



Survey of rural territorial development policies and programs in Mexico ¹

Authors: Mauricio Soberanes Hernández, María José Burgin

Executive Summary

The survey presented in the pages that follow is based on data available online and in public documents. For the purposes of this exercise, we defined territorial policies and programs as those that explicitly state that they utilize or apply a territorial approach, pursue objectives of territorial development, or contain one or more territorial development components.

The data is presented in the form of entries, each of which contains: the title or name of the initiative; general background information; a section on the lead, executor and co-executor agencies (identification and general description); general and specific objectives; type and number of beneficiaries, clients or users; methodology and instruments; types of activities; main results, effects and impacts, including evaluations (where applicable); budget and financing; contact information; and bibliographical references.

Following the initial selection and a depuration, there was a total of 70 entries, one for each territorial policy and program. The entries are presented in two groups: federal (27) and state (43). The latter correspond to the states of Chiapas, Oaxaca, Guerrero and Michoacán.

As this effort was implemented, federal public administration changes began to take place in a shift characterized by the grouping and apparent reduction of public policy instruments. A significant portion of these changes impacted the federative entities that act as executor counterpart and co-investor. However,

¹ This working paper has been originally published in Spanish: Soberanes, M. y Burgin, M. J. 2009. "Catastro de políticas y programas de desarrollo territorial rural en México". Documento de Trabajo N°28. Programa Dinámicas Territoriales Rurales. Rimisp, Santiago, Chile. This document can be accessed through the following link www.rimisp.org/dtr/documentos.

thus far this has not led to the horizontal and vertical coordination needed in order for the effect of its actions to be reflected in the value of the territory that some of these programs intend.

In addition to the multiplicity of programs, we observed limited participation of beneficiaries and a lack of coordination among the three levels of government (federal, state and municipal), with the resulting dispersion and dissipation of efforts. At the same time, there was a clear tendency towards openness to spaces for coming together, as yet in an advisory manner, and the incorporation of territorial criteria into the design of more public programs and policies.