

Workshop Output WS 3.4.B

Title of workshop: Initiatives for inclusive local development in mountain regions.

Prepared by

Moderators	Fernando Ruiz Peyré, Armin Kratzer, Valerià Paül
Participants*	12

* Workshop participants that have submitted contributions to the workshop

General questions to please be answered in the workshop reporting

- 1) What was the focus of the workshop? Methodological issues and advancements or thematic issues (systems knowledge, transformation knowledge, target knowledge). Please check and fill in the matrix in the output section.

Methodological issues and advancements	Thematic issues		
	System knowledge	Transformation knowledge	Target Knowledge
Inter and transdisciplinary research	Local economic and social systems	Local innovations Governance Capacity building	Different perspectives on inclusive development Rural revitalization Natural conservation

- 1) Which key points were discussed in the workshop as a whole? (This should be more a synthesis and not simply a summary of the key points in each presentation)

One of the participants qualified Workshop 3.4.B as an “inspiring” opportunity to collectively reflect on inclusive local development in mountain regions. After an initial round of twelve individual presentations, most of them case-specific and embracing cases from all over the world (from Thailand to Argentina, from Norway to Armenia, including India, Nepal, Spain, etc.), two rounds of discussion were carried out in order to deliver opportunities for interchange and mutual understanding of ideas and experiences amongst the more than 50 people in the room. The 2nd round was structured around four main topics that had departed from the previous discussion and that understood as possible drivers learnt from experiences on mountain local development that can be adopted in many contexts:

1. **Local inclusion** implies taking into account critical aspects such as building trust, mutual listening and understanding (including alternative perspectives), minority representation (including bridging gender gaps and between different cultural and social backgrounds) and co-production of knowledge. Maybe there are no universal solutions, but local initiation of development processes might be a good way, rather than thinking solely about external interventions (governments and companies), whose funds and investments do not always are consistent with local expectations. Compromise of people (including academics and practitioners) in this locally driven processes seems also essential.
2. **Governance** appears as a basic question when dealing with mountain inclusive local development. Commonly, more than governance, we deal with lack of governance and, sometimes, with an excess of government intervention. Building partnerships at different levels is a basic procedure for mountain local inclusive development but this needs mutual

responsibility and leadership. Conflicts can typically arise and, in this regard, maybe in that case intermediary actors (mediators) can help in the situations when they become hard; academics could be key facilitators, going beyond the institutionalised systems in place. Transnational contexts must be considered, with a lot of work to do at an inter-state scale by means of transnational diplomacy. Voluntary work might be considered but typically this clashes with how academic work is carried out.

3. **Geographical arenas** must be considered when dealing with inclusive local development. Mountain development cannot be isolated from development of neighbouring flat areas. Mountain development commonly embraces both rural and urban areas that cannot be understood as mutually exclusive. Mountain development needs to consider both people and their living environments. The very definition of local development in the sense that it means to define what is understood by “the local community” is challenging: which are the boundaries of the local communities, how are they bounded? Of course local communities have to be understood in their internal complexity and also in the sense that they are heterogeneous: each one has its own conflicts, actors, power relations, leaders, etc. The landscape approach, in the sense that it embraces necessarily both people and nature is understood as a quite commonly suitable perspective to deal with mountain local development, especially for concealing people with their human-made environments.
4. **The role of academics.** Interestingly, a wide topic for discussion in the room was dealing with the involvement of academics ourselves when working in mountain local development. We heard about action research initiatives – a quite common research method –, but also about the continuing difficulties of academics to effectively engage with practitioners, local people, politicians and stakeholders, local businesses, etc. Someone said the academic system as a whole should change, for instance in order to allow that the work of academics is not only assessed by means of the figure of published papers in leading international journals but also with regard to the impact on the ground that research implies in effective local development terms; the notion of “slow science” was mentioned in this respect. Trans- and inter-disciplinarity were also mentioned as effective approaches to deal with mountain local development. While scaling-up research findings is difficult when developing local-based research, an effort should be done in this regard.

- 2) What is your opinion on the current state of knowledge concerning your topic(s) (focusing on mountain regions)? *Please check and fill in the matrix on the following page.*

Overall assessment of the state of:

What is your personal opinion on the current state of knowledge concerning the topic(s) addressed in your workshop. Please tick the appropriate field. Brief explanations are appreciated.

State of knowledge	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor	Not appropriate	Comments
Global						
Regional						<i>The knowledge about regional aspects can strongly vary between the Global North and South, as well as between rural and urban areas.</i>
Scattered case study-based knowledge		x				
Knowledge about past states/trends					x	
Knowledge about current situation		x				<i>In specific region or communities</i>
Knowledge about future states/trends/thresholds					x	
Knowledge about the system		x				
Knowledge about shaping pathways to more sustainable development (transformation knowledge)			x			<i>There is diversity of approaches in many communities, regions, disciplines but they are not aligned and therefore the ideas how to change differ. Additionally, the way how a societal transformation can occur is still very unclear.</i>
Knowledge about envisaged goals (target knowledge)					X	<i>The target are contested because this decisions depend on the involved actors, the scale/space and time frame. It became clear that different circumstances lead to different perspectives on where and how to develop.</i>

Ideas for questions to potentially be answered by the moderators after the workshop in the reporting (please delete what is not useful):

- 1) Were there any new insights and/or findings presented? If yes, which ones?
- 2) What was the main message/consensus of your workshop?
- 3) Were major uncertainty issues identified and discussed? If yes, which ones?
- 4) Was there any significant controversy (if so, what?) that requires new data (or further exploration of existing data) to resolve the issue? (explain)
- 5) Were new research questions raised? If yes, would working on these questions need to involve other disciplines (which ones)?
- 6) Did the workshop identify research topics (e.g. environmental drivers other than climate) that are, in your opinion, currently greatly underrepresented in mountain research, but should urgently be addressed?

Further Comments