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Theoretical framework

• Social capital, the assets that one has as a consequence of one’s relationships with others and one’s membership in organizations which in turn facilitate access to other resources (Bebbington)

• Political capital, voice and power. The power to claim rights over resources and the power to influence decisions regarding their distribution and management. The power to have voice to be listened to at the moment of defining the agenda (Flora and Flora, Fernandez-Baca).

• The Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) is one way to study relationships and to build agency among key actors around natural resource management issues. AC proposes that the increase of political capital in a community, through the strengthening of social and human capital, improves the political participation of the community to define or influence the development agenda (Flora and Flora, Fernandez-Baca).
Theoretical framework (cont.)

- Power relations and participatory processes
  - Idiosyncratic circumstances of leaders and individual parties. Heterogeneity of community structure, organization and relations with government (Reed).
  - Actors start from very different knowledge systems, agendas, positions of power, and possessions of economic, cultural and symbolic capital (Hampshire).
  - The more authoritarian power relations, the more resistant to renovate institutions, perpetuating unequal power relations and discrimination against the disadvantaged. The less authoritarian system, the greater the possibility of renovating institutions despite the perpetual existence of social and economic heterogeneity (Ray and Bijarnia).
  - Heterogeneity, Community power relations structure, and the type of social capital existent
Context

- SANREM project “Adaptation to climate change and markets of vulnerable agricultural ecosystems of the Altiplano”
- In the Peruvian Altiplano since 2006
- To increase resilience of Aymara households to deal with climate and market changes.
## Community capitals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Santa Maria</th>
<th>Apopata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lakeside zone</td>
<td>dry puna zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3800 – 4000 m.a.s.l.</td>
<td>4000 - 5000 m.a.s.l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>340 hectares</td>
<td>12,963 hectares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>river, few springs, wells</td>
<td>few springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>low soil fertility</td>
<td>soil erosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alfalfa</td>
<td>rangelands (bofedales, toleres) degradation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cropping for consumption (potato, quinoa)</td>
<td>No cropping system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>livestock market oriented</td>
<td>Grazing livestock systems market oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Close to market places (Ilave)</td>
<td>Access to small local market (Mazocruz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Close to urban centers (Puno and Juliaca)</td>
<td>Remote area, far from urban centers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Community capitals (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Santa Maria</th>
<th>Apopata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Built** | Communal center  
Access to roads  
Small elementary school  
Storage building for potato seeds  
Machinery and equipment | Communal center  
Access to roads |
| **Financial** | Animals: cattle, sheep  
Main source of income is animal trade  
Off farm income | Animals: camelids, sheep  
Main source of income is sale of alpaca wool  
Off farm income |
| **Cultural** | Shared cropping (Aynokas)  
Shared labor (Ayni & Minka)  
Use of local bioindicators to predict climate  
Practicing ancient rituals  
Aymara language, clothing and food | Shared grazing |
| **Human** | 60 households members  
Family labor for farming  
Local knowledge (diverse local plant varieties, chuno and tunta)  
Training, mostly men  
Scholar education, mostly men  
Knowledge of alfalfa management  
Food security depends on farm production  
Experience of participating in research projects | 80 households members  
Family labor for farming  
Local knowledge (alpaca husbandry, charqui and chalona)  
training, mostly men  
scholar education, mostly men  
Knowledge of bofedales  
Food security depends on market  
Experience of participating in research projects |
## Community capitals (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Santa Maria</th>
<th>Apopata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Social** | Communal organization (president and board)  
Well organized  
Good participation of members  
Weekly communal meetings  
6 internal associations  
Networks: 2 NGOs, 3 gov programs, and municipality of Ilave | Communal organization (president and board)  
Weak organization  
Little participation of members  
Monthly communal meetings  
1 internal associations  
Connection with municipality of Mazocruz |
| **Political** | Participation in municipality meetings  
Limited voice to claim their demands to external institutions  
Little agency  
Little negotiation power for better prices in the market | Little participation in municipality meetings  
No voice to claim their demands to external institutions  
No agency  
Lack of negotiation power for better prices for their livestock products with intermediaries |
Advocacy coalitions in the Altiplano

• In recognition of their cultural, human and social capitals as strengths, AC was proposed for the Aymara communities of Santa Maria and Apopata from the Peruvian Altiplano to build agency - to increase their negotiation capacity and ability to act (political capital)- for the achievement of community goals that contribute to their resilience to climate and market changes, through strengthening their ability to form internal associations and alliances with external institutions (social capital).
Advocacy coalitions in the Altiplano (cont.)

• AC started in 2007. Introduction of ACF to both communities
• Communal engagement in the participatory process
• Identification of the desired goal which the community is interested in pursuing: Increased soil fertility for Santa Maria, and Improved market access for alpaca wool for Apopata
• Democratic election of the AC local team to represent the community. 8 community members including authorities.
• Identification of potential external org. to build alliances that would support their goals. NGOs for SM and gov agencies for Apopata
• Training in negotiations skills, and capacity building activities
• Meetings with selected organizations
• Reporting on advances and sharing achievements in the community
• Following up meetings to evaluate and supervise the AC process
Advocacy coalitions in the Altiplano (cont.)

• Democratic election of the advocacy coalition team to represent the community

• Training in negotiations skills
Findings

• Santa Maria with a mixed-farming system from the lakeside zone, and Apopata with a pastoral system from the dry puna zone, have some similarities and some differences with regard to community capitals. Santa Maria has stronger social capital (bonding and bridging) and some political capital.

• Both communities increased their bonding SC with the formation of AC teams, and bridging SC with the increased linkages with NGOs (Cirnma and Sierrasur) and gov. agencies (Pronamachs and Conacs).

• Human capital increased with the increased access to knowledge through capacity building activities, increased access to information shared by external institutions, and improved capacities with training on negotiation skills.
Findings (cont.)

• Two different responses were obtained. Apopata (lower SC) showed more willingness to engage in AC building while Santa Maria (stronger SC) showed some reticence, apparently as a result of the change in local authorities with a different community goal.

• During the second half of the year, the new authorities of Santa Maria placed conditions on their participation by making demands on livestock improvement and were not willing to continue working to increasing soil fertility. Community members were not happy with their new authorities and did not feel represented. AC process was stopped.

• Apopata representatives recognized that before the AC process the community was going through a process of loss of cohesion and individualism and with AC process they are learning again to work together. They confirmed their interest to work in increasing access for alpaca wool.
Findings (cont.)

• Heterogeneity of livelihood strategy can create some conflicts at the moment of prioritizing the goal of the community because not all of them will be benefit equally with the final decision.

• The community power structure in Santa Maria did not contribute to building the participatory processes of the AC. It seems that each group of power has its turn to influence communal decisions for a period of two years. It is possible that the last group in office was more cropping system oriented, either for market or food security purposes, and therefore they were more interested in increasing soil fertility. The next group in office might have been more livestock oriented, and that could explain their demands in livestock improvement, and their lack of willingness to continue the AC process that focused on increasing soil fertility.
Findings (cont.)

• In Santa Maria, most of internal associations have emerged to cover the demands of external institutions to work with a group of interest within the community to achieve their institutional goals rather than to work with the whole community.

• The relationship between external institutions and these groups of interest is a of dependence or clientilism, because most of the external institutions give agricultural inputs in exchange for participation.
Conclusions

• Santa Maria, the mixed farming community of the lakeside zone with diverse livelihoods strategies, and strong social capital, failed in the attempt to build agency through AC to increase soil fertility, which as identified by the community as a goal to deal with climate and market changes.

• The types of social (bonding and bridging) and political capital of Santa Maria do not promote activities that require collective action such as AC. The numerous internal associations in Santa Maria were formed as responses to the demands of external organizations rather than spontaneous collective action. The relationships between the community and the external institutions were of dependency rather than of collaboration. The community power structure does not allow the continuation of decisions made by previous authorities and lacks sustainability to support participatory processes.
Conclusions (cont.)

• Apopata, the pastoral community from the dry puna zone, with more homogenous livelihoods, presenting low social capital, could increase their agency through AC to improve access to alpaca wool market as identified by the community as a goal to deal with climate and market changes.

• Lack of contact with external institutions that operate with the clientilistic way, the less variability in their livelihood strategies and the type of community power structure provided the conducive environment to build coalitions.
Conclusions (cont.)

• Advocacy Collations approach has been demonstrated to be a useful tool to build agency in the Altiplano but only under certain circumstances.

• When building participatory process such as AC in regions like the Altiplano it is important to consider heterogeneity of livelihoods, the type of community power structure and the historical institutional environment.