STATE AND SOCIETY IN BUILDING CAPACITIES TO STRENGTHEN PRACTICES OF TERRITORIAL GOVERNANCE

Valdir Roque Dallabrida[*]
Pedro Luís Büttenbender[**]
António Manuel Alhinho Covas[***]
Maria das Mercês Cabrita de Mendonça Covas[****]
Pablo Costamagna[*****]
Elaine Cristina de Oliveira Menezes[*]

[*]Universidade Federal do Paraná, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Desenvolvimento Territorial Sustentável, Matinhos, PR, Brazil
[**]Universidade Regional do Noroeste do Estado do Rio Grande do Sul, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Desenvolvimento Regional, Ijuí, RS, Brazil
[***]Universidade do Algarve, Faculdade de Economia, Faro, Algarve, Portugal
[****]Universidade do Algarve, Faculdade de Ciências Humanas e Sociais, Faro, Algarve, Portugal
[*****]Instituto Praxis/Universidad Tecnológica Nacional, Faculdade Regional de Rafaela, Rafaela, Santa Fe, Argentina

Abstract

This research assumes that processes of territorial articulation, in order to achieve the desired territorial future, require democratic, horizontal, and collaborative practices of territorial governance, involving state agents and representatives from the social, productive-business and academic sectors. Highly complex environments together with the current digital transformation have significantly changed the agenda across territories. These issues have led to questioning the competencies and capabilities of the territorial actors with regard to their performances in the processes of territorial articulation. Against this backdrop, the notion has been ratified that this systemic complexity is assimilated through a methodological, multi-referential hybridism, which includes processes of co-production and action research. The objective of this article is to produce theoretical and methodological contributions in order to address the challenges posed to the state and society in building capabilities for practices of territorial governance. The text has been structured as a theoretical essay referenced in Latin American academic production regarding the subject.

Keywords

State; Society; Territorial Governance; Capabilities; Territorial Articulation.

ESTADO E SOCIEDADE NA CONSTRUÇÃO DE CAPACIDADES PARA FORTALECER PRÁTICAS DE GOVERNANÇA TERRITORIAL

*Valdir Roque Dallabrida**

*Pedro Luís Büttenbender***

*António Manuel Alhinho Covas****

*Maria das Mercês Cabrita de Mendonça Covas*****

*Pablo Costamagna******

*Elaine Cristina de Oliveira Menezes**

*Universidade Federal do Paraná, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Desenvolvimento Territorial Sustentável, Matinhos, PR, Brasil

**Universidade Regional do Noroeste do Estado do Rio Grande do Sul, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Desenvolvimento Regional, Ijuí, RS, Brasil

***Universidade do Algarve, Faculdade de Economia, Faro, Algarve, Portugal

****Universidade do Algarve, Faculdade de Ciências Humanas e Sociais, Faro, Algarve, Portugal

*****Instituto Praxis/Universidad Tecnológica Nacional, Faculdade Regional de Rafaela, Rafaela, Santa Fe, Argentina

Resumo

Parte-se do entendimento de que processos de articulação territorial, com vistas à prospecção do futuro desejado territorialmente, exigem práticas de governança colaborativa, horizontal e democrática, envolvendo agentes estatais e representações dos setores sociais, produtivo-empresarial e universitários. Ambientes de alta complexidade, aliados à transformação digital contemporânea, alteraram significativamente a agenda dos territórios, permitindo questionar as competências e capacidades dos atores territoriais para atuar em processos de articulação territorial. Isso ratifica a visão de que essa complexidade sistêmica seja assimilada por intermédio de um hibridismo metodológico, multirreferencial, que contemple processos de coprodução e pesquisa-ação. O objetivo deste artigo é gerar aportes teórico-metodológicos para abordar os desafios postos ao Estado e à sociedade na construção de capacidades para as práticas de governança territorial. O texto está estruturado na forma de um ensaio teórico, referenciado na produção acadêmica latino-americana sobre o tema.

Palavras-chave

Estado; Sociedade; Governança Territorial; Capacidades; Articulação Territorial.

STATE AND SOCIETY IN BUILDING CAPACITIES TO STRENGTHEN PRACTICES OF TERRITORIAL GOVERNANCE[1]

Valdir Roque Dallabrida
Pedro Luís Büttenbender
António Manuel Alhinho Covas
Maria das Mercês Cabrita de Mendonça Covas
Pablo Costamagna
Elaine Cristina de Oliveira Menezes

Introduction

In the first quarter of 2021, an investigation began with the aim of developing studies, and proposing and validating a methodological instrument that would be more appropriate for the perspective of territorial analysis. The aim was also to contribute to the production of territorial diagnoses that would favor the prospection of innovative, sustainable alternatives of development, with territorial heritage as a reference. This debate resulted in the publication of two texts at the beginning of the second half of 2021: (i) Dallabrida, Rotta and Büttenbender (2021), in which the epistemic-theoretical assumptions of the research were presented; and (ii) Dallabrida et al. (2021), in which the conceptual categories and methodological assumptions converging with a territorial approach to development were expounded.

In consonance with epistemic foundations, a theoretical framework based on four conceptual categories was assumed by the project: territory, territorial governance, territorial heritage and territorial development. The analytical

categories of the geographical method by Santos (1997) were taken as a guideline, and a relationship was established with the territorial dynamics of development. Thus, the four conceptual categories were organized as follows:

i. **a starting-off category**, the *territory*, as a socio-territorial **structure** located historically and territorially, whose parts are interrelated;

ii. **an intermediation category**, the practices of *territorial governance*, as a **process** in which different interests/intentions are confronted, with the purpose of building convergences regarding the desired territorial future, starting from an understanding that the form historically assumed by a structure results from horizontal social conversations;

iii. **a resulting category**, the *territorial heritage*, as the **form** assumed by the socio-territorial structure, formatting the spatial arrangement with its different dimensions;

iv. **a functionality category**, the *territorial development* (or local/regional development), as a **function** of form, based on the understanding that, from the confrontation between different future projects, administratively demarcated spatial configurations result (municipalities, regions, countries) or through relations of identity, anchoring and belonging to a place (territories), and are part of the desired territorial utopia and its momentary concreteness as a possible reality (DALLABRIDA, 2020a).

The challenge of assuming the dynamics of territorial planning and management based on methodological-theoretical-epistemic assumptions converging with the territorial approach implies using procedures of territorial articulation, which do not counter one another. Therefore, one question deserves attention: which methodological foundations should be assumed by the actors in the articulation process with a view to carrying out the territorial diagnosis and planning? This questioning refers to essential questions on the subject studied, such as the practice of territorial governance. Le Galès (2014) defined governance as a coordination process of actors, social groups and institutions, with the intent of achieving defined and collectively discussed objectives.[2]

---

2. Here, we knowledge both the convergences and the specificities of two concepts, governance and governmentality, the latter being coined by Michel Foucault. Cf. FOUCAULT, M. Governmentality. In: BURCHELL, G.; GORDON, C.; MILLER, P. (Eds.). *The Foucault effect: studies in governmentality.* Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1991. p. 87-104.

> Governance refers to both a public and private set of institutions, networks, directives, regulations, norms, political and social uses that contribute to the stability of a society and a political regime, its orientation, the capabilities to direct and provide services and to ensure its legitimacy (LE GALÈS, 2014, p. 301).[3]

As a derivative concept, territorial governance is understood here as the articulation processes by actors within a territory, on a collaborative basis, involving state agents and representations from the social, business and academic sectors, in relationships marked by horizontality and democratic practice, with a view to solving public problems and/or planning the desired territorial future (DALLABRIDA, 2015).[4]

The question raised imposes the challenge of a theoretical reflection that may inspire both the research process on which this article is based and others with similar objectives. This reflection should serve as a methodological path or pedagogical orientation for territorial articulation as a practice of territorial governance. This is the intended contribution of this text. Methodologically, in the form of a theoretical essay, it is based on the academic production of researchers who are members of the research project mentioned in a footnote, and on contributions from the available Latin American literature on the subject, covering the following topics: (i) theoretical-practical contributions on planning from the perspective of the territorial approach; (ii) the process of territorial articulation and planning in contemporaneity; (iii) building capabilities in the process of territorial articulation; and (iv) final considerations.

Planning from the perspective of a territorial approach

The debate on the territorial approach to development emerges as a proposal to overcome the sectoral focus of economic activities, to assuage the spatial dichotomy between rural and urban, countryside versus city, and to recognize the protagonism of civil society actors, taking into account the bottom-up perspective of action. "Territory is viewed and understood as a space and field in which these processes are established and take place, thus becoming an important unit for the planning and implementation of development actions" (SCHNEIDER et al., 2010, p. 28).

An understanding of planning, from the perspective of recognizing the protagonism of civil society actors, is not affiliated with any of the extremes

---

3. This and all other non-English citations hereafter have been translated by the authors.

4. See Other approaches regarding territorial governance in: FARINÓS, J. D. Gobernanza territorial para el desarrollo sostenible: estado de la cuestión y agenda. *Boletín de la A.G.E.*, n. 46, p. 11-32, 2008.

accepted by theoretical trends that either emphasize the exclusive role of the State or reject the State and representations from the productive-business sector, giving exclusivity to the role of social actors. It advocates an alternative path, namely, arguing that processes of territorial articulation with a view to the prospection of a desired territorial future must result from practices of collaborative territorial governance, involving state agents and representations from the social, productive-business and academic sectors, in relationships guided by horizontality and democratic practice. The presence of the State in processes of this nature is fundamental in providing public policies that enable the preservation of citizens' rights, in addition to contributing to the effectiveness of social cohesion and integration.

Practices of territorial governance require a balance between economic, social and environmental dimensions in development processes, which implies that they need to be grounded in architectures with democratic, participatory and cooperative capabilities and dynamics (BÜTTENBENDER; SAUSEN, 2020). Complementing this, Saquet (2018) highlighted that practices of territorial governance are necessarily participatory, dialogic and reflexive, involving and valuing the differences, inequalities and identities of each place and territory, without becoming disconnected from the world. Emphasis is also given to close relationships, solidarity, popular culture, anchoring, artisanal production, agroecological practices, and specific soil and climate conditions of ecosystems, among other characteristics.

Taking into account the considerations made by Schneider and Saquet, a process of socio-institutional articulation with a view to planning and territorial management entails establishing a dialogue with the acceptation of territory. Here, the position is assumed that this is a social construction, in which its parts interrelate, taking on a form that results from historical and contemporary processes of social articulation or practices of territorial governance, an arrangement represented by its territorial heritage (DALLABRIDA, 2020a; DALLABRIDA, 2020b).

For Souza (2009), territory is understood and defined through the answer to a question: who dominates or influences whom in this space, and how? According to the author, the political dimension is that which, above any other, defines the profile of the territory: "In each concrete case, when examining the factors behind the territorialization processes, we will discover, going back in time and digging deep enough, a tangle of reasons and motivations" (SOUZA, 2009, p. 60). These latter emanate, in parallel, both from state agents and from social and productive-business representations, as well as, in some cases, from academic

agents, in order to contribute to actions of investigation from the perspective of action research.[5]

Thus, it is in the "reasons and motivations" that the pathways of the territorialization process (appropriation, domination and production of territory) or deterritorialization (forms of expropriation and territorial exclusion) were justified in the past (or are justified in the present) and expressed (or expresses) the dimension of power, i.e., who and how influenced/influences processes.

It is possible to speak of a neighborhood, a region or a municipality as an expression of a territory, as long as the planning process results from an intentionality consciously manifested and assumed by state agents and representatives of the social, productive-business and academic sectors, from which give rise to manifestations of power. As a result of this, there is a major challenge that needs to be faced in the articulation aimed at territorial planning and management: to pledge through democratic means the intention to undertake a diagnostic process - referenced in territorial heritage - that becomes a parameter and serves to define principles and guidelines in the prospection of a project for a desired territorial future.

Proposing a participatory planning process sustained by a sense of territory represents a Herculean challenge. When new development alternatives are put forward, a design approach still predominates, in which the planning vision is overestimated, and no attention is paid to local capabilities and knowledge, much less to the conflicts and tensions inherent in the territory. Therefore, there is an urgent need to situate the territorial planning process within a sense of knowledge co-production. To speak of co-production is to recognize the premise that knowledge and action are interdependent. This acceptation has its origins in trends of constructivism, according to which, imaginatively or materially, people make the world, societies, institutions and, in the same way, science and knowledge. In addition, the notion of co-production enables the dichotomy to be broken between specialized and local knowledge, together with their intersections and their processes of mutual adaptation (MILLER; WYBORN, 2020). Civil society, the State and the market may encounter complementary, alternative paths, along with the collaboration of governments that connect with other governments and with the non-governmental sector, through partnerships, networks, alliances, committees, consortia, councils, agencies, among other collaborative alternatives that may jointly develop strategies to promote territorial management (SCHOMMER et al., 2011).

---

5. On this themes, see: TRIPP, D. Pesquisa-ação: uma introdução metodológica. *Educação e Pesquisa*, São Paulo, v. 31, n. 3, p. 443-466, set./dez. 2005.

Thus, both the notion of territorial governance – the collaborative and social process of articulating actors within a territory – and the concept of co-production – a process of territorial articulation in which knowledge and action are interdependent and where specialized and local knowledge intersect – indicate that articulation, aimed at defining the future in the territories may only take place as an integrated action between planners (state agents and/or academic researchers) and impacted society.

Participatory territorial planning and the challenges of practicing it

The understanding has been adopted that a desired territorial future implies processes of territorial articulation which focus on planning, through innovative and cooperative initiatives. But what does the act of planning mean?

For Guzmán et al. (2001), planning signifies acting in the present with a vision of the future, seeking the means of obtaining both the possible and desired changes. Even considering the ECLAC planning vision of the 1960s and 1970s, it was from the 1980s onwards that managerial and participatory planning mechanisms became part of the agenda for state reforms in Latin America and Brazil, instead of planning for development. These new mechanisms, anchored in social, economic, technological and cultural transformations, created a greater connection with the democratic expectations of reducing social inequalities and improving the performance of public administration. One of the challenges involved was the need to understand planning in a multidimensional manner (MENEZES et al., 2020).

In the current context, according to Guzmán et al. (2001), planning seems to have moved toward a process that takes place individually, in groups, in business and institutionally over a period of time, called the planning horizon, and in a space, with certain methods, instruments and resources. This process is understood as a succession of interrelated, non-linear phases and moments that should generate improvements, which are not always achieved.

With regard to the moments, Becker (1998, p. 103) states that the process of elaborating/formulating a development project is made up of five phases: (i) elaborating a shared understanding in terms of the reality/object of planning or pre-planning ; (ii) designing the desired future; (iii) characterizing the given reality; (iv) contrasting the desired future with the given present reality (what is required and what is available or comparing the quality of the future to the quantity of the present); (v) defining, organizing and structuring the action, deciding on priorities, as well as formulating action strategies and allocating resources, covering their operationalization.

For Matus (1996), planning a territorialized approach to development requires negotiation between the actors with distinct, real, but reconcilable, interests. The agreements then result from negotiation. This is a participatory planning process that respects differences without cancelling them out. To differentiate the extreme positions, in the conflict and consensus dialectic, Matus (1996, p. 16) suggested three types of strategies: (i) the "cooperation game", in which there is a prevalence of persuasion, positive sum negotiation, agreement, the creation of conflict prevention instances and the intention to open spaces for consensus that straighten out potential disagreements; (ii) the "opposition game", in which zero-sum negotiation, the measurement of forces, the struggle to accumulate more strength, tense confrontation, deterrence, attrition of the adversary and the search for the weakness of the other are dominating features, where ally-opponent logic prevails; and (iii) the "game of violent confrontation", in which the objective is to nullify the strength of others and to impose a will upon them, and in which the aggressive friend-enemy logic prevails, in order to leave the other with no freedom of action or choice. These different positions have a direct influence on the ability of territories, regions or municipalities to build political development projects through collaborative-participatory processes. Matus (1996) also stated that the postures resulting from the game of cooperation seem to have a greater contribution, since they occur in a context of trust, via strategies marked by persuasion, seduction and transparency, with the goal of producing agreement, using the means of convincing/coordination with "I" and the "other" as actors – metaphorically, a game between friends.

Thus, planning implies having a vision, a mental representation or an objective image of a possible and desired future. It must express the fundamental aspirations of the different territorial actors and the State in its instances (municipal, macro-regional, provincial, federal). The vision must be achievable and defined as a process of change (GUZMÁN et al., 2001). In territorial planning, the desired situation corresponds to everything that may be projected but is not necessarily achievable. The possible situation refers to that which is contained within the desired and is realizable, i.e., it is possible to be achieved.

The State has a prominent role in these processes, albeit not the only one. From an optimistic, contemporary viewpoint, territorial planning has increasingly tended to occur in processes of co-production, co-creation and collaboration between civil society, the State and the market, following complementary, alternative paths, in the form of joint development strategies (SCHOMMER et al. al., 2011; RONCONI; DEBITER; DE MATIA, 2011; AGRANOFF; MCGUIRE, 2003). Thus, territorial planning considers the territorial context and the needs of citizens as being central guidelines.

However, previously analyzed experiences demonstrated that the coordination of resources and, consequently, of financing actions, are concentrated within the State, which, in the Brazilian case, has not as yet presented a favorable territorial, federative configuration for coordinating actions on a territorial level (MENEZES et al., 2020). Herein lies a challenge to be overcome.

Guzmán et al. (2001) went further by stating that planning defines the desired type of society, setting its direction, its routes and the manner with which to implement them. They emphasized, however, that it is necessary to have decision-making power and political will to execute it, since there is a close relationship between planning and leadership: whoever plans directs and whoever directs plans. In other words, planning needs to maintain an intrinsic relationship with decision-making so that the options chosen become decisions that may be implemented. Planning requires an authority capable of arbitrating between the different interests and purposes of different actors. Thus, the State, in all its instances, has a leading role.

It may be concluded that the processes of territorial articulation, which aim at planning, through innovative and cooperative initiatives, are based on the following principles: participatory equity, cooperation, inclusion, solidarity, pluralism, common good and autonomy, with respect for people's identities, needs, desires and dreams, in addition to the promotion and/or sustainable preservation of life in all its dimensions.

The process of territorial articulation and planning in contemporaneity

It is important to remember that today there has been a transition from a situation of contiguous territories to territories intersected and impacted by different internal and external networks. The transition from the society of objects, from contiguous territories to the economy, or society of signs, implies a transition from the current zone-territories, more traditional and associated with the spatial contiguity of demarcated areas and frontiers and with enrooted groups, toward network-territories, an articulated combination of networks, in the form of a mesh (HAESBAERT, 2011; COVAS; COVAS, 2014).

The challenge is to understand the consequences of this new reality in the planning and management of territories, regions or municipalities. This requires a new methodology of planning but does not exclude the orientation of collective action in the territory, exercised in a democratic and collaborative manner. Either way, one of the demands is to contemplate the notion of a network-territory.

The network-territory (N-T) of an intelligent community, or an integrated territorial-based action, is managed by a main agent, the network-actor, which is

a linking structure taking into account the realization of the common good and collaboration. The role of the network-actor is generally taken on by state agents, however, it does not exclude the possibility of other territorial actors. In either case, to be successful, certain fundamental conditions must be met: (i) the delimitation and mapping of the smart territory; (ii) an appropriate action-intervention methodology; (iii) the geoeconomics of the cooperation spaces; and (iv) the political agenda for the smart community.

Delimiting and mapping the smart territory

Digital transformation enables the processes of territorial governance to extend beyond the usual borders of a territory and facilitates the practice of decentralized territorial cooperation strategies. Among the factors that delimit the smart territory and the territorially based integrated action, it is important to highlight that:

- The geographies of desire and the plurality of interests determine the variety of resources and actors that will act, together with the set of expectations;
- The importance of the multi-scalar perspective and multi-level administration determines the stock of resources and the scale of operations;
- The quality of the technical teams and the effectiveness of the administrations depend on the degree and quality of the cooperation undertaken, without forgetting that competence only exists if there is continuity;
- Partnerships are essential and investment in social capital is not to be confused with simple arrangements of convenience;
- All projects release idle resources that are often converted into counter-resources, requiring the use of prudent management and mediation;
- The neighborhood paradox really exists: neighbors cooperate rarely and inadequately, requiring intelligent and creative management;
- The cognitive process is very fragile, learning is limited and poor, because there is a fear of making mistakes and being politically censored;
- Multilevel governance cannot be relegated to a secondary level, because a precious resource is wasted, and turns into inertia within the system (COVAS; COVAS, 2015a).

Covas and Covas (2015a) broadened the importance of rigorous management of all these factors, since it is these that alter the perimeter of the smart community or the smart integrated action. A new public culture of the collaborative common

good is at stake. What it is that may hinder this new public culture? Among other factors are the power of corporations, the narcissism of leaders, political bureaucracies, manipulation of the media, the trivialization of public space, disaffection for politics and discursive cacophony.

With regard to mapping the smart territory, it may be highlighted that today, in the digital age, platforms have gone beyond the physical limits, and it is increasingly difficult to say what is internal (insourcing) and external (outsourcing) to a territorial community (COVAS; COVAS, 2020). This signifies that a problem may only be solved cooperatively, whereas previously it would have been solved by simulation, concealment or denial, since the existence of a barrier made many arrangements of convenience feasible. In other words, the network-actor is now tasked with looking for cooperative forms of government and new dynamics of cooperation that will give rise to many positive-sum combinations.

In addition, the cognitive value of territorial intelligence will be highly valued if the necessary points of approximation for mapping the territory are built and monitored, for example: (i) plans for territorial ordering; (ii) delimiting protected landscape areas; (iii) requalifying the spaces surrounding the equipment and infrastructures; (iv) product reference marks, certifying services and targets and accrediting collective structures for promoting territories; (v) creating solid partnerships with research centers and community intervention programs, aiming at recognizing territories and a desired geography. This mapping, with points of reference and approximation, is the source of collective intelligence that network-actors must transform into resources and cognitive assets for territorial development.

Lastly, in territories with no limits, with open markets and a much more mobile population base, political action that is more attentive to the circular economy and to the production of externalities is essential, since there is a real risk that negative externalities may jeopardize the good neighborhood relationship and cooperation with geographically contiguous territories.

Appropriate action-intervention methodology

The smart territory planning methodology and the definition of its network-actor suggest attention to the following elements:

- Select one (or more) distinctive territorial sign: consider, for example, a protected landscape area (PLA), a natural park or geopark (COVAS; COVAS, 2020, 2019; COVAS; COVAS; DALLABRIDA, 2019; DALLABRIDA, 2019; DALLABRIDA, COVAS; COVAS, 2017);

- PLA association of producers and/or friends' club: consider, for example, the functional and institutional competences that may be identified and mobilized;
- A PLA basket of products and services: consider, for example, endemisms, traditional food stuffs, nature trails, ecosystem services, gastronomy, fauna and flora, aromatic and medicinal herbs, landscape arts;
- An associative, community and volunteer project associated with the APP: consider, for example, the offer of *institutional food*, pedagogical, recreational and therapeutic services provided to the youngest or the oldest;
- A smart territory project associated with agroforestry, agro-recreational and agro-landscape geo-economics: consider, for example, forest fire prevention, village condominiums, agroforestry property subdivision or management of integrated landscape management areas (COVAS; COVAS: 2020; 2019);
- A research project linked to the provision of environmental and ecosystem services: consider, for example, the design of a territorial convention for protecting natural resources and providing ecosystem services that are essential for the well-being and quality of life, from the management of hydrographic basins to irrigation and the provision of riverside amenities;
- A circular economy project for the network-territory: consider, for example, the fact that in nature nothing is created, nothing is lost, everything is transformed. This is what also happens with network territories, since, from now on, goods of merit and reputation are those that demonstrate higher rates of circularity and the territories that host them will therefore be duly rewarded;
- A PLA educational, scientific and cultural project: consider, for example, its international articulation with other PLAs through joint participation in programs and projects of international organizations related to climate change, and to restoring biodiversity and ecosystems.

The geoeconomics of cooperation spaces

In terms of the geoeconomics of cooperation spaces, it should be noted that, in a given inter-municipal community or sub-region, it cannot be limited to a simple application for investing in an agricultural holding or industrial unit. It is necessary to relate these investments at the mesoeconomic and regional level and ask: what is the added value that results from this? Which space may be used for business and institutional cooperation, which is organized and mobilized and to

what extent does a given investment program add value to the geoeconomics of that community or sub-region? (COVAS; COVAS, 2020; 2019; 2015b). In other words, in the global village, there is no longer an inside and an outside. The geoeconomics of cooperation spaces will be challenged to program and design cooperative strategies that reduce their own vulnerabilities and increase the field of possibilities to generate social capital between actors who until then barely knew one another and hardly ever interacted.

Below are some examples of cooperation spaces that may be the object of network and agglomeration economies, as long as, for this, there is an ability to organize the corresponding collaborative platforms: (i) smart territories (smart city, smart region); (ii) value chains; (iii) science and technology networks and platforms; (iv) green and circular economy networks; (v) extension networks and business cooperation; (vi) community-based prevention and civil protection networks; (vii) geoeconomics of systems (types of agroforestry, agrifood, agrotourism or agrolandscape).

In all cases, it is a question of increasing synergy and reducing the entropy of the relationships between spaces, adapting the respective network intensity to the gestational rhythm of new common and collaborative projects. The objective is, therefore, to intentionally manage a very rich matrix of flows and not a collection of projects disconnected from one another, as well as their emerging properties, namely: (i) the multiscalar approach and subsidiarity of multilevel governance; (ii) the multifunctionality and capillarity of network and agglomeration economies; (iii) the internalities and circularities of the life cycle of products; (iv) positive and negative externalities and the ethics of common and collective goods; (v) the conditionalities and institutional competences to deal with them; (vi) the creativity and design of the collaborative and cultural space (COVAS; COVAS, 2013a; 2013b).

The political agenda of the smart community

In contemporaneity, the expected tasks have been recognized: (i) desired geographies and target communities (A); (ii) a grammar of common goods and collaborative digital platforms (B); (iii) network territories, integrated actions, inter-municipal communities and network actors (C). Here it may be detected what is termed the ABC method, the three great missions that people have to face today. The following is a possible agenda of the new economy of smart communities and platforms.

- Desired geography of target territories and communities (A);
- Active principle of networks, cooperation and delimitation of common goods (A);

- Collaborative platforms and formation of network-actor (A);
- Network economies and agglomeration of smart communities (B);
- Integrated supply of complementary goods and services from the community (B);
- Integration of externalities, internalities and circularities (B);
- Process and product innovation as distinctive territorial signs (C);
- Care and services network, nearby outpatient clinics (C);
- Territorially based digital ecosystem, a welcoming and innovative environment (C) (COVAS; COVAS, 2020).

In order to properly manage this political agenda of the territory, the network-actor will have to play an exemplarily role of the main agent of the community or smart territory, i.e., it is essential to be an effective leader in mobilizing peers. The following actions are required of the network-actor: (i) a good use of information and knowledge to consolidate a desired geography and a target community; (ii) a very judicious notion regarding the good use of horizontal and vertical cooperation networks and respective collaborative platforms; (iii) a very keen critical sense, not only regarding the innovation of processes and products, but also to the essence of the places in terms of territorial marketing and associated products; (iv) a very open approach to social capital and, particularly, to intergenerational and transgenerational entrepreneurship; (v) lastly, very comprehensive attention in relation to the new sociocultural references of the third decade of the twenty-first century and their transfer to the network-territories, to the integrated actions of the territorial base and to the inter-municipal communities and their target communities. In short, it is essential that the network-actor scrupulously respects the general assumptions that inform the functioning of the network territories, "the decalogue of major principles" that inspired a working methodology (COVAS; COVAS, 2020; 2015b).[6] If these principles and structural conditions are fulfilled, local actors will be able to effectively perform their functions as curators and energizers of the territory.

In this approach, systemic conditions and their contextual benefits are given special emphasis in the relationship between the actor and the system. In summary, smart communities that seek to delimit a territory of direct action need to be supported by pillars that designate a future network economy and cooperation among themselves, such as: (i) integrated action on a territorial basis

---

6. Proposal for the methodology of action research and practices applied in Portugal between 2011-2012, such as the Querença Project (Loulé-Algarve, Portugal), articulated by the actors in this article.

or inter-municipal community that articulates territorial processes; (ii) network-actors that create innovative means through collaborative platforms; (iii) an integrated inter-municipal offer of common and complementary goods and services; (iv) productive agglomerations and value chains that form the economic base of a region. Are these capabilities dominated by the actors in the processes of territorial articulation, in all territories? Not always.

Constructing capabilities, challenges and problematics in the process of territorial articulation

Territorial development is a process with multidimensional characteristics, thus covering the economic, social, cultural, environmental, institutional, rural and urban dimensions. It incorporates the idea of new governance and includes the active role of the State in the construction of dialogues and changes in the act of triggering the ensemble of organizations in the territory, with an axis in the strengthening of capabilities.

The processes of territorial governance make it possible to facilitate the management of heterogeneous and complex social dynamics, marked by the characteristics of its people, its infrastructure and its technological resources. No one single actor, be it the State, civil society or the productivity-business sector, is able to unilaterally solve all the problems in the territories. Thus, even if, at times, there is criticism of State actions, they may also be directed toward other actors who seek solutions in isolation or only according to their sectoral interests. Thus, it becomes important to reflect and act within the context of complex processes, marked by a constant movement of people and decisions, with tensions in the ways of accomplishing and in the interests. The proposal is to step away from the static, simple views, and move toward the multiple relationships in which no one has absolute control over all processes and at the same time, think about how people coordinate, facilitate and dialogue so that the processes take place.

Territorial development implies changing the ways of governing and of positioning the territory as a place to incorporate management innovations and social innovations. However, this perspective contains yet another strong requirement: the strengthening and building of capabilities, not as a complement, but as a focal strategy that helps to achieve the desired transformations. For political processes that contemplate a new way of creating articulations and taking decisions, it is essential to build capabilities that organize the work agenda, not just in any way, but with methodological changes, which, in turn, imply different epistemological conceptions.

There are elements that require explanations, which are the basis for reflection on the pedagogical approach: the way of relating within the territories,

of proposing democratic dialogues and flexible leadership, of generating trust and co-generating knowledge from collective thinking (COSTAMAGNA; SPINELLI; PEREZ, 2013). These topics have not been addressed over the past few decades. This requires defining methodological frameworks so as to manage territorial dynamics impregnated with interests, logics, feelings and emotions, since decisions in territories are not only rational, nor linear. Added to this idea is another powerful argument: the need to value the way territories learn.

In this framework, the pedagogical approach to territorial development defends a way of understanding and acting in the construction of learning processes for coherent changes in the territory, as a social and political learning process (COSTAMAGNA; SPINELLI; PÉREZ, 2013). Thus, the density of connections is sought in an articulated institutional framework, with joint projects, networking, with increased opportunities for everyone, within a scheme of new learning processes. Thus, the most important elements of the pedagogical approach to territorial development are: (i) to move away from traditional training, linked to a formal educational scheme, toward a more innovative form of training, opening up to different areas of the territory and the concept of praxis; (ii) to move on to building capabilities, considering non-neutrality; (iii) to institute processes for the co-generation of knowledge and the revalorization of the context.

Through a pedagogical approach to territorial development, a path of multiple interactions is strengthened, such as action research (KARLEN; LARREA, 2015), which contributes elements such as the social researcher's claim to be the generator of change, interpreting conflict as a natural situation in the process of territorial articulation, guidance for constructing collective knowledge in action and interpreting dialogue as a basic process of public space, seen as a space for dialogue for territorial development.

The pedagogical approach and action research for territorial development provide the possibility of working on medium and long-term problems – these perspectives are connected, as a strategy for building capacities for territorial development, with an alternative methodological framework to what occurs hegemonically in the academic spheres.

The facilitator in the process of territorial articulation

Taking international experiences as a reference, we move on to valorizing teams that manage complexity, from which emerges the facilitator of territorial development or the team of actors and facilitators, understood as people who work in the process, creating the conditions for them to reflect, decide and move into action . The roles of these people, who are also neutral actors and not subjects, are

to create spaces for dialogue, to build shared visions, to manage conflict situations, and to connect theories and practices (COSTAMAGNA, 2015; COSTAMAGNA; LARREA, 2015). When there are no people who act in this way, the conditions to advance are not created and the processes become debilitated.

Thus, considering the role of the articulator and the actor in the process of territorial articulation, it is evident that there is a need for people who induce emerging processes, since these do not occur spontaneously. It is therefore necessary to work more actively, as it is the strengthened capabilities or the new capabilities that make it possible to overcome the restrictions that exist when facing a new process of governance (COSTAMAGNA; LARREA, 2015).

In the broad concept of territory adopted herein, there are institutions, both public and private, which are linked and related in different ways, and which constitute more or less active territories. International experience suggests that, when their behavior is synergistic and articulated, these environments act to enhance learning and cooperation processes. Thus, territorial articulation takes on a fundamental importance.

However, not all territories are equally prepared to face the challenge of cooperating, since, in general, there is a huge territorial disparity. Therefore, management needs to be considered contextually. Again, these processes do not emerge spontaneously or just in any manner; it is necessary for people to work in shared spaces, hence the value of politics, leadership and facilitators in building capabilities.

In broad terms and aware of the existence of nuances, it is possible to ask: what types of institutional systems may be found in the territories?

- Traditional institutional systems, with a significant degree of isolation between actors and organizations, which relate to one another mobilized by sectoral interests and have not yet begun the debate on the need to change and modernize, and have no available people who facilitate dialogue and learning;
- Institutional systems at the beginning of the process of change, which present an average level of articulation between the parties and have already achieved some advances in terms of the innovation of the institutional system;
- Institutional systems with an ongoing process of change, which present a good level of interaction between the actors, an institutional framework with a good level of dialogue; these encourage the creation of opportunities for cooperation and intersectoral relations, taking advantage of the knowledge, experiences and advances of each of the sectors.

This description could be part of the possible strategies for change that are introduced, also taking into account the aspect of how learning achieved for the transformation in the territories.

The need to carry on learning from uncertainty

For the new governance, there is no single viewpoint. The multidisciplinarity of territorial development is an invitation to meet other men and women, recognizing different perspectives and interests. This does not signify adopting just one position, but understanding the need for dialogues, in the broadest sense of the word. To take as an example, the outbreak of the pandemic required a transition to scenarios for which the final configurations are still unknown.

This requires recognizing a new component for the approach to territorial development: uncertainty, which changes the way of thinking, planning and acting. It is no longer possible to plan when faced with the omnipresence of uncertainty regarding the future; in any case, it is necessary to propose combined processes, in which part of the solutions must be thought of collectively and through the territories from which the problems have emerged. The best thing to do is to keep learning. Thus, it will be essential to review processes, reflect on the complexity of relationships and generate proposals. In such situations, it is not possible to have predetermined solutions, in which the trajectory of accomplishing is interpreted in terms of implementing the plan in the traditional manner.

Observing international experiences, it may be perceived that the territories which have achieved the best results are those that had experiences of dialogue in the crisis, contrived according to an intersecting bias between politics, people and science. It is imperative to visualize organizations that are close to the problems, which not only seek solutions in a joint, cooperative manner, supported by democratic methods and participatory systems, but also to oppose, if necessary, groups in which the crisis has not generated empathy or required the creation of different logics. There is a need for a social and political construction that is open to an approach that proposes co-construction and new roles, in a scenario of innovative, inclusive knowledge management.

Final considerations

Thinking and working on governance for change in territories requires innovative methodological frameworks that enable the management of territorial dynamics impregnated with interests, logics, feelings and emotions. To achieve this, it is necessary to build and strengthen capabilities, starting from epistemological frameworks in which dialogue, in its very broadest sense, is placed at the center of the process of territorial planning and articulation.

It is important to assume that these processes do not occur spontaneously, but involve new personages that drive the emerging processes forward, in which facilitators play a prominent role, creating conditions for territorial actors to reflect, decide and take action, according to their roles: creating spaces for dialogue, building shared visions and managing conflict situations, connecting theory and practice.

In addition to the magnitude of the challenge, which is planning through processes of governance, there is one additional challenge: planning territories intersected and impacted by different networks, both internal and external, i.e., smart, network territories. Among the new requirements, territorial planning and development must begin to consider the links between the digital economy and the creative economy, since the future will transit between technology, art and territory, generating creative processes, transforming territories and impacting value chains.

The processes of territorial articulation, encompassing State and society, are adduced to the use of pedagogical practices capable of stimulating collective learning processes aimed at developing the capabilities mentioned throughout the text, supported by democratic methods and participatory systems that characterize sustainable planning and management mechanisms, with the engagement and a sense of belonging from its citizens. The establishment and strengthening of institutionalized governance mechanisms in the network-territories become essential for forming a collective social capital that guarantees self-management and self-control by society, in combination with the State, for maintaining innovative and sustainable practices of territorial governance.

Additional challenges for the research are: assessing how the network-territories will introduce, institute and maintain enhanced, active dynamics of participation in learning processes, given the transformations they are currently experiencing. Undoubtedly, the more adept the collectivities become in the practice of territorial governance, considering the importance of the constant need for citizen participation and the preponderant role of the State, the more qualified the articulation practices for territorial development will become.

References

AGRANOFF, R.; MCGUIRE, M. *Collaborative public management:* new strategies for local governments. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2003.

BECKER, D. F. Os limites desafiadores do planejamento. *REDES*, v. 3, n. 2, p. 87-105, dez.1998.

BÜTTENBENDER, P. L.; SAUSEN, J. O. Innovative development management practices in a border region: a construct proposal of innovative governance and territorial development. *Revista Brasileira de Gestão e Desenvolvimento Regional*, v.16, n. 2, p. 446-458, 2020.

COSTAMAGNA, P. *Política y formación en el desarrollo territorial. Aportes al enfoque pedagógico y a la investigación acción con casos de estudio en Argentina, Perú y País Vasc*o. Bilbao: Orkestra-Publicaciones Universidad Deusto, 2015.

COSTAMAGNA, P.; LARREA, M. La Gobernanza Multinivel en los procesos de desarrollo territorial. Elementos para una estrategia de trabajo colaborativo. *Desarollo y Territorio*, p. 45-53, 2015.

COSTAMAGNA, P.; SPINELLI, E.; PÉREZ, R. E*lementos estratégicos de un enfoque pedagógico para el Desarrollo Territorial*. Buenos Aires: ConectaDEL, 2013.

COVAS, M. M.; COVAS, A. Cidades inteligentes e criativas e smartificação dos territórios: apontamentos para reflexão. *Desenvolvimento Regional em Debate*, v. 10 (ed. esp.), p. 40-59, 2020.

COVAS, A.; COVAS, M. M. A Inteligência dos Territórios: os terroirs como espaços de inovação colaborativa. *Informe GEPEC*, v. 23 (ed. esp.), p. 40-54, 2019.

_____. *Multiterritorialidades I:* temas e problemas de governança e desenvolvimento territoriais. Lisboa: Editora Colibri, 2015a.

_____. Sociedade do conhecimento, escalas de governo e governança territorial: um ensaio exploratório e prospetivo para a sociedade portuguesa. *DRd – Desenvolvimento Regional em debate*, v. 5, n. 2, p. 25-47, jul. -dez. 2015b.

_____. A construção social dos territórios-rede: a inteligência territorial da 2ª ruralidade. São Paulo: Editora LiberArs, [eBook Kindle], 2014.

_____. A construção social dos territórios-rede da 2ª ruralidade. Dos territórios-zona aos territórios-rede. Construir um território de múltiplas territorialidades. *Revista de Geografia e Ordenamento do Território*, n. 3, p. 43-66, jun. 2013a.

_____. Em busca de uma racionalidade territorial multiníveis nos processos de governança regional: o exemplo da região do Algarve. *Desenvolvimento Regional em debate*, v. 3, n. 2, p. 66-85, 2013b.

COVAS, A.; COVAS, M. M.; DALLABRIDA, V. R. Os Signos Distintivos Territoriais e a Smartificação do Território: uma abordagem exploratória. *Biblio3W - Revista Bibliográfica de Geografía y Ciencias Sociales*, v. XXIV, n. 1.268, 2019.

DALLABRIDA, V. R. Território e Governança Territorial, Patrimônio e Desenvolvimento Territorial: estrutura, processo, forma e função na dinâmica territorial do desenvolvimento. *G&DR - Revista Brasileira de Gestão e Desenvolvimento Regional*, v. 16, n. 2, p. 63-78, mai.-ago. 2020a.

_____. Patrimônio Territorial: abordagens teóricas e indicativos metodológicos para estudos territoriais. *Desenvolvimento em Questão*, v. 18, n. 52, p. 12-32, jul. 2020b.

_____. Governança territorial: do debate teórico à avaliação da sua prática. *Análise Socia*l, v. 215, n. l (2.º), p. 304-328, 2015.

DALLABRIDA, V. R.; COVAS, M. M.; COVAS, A. Inovação, desenvolvimento e espaço urbano: uma relação necessária mas não suficiente. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Urbanos e Regionais*, v. 19, n. 2, p. 360-378, mai.-ago. 2017.

DALLABRIDA, V. R.; ROTTA, E.; BÜTTENBENDER, P. L. Pressupostos epistêmico-teóricos convergentes com a abordagem territorial. *Revista Brasileira de Gestão e Desenvolvimento Regional*, v. 17, n. 2, p. 256-273, mai.-ago. 2021.

GUZMÁN, R. S. et al. *Planificación del Desarrollo*. Bogotá: Fundación Universidad de Bogotá Jorge Tadeu Lozano, 2001.

HAESBAERT, R. O território e a nova des-territorialização do Estado. In: DIAS, L. C.; FERRARI, M. (Orgs.). *Territorialidades humanas e redes sociais*. Florianópolis: Insular, 2011. p. 17-37.

KARLEN, J.; LARREA, M. *Desarrollo territorial e investigación acción. Innovación a través del diálogo*. Bilbao: Orkestra-Publicaciones Universidad Deusto, 2015.

LE GALÈS, P. Governance. In: BOUSSAGUET, L.; JACQUOT, S.; RAVINET, P. (Orgs.). *Dictionnaire des politiques publiques*. 4. ed. Paris: Sciences Po Les Presses, 2014. p. 299-307.

MATUS, Carlos. *Estratégias Políticas. Chimpanzé, Maquiavel e Ghandi*. São Paulo: FUNDAP, 1996.

MENEZES, E. C. O. et al. Planejamento municipal em debate: trajetória e prioridades no município de Florianópolis. *Administração Pública e Gestão Social*, v. 12, n. 1, p. 1-22, 2020.

MILLER, C.; WYBORN, C. Co-production in global sustainability: histories and theories. *Environmental Science & Policy*, v. 113, p. 88-95, nov. 2020.

RONCONI, L. F. A.; DEBETIR, E.; DE MATTIA, C. Conselhos Gestores de Políticas Públicas: Potenciais Espaços para a Coprodução dos Serviços Públicos. *Contabilidade, Gestão e Governança*, v. 14, n. 3, p.46-59, set.-dez. 2011.

SANTOS, M. *Espaço e Método*. 4. ed. São Paulo: Nobel, 1997.

SAQUET, M. A descoberta do território e outras premissas do desenvolvimento territorial. *Rev. Bras. Estud. Urbanos Reg.*, v. 20, n. 3, p.479-505, set.-dez. 2018.

SCHNEIDER, S. et al. Análisis multidimensional y escalar del desarrollo territorial en Brasil. *Eutopía*, n. 1, p. 25-49, nov. 2010.

SCHOMMER, P. C. et al. Coprodução e inovação social na esfera pública em debate no campo da gestão social. In: SCHOMMER, P.C.; BOULLOSA, R. de F. (Org). *Gestão social como caminho para a redefinição da esfera pública*. Florianópolis: UDESC, 2011. p. 31-70.

SOUZA, M. L. "Território" da divergência (e da confusão): em torno das imprecisas fronteiras de um conceito fundamental. In: SAQUET, M. A.; SPÓSITO, E. S. (org.). *Territórios e territorialidades:* teorias, processos e conflitos. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2009. p. 57-62.

Valdir Roque Dallabrida

Geographer, with a doctorate in Regional Development on the Universidade de Santa Cruz do Sul (UNISC). Professor on the Postgraduate Program in Sustainable Territorial Development at the Universidade Federal do Federal – Setor Litoral (UFPR, Matinhos-PR). He is the general coordinator of the Ibero-American Network of Studies on Territorial Development and Governance (REDETEG).

> **Email:** valdirdallabrida@gmail.com
> **ORCID:** 0000-0003-2927-960X
> **Authorship contribution:** project administration; conception; methodology; original draft, review and editing; validation.

Pedro Luís Büttenbender

Graduated in Business Administration, with a doctorate in Business Administration, and a specialist in Cooperativism. Professor on the Postgraduate Program in Regional Development, at the Universidade Regional do Noroeste do Estado do Rio Grande do Sul (Unijuí).

> **Email:** pedrolb@unijuí.edu.br
> **ORCID:** 0000-0002-7011-8552
> **Authorship contribution:** conception; formal analysis; visualization; review and editing.

António Manuel Alhinho Covas

Economist from the Universidade de Évora (Portugal) and doctorate in European Affairs from the University of Brussels (Belgium). Full professor at the Universidade do Algarve (Portugal), retired, working in the organizations CinTurs and VALORIZA, at the Polytechnic Institute of Portalegre (Portugal).

Email: acovas@ualg.pt

ORCID: 0000-0002-0034-102X

Authorship contribution: conception; methodology; original draft.

Maria das Mercês Cabrita de Mendonça Covas

Sociologist, with a doctorate in Sociology from the Universidade de Évora (Portugal), and associate professor at the Universidade do Algarve (Portugal), at the Reseach Center for Spatial and Organizational Dynamics (CIEO). Retired, working in the organizations CinTurs and VALORIZA, at the Polytechnic Institute of Portalegre (Portugal).

Email: mcovas@ualg.pt

ORCID: 0000-0002-3531-8444

Authorship contribution: conception; methodology; original draft.

Pablo Costamagna

Economist, doctorate in Development Studies from the Universidad del País Vasco. Professor at the Universidad Tecnológica Nacional, Facultad Regional Rafaela (UTN FFRa), Where he is also the director of the master's degree course in Territorial Development at the Instituto Praxis (Argentina).

Email: coboin@wilnet.com.ar

ORCID: 0000-0002-2217-1703

Authorship contribution: conception; methodology; original draft.

Elaine Cristina de Oliveira Menezes

Economist, with a master's degree in Administration and a doctorate in Political Sociology on the Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC), professor on the Postgraduate Program in Sustainable Territorial Development at the Universidade Federal do Paraná – Setor Litoral (UFPR, Matinhos-PR).

Email: eoliveira.menezes@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-1427-0744

Authorship contribution: conception; formal analysis; review and editing.