

ANNEX 2

COMPARATIVE MATRIX OF COMMUNITIES

INTRODUCTION

In order to process the data we created a matrix to compare qualitative results by community type. This matrix allowed us to make comparisons between the communities of each municipality.

Community “types” were defined according to the strength or weakness of their grassroots organizations, especially those that were formed as counterparts to Popular Participation.

To define if a community has strong organizations, more or less strong or weak, we took into account the following indicators:

	Strong Organizations	More or Less Strong Organizations	Weak Organizations
Legitimacy and power of convocation within the community	Positive or very positive results in the three indicators according to the qualitative information.	Positive or very positive results in at least two of the indicators according to the qualitative information.	Positive results in one, or none of the indicators according to the qualitative information.
Capacity to channel demands and to negotiate with external agents			
Capacity to question and oversee the work of the municipal government and hold it accountable.			

We used these criteria to identify communities with strong, more or less strong, or with weak organizations for each municipality.

The matrix takes into account the following indicators:

1. INVENTORY OF GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS AND LOCAL INSTITUTIONS

1.1 Grassroots Organizations

- Which community organization is Popular Participation's counterpart
- Regularity of activities and functioning.
- Another type of community organizations and activity

1.2 Local Institutions

- Name of the NGOs that work in the community, length of time of their programs and projects.
- Regularity in their activities.
- Other local institutions in the community, length of time they have been working in the communities and activities.

2. ROLE IN THE PROVISION OF SERVICES

2.1 Education

- How to satisfy this need in the community (financing and maintenance).
- Role of the grassroots organizations.
- Role of local institutions.
- Role of the state.
- General evaluation of services.

2.2 Health

- How to satisfy this need in the community (financing and maintenance)
- Role of the grassroots organizations
- Role of local institutions
- Role of the state
- General evaluation of services

2.3 Potable Water

- How to satisfy this need in the community (financing and maintenance)
- Role of the grassroots organizations
- Role of local institutions
- Role of the state
- General evaluation of services

2.4 Electricity

- How to satisfy this need in the community (financing and maintenance)
- Role of the grassroots organizations
- Role of local institutions
- Role of the state

- General evaluation of services

2.5 Irrigation

- How to satisfy this need in the community (financing and maintenance)
- Role of the grassroots organizations
- Role of local institutions
- Role of the state
- General evaluation of services

2.6 Credit

- How to satisfy this need in the community (financing and maintenance)
- Role of the grassroots organizations
- Role of local institutions
- Role of the state
- General evaluation of services

2.7 Roads

- How to satisfy this need in the community (financing and maintenance)
- Role of the grassroots organizations
- Role of local institutions
- Role of the state
- General evaluation of services

2.5 Transportation

- How to satisfy this need in the community (financing and maintenance)
- Role of the grassroots organizations
- Role of local institutions
- Role of the state
- General evaluation of services

2.9 Other Services

- How to satisfy this need in the community (financing and maintenance)
- Role of the grassroots organizations
- Role of local institutions
- Role of the state
- General evaluation of services

3. INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONS

3.1 Relationships between Grassroots Organizations and Local Institutions

- Description of relationships
- Types of relationships
- Evaluation and projection of those relationships

3.2 Grassroots Organizations and the Population (community members)

Relationships

- Grassroots Organizations relationships to community members (ability to convoke, participation, legitimacy).
- Relationships of NGOs with the population (ability to convoke, participation, legitimacy)
- Relationships with other local institutions with the population. (Ability to convoke, participation, legitimacy).

3.3 Relationships of Grassroots Organizations and the State

- Relationships between Grassroots Organizations and the Municipality (type of relationship, results).
- Relationships between Grassroots Organizations and other government institutions (type of relationship, results).

4. FACTORS THAT STRENGTHEN/WEAKEN GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS

4.1 Historical

- Experience with the Agrarian Reform
- Tradition to interpellate the state (of holding the state accountable)
- Organizational experience
- Traditional presence of local institutions in the community (especially NGOs in the Municipality)

4.2 Economic Productivity

- Productive potential
- Market links
- Poverty indicators
- Internal stratification: local elites and power groups.

4.3 Ethnic and Cultural

- Homogeneity/diversification ethnic, cultural and religious
- Relationships with modernizing values and practices
- Training of ideological elites (characteristics)

5. GENERAL EVALUATION

- Strengths/weakness of grassroots organizations
- Role in local development and service provision
- Factors that explain strengths/weakness

MUNICIPALITY: TIAHUNACU

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS Chambi Grande; Ñachoca; K'asa Achuta; Santa Rosa; Chambi Taraco; Yanarico	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huakullani; Huank'ollo; Tiahunacu	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Pekeri, Taraco
I. INVENTORY OF GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS AND LOCAL INSTITUTIONS		
1.1. Grassroots organizations		
<p><u>Grassroots organizations counterpart of Popular Participation:</u> Agrarian Union 1953 -- highest communal authority: organizes, manages, litigates internal problems, lobbies for and channels institutional support. Irregular service.</p> <p>Other grassroots organizations: School Board 1953 - oversees the strict compliance of the school plan and lobbies for institutional support. Area President 1993- organizes, mobilizes and litigates internal community problems. Fishermen Association 1987: concerned with interests of the fishermen, seeks markets for commercialization, lobbies for institutional support. Irregular service.</p>	<p>Huakullani, Huank'ollo <u>Grassroots organizations counterpart of Popular Participation:</u> Agrarian Union. Irregular service.</p> <p><u>Other grassroots organizations:</u> School Board, area President and Neighborhood Committee, which represents neighborhood interests, but only exists in Huakullani. Parents' Association, oversees compliance of the school schedule. Irregular service.</p> <p>Tiahunacu <u>Grassroots organizations counterpart of PP:</u> School Board <u>Other grassroots organizations:</u> Civic Committee of Tiahunacu Residents in La Paz 1992 –represents interests of the town and lobbies for institutional support in La Paz.</p>	<p><u>Grassroots organizations counterpart of Popular Participation:</u> Agrarian Union. Irregular service. <u>Other grassroots organizations:</u> School Board Fishermen Association 1987: concerned with fishermen's interests, seeks markets for commercialization, lobbies for institutional support. Irregular service.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Chambi Grande; Ñachoca; K'asa Achuta; Santa Rosa; Chambi Taraco; Yanarico	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huakullani; Huank'ollo; Tiahuanacu	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Pekeri, Taraco
1.2. Local Institutions : NGOs		
<p>Plan International- basic services, school infrastructure.</p> <p>Chambi Grande, K'asa Achuta has plans to install electricity. Intervida (since 1996) provides school infrastructure and supplies.</p>	<p>Huakullani, Huankollo Plan International is not working in Huacullani. Intervida</p> <p>Tiahuanacu Plan International 1980- school infrastructure, services basic. Intervida 1995-infrastructure; Cocas 1993-training and technical assistance to rural communities. They do not work in Tiahuanacu; Sartawi 1993-individual credits, mainly for the rural sector of the municipality. Regular service..</p>	<p>Intervida 1996 - school infrastructure and supplies. Plan International does not support these communities because they lost the trust of the communities . Communities do not want to work with institutions.</p>
1.3. Other Local Institutions		
<p>Catholic Church 1987- Only in Chambi Grande training, technical assistance</p>	<p>Catholic University 1989 -Training agronomist technicians.</p>	
2. SERVICE PROVISION		
2.1. Education		
<p>Community schools are funded by the Government, built by the community, and enlarged by Plan International. The School Board oversees teachers and the government pays the salaries. Regular service.</p>	<p>Huakullani, Huankollo The government funded the schools, at the union's request. The School Board oversees the work of the teachers. Poor infrastructure.</p> <p>Tiahuanacu Two private schools and two public ones, also a school for adults and the Technical University. The Government funded the schools. Grassroots organizations did not fund these works. The Catholic Church built and funds the Technical University.</p>	<p>The government built a school and Plan International later enlarged and repaired it. The School Board oversees education and coordinates the maintenance of the infrastructure. Service is regular.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Chambi Grande; Ñachoca; K’asa Achuta; Santa Rosa; Chambi Taraco; Yanarico	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huakullani; Huank’ollo; Tiahunacu	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Pekeri, Taraco
2.2. Health		
<p>Ñachoca Health center built by Suma Mank’añani (NGO) in coordination with the Agrarian Union. This health center stopped working due to lack of funds for the nurse’s salary.</p> <p>Chambi Grande, K’asa Achuta, Santa Rosa Taraco, Chambi Yanarico Do not have health services in the community. They must go to La Paz for health services.</p>	<p>Huank’ollo They have a hospital of traditional medicine created in 1968- funded by the Inter-American foundation, built by the community and currently maintained by “popular health representative”. The government does not participate providing this service. Does not have adequate infrastructure, does not work in actuality.</p> <p>Huakullani Does not have this service</p> <p>Tiahunacu Has a health center funded by the state, built by the community. The Health Ministry manages it, the personnel includes a general practice doctor, a dentist and a nurse. It Regular service., even though it does not have the necessary materials.</p>	<p>Do not have health services</p>
2.3. Potable water		
<p>Chambi Grande Piped water non-potable to homes. Project channeled by the union and financed by Plan International in 1995</p> <p>Ñachoca, K’asa Achuta, Santa Rosa, Chambi Taraco, Yanarico Does not have this service. They store water in wells and irrigation ditches.</p>	<p>Huakullani, Huankollo Does not have this service</p> <p>Tiahunacu Piped water to homes. The system was built by the Municipality and managed by a cooperative called CORELPAZ and financed by town residents. Grassroot organizations did not play an active role to obtain this service. Regular service.</p>	<p>Do not have this service. They store water in wells. Provision is through irrigation ditches.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Chambi Grande; Ñachoca; K'asa Achuta; Santa Rosa; Chambi Taraco; Yanarico	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huakullani; Huank'ollo; Tiahunacu	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Pekeri, Taraco
2.4. Electricity		
<p>Electricity to homes partly financed by Plan International and in some communities, such as Kasa Achuta with money from Popular Participation. CORELPAZ (Rural Electricity Cooperative of La Paz). Service is irregular, many blackouts and low power.</p> <p>Chambi Grande Does not have electricity. The Union is trying to get funding from Plan International for the installation.</p>	<p>Huakullani, Huankollo Does not have this service.</p> <p>Tiahunacu Electricity to homes was installed, maintained and managed by CORELPAZ (Rural Electricity Cooperative of La Paz). Town residents financed it. Grassroots organizations did not play an active role to obtain this service. Service is regular.</p>	<p>Pekeri, Taraco Electricity to homes was installed, and financed through an agreement with a neighboring community maintained and managed by CORELPAZ. The Agrarian Union lobbied to obtain this service and negotiated the agreement. Service is irregular.</p>
2.5. Irrigation		
<p>Do not have irrigation systems. They cultivate "secano" (without irrigation).</p>	<p>Do not have systematic service.</p>	<p>Do not have systematic service.</p>
2.6. Credit		
<p>Families have access to credit from Sartawi</p>	<p>Families have access to credit from Sartawi</p>	<p>Families have access to credit from Sartawi</p>
2.7. Roads		
<p>Neighborhood roads are built and maintained by the communities. There is almost no maintenance work. The roads can be traveled most of the year, especially during the dry season.</p>	<p>Huakullani, Huankollo Dirt road built by the large landowners before the 1952 revolution. The regional Transportation Union, Ingavi repairs them sporadically.</p> <p>Tiahunacu Ingavi serves the community twice a week and Tiahunacu, the transportation cooperative provides daily service, every hour. Service is regular and good.</p>	<p>Neighborhood roads are built and maintained by the communities. During the rainy season roads can not be traveled.</p>
2.8. Transportation		
<p>Ingavi, the transport union is responsible for public transportation. They come through the road that links Tiahunacu and Taraco two or three times a week. Yanarico residents, walk 20 minutes to get to the main road. The other communities are on the main road. Service for passengers is regular. They hardly have any transportation service for cargo.</p>	<p>Huakullani, Huankollo Ingavi serves these communities twice a week.</p> <p>Tiahunacu Tiahunaco Transport Cooperative has hourly service every day, and Ingavi serves these communities twice a week. Service is regular and good.</p>	<p>Ingavi provides service twice a week. Service is regular.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Chambi Grande; Ñachoca; K'asa Achuta; Santa Rosa; Chambi Taraco; Yanarico	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huakullani; Huank'ollo; Tiahunacu	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Pekeri, Taraco
2.9. Other Services		
<p>Santa Rosa of Taraco has a radio station that airs messages between communities and families. It Regular service.</p>	<p>Tiahunacu The community has two public telephones, one under through the telephone cooperative of La Paz and another through the National Telecommunications Company. Tiahunacu and Huakullani have ratio stations that air community and family messages. They operate irregularly</p>	
3. INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS		
3.1. Between Grassroots Organizations and Local Institutions		
<p>Infrequent relationships between the union and NGOs (especially Plan International). Once, the Union approves a project, coordination is scarce.</p>	<p>Almost non-existent. Sporadic contacts between the Agrarian Union and NGOs.</p>	<p>Conflictive relationships due to lack of compliance of NGOs.</p>
3.2. Relationships with the Population		
<p>* Community accepts the union's decisions and participates in projects. *Relationship between NGOs and the population only with families that participate in projects.</p>	<p>Huacullani, Huankollo * The Union has support of the population. Massive participation by heads of households in meetings. * NGOs do not coordinate their activities with the entire population, only with the Union. Tiahuanacu * Neighborhood Committees have a limited power of convocation. Only a few heads of households participate in meetings. * NGOs do no carry out activities with the urban population of Tiahuanacu.</p>	<p>* Agrarian Union members do not have the power to organize these communities. During meetings only a few heads of households assist, younger members do not feel identified with the union. * NGOs do not maintain relationships with the population.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Chambi Grande; Ñachoca; K'asa Achuta; Santa Rosa; Chambi Taraco; Yanarico	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huakullani; Huank'ollo; Tiahunacu	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Pekeri, Taraco
3.3. Relationships of Grassroots Organizations with the Municipality		
Depends on the dynamism of the Secretary General of the Union. The more dynamic the Secretary, the more personal contact with the Mayor (Chambi Grande, Ñachoca, Chambi Taraco). The less dynamic the secretary, the less contact with the Mayor (Yanarico, Santa Rosa of Taraco).	Huakullani, Huankollo Almost non-existent. The general secretaries do not take initiative. Tiahuanacu Coordination of activities between neighborhood committees and the municipality. Close relations.	Non-existent.
3.4. Relationships of Grassroots Organizations with Other Government Institutions		
Non-existent	Non-existent	Non-existent
4. FACTORS THAT STRENGTHEN/WEAKEN GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS		
4.1. Historical		
<p>* <u>Experience with the Agrarian Reform:</u> Strengthening grassroots organizations by allowing the transition of more traditional grassroots organizations to less traditional ones (such as the Agrarian Union).</p> <p>* <u>Tradition of holding the state accountable:</u> Before the Agrarian Reform of 1952, a strong tradition to hold the state accountable existed in these communities, even though currently, this is reoriented toward the Municipality.</p> <p>* <u>Organizational experience:</u> Since pre-Columbian times, through the Republic and now in a democracy (especially the Agrarian Union).</p> <p>* <u>Presence of local Institutions in the community:</u> limited presence of local entities, especially NGOs.</p>	<p>Huakullani, Huankollo</p> <p>* <u>Experience with the Agrarian Reform:</u> as a product of the reform, traditional grassroots organizations are substituted by less traditional ones such as the Agrarian Union.</p> <p>* <u>Interpellation of the state:</u> the Agrarian Union becomes the interlocutor and legitimate intermediary of the needs and demands of the population to the State</p> <p>* <u>Organizational experience:</u> Since pre-Columbian times, through the republic and now in a democracy (specially the Agrarian Union).</p> <p>Tiahuanacu</p> <p>* <u>Tradition of hold the state accountable :</u> Do not have a tradition of holding the state accountable, but due to the political reorientation of the country currently, they are questioning the Municipality.</p> <p>* <u>Organizational Experience.</u> They have a 60-year old organizational tradition (the case of the neighborhood association).</p>	<p>* <u>Experience with the Agrarian Reform:</u> Product of the agrarian reform, grassroots organizations are reorienting their functions.</p> <p>* <u>Tradition of holding the state accountable:</u> the Agrarian Union became the interlocutor and legitimate intermediary of the needs and demands of the population to the state</p> <p>* Tradition of limited presence of local institutions in the community.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Chambi Grande; Ñachoca; K’asa Achuta; Santa Rosa; Chambi Taraco; Yanarico</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huakullani; Huank’ollo; Tiahuanacu</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Pekeri, Taraco</p>
4.2. Economic Productivity		
<p>Ñachoca; Santa Rosa of Taraco * <u>Productive potential</u> Cattle-raising, agricultural and fishing communities with greater capacity to generate productive surpluses for sale. * <u>Market links</u>: greater links, specially La Paz, El Alto and Tiahuanacu (do not have their own fair). * <u>Poverty indicators</u>: they do not have many basic services or housing, but they generate a production surplus. They fall within moderate poverty. * <u>Internal stratification</u>: Grouped around a power elite of subcentral Agraria Taraco. Chambi Grande; K’asa Achuta; Chambi Taraco * <u>Productive potential</u>. Cattle-raising and agricultural communities. * <u>Market links</u>: minor links with area markets (do not have their own fair). * <u>Poverty indicators</u>: do not have many basic services nor housing, * There is not an important internal stratification.</p>	<p>Huakullani, Huankollo * <u>Productive potential</u>: Communities based in cattle raising, and agricultural subsistence production. * <u>Market links</u>: Maintain links with Tiahuanacu and La Paz markets. Huakullani has an important fair. * <u>Poverty indicators</u>: Communities do not have social services and the housing is precarious. * There is not marked internal stratification. Tiahuanacu * <u>Productive potential</u>. Town of merchants, teachers, artisans and farmers. * <u>Market links</u>: the same town has a local fair, although its population maintains links with the market of La Paz.</p>	<p>* <u>Productive potential</u>. Communities based in subsistence cattle raising and agriculture. These communities have been affected by the <i>minifundio</i> (small plots ownership pattern). * <u>Market links</u>. Limited links with the Tiahuanacu fair. * <u>Poverty indicators</u>: Communities do not have social services and the housing is precarious. Extreme poverty and chronic migration.</p>
4.3. Ethnic and cultural		
<p>* Aymara cultural homogeneity. Diversity of religious practices (important evangelical presence). * Familiarity with western organizational and negotiating procedures.</p>	<p>Huakullani, Huankollo * Aymara population, little religious diversity. Tiahuanacu * Mixed <i>mestizo</i> (Spanish and indigenous) and aymara population and great religious diversity. (Evangelical presence). * Familiarity with western organizational procedures.</p>	<p>* Aymara population. Religious diversity.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Chambi Grande; Ñachoca; K'asa Achuta; Santa Rosa; Chambi Taraco; Yanarico	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huakullani; Huank'ollo; Tiahunacu	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Pekeri, Taraco
5. GENERAL EVALUATION		
<p>Strength related to the training of historical and traditional organizations that inspire respect, obedience and loyalty inside the community; but weak externally because they are channels with limited capacity and experience of institutional negotiation.</p> <p>Uobbies for and channels the demands of the population, but participates little in the identification and prioritization of needs.</p>	<p>Grassroots organizations have little power to mobilize community work. They can channel demands to the Municipality, but have little power to oversee and control.</p> <p>Farmers and townspeople question their efficiency.</p>	<p>Grassroots organizations have irregular funding. High migration of the younger families impedes the training stable community leadership.</p>

MUNICIPALITY: MIZQUE

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS Mizque Pampa, Tabacal, Molinero	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Churo, Thago Thago Alto, Mizque	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Tipa Tipa, Taboada, Tukma Baja, Tin Tin
I. INVENTORY OF GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS AND LOCAL INSTITUTIONS		
1.1. Grassroots organizations		
<p>Grassroots organizations counterpart Popular Participation: Agrarian Union, responsible for addressing community demands. Activities include bimonthly meetings to discuss community issues * Other grassroots organizations: Mother's Clubs: organized women. Lasted while food was given away (6 months to a year) and then disappeared.</p>	<p>Churo, Thago Thago Grassroots organizations counterpart of Popular Participation.: Agrarian Union, responsible for addressing community demands. Monthly meetings to discuss community issues. Other grassroots organizations: Mother's Clubs that meet occasionally. Irrigation association: their activities are permanent, they control the turns of community members to irrigate their land, and solve problems related to water use. Mizque Grassroots organizations counterpart of the PP. Neighborhood association, with little power of convocation. Civic committee: lobbies the government to get benefits to the region. Teacher's Union Transportation Union</p>	<p>Grassroots organizations counterpart to P.P: Agrarian Union: responsible for addressing community demands. Monthly meetings to discuss community issues. Mother's Clubs: lasted only while food was given away and then disappeared. Irrigation association: their activities are permanent, they control the turns of community members to irrigate their land, and solve problems related to water use. School Board: deals with schools and student issues. Irregular service.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mizque Pampa, Tabacal, Molinero	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Churo, Thago Thago Alto, Mizque	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Tipa Tipa, Taboada, Tukma Baja, Tin Tin
1.2. Local Institutions : NGOs		
<p>Doctors Without Borders: 6 years working in this community. They built a small hospital and health center with primary health programs. Regular service.</p> <p>Cedeagro: 3-6 months working in the communities. Potable water projects, crop improvement training and agricultural credit. When projects are finished, they leave the communities.</p> <p>Senda: does not work with the entire community, only with a few community members. They have some reforestation programs.</p>	<p>Cedeagro: 3-6 months working in the communities. Potable water projects, agricultural credit and training in crops improvement.</p> <p>Pedeaire (NGO) irrigation projects including ditches water canalization and reinforcing ditches.</p> <p>Asterc: Training and credit projects.</p>	<p>Doctors Without Borders: built a health center with primary health programs. Regular service..</p> <p>Cedeagro: Built a school, boarding school, courts and training to improve crops and provide agricultural credit.</p> <p>Pedeaire (NGO) irrigation projects including ditches water canalization and reinforcing ditches</p> <p>Proimpa: training and credit projects. They work regularly.</p> <p>World Vision: primary health projects, training to improve crops and agricultural credit.</p>
1.3. Other Local Institutions		
<p>Radio Esperanza (Catholic church) training and crop improvement.</p>	<p>ELFEC (electric company): electricity</p>	<p>ELFEC: has worked in the area for 3 years.</p>
2. SERVICE PROVISION		
2.1. Education		
<p>Mizque Pampa, Molinero Schools funded by the FIS and built by Cedeagro. The community maintains the infrastructure. The union's role is to organize the community in collective works to help the building the schools and for maintenance. The state provides teacher's salaries. Service works well.</p> <p>Tabacal Does not have this service.</p>	<p>Churo, Thago Thago, Alto Do not have this service</p> <p>Mizque The school was funded y the FIS and built by Cedeagro. Grassroots organizations did not request this service.</p>	<p>Schools funded by the FIS and built by Cedeagro and the Bilingual Intercultural Project (PIB). The community maintains the infrastructure through the School Board. The state provides for teachers' salaries. This service works well.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mizque Pampa, Tabacal, Molinero	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Churo, Thago Thago Alto, Mizque	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Tipa Tipa, Taboada, Tukma Baja, Tin Tin
2.2. Health		
<p>Mizque Pampa , Molinero Health Center funded by Doctors Without Borders (NGO). The community takes care of maintenance of the infrastructure. The state does not intervene. Irregular service.</p> <p>Tabacal Does not have this service</p>	<p>Churo, Thago Thago Alto Do not have this service</p> <p>Mizque Hospital built by Doctors Without Borders. The Municipality manages is and the Prefect pays the salaries.</p>	<p>Tipa Tipa, Tin Tin Health Center funded by Doctors Without Borders and World Vision The community takes care of maintenance of the infrastructure. The state does not intervene. It functions well</p> <p>Taboada, Tukma Baja Do not have this service</p>
2.3. Potable water		
<p>Mizque Pampa, Molinero Service financed by Cedeagro (NGO). The community takes care of the maintenance through the Water Committee, linked to the union. The state does not intervene. Service not working well, due to bad installation.</p> <p>Tabacal Does not have this service</p>	<p>Churo, Thago Thago Alto Service financed by Cedeagro (NGO). The community takes care of the maintenance through the Water Committee, linked to the union. The state does not intervene. This service is not working well, due to a bad installation.</p> <p>Mizque Potable water system built by the Prefect and administered by a water cooperative. Service is regular and good.</p>	<p>Taboada, Tukma Baja, Tin Tin Service financed by Cedeagro (NGO). The community takes care of the maintenance through the Water Committee, linked to the union. The state does not intervene. Service does not work well, due to bad installation.</p> <p>Tipa Tipa Does not have this service.</p>
2.4. Electricity		
<p>Do not have this service. They use lamp burners and candles.</p>	<p>Thago Thago Alto, Mizque System built and maintained by ELFEC. Grassroots organizations do not intervene. Service is regular and good.</p> <p>Churo Does not have this service.</p>	<p>Tipa Tipa, Tin Tin Each community member pays his or her own installation and consumption. ELFEC provides this service. The union requests the service. The service is good.</p> <p>Taboada, Tukma Baja Do not have this service.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mizque Pampa, Tabacal, Molinero	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Churo, Thago Thago Alto, Mizque	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Tipa Tipa, Taboada, Tukma Baja, Tin Tin
2.5. Irrigation		
<p>Molinero System built by the Peasant Development Fund and managed by the Irrigation Committee, linked to the union. It is somewhat deficient due to the scarcity of water.</p> <p>Mizque Pampa, Tabacal Do not have this service.</p>	<p>Churo, Thago Thago Alto System funded by Cedeagro, built by the community. The Irrigation Committee linked to the union manages it. Service is regular.</p> <p>Mizque System built and maintained by Pedaire. Community members did not build it, and they do not manage it either. Service is regular.</p>	<p>Communities' Development helped with irrigation systems. Cedeagro took advantage of rivers in the area. This service works well. The union has the role of organizing the community to contribute with labor. Institutions provide funds and technical assistance in the installation of this service.</p>
2.6. Credit		
<p>Cedeagro offers credit. The union has the role of gathering the community member to learn about the advantages of credit. The state does not intervene. This service does not work well, because community members are unwilling to take out credit since they have one crop per year and are very poor.</p>	<p>Churo, Mizque Cedeagro offers credit. Access to credit is personal and it is not mediated by grassroots organizations. It Regular service..</p> <p>Thago Thago Alto Do not have this service.</p>	<p>Cedeagro, Proimpa and Astec (all NGOs) offer credit to aid community members. The union has the role of gathering the community member to teach them about the advantages of credit. Government does not intervene. This service works well, because community members have three crops a year and need credit.</p>
2.7. Roads		
<p>Communities built and maintain the roads through communal work. The role of the union is to organize the community to keep up the roads. Institutions did not intervene. Recently, the state improved this service though their Neighborhood Roads Program. This service only works well during the dry season.</p>	<p>Communities built roads and and maintain them through organizations established by the Agricultural Union. The state does not intervene. This service is not usable during the rainy season.</p>	<p>Cordeco, Community Development and Neighborhood Roads improved the roads. The role of the union is to organize the community to keep up the roads. Institutions fund paving the roads with stone, and the state improves the service. This service only works well during the dry season.</p>
2.8. Transportation		
<p>Do not have a regular transportation system. Community members go to the regional fairs by foot.</p>	<p>Churo, Thago Thago Alto, Mizque Do not have a regular transportation system. Community members walk to the main road.</p>	<p>The community provides the service. Some community members have their own transportation, which other members can rent to get their products to the market. The majority has bicycles and motorcycles. Tin Tin has a Transportation Union provides service to Mizque.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mizque Pampa, Tabacal, Molinero	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Churo, Thago Thago Alto, Mizque	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Tipa Tipa, Taboada, Tukma Baja, Tin Tin
2.9. Other Services		
	<p>Mizque Sewage built by the Prefecture. The national telephone company ENTEL provides telephone services.</p>	
3. INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS		
3.1. Between Grassroots Organizations and Local Institutions		
<p>Relationship of coordination and mutual collaboration. This relationship has allowed local leaders to acquire the necessary experience in institutional negotiation and the NGOs to have a closer contact with the communities.</p>	<p>Churo, Thago Thago Alto Close coordination between the Union and the NGOs that work in the communities. Mizque Service does not exist.</p>	<p>Relationships plagued by mistrust and sometimes conflict. Community leaders assume a fiscalizing role over NGO projects and interventions.</p>
3.2. Relationships with the Population		
<p>Grassroots organizations: have total legitimacy in the community, because they are the only one that represents them and makes others “respect them.” The community participates in all the activities that the union programs. NGOs: before starting a project the community is mistrustful, however, once the project is accepted and implemented the community collaborates. The relationship could be characterized as one of mutual respect and collaboration.</p>	<p>Churo, Thago Thago Alto Grassroots Organizations: have almost total legitimacy in the community, but some community members, especially the younger ones do not recognize the Union as the highest authority. The entire community does not participate in the activities programmed by the Union. NGOs: relationships with the population are positive. They have credibility. Mizque Grassroots Organizations: have some legitimacy and power to convoke. There is not enough organizational experience in the town. NGOs are appreciated in the community.</p>	<p>Grassroots organizations: partial legitimacy in the community. Agrarian Union members do not have enough power of convocation. There is a lot of internal stratification, so the union can not represent all the social segments. Relationships between NGOs and the population are of mutual respect.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mizque Pampa, Tabacal, Molinero	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Churo, Thago Thago Alto, Mizque	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Tipa Tipa, Taboada, Tukma Baja, Tin Tin
3.3. Relationships of Grassroots Organizations with the Municipality		
They are not direct because the Community Union is more closely linked to the Central Peasant Organization of the Municipality and expresses urgent demands through them.	There is not a direct relationship. It is mediated through the Central Peasant Organization.	They are not direct because the Community Union is more closely linked to the Central Peasant Organization of the Municipality and expresses urgent demands through them.
3.4. Relationships of Grassroots Organizations with Other State Institutions		
Cooperation with the Social Investment Fund.	No Relationships of Grassroots Organizations with state institutions.	No Relationships of Grassroots Organizations with state institutions.
4. FACTORS THAT STRENGTHEN/WEAKEN GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS		
4.1. Historical		
* <u>The Agrarian Reform</u> : key point, marking the beginning of Peasant Unions with absolute power and legitimacy. Communities have many organizational traditions since pre-Columbian times.	Churo, Thago Thago Alto The organizational tradition is important, but unions have not completely adapted to the new conditions posed by Popular Participation.	Communities historically assisted by state institutions and NGOs. They have not developed a strong organizational tradition to channel demands.

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mizque Pampa, Tabacal, Molinero	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Churo, Thago Thago Alto, Mizque	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Tipa Tipa, Taboada, Tukma Baja, Tin Tin
4.2. Economic Productivity		
They only have one crop a year, and few market links. Very poor communities without strong social stratification.	Diversification in economic activities impedes the consolidation of grassroots organizations.	Nearness to the market contributed to the diversification of the economic base, which has weakened the Union's power of convocation and representation.
4.3. Ethnicity and Culture		
Homogeneous ethnic, cultural and religious makeup. Cultural traditions outline organizational rules and the interpellation of the municipality and other local institutions.	Churo, Thago Thago Alto Strong Quechua tradition and religious homogeneity allow the formation of a collective identity as the base for grassroots organizations. Mizque Frequent contact of the population with the urban center of Cochabamba has made them learn Spanish.	Cultural and religious homogeneity weakened by socioeconomic fragmentation.

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mizque Pampa, Tabacal, Molinero	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Churo, Thago Thago Alto, Mizque	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Tipa Tipa, Taboada, Tukma Baja, Tin Tin
5. GENERAL EVALUATION		
<p>Grassroots organizations are strong, with power to convoke and absolute legitimacy in the community. The role of the grassroots organizations and NGOs is fundamental for local development and service provision</p> <p>Factors that explain this strength are the need to surmount adverse economic limitations (only one productive cycle per year). Economic, cultural and religious homogeneity provides a symbolic common foundation for the legitimacy of the union and the negotiating experience of the leaders.</p>	<p>Grassroots organizations have experience in institutional relations, but inside the communities legitimacy is not total, due to the lack of institutional channels that allow participation of younger community members seeking their own representation. Despite this, in Mizque, grassroots organizations are very important to channel demand and for the organization of collective works.</p> <p>In Mizque, grassroots organizations do not play a central role in local development, but in the last few years they have sought to increase their presence in the dynamics of Popular Participation.</p>	<p>Grassroots organizations are weak. They do not have power to convoke the communities and only have partial legitimacy. The role of grassroots organizations and NGOs helps local development and service provision. The factors that explain this weakness are the economic conditions, proximity to Mizque, an urban center and access to its services, which does not foster motivation to develop the communities. Growing urbanization in these communities affects the legitimacy of the Agrarian Union.</p>

MUNICIPALITY: VILLA SERRANO

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Nuevo Mundo, La Quebrada	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mendoza, Zamora	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huerta Mayu, Lampasillos, Cañadillas, Villa Serrano, Pampas Arias, Chapas
I. INVENTORY OF GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS AND LOCAL INSTITUTIONS		
1.1. Grassroots organizations		
<p>* <u>Popular Participation Counterpart</u>: Agrarian Union.</p> <p>* <u>Regular activities</u>: Meetings 2 or 3 times a month, according to the needs of the community.</p> <p>* <u>Other community organizations and activities</u>: Civic Committee (except in La Quebrada) interlocutor before the Municipality; First Aid School Committee, with the assistance of students and teachers (Nuevo Mundo has fundraising raffles). The Water Committee oversees the quality of potable water and coordinates cleanings. Mothers' clubs activities involve weaving, family planning, and family garden instruction.</p>	<p>* <u>Popular Participation Counterpart</u>: Agrarian Union.</p> <p>* <u>Regularity of activities</u>: Meetings 2 o 3 times a month according to the needs of the community.</p> <p>* <u>Other community organizations and activities</u>:</p> <p>Mendoza The Water Cooperative, distributes and collects this service. The Association of Potato Producers, created by the community. The Civic Committee, which functions as an extension of the union.</p> <p>Zamora The Water Cooperative manages and receives a small annual fee for the service. The Family Store is responsible for the supply of basic products comprising the family basket. Auxiliary School Board oversees faculty and student. Mothers' Clubs work with family gardens and receive health training.</p>	<p>Lampasillos; Cañadillas; P. Arias; Chapas</p> <p>*<u>Popular Participation Counterpart</u>: Agrarian Union.</p> <p>*<u>Regularity of activities</u>: Meetings 2 o 3 times a month according on the needs of the community.</p> <p>* <u>Other community organizations and activities</u>:</p> <p>Huerta Mayu Mothers' Clubs created by CARE, their activities center around the maintenance of community gardens.</p> <p>Lampasillos; Cañadillas Auxiliary School Board, controls faculty and student assistance. Mothers' Clubs, created by CARE instruct women in family gardening, weaving and cooking.</p> <p>Villa Serrano *<u>Popular Participation counterpart</u>: Neighborhood Committees (3 committees). * <u>Regular activities</u>: Meetings when necessary.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Nuevo Mundo, La Quebrada	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mendoza, Zamora	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huerta Mayu, Lampasillos, Cañadillas, Villa Serrano, Pampas Arias, Chapas
1.2. Local Institutions : NGOs		
<p>Nuevo Mundo CARE has promoted family gardens, reproductive health training, silos, soil improvement, live barriers and irrigation since 1995 (2 years). CEDEC literacy training of adult women since 1996 (1 year).</p> <p>La Quebrada CEDEC agroforestry, literacy training, credit in wheat seeds since 1994 (3 years). CARE reinforcing health promoters' training since 1996 (1 year). PLAFOR reforestation since 1996 (1 year). IMCC training health promoters since 1990 (7 years).</p>	<p>Mendoza CEDEC seed credit, erosion control, and recently, literacy training of adult women since 1990 (7 years). CARE has worked building silos and providing veterinary technical assistance since 1994 (3 years). PLAFOR soil erosion control and reforestation since 1987 (10 years). CARITAS provides credit for commercial seed since 1995 (2 years). IMCC trains health promoters since 1994 and donated first-aid kits and medicine.</p> <p>Zamora CARE builds silos and chicken coops, does reforestation, family gardens and provides health support since 1994 (3 years). CEDEC implemented a greenhouse, does erosion control and literacy training of adult women since 1990 (7 years). PLAFOR soil erosion control since 1995 (2 years). IMCC trains health promoters since 1988 (9 years).</p>	<p>Huerta Mayu CARE builds silos and chicken coops, provides seeds and fences since 1994. CEDEC does literacy training of adult women since 1996 (7 people participate). PLAFOR works on reforestation since 1996 (only 2 people participate).</p> <p>Lampasillos, P. Arias. CEDEC provides credit in form of wheat and potato seeds since 1996, and literacy training of adult women since 1992. CARE works on food security, implementation of family gardens, family planning and silo building since 1995. PLAFOR works on reforestation since 1992 IMCC trains health promoters since 1993.</p> <p>Cañadillas, Chapas CEDEC provides credit in form of wheat and potato seed, has implemented 9 solar tents since 1993 and literacy training of adult women since 1996 CARE has donated wheat seed, and constructed silos and coops since 1995. IMCC trains health promoters since 1995.</p> <p>Villa Serrano PLAFOR works on reforestation since 1990, Microcuenca Program. CEDEC has worked since 1990 on productive transformation, food security, literacy training centers and strengthening of unions. Recently they have started a radio station. Since 1994, CARE works in the communities with natural resource management and community planning. IMCC works with the hospital in health issues since 1987.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Nuevo Mundo, La Quebrada	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mendoza, Zamora	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huerta Mayu, Lampasillos, Cañadillas, Villa Serrano, Pampas Arias, Chapas
1.3. Other Local Institutions		
<p>The Parish built a boarding school and prepares breakfast for the school. IMCC (cooperation agency) since 1988 (9 years) health promoter training.</p>	<p>Parish trains leaders and prepares school breakfasts.</p>	<p>Huerta Mayu and V. Serrano Parish built a chapel. Lampasillos, Cañadillas, P. Arias, Chapas. Parish built a chapel prepares breakfasts for school and trains leaders. PROSABAR and the Municipality since 1996 works in potable water storage.</p>
2. SERVICE PROVISION 2.1. Education		
<p>Nuevo Mundo 2 schools, one built by the community and the other, which is an educational complex, was built with resources from PP (FIS resources, carried out by a private company, Hidroservise and the community). The community maintains the school and the Union made the request. Service is good; the new school is large and has a court. La Quebrada One school built by CEDEC and the Municipality with resources from the FIS. The community is in charge of maintenance. The union made the request. Service is good, however it is only up to 5th grade.</p>	<p>Mendoza One school and another is being built by and the Espinoza Company with funding from the FIS. The community and the Municipality are in charge of maintenance. The union requested the funds. Surrounding communities use this service. Zamora One school built with FIS resources through the CEDEC, the community also helped to transport materials and is responsible for maintenance. The union requested this service. There are 2 teachers for 1st through 5th grade.</p>	<p>Huerta Mayu, P. Arias. Does not have a school Lampasillos; Cañadillas; Chapas One school funded by the FIS and built by CEDEC. Maintenance is the responsibility of the Union. Service is regular, and classes are through 2nd grade. Villa Serrano One existing school and another is being built by CEITHAR with funding from the FIS, the Mayor's office and the Parish. Also, there is a teacher's institute paid by the Municipality and the population. Neighborhood committees did not request this service.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Nuevo Mundo, La Quebrada	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mendoza, Zamora	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huerta Mayu, Lampasillos, Cañadillas, Villa Serrano, Pampas Arias, Chapas
2.2. Health		
<p>Nuevo Mundo Health center funded by the Inter-American Development Bank maintained by the Municipality and the community. The union requested this service. Service is regular. The center is not equipped, and they need a physician, since they only have a nurse.</p> <p>La Quebrada Does not have this service.</p>	<p>Mendoza One health center built by CREILE and funded by the Health and Strengthening Program of the Health Ministry. The Union requested this service. They need doctors.</p> <p>Zamora Does not have this service.</p>	<p>Huerta Mayu; Lampasillos; P. Arias Do not have a school.</p> <p>Cañadillas; Chapas CEDEC's doctor and Health Department employees visit these communities once a month to weigh the children and provide food security support.</p> <p>Villa Serrano One hospital built and maintained by the Municipality. Neighbor hood committees did not request it. The service works well, users pay a fee per visit, but some are not satisfied because of the lack of specialist doctors.</p>
2.3. Potable water		
<p>Nuevo Mundo Piped water to homes, the community got it through the Union and with the help of CARE and the ex-Cordech. The community takes care of maintenance and pays a fee. They have a Water Committee. This service works well thanks to the Water Committee, but there are difficulties with the purification, and also the fact that houses are disperse makes it difficult for water to reach all the areas.</p> <p>La Quebrada 3 public wells in the school area. The Water Cooperative provides maintenance and members pay for the service. The Union requested the service. The service is regular, but does not reach all areas of the community.</p>	<p>Mendoza Piped water to homes. The Union requested the potable water and got it through CARE. The Water Cooperative and the community provide maintenance. Service is not good in the rainy season.</p> <p>Zamora There are public wells around the school, but other areas have no water. This service was obtained through Public Health, part of the Health Ministry . The Union requested this service. The Water Cooperative organizes members to carry out clean-ups in places where the water is taken. The service is deficient when it rains, because the water becomes clouded.</p>	<p>Huerta Mayu, P. Arias Do not have this service.</p> <p>Lampasillos; Cañadillas; Chapas Public wells around the school in Lampasillos through PROSABAR, and Cañadillas with CARITAS and with PROSABAR. Maintenance through the Water Cooperative. Community members pay an annual fee. The unions requested the service.</p> <p>Service is deficient, the water is cloudy and does not reach all the areas of the community The population obtained piped water to the homes through the municipality. The Water Cooperative is responsible for maintenance. Service is bad in the rainy season. The population has not mobilized to improve the service.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Nuevo Mundo, La Quebrada	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mendoza, Zamora	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huerta Mayu, Lampasillos, Cañadillas, Villa Serrano, Pampas Arias, Chapas
2.4. Electricity		
Nuevo Mundo, La Quebrada They use candles and lamp burners. The Union is requesting electricity to the municipality.	Mendoza They use candles and lamp burners. They used to have electricity from a generator the community purchased, but it was expensive and they decided to stop the service. There is a solar panel in CEDEC's office. Zamora They use candles and lamp burners. There is a solar panel in the school.	Lampasillos; Chapas A solar panel was donated by CEDEC. The parents of the students give a fee to purchase the battery for the panel. Huerta Mayu; Cañadillas; P. Arias They use candles and lamp burners. Villa Serrano Electricity for homes is provided by CESA (Sucre's electric company). The Municipality requested this service. Service is deficient, suffering from frequent cuts and low power.
2.5. Irrigation		
Nuevo Mundo and La Quebrada Wells, irrigation ditches and rain. Families that work with CARE's project use it for their family gardens.	Mendoza, Zamora Wells, irrigation ditches and rain.	Wells, irrigation ditches and rain.
2.6. Credit		
Nuevo Mundo Does not have this service. La Quebrada Credit (seeds) provided by CEDEC	Mendoza, Zamora Does not have this service.	Lampasillos; Chapas Credit (seeds) through CEDEC Huerta Mayu; Cañadillas; P. Arias Does not have this service. Villa Serrano Does not have this service.

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Nuevo Mundo, La Quebrada	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mendoza, Zamora	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huerta Mayu, Lampasillos, Cañadillas, Villa Serrano, Pampas Arias, Chapas
2.7. Roads		
<p>Nuevo Mundo Road construction is the responsibility of the ex-Development Corporation of Chuquisaca. The community and the Municipality are in charge of maintenance (there are problems because the municipality does not want to take responsibility for maintenance). The union requested this service. Roads are bad in the rainy season, almost impassable.</p> <p>La Quebrada The community is responsible for maintenance of roads. Roads work well if it does not rain too much.</p>	<p>Mendoza, Zamora The municipality built the road with help from the communities. Communities provide maintenance to the roads. The union organizes communal work. The road is regular, in the rainy season it is passable, but there are holes and platforms cave in.</p>	<p>Huerta Mayu; Chapas The municipality built the road. The community and sometimes the municipality are responsible for maintenance.</p> <p>Lampasillos; P. Arias Community members began working on the road and the municipality finished it. The community is responsible for maintenance.</p> <p>Cañadillas The Municipality began making the road. The community and the municipality are responsible for maintenance.</p> <p>Villa Serrano Roads funded by the municipality. The service works well.</p>
2.8. Transportation		
<p>Occasional transportation through merchants. No regular service.</p>	<p>Occasional transportation through merchants. No regular service.</p>	<p>Huerta Mayu; Lampasillos; Cañadillas; P. Arias; Chapas Occasional transport through merchants. There is no regular service.</p> <p>Villa Serrano Through fleets that leave for Sucre a day and a half apart. Good service.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Nuevo Mundo, La Quebrada	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mendoza, Zamora	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huerta Mayu, Lampasillos, Cañadillas, Villa Serrano, Pampas Arias, Chapas
2.9. Other Services		
Nuevo Mundo Sewage: only community members in the main nucleus of Nuevo Mundo benefit from this service donated by CARE and ex-CORDECH. Community members contributed to build sidewalks surrounding the town's main square.	Mendoza CEDEC built 4 solar tents. DITER short wave radio operation that community members use to communicate with other aficionados. Community members provide maintenance. ENTEL has 3 telephone booths that are out of service. No one knows who set them up, because no one requested them.	Cañadillas; P. Arias 9 Solar tents implemented by CEDEC. Villa Serrano 3 boarding houses maintained by the Parish .
3. INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS		
3.1. Between Grassroots Organizations and Local Institutions		
Nuevo Mundo There is no coordination. La Quebrada Good relationships based on cooperation and coordination.	Mendoza There is coordination, yet it is somewhat weak due to a certain mistrust of the population with the work of some NGOs. Zamora Positive coordination.	Huerta Mayu; P. Arias There is no coordination. Lampasillos; Cañadillas; Chapas There is coordination. Villa Serrano There is no coordination due to political and partisan conflicts.
3.2. Relationships with the Population		
* Grassroots organizations: Excellent relationships due to the power of convocation the union has community members, which assures massive participation in meetings. * NGOs: variable relationships, depending on the degree of compliance of the NGO. If they do not carry out their promises they lose credibility and the community does not participate. Communities participate actively in NGO projects, if it they are attractive to them.	Mendoza; Zamora * Grassroots organizations: Good relationships, especially the union because it is responsible for making the requests to the municipality and solves internal community problems. People participate in the meetings. * NGOs: Goods as long as they implement projects and provide support for the community.	Huerta Mayu; P. Arias * Grassroots organizations: the relationship between the Union and the population is not good because leaders have no power of convocation. *NGOs: Recently began working here. Lampasillos; Cañadillas; Chapas * Grassroots organizations: good relationship. The union represents the community and the population participates in the meetings the union calls. * NGOs: Good because NGOs have been working for a long time in these areas. Villa Serrano * Grassroots organizations: relationships are not good due to the open affiliation to a specific political party.

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Nuevo Mundo, La Quebrada	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mendoza, Zamora	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huerta Mayu, Lampasillos, Cañadillas, Villa Serrano, Pampas Arias, Chapas
3.3. Relationships of Grassroots Organizations with the Municipality		
They are not good because there are too many needs and the municipality does not provide solutions.	The relationships between the unions of these two communities and the municipality are not good. The Municipality did not carry out promised works.	Huerta Mayu; Lampasillos; Cañadillas; P. Arias; Chapas They do not have a good relationship with the municipality because it does not attend to communities' requests, especially road improvement. Villa Serrano They are not good due to political conflict.
3.4. Relationships of Grassroots Organizations with Other State Institutions		
Relationships with the Health Ministry (programs it carries out) are good because they are working in water storage and thus benefiting the population.	Do not have a relationship.	Lampasillos; Cañadillas; P. Arias; Chapas In Lampasillos and Cañadillas the relationship with PROSABAR depends on the Health Ministry. They are seeking new water sources. V. Serrano; Huerta Mayu Do not have direct relations.

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Nuevo Mundo, La Quebrada	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mendoza, Zamora	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huerta Mayu, Lampasillos, Cañadillas, Villa Serrano, Pampas Arias, Chapas
4. FACTORS THAT STRENGTHEN/WEAKEN GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS 4.1. Historical		
<p>Nuevo Mundo <u>Experience with the Agrarian Reform:</u> It is part of a “hacienda,” so there are still tenants. Peasants that actually own plots do not have land titles. <u>Tradition of interpellation:</u> None. <u>Organizational experience:</u> Through the union. <u>Presence of local institutions in the community:</u> Since 1995 the NGOs, and the ex-Cordech.</p> <p>La Quebrada <u>Experience with the Agrarian Reform:</u> land is being divided into small plot, and many of the owners do not have land titles. <u>Tradition of interpellation :</u> None. <u>Organizational experience:</u> Through the union and other grassroots organizations. <u>Presence of local institutions in the community:</u> NGOs work in the area since 1994.</p>	<p><u>Experience with the Agrarian Reform:</u> land ownership is shifting toward small plots, and many owners do not have land titles. <u>Tradition of interpellation:</u> None. <u>Organizational experience:</u> Through the Union <u>Presence of local institutions in the community:</u> Since the 90’s and NGOs since 1995.</p>	<p>Huerta Mayu; Lampasillos; Cañadillas; P. Arias; Chapas <u>Experience with the Agrarian Reform:</u> land is divided into small plots. <u>Organizational experience:</u> Through the union <u>Presence of local institutions in the community:</u> NGOs work in Thola Pampas since 1996, in Lampasillos since 1992, and in Cañadillas since 1993.</p> <p>Villa Serrano <u>Experience with the Agrarian Reform:</u> land divided in small plots and most owners have titles. This was not a “hacienda” (large state). <u>Interpellation:</u> through the Municipality. <u>Organizational experience:</u> through their grassroots organizations. <u>Presence of local institutions in the community:</u> the Church and a cooperation agency (1987). NGOs only have their office.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Nuevo Mundo, La Quebrada	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mendoza, Zamora	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huerta Mayu, Lampasillos, Cañadillas, Villa Serrano, Pampas Arias, Chapas
4.2. Economic Productivity		
<p>* <u>Productive potential</u>: Agriculture and pecuary production.</p> <p>* <u>Links with markets</u>: Once a year in the Serrano Fair. Transportation owners and intermediaries purchase their products.</p> <p>* <u>Poverty indicators</u>: Illiteracy (especially due to lack of use of skill), health services.</p>	<p>* <u>Productive potential</u>: Agriculture and pecuary production.</p> <p>* <u>Links with markets</u>: Twice a year in the Serrano and Mendoza fairs. Transportation owners and intermediaries purchase their products</p> <p>* <u>Poverty indicators</u>: Illiteracy (especially due to lack of use of skill), health services and lack of electricity.</p>	<p>Huerta Mayu; Lampasillos; Cañadillas Arias; Chapas</p> <p>* <u>Productive potential</u>: Agriculture and pecuary production.</p> <p>* <u>Links with markets</u>: Once a year in the Serrano Fair. Transportation owners and intermediaries purchase their products.</p> <p>* <u>Poverty indicators</u>: Illiteracy (especially due to lack of use of skill), health services, and lack of electricity, bad quality housing.</p> <p>Villa Serrano</p> <p>* <u>Productive potential</u>: Services and agriculture.</p> <p>* <u>Links with markets</u>: Markets in Sucre and other departments.</p>
4.3. Ethnicity and Culture		
<p>* <u>Ethnic, cultural and religious homogeneity/diversity</u>: population with Spanish and Catholic influences (few evangelicals).</p> <p>* <u>Modernizing values and practices</u>: frequent seasonal migration has introduced urban behavioral rules.</p>	<p>* <u>Ethnic, cultural and religious homogeneity/diversity</u>: population with Spanish and Catholic influences (few evangelicals).</p> <p>* <u>Modernizing values and practices</u>: frequent seasonal migration (20%) shows contact that influences their lifestyles.</p>	<p>Huerta Mayu; Lampasillos; Cañadillas; Chapas; P. Arias</p> <p>* <u>Ethnic, cultural and religious homogeneity/diversity</u>: population with Spanish influences</p> <p>* <u>Modernizing values and practices</u>: seasonal migration (10%) does not affect the development of the community.</p> <p>Villa Serrano</p> <p>* <u>Ethnic, cultural and religious homogeneity/diversity</u>: population with Spanish and Catholic influences (few evangelicals).</p> <p>* <u>Modernizing values and practices</u>: frequent seasonal and permanent migration and the road to Sucre have introduced urban behavioral rules.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Nuevo Mundo, La Quebrada	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Mendoza, Zamora	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Huerta Mayu, Lampasillos, Cañadillas, Villa Serrano, Pampas Arias, Chapas
5. GENERAL EVALUATION		
<p>* <u>Strength/weakness of grassroots organizations:</u> grassroots organizations are strong because the union gathers the community, and is the interlocutor of the community before the municipality and the institutions that work in the area.</p> <p>* <u>Role in local development and service provision :</u> decentralization and popular participation are helping the provision of services . However, we still can not see the impacts on the social level. Even though schools are being built, they only have grades 1st - 3rd due to a lack of teachers and funds. Local Institutions, especially NGOs have been able to aid local development, however analyzing each community we see this is not the case in all communities.</p> <p>* <u>Factors that explain the strength of social capital</u> include: dynamism of union leaders, support and participation of the community, roads even if bad during the rainy season, they still help communities sell their production to intermediaries or others, and a low percentage of seasonal and permanent migration for these communities.</p>	<p>* <u>Strength/weakness of grassroots organizations:</u> grassroots organizations are strong because the union has power of convocation, and because other organizations coordinate work through the union.</p> <p>* <u>Role in local development and service provision:</u> NGOs have contributed to community development and not only in the provision of services. The FIS by providing resources for schools has had an impact in local development (Zamora up to 5th grade).</p> <p>* <u>Factors that explain strength/weakness:</u> precarious living conditions impede the consolidation of social capital.</p>	<p>* <u>Strength/weakness of grassroots organizations:</u> grassroots organizations are weak in these communities (especially Thola Pampa) because the union does not have much power of convocation. In Serrano, grassroots organizations are weak because they do not have the backing of the population. Participation of the population is reduced; partisan conflicts are debilitating credibility.</p> <p>* <u>Role in local development and service provision:</u> Thola Pampa evidenced the lack of services, they only have a road and NGOs are just beginning to work in this area.</p> <p>In Serrano, the municipality is responsible for providing services, but now it works with the church in some projects.</p> <p>* <u>Factors that explain this weakness:</u> the passive attitude of the unions channeling demands, lack of capacity to come up with proposals to solve concrete problems.</p>

MUNICIPALITY: CHARAGUA

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: San Lorenzo, Taputá, Masavi, Akac	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Charagua, Machipo, San Francisco, Kaipepe	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: San Antonio, Isoporenda
I. INVENTORY OF GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS AND LOCAL INSTITUTIONS		
1.1. Grassroots organizations		
<p>* <u>Popular Participation's Counterparts</u>: San Lorenzo is the leading community. The Local Assembly of Guaraní People (APG) is present in the other three. Their goals are to mobilize, organize, and represent the community, and to lobby for institutional support.</p> <p><u>Other grassroots organizations</u>: Commissions articulated from the APG, in charge of production, infrastructure, health, education, land and communal territory (PISETT). Working groups 1980 –communal work cooperative 15 to 30 people in agriculture and cattle, benefiting from credits and technical assistance. Women's Organization 1990 --training, organizing, and providing technical assistance. Religious youth group 1994 –only in San Lorenzo, Masavi- Water Committee, health –only in Masavi- Oversees, manages, maintains both services in perfect conditions. Nuclear School Board–only in Masavi- 1953 oversees compliance with the school plan. The great majority of these organizations work regularly.</p>	<p>Kaipepe * <u>Popular Participation's counterparts</u>: the Captain of the community is the highest authority of the community. He organizes, mobilizes, represents the community, lobbies for institutional support, also makes recommendations and suggestions. * <u>Other Grassroots organizations</u>: School Board; Mayor of the community 1977 --the position immediately below Captain of the community. Working groups 1987 --a communal work cooperative); women's dressmaking (sewing) group. Machipo; San Francisco * <u>Counterpart of Popular Participation</u>: Local APG. Regular service. Charagua * <u>Popular Participation's Counterparts</u>: 3 neighborhood committees representing the neighborhood. They lobby for municipal support. Irregular service. <u>Other grassroots organizations</u>: Civic Committee of Charagua 1991 --represents regional interests before the Central Government. Female Civic Committee 1993. Charaguan Resident Committee 1993 --Lobbies for institutional support, speeds up legal procedures in the town of Charagua. Mothers' Clubs 1991--Training, technical assistance, alternative education, and communal works. Most of these organizations work regularly.</p>	<p>San Antonio * <u>Popular Participation's Counterparts</u>: Local APG provides regular service. * <u>Other grassroots organizations</u>: Women's Organization trains, organizes, and provided technical assistance. School Board oversees compliance with school calendar, lobbies for institutional support. They work regularly. Isoporenda * <u>Popular Participation's counterparts</u> : the Captain is the highest authority of the community. * <u>Other grassroots organizations</u>: School Board, Women's Organization. They function irregularly.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: San Lorenzo, Taputá, Masavi, Akae	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Charagua, Machipo, San Francisco, Kaipepe	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: San Antonio, Isoporenda
1.2. Local Institutions: NGOs		
CIPCA 1980 (Technical assistance , credit, agricultural inputs); Fondecó 1990 (Credit); Care-Bolivia basic services); Caritas (Food for work); Teco Guaraní (Literacy training), PAMG 1990 (Training women)	CIPCA 1977; Fondecó 1990 (Credit); Caritas (Food by work); Care Bolivia 1984-90 –only Machipo and Kaipepe- (basic services). PAMG – only Machipo and Kaipepe.	San Antonio CIPCA 1983, Caritas 1987, Teco Guaraní 1983 school infrastructure. These NGOs stopped activities in the communities. Isoporenda Aco 1987 (building materials, technical advise for women).
1.3. Other Local Institutions		
Social Investment Fund: state entity (basic services, sanitary and school infrastructure).	Catholic Church 1992 -only supports San Francisco- (Parish);	Social Investment Fund, school infrastructure.
2. SERVICE PROVISION		
2.1. Education		
Schools funded by the FIS (Social Investment Fund) and requested by grassroots organizations. The education committee of the local APG is in charge of overseeing the teachers and providing maintenance to the infrastructure.	Machipo; San Francisco; Kaipepe Built schools with funds from Popular Participation and the community contributed with labor. The infrastructure is small for the needs of these communities. Charagua Two public schools built by the government. A private school. Rural Technical Teachers' University, Technical Training Center for Guaranís. Grassroots organizations did not intervene channeling the demand.	San Antonio School built by the State, grassroots organizations did not make the request nor built it. Irregular service. . Isoporenda Does not have this service.
2.2. Health		
San Lorenzo; Taputá Health center 1993 funded and built by the FIS and the community. The community supports a Popular Health Promoter and provides maintenance to the health center. Masavi; Akae Do not have this service.	Machipo; San Francisco; Kaipepe Do not have this service. Charagua Hospital 1985 funded and built by the Regional Health Organization of Santa Cruz and CORDECRUZ. It is managed and maintained by the Vicar of Cuevo (Catholic Church). The hospital is relatively well equipped and provides good and regular service.	San Antonio Health center 1993 funded and built by the FIS at the request of the local APG. Service is not regular. Isoporenda Does not have this service.

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: San Lorenzo, Taputá, Masavi, Akae	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Charagua, Machipo, San Francisco, Kaipepe	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: San Antonio, Isoporenda
2.3. Potable water		
Piped water to homes and collective water sources 1987-90. In San Lorenzo, the system was funded and built by FIS and CORDECRUZ, and in the three remaining communities by Care-Bolivia and CORDECRUZ. The Water Committee of the local APG manages the system. Service is irregular and deficient.	Charagua; Kaipepe Piped water service to the homes (in Charagua funded and built by CORDECRUZ and remodeled by the FIS. It is managed and maintained by Cooperative Charagua. In Kaipepe, Care-Bolivia provides maintenance and the Mayor manages the service. Service is regular and good in Charagua, but deficient in Kaipepe (frequent cuts). Machipo, San Francisco. Do not have this service. They use streams, wells and irrigation ditches.	San Antonio Service of non-potable water to homes, funded and built by CORDECRUZ in 1982. It is managed and maintained by a water and electricity cooperative. Service is irregular not efficient. Isoporenda Does not have this service
2.4. Electricity		
San Lorenzo Electricity system to homes funded by the FIS and remodeled with funds from Popular Participation. It is maintained and managed by the community's water committee. Service is regular, reaching 50% of the population. Masavi; Taputá; Akae Do not have this service. They use candles, and lamps.	Machipo; San Francisco, Kaipepe Do not have this service Charagua Electricity. Network built by CORDECRUZ and managed by a water and electricity cooperative. Regular service reaching 70% of the population.	San Antonio Electricity since 1973. Network funded and built by CORDECRUZ and maintained by a water and electricity cooperative. Service is irregular with frequent interruptions. Isoporenda Does not have this service.
2.5. Irrigation		
Do not have irrigation systems. Families channel underground water and use streams.	Do not have this service.	Do not have this service.
2.6. Credit		
Families have access to FONDECO credits.	Families have access to FONDECO credits.	Families have access to FONDECO credits.

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: San Lorenzo, Taputá, Masavi, Akae	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Charagua, Machipo, San Francisco, Kaipepe	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: San Antonio, Isoporenda
2.7. Roads		
Main road built by CORDECRUZ. The Prefecture of Santa Cruz has plans to pave the road. It is usable almost the entire year, except when rains are strong. Community roads connecting communities with the main road are built and maintained by the community (Taputá) or with Popular Participation funds (San Lorenzo, Akae). The APG channeled the demand and coordinates maintenance works. The road is not passable in the rainy season.	Main road built by CORDECRUZ and maintained by the Prefecture.	San Antonio Main road built by CORDECRUZ. Isoporenda Dirt road built by the Prefecture. It is not passable in the rainy season. The community does not participate in its maintenance.
2.8. Transportation		
Irregular service. They are trying to use the fleets from Santa Cruz.	Charagua Public service to Santa Cruz provided by three transportation companies. Regular trips three times a week. Private taxi service connects Charagua with nearby communities.	San Antonio State train services this community. Isoporenda Does not have this service. Transportation is irregular with logging and cargo trucks.
2.9. Other Services		
	Charagua has a telephone connection provided by the National Telecommunications Company.	
3. INSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS		
3.1. Between Grassroots Organizations and Local Institutions		
Close coordination and collaboration relationships Especially in San Lorenzo, Masavi and Kaipepe.	Machipo, San Francisco, Kaipepe Coordination and collaboration relations, even though they are not always regular. Charagua No relationships.	No relationships.

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: San Lorenzo, Taputá, Masavi, Akae	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Charagua, Machipo, San Francisco, Kaipepe	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: San Antonio, Isoporenda
3.2. Relationships with the Population		
<p>* Grassroots organizations have legitimacy and power of convocation.</p> <p>* Despite some conflicts in Masavi and Taputá, NGOs maintain a close relationship with the working groups based on productive projects.</p>	<p>Machipo, San Francisco, Kaipepe</p> <p>* Organizations have legitimacy, even though there are some struggles to control them.</p> <p>* NGOs only coordinate their activities with grassroots organizations and not with the population</p> <p>Charagua</p> <p>* Grassroots organizations do not have power to convoke the population. Partisan struggles to control them.</p> <p>* NGOs maintain relationships with some women's groups</p>	<p>San Antonio.</p> <p>* Grassroots organizations have little power to convoke.</p> <p>* NGOs do not have a relationship with the population.</p> <p>Isoporenda</p> <p>* Great legitimacy and power of convocation of the Captain of the community.</p> <p>* NGOs maintain a relationship with the population mediated by the Captain.</p>
3.3. Relationships of Grassroots Organizations with the Municipality		
Indirect relationship through the Northern Charagua APG.	There is no relationship	There is no relationship
3.4. Relationships of Grassroots Organizations with Other State Institutions		
Relationship of coordination and canalization of demands with the FIS.	Does not exist.	Do not have this service.
4. FACTORS THAT STRENGTHEN/WEAKEN GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS		
4.1. Historical		
<p>These communities developed a dynamic leadership during the seventies, with and intermediate education level and experience holding the state accountable . The presence of NGOs, particularly of CIPCA since the seventies, has contributed to develop leaders and in the formation of local APGs.</p>	<p>The presence of large landowners near these communities and in the town of Charagua has inhibited the formation of community and grassroots leaders. NGOs have worked relatively less in these communities.</p>	<p>San Antonio</p> <p>Has developed more as a service station for the train than as a Guaraní town or community. Does not have experience in community organizing or holding the state accountable. Limited presence of NGOs.</p> <p>Isoporenda</p> <p>Ample organizational tradition under the community Captain, a hereditary title, not subject to fiscalization.</p> <p>Despite NGO presence in the area, this community has not developed an important organizational experience.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: San Lorenzo, Taputá, Masavi, Akae	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Charagua, Machipo, San Francisco, Kaipepe	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: San Antonio, Isoporenda
4.2. Economic Productivity		
<p>These communities are located at the foot of the Andes, an agro-ecological area which favors agricultural and cattle raising activities. Productivity increased during the eighties and market links between Charagua and Santa Cruz have allowed improved living standards and access to services.</p>	<p>Machipo, Kaipepe They are located near the Chaqueña Plains, where aridness and dryness of the land make it unsuitable for agriculture and cattle raising. Living conditions are more precarious than for communities near the mountains. Market links are difficult because neighborhood roads deteriorate in the rainy season.</p> <p>San Francisco Communal land has been divided into small plots, making productive activities difficult. Contact with the Charagua market is fluid and living conditions are better than in Machipo and Kaipepe.</p> <p>Charagua The diversity of economic activities and internal stratification has weakened grassroots organizations. There is no tradition of holding the state accountable. Before Popular Participation, power groups controlled the mechanisms of access to resources for the development of the town.</p>	<p>San Antonio Diversification of a productive activities around services linked to the train station, as well as agricultural and pecuary activities. Agricultural and pecuary production is limited, thus peasant families are the poorest, while families engaged in commercial and service activities have better incomes.</p> <p>Isoporenda Agro-ecological conditions are adverse for agricultural and pecuary production. Located in the Chaco region, the soil is dry, salty and not apt for agriculture. Their link with the Charagua market is hampered by road and transportation deficiencies. No important internal stratification is apparent.</p>

COMMUNITIES WITH STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: San Lorenzo, Taputá, Masavi, Akae	COMMUNITIES WITH MORE OR LESS STRONG GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: Charagua, Machipo, San Francisco, Kaiepe	COMMUNITIES WITH WEAK GRASSROOTS ORGANIZATIONS: San Antonio, Isoporenda
4.3. Ethnicity and Culture		
<p>Population is predominantly Guaraní with some religious diversity (presence of evangelical groups). Pro-indigenous discourse supported by Western organizational practices.</p>	<p>Machipo, San Francisco, Kaiepe Cultural (Guaraní, Caucasian and highland migrants) as well religious heterogeneity. Despite this, the discourse of vindication of a Guaraní identity persists. Organizational heterogeneity. Superposition of traditional and modern organizational practices.</p> <p>Charagua Population is predominantly white, with some Quechua merchants. Religious homogeneity, mainly Catholic with only a few evangelicals. Organizational forms are predominantly Western, but they lack a unifying discourse as in the case of the peasant communities.</p>	<p>San Antonio Cultural and religious heterogeneity. As in Charagua, grassroots organizations have not developed a discourse of ethnic identity.</p> <p>Isoporenda Cultural and religious homogeneity. Traditional patterns of organization linked the Captain of the community are very important. A strong discourse of indigenous identity, yet it contrasts with the APG which has traditional practices.</p>
5. GENERAL EVALUATION		
<p>Strong organizations due to the degree of support of their population for organizational initiatives, as well as for the experience and youth of grassroots leaders. Local APGs have channeled demands to the Central Government and then to Municipalities. They have made contacts with NGOs and the church, thus allowing an increase in investment sources for communities.</p>	<p>As leader's succeed meeting community demands, they earn support of their population, thus organizations are strong. However, grassroots leaders have demonstrated less initiative to establish parallel institutional relationships to demands posed before the Municipality. This is because they have less experience negotiating and lower education levels than leaders of the first group.</p> <p>Charagua Organizations are still weak. They do not have organizational experience, a tradition of holding the Municipality accountable, or a discourse of ethnic identity. Urban elites control local power, and they do not need to organize to access resources and services.</p>	<p>San Antonio Grassroots organizations are relatively weak because they do not have enough power of convocation. Also, growing diversification of economic activities prevents the formation of strong collective and mobilizing identities. No organization can claim to represent and channel demands of the different socio-economics groups.</p> <p>Isoporenda Inside the community, grassroots organizations are strong because they are based in traditional organizational practices with strong ethnic discourse. However, outside the communities these organizations are weak because they do not have institutional negotiating experience. Traditional practices do not allow the renovation of leadership, thus perpetuating certain patterns of community organization.</p>