the problems posed, enriching their knowledge of the topics which concern them most (experiments in which the ill consciously take part in research in the field of medicine, research in the field of company organisation which include clients or workers, studies into ecological agriculture which include farmers, and those in the field of engineering that work with companies, are some good examples of this type).

#### ***4.2. Participatory research-action as a producer of territorial intelligence***

*If the participatory dynamic described in the previous section proves today to be enormously productive in very different fields of applied research, this becomes absolutely indispensable in relation to the development and promotion of territorial intelligence. And this is important in order to encourage sustainable development in the sense that we have defined it here, since, as we have argued in this work, the promotion of territorial intelligence is a sine qua non condition of the governance of territorial development.*

The development of territorial governance requires, first of all, knowledge of the territorial dynamic to generate comprehensive visions of the principal problems that affect lasting territorial development. However, scientific knowledge about territory is an uncertain form of knowledge. This is due to the fact that scarcity of information, errors in measurement and indetermination of results are often the norm. There is a lack of indicators on a territorial level, especially on a local scale, both owing to a shortage of data and because much of the data available about territory does not represent relevant information.

At the same time, what is important for action is not the comparative situation of local indicators in relation to other contexts (this, at most can justify the action), but the analysis of why those territorial indicators change and what the importance of global determinants is as well as that of local ones (this allows the action to be planned). However, the study of this last point is a complex matter, in terms of the difficulty of identifying and quantifying causal links

among a multitude of potential factors; as a result of this, scientific knowledge of territory is usually ambiguous and different legitimate interpretations based on observations or assessments of identical data usually co-exist.

In this case in particular, the values acquire special importance when it comes to interpreting the results. This is why, in order to produce relevant knowledge of territory the participation of the territorial actors involved becomes particularly necessary, including the population itself for whom the action is intended or who are directly affected by the problems under analysis, different types of knowledge are brought into play and different value systems are explicitly proposed, using which the scientific results can be interpreted.

But the principal value of participation is not only that the territorial actors produce in the course of carrying out their actions, very valuable information for producing theories and models relating to territorial dynamics, nor even that their knowledge is paramount for the interpretation of the results. The fundamental contribution of participatory dynamics is that, when it achieves the complete involvement of territorial actors in the process of converting information into knowledge, and even manages to incorporate research activity into its courses of action, there is a direct impact on the actors' capacity for learning from their own experience, and their possibility of adapting to change, stimulating their individual intelligence and improving their capacity for action on the territory.

Additionally, insofar as the territorial knowledge required is comprehensive knowledge, the research must not only involve researchers from different disciplines, but actors from different sectors should also take part (Girardot, 2005). However, this is a much more complex matter, as it requires the research to be developed within the framework of partnerships of territorial actors who should act on the same problems.

The difficulty lies in the fact that there are many obstacles to the correct functioning of partnership actions on territory. These are both institutional in nature, including a lack of confidence, and technical, for example limitations in the abilities of actors to work together<sup>16</sup> (OECD, 2005). Hence the results in terms of territorial governance are not as efficient and democratic as would be hoped.

It is here that participatory research dynamics can produce a greater impact, since the fact of compiling, producing, analysing information and interpreting the results collectively, on the one hand increases the individual capacities of the actors, mobilising the potential ability to produce and process knowledge about the field of action, and on the other hand, can contribute to favouring consensus as to diagnoses of the principal problems, or at least a common base of information and knowledge on which to discuss the discrepancies. All this makes possible the proposal for joint comprehensive solutions, which is the first step towards coherence and coordination of action on territory. On this point, it is important to clarify that for this connection between research and action to be effective, *the dynamic has to involve actors who really have more direct contact with the field*, as it is their contribution of systems of knowledge of the effects and determinants of their actions that can have a greater effect on territorial action in the long term (learning), regardless of whether the involvement of those in charge at an institutional level is indispensable for reaching agreements to establish the appropriate synergies.

---

<sup>16</sup> For a reasonably detailed analysis of these obstacles see OECD (2005).

In this way, participatory research proves to be a basic premise of territorial intelligence and hence of territorial governance.

To sum up, what is being proposed here is that the challenges of territorial governance require a type of applied research in the vein of research-action: an approach with a long-standing tradition in the social sciences and with less impact on other disciplines, which enhances the complementarity between the scientific world and the action of human groups.

Applied to the field of territorial governance, research-action, which in this context can be nothing other than participatory, can be defined as that type of research in which researchers and territorial actors are involved and which is dual purpose: scientific, to improve knowledge of a specific aspect of the territorial structure and/or dynamic; and practical, to act on a specific problem in this territory.

However, in spite of the fact that recent years have produced advances in this field from different perspectives and approaches (DICK, 2004, 2006), research-action of the type we are describing here continues to be marginal, even in the field of the social sciences, at least if publications on these matters in the principal journals from the different scientific areas are considered. There may be various reasons for this development. In the first place, it may be because the results of these research projects are normally observed in the very long term and are usually quite difficult to express in terms of what are normally considered conventional scientific results. A second point is that the results described are normally in political terms (the results of the action or the impact on the actors) but there are fewer descriptions in terms of contribution to territorial knowledge. However, perhaps the main reason that these projects are not extended further is due to the fact that the dynamic of carrying out research and action together (researchers and actors working multidisciplinary and multisectorially) is really very complicated, due essentially to the lack of tools to promote and facilitate cooperative learning.

Hence part of the effort that has to be carried out by specialist knowledge bodies is precisely the design and creation of tools which contribute to the development of these participatory processes. In this sense the potential of new information and communication technologies is huge. At the same time, it is also necessary for universities and research centres to work towards the goal of making available knowledge and tools that are accessible to territorial actors for analysis of the territory, thereby making the best use of currently underused systems for the treatment and analysis of information. Lastly, from the institutional point of view, new rules need to be written allowing protocols and precise standards to be established for the development of this systematic, participatory, long-term work, creating networks of confidence, guaranteeing transparency, critical distance and veracity in the results and establishing basic rules for the appropriation and exploitation of results.

The work that the members of CAENTI WP5-GOVERNANCE have set themselves is precisely that of starting to draw up this normative framework relating to research applied to economically, socially and environmentally sustainable territorial development<sup>17</sup>.

The objective for the first year is to reach a consensus on the formulation of a series of *basic principles that the members think must be observed by the protocols of research-action applied to territorial development, in such a way that the processes and results of the*

---

<sup>17</sup> The progress of this work can be followed at <http://territorial-intelligence.eu>.

*research allow the promotion of good governance.* In the forthcoming years, the question of specific protocols will be tackled by the drawing up of a *quality charter for research-action applied to territorial development.*

### ***4.3. The application of the governance principles of sustainable development to research-action***

The principles presented below, as well as their formulation, have come from a number of sources: first of all, they are based on the considerations laid out in the previous sections, which are, in general, shared by the members of the project; secondly, they have taken inspiration from the extensive experience in carrying out research-action projects applied to territorial development of the participants in the CAENTI project (compiled in the individual experience catalogues drawn up in CAENTI WP5-GOVERNANCE); thirdly, they have been expressed in concrete terms by members during the deliberations held at the three scientific meetings which took place during the first phase and discussed by means of the exchange of members' documents and impressions on Coospace, the virtual platform for scientific collaboration.

Therefore, the statement of the nine principles, which according to the members of CAENTI WP5 have to be observed by the research-action processes as applied to sustainable development for the promotion of good governance, is as follows:

- *Transformation*: this is a principle which serves as a premise for all the others proposed below and which consists of explicit recognition of the transforming effect research can have on reality, especially when carried out in relation to social problems.
- *Multidimensionality*: the objectives of research-action are to focus multidimensionally and multisectorially, trying to ensure in any case that the participation of the disciplines and sectors involved is balanced, corresponds to the characteristics of the problem in hand and helps to achieve a global vision.
- *Partnership*: the research-action processes must include among their objectives the involvement of territorial partnerships which may be concerned with the question under analysis, or else promote the creation and development of them whenever these partnerships do not exist.
- *Participation*: the process must also be designed in such a way that the participation of local actors is produced effectively at all levels, from institutional decision-makers to those actors most directly facing the needs of the field, and of course, the population affected.
- *Sustainability*: the research-action processes must be long-term propositions, so that evolutionary knowledge of the problems that affect the territories can be produced. The theories, models and databanks produced in this way will allow the long-term dynamics, and therefore the determining factors of sustainability of the development model to be understood and monitored.

- *Transparency*: the research-action processes must also have as their objective an increase in the transparency of the results, both of the research and the action, facilitating decision-making and contributing to this becoming more democratic.
- *Co-responsibility*: in the research-action process, the “actor-investigators” and the “investigator-actors” are equally responsible for the progress of the project and the results reached and this must be reflected in the distribution of the work.
- *Co-evaluation*: the objectives of the research-action are to include systematic assessment of the process to allow feedback and the redirection of the objectives in line with transformation of the initial context.
- *Co-learning*: the research-action processes must facilitate the cooperative learning of all the participants, improving the capacity of the whole system of territorial actors to find solutions to their problems by making best use of their past experience. In other words, research-action must promote and strengthen the development of territorial intelligence.

As in the case of the principles of good governance stated by the European Union, each of these principles is important in itself, however, the efficacy of their application depends on all of them being respected simultaneously. In addition, for them really to achieve the desired effects they have to be observed in each and every phase of the research: the selection of topics to research, the methodology, the objectives and the systems to be used for dissemination and technological transfer of the results.

The statement of these principles allows us to clarify in what way research-action can contribute to promoting the governance of sustainable development.

As compiled in the WP5 document “*Analysis of the application of the governance principles of sustainable development to territorial research-action*” summarising the conclusions of the working group at the 1<sup>st</sup> CAENTI International Conference at Alba Iulia (Romania), although systematic assessment of the impact of research-action into territorial governance is not sufficiently developed, analysis of the results of the experience compiled in the catalogues put together by the universities participating in CAENTI allows us to outline some positive aspects of the application of an approach that follows these principles.

First of all, in general terms, this type of research, by encouraging actors to share their information and knowledge of the territory, would make possible better adaptation of actions to the needs of the territory, greater coordination and coherence of actions and policies and improved allocation of resources. In turn, to the extent that it can be translated into an improvement in transparency and an increase in the mutual confidence among actors, it could greatly strengthen social capital and promote its distribution in society as a whole.

Another meaningful expected effect of this kind of research-action processes is actors’ appropriation of scientific methods and tools for analysing, managing, and evaluating territorial projects. This is the case because an essential part of these processes consists of adapting these methods and tools to the specific needs of the field. All this can contribute to extending a culture of evaluation of territory allowing actors more systematic learning from their experiences. The consequence of all the effects mentioned, on the whole, is

empowerment of actors, which, in turn, can contribute in large measure to improving their capacity to undertake action.

The benefits for research, as the CAENTI researchers have emphasised, are obvious as well. Processes of this kind provide much more pertinent information and allow the research results to be compared more directly.

Unfortunately, however, the formulation of these principles does not mean their automatic application. In fact, as the members' practical experience shows, reflected in their experience catalogues, their application is quite complex and places certain limits on carrying out research-action processes which have been developed from this standpoint. The principal obstacles in this sense relate to the institutional context in which these experiences are produced. Some of these are raised in the following paragraphs.

As regards research, although the need for development of multidisciplinary approaches to be carried out in partnerships is widely recognised, neither research funding systems nor means of scientific dissemination, nor the structure of academic merits promote this type of project, especially in the field of the social sciences.

In terms of action, there are also several factors limiting the applicability and extension of research-action practices: the urgency of territorial needs which do not allow for the use of time and resources in research, the imposed "management by projects" system which has the effect of fragmenting public policies and actions, on many occasions territorial actors lack the necessary expertise to appropriate and internalize research methods and tools properly, incorporating them into their daily management and, of course, the willingness of actors to take part in genuine, long-term participatory processes does not always materialise and does not normally occur automatically .

Therefore, generation of these positive results is by no means automatic. In addition, the development of a culture of participation which favours the development of territorial intelligence is not a linear process. There are so many variables involved that advances can often be followed by significant setbacks with strong adverse effects (institutional confidence failures, for example). This is the reason why it is so important to analyse these research-action processes and to study in depth the possible methodological and ethical rules which might lead to better results. That is the direction of development for the *quality charter* which will be drawn up during 2007.

A very important question which remains to be answered in the subsequent phases of CAENTI WP5 is analysis of the potentialities and the limits that the use of information and communication technologies can bring to this process.

## **5. CONCLUSIONS**

To sum up, as the experience of research teams and CAENTI actors reveals in their experience catalogues, the attempt to respond to the challenges that sustainable development and its governance in the sphere of territory pose for scientific activity today, both from the point of view of contents and methods, represents a unique opportunity for the sciences,

especially the social sciences, to reassess their contribution to society and for scientists to renew their role as professionals who are specialists in the production, transmission and management of knowledge. This is not merely a technical transformation, but also a political one, since it is a question of placing research at the service of democratic governance in favour of sustainable development. In this sense research is explicitly involved in achieving human development.

Territorial development also needs a new science-society model. Territorial governance reveals that science's contribution to sustainable development, in addition to demanding close collaboration among research centres and companies, as a source of innovation and economic growth, also requires that knowledge bodies work closely together with territorial actors who create or produce social cohesion, in order to promote their capacity for action in this way. The latter is indispensable from the ethical point of view if we accept that human development is by definition an act of solidarity. But in the same way it is if we focus solely on reasons for economic growth through an increase in productivity and territorial competition.

Working for social cohesion means, among many other things, extending education and professional training, promoting decent work, contributing to the development of territories' social capital and reducing conflicts and tensions, all of which are key aspects for maintaining productivity in the knowledge society. It is a question of admitting that the resources of social innovation, the creation of value through invention, are not the exclusive domain of companies but also of all the actors who participate in the processes of territorial governance.

This new relationship transcends the traditional role of science as adviser, as supposedly neutral counsel, whose reports and analyses are only considered by territorial actors when it suits them for reasons of mediation or for partisan purposes. The alliance that is proposed here is different in nature; it is one of shared knowledge, of co-responsibility in the generation of knowledge, one of a commitment to maintain confidentiality when this is agreed, but also to establish a clear policy to disseminate results to contribute transparency, critical distance and veracity to territorial governance, traditional scientific values which are perfectly functional in that field.

However, the creation of this alliance requires something more than determination; it requires coordination of scientific policies with territorial policies, and both of these with the lifelong learning policy. An institutional framework of this nature would definitely promote the development of territorial intelligence.

## ***6. BIBLIOGRAPHY***

ANAND, S. y SEN A. (1994): "Desarrollo Humano Sostenible: Conceptos y Prioridades".

Available at

[http://portal.unu.org.do/contenidos/archivos/\(%20traducci%C3%B3n\)%20Desarrollo%20humano%20sostenible.pdf](http://portal.unu.org.do/contenidos/archivos/(%20traducci%C3%B3n)%20Desarrollo%20humano%20sostenible.pdf)

- ASENSIO, M. J. (2004): “El modelo de Desarrollo Sostenible”. Sustainable Development Module. University Master’s in Social Economics and Local Development. University of Huelva. Mimeograph.
- BASKERVILLE, R. L. (1999): “Investigating information systems with action research”. Communications of the association for information systems, Volume 2, Article 19 October 1999, Available at [http://www.cis.gsu.edu/~rbaskerv/CAIS\\_2\\_19/CAIS\\_2\\_19.html](http://www.cis.gsu.edu/~rbaskerv/CAIS_2_19/CAIS_2_19.html)
- BERVEJILLO, F. (1998): “La reinención del territorio. Un desafío para ciudadanos y planificadores”, Universidad Católica de Uruguay, Mimeographed draft.
- BOISIER, S. (1997): “El vuelo de una cometa. Una metáfora para una teoría del desarrollo territorial”, *Estudios Regionales*, núm. 48, pp. 41-79.
- BRYDON-MILER, M., GREENWOOD, D., MAGUIRE, P. (2003): “Why action research?” *Action Research*, Vol. 1 (1): 9-28, <http://arj.sagepub.com>.
- CENTER FOR DEMOCRACY AND GOVERNANCE, Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support, and Research U.S. Agency for International Development (2000): Decentralization And Democratic Local Governance Programming Handbook, Technical Publication Series, Washington.
- COGHLAN, D. SHANI, A.B. (2005): “Roles, Politics, and Ethics in Action research Design” *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, Vol. 18, nº 6, December 2005
- COMMISSION DES COMMUNAUTES EUROPÉENNES (2001): Gouvernance européenne. Un livre blanc. COM (2001) 428 final.
- DICK, B. (2004): “Action research literature 2004-2006: Themes and trends”, *Action Research*, Vol. 2 (4): 425-444, <http://arj.sagepub.com>.
- DICK, B. (2006): “Action research literature”, *Action Research*, Vol. 4 (4): 439-458, <http://arj.sagepub.com>.
- FOX, N. J. (2003): “Practice-Based Evidence: Towards Collaborative and Transgressive Research”. *Sociology*, 37 (I), 81-102.
- FRANCO, P. (1998): “Los principios estratégicos: el abordaje multidimensional, el partenariado y la participación”, *Políticas sociales en Europa*, núm. 3, «Estrategias europeas frente a la exclusión social», pp. 35-44, Hacer, Barcelona.
- GIRARDOT, J. J. (2005): “Intelligence territoriale et participation”. Available at <http://labiso.be/ecolloque/forums/read.php?3,197,197>.
- JÁUREGUI, G. (2000): *La democracia planetaria*, ediciones Nobel, Oviedo.
- JUAN, S. (1999): *Méthodes de recherche en sciences sociohumaines. Exploration critique des techniques*. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.
- LELOUP F., MOYART L., PECQUEUR B., 2004 : "La gouvernance territoriale comme nouveau mode de coordination territoriale?", *Actes des 4emes journées de la proximité "Proximité, réseaux et coordinations"*, 17-18 juin 2004, 15 p. Available at [http://iga.ujf-grenoble.fr/territoires/publications/documents%20en%20ligne/pequeur\\_proximite\\_04.pdf](http://iga.ujf-grenoble.fr/territoires/publications/documents%20en%20ligne/pequeur_proximite_04.pdf)
- LÉVY, P. (1994): *L'intelligence collective. Pour une anthropologie du cyberspace* La Découverte, Paris.
- LÉVY, P. (1994): Inteligencia Colectiva, Humanidad emergente en el mundo del ciberespacio, available at <http://espora.org/biblioweb/cultura/inteligencia1.html>
- LÉVY, P. (1998): « L'intelligence collective, une nouvelle utopie de la communication? » available at <http://membres.lycos.fr/natvidal/levy.htm>
- LUNDY, P., McGovern, M. (2006): “Participation, Truth and Partiality: Participatory Action Research, Community-based Truth-telling and Post-conflict Transition in Northern Ireland”. *Sociology*. 40(1), pp. 71-88
- MARTÍNEZ, M. (1998): “Lo complejo es el contexto. Exploración participativa, intervención estratégica y autogestión en el Ecosistema Social”, paper submitted at the VI Spanish Conference of Sociology, Septiembre 1998, A Coruña (Spain).

- MEADOWS, D. H. et al. (1972): *The Limits to Growth*, Universe Books, New York.
- MELDOLESI, L. (1997): *En búsqueda de lo posible. El sorprendente mundo de Albert O. Hirschman*, Fondo de Cultura Económica, México.
- NOFFKE, S. E. (1997): “Professional, Personal and Political Dimensions of Action Research”. *Review of Research in Education*, 22, pp. 305-343.
- NUSSBAUM, M. and SEN A. (eds.) (1993): *The Quality of Life*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- PERROUX, F. (1984): *El desarrollo y la nueva concepción de la dinámica económica*, Serbal/Unesco, Barcelona.
- RAMÍREZ-PÉREZ, M.A., NAVARRO-YÁÑEZ, C.J., CLARK, T.N (2004): “Local governance”: redes de responsividad en un espacio de “multi-governance”, IX International Congress of CLAD on State and Public Administration Reform, Madrid, Spain, 2 – 5 Nov. 2004.
- SEN, A. (1992): *Inequality Re-examined*, Oxford Clarendon Press; and Cambridge, MA Harvard University Press.
- SHANI, A.B. , PASMORE, W.A. (1985): Organization inquiry: Towards a new model of the action research process. In Warrick, D.D. (ed.) *Contemporary Organization development: Current Thinking and Applications*, Scott, Foresman, Glenview, IL., pp. 438-448.
- SMALL, S. A. (1995): “Action-Oriented Research: Models and Methods”. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57(4), 941-955.
- SMITH, M. K. (2001): “Kurt Lewin: Groups, Experiential Learning and Action Research”. *The Encyclopedia of Informal Education*. Available at <http://www.infed.org/thinkers/et-lewin.htm> (accessed August 2006).
- SOMEKH, B. (1995): “The Contributions of Action Research to Development in Social Endeavours: A Position Paper on Action Research Methodology”. *British Educational Research Journal*, 21(3), 339-355.
- Tripp, D. H. (1990): “Socially Critical Action Research”. *Theory into Practice*, 29 (3), 158-166
- TULCHIN, J. S. Y SELEE, A. (2004): *Decentralization and Democratic Governance in Latin America*. Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington, D.C. [www.wilsoncenter.org](http://www.wilsoncenter.org)
- UNESCO (2005): *Hacia las sociedades del conocimiento*, París. Available at Anand, S. y Sen A. (1994): “Desarrollo Humano Sostenible: Conceptos y Prioridades”. Available at [http://portal.onu.org.do/contenidos/archivos/\(%20traducci%C3%B3n\)%20Desarrollo%20humano%20sostenible.pdf#search=%22Sen%20Anand%20Desarrollo%20Humano%20Sostenible%3A%20Conceptos%20y%20Prioridades%22](http://portal.onu.org.do/contenidos/archivos/(%20traducci%C3%B3n)%20Desarrollo%20humano%20sostenible.pdf#search=%22Sen%20Anand%20Desarrollo%20Humano%20Sostenible%3A%20Conceptos%20y%20Prioridades%22)
- WADSWORTH, Y. (2005): “‘Gouldner’s child?’ Some reflections on sociology and participatory action research”. *Journal of Sociology*, 41(3), 267-284
- WILLIAMSON, G. R. and PROSSER, S. (2002): Action research: Politics, ethics and participation, *J. Adv. Nurs.* 40 (5), 587-593.

#### Web sites

Territorial Intelligence web site: <http://www.territorial-intelligence.eu>

OECD LEED Programme web site:

[http://www.oecd.org/document/43/0,2340,en\\_2649\\_34417\\_1935339\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/document/43/0,2340,en_2649_34417_1935339_1_1_1_1,00.html)

- Local Governance and the Drivers of Growth (June 2005).
- Evaluating Local Economic and Employment Development: How to Assess What Works among Programmes and Policies (January 2005).

- New Forms of Governance for Economic Development (November 2004).
- Managing Decentralisation: A New Role for Labour Market Policy (November 2003).
- Local Partnerships for Better Governance (November 2001).
- Decentralising Employment Policy: New Trends and Challenges (April 1999).
- Local Management for More Effective Employment Policies (1998).

***APPENDIX I: CATALOGUE OF EXPERIENCE - RESEARCH TEAM DOCUMENT***



**CAENTI**  
Coordination Action of the European  
Network of Territorial Intelligence

**Analysis of the application of the principles of  
governance of sustainable development in  
territorial research-action**

**Workpackage 5**

**University of -----**  
**Research team name**  
**Catalogues of experiences**

*Autors*

**I. GENERAL DATA**

**Organizational data**

**Topics**

**Ethical principles of the research team**

**II. ANALYSIS OF THE DEVELOPED RESEARCH-ACTION  
EXPERIENCES**

**1) Applicability of the research-action concept**

**2) Analysis of main results**

**III. BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*APPENDIX II: CATALOGUE OF EXPERIENCES – PROJECT DOCUMENT*



**Analysis of the application of the principles of governance of sustainable development in territorial research-action**

**Workpackage 5**

**University of -----**  
**Research team name**  
 Catalogues of experiences

Technical document

**« Project name »**

<b>Name of the projet :</b>
<b>Responsibles :</b>
<b>Concerned ThéMA research team(s) :</b>
<b>Other associated research teams) :</b>
<b>Partner(s) – actor(s) who are associated to this study :</b>  -
<b>Financing mode :</b>

--

<b>Context of the study :</b>
-------------------------------

--

<b>Nature and goal of the research project :</b>
--

--

<b>Applicability of the « research-action » concept</b>
---

--

<b>Methodology</b>
--------------------

--

<b>Analysis of the main results (regarding to governance)</b>
---

--

<b>Limits and perpetuation</b>
--------------------------------

--