

Received: 11/26/2020

Accepted: 05/04/2021

SOCIAL INNOVATION AND SUSTAINABLE TERRITORIAL PUBLIC POLICIES: COMMUNITIES OF OAXACA-MEXICO

INNOVACIÓN SOCIAL Y POLÍTICAS PÚBLICAS TERRITORIALES SUSTENTABLES: COMUNIDADES DE OAXACA-MEXICO

Alma Delia Torres-Rivera¹

Jorge Alejandro Silva Rodríguez de San Miguel²

Rodrigo Florencio da Silva³

Abstract

One of the tensions in constructing a fair, supportive, and inclusive society derives from the commitment not to compromise the future of coming generations: there is a set of contradictions between the formulation and execution of territorial public policies and sustainability leading to social transformations. The study's objective is to explore the implications of social innovation in territorial public policies with a sustainable approach based on the experience of two business organizations operating in Salina Cruz, Oaxaca. The research method, designed with a qualitative approach, includes a literature review and data collection. It was concluded that social innovation by interconnecting social projects for sustainable territorial development with a weak involvement of the public sector is not exclusive of Mexico, but exists in different countries in Latin America and the Caribbean. Therefore, this research provides tools for decision-makers and envisions new scenarios for future research.

Keywords: Public policies. Social innovation. Sustainability. Territorial development.

Resumen

Una de las tensiones en la construcción de una sociedad justa, solidaria e inclusiva se deriva del compromiso de no comprometer el futuro de las próximas generaciones. La razón para que esto sea así, es que existen un conjunto de contradicciones entre la formulación y ejecución de las políticas públicas territoriales y la sustentabilidad dando lugar a transformaciones sociales. Bajo este argumento el objetivo del estudio es explorar las implicaciones de la innovación social en las políticas públicas territoriales con enfoque sustentable a partir de la experiencia de dos organizaciones empresariales que operan en Salina Cruz, Oaxaca. Para tal efecto, se diseñó el método de investigación con un enfoque cualitativo se desplegó tanto en la revisión de la literatura y como en la recopilación de los datos. Se concluye que la innovación social al articular proyectos sociales para un desarrollo territorial sostenible con un involucramiento débil del sector público, lo

¹ PhD in Education. Research professor at the Santo Tomás Higher School of Commerce and Administration of the National Polytechnic Institute, Mexico. E-mail: atorresri@ipn.mx

² PhD in Administrative Sciences from the Higher School of Commerce and Administration - ESCA Santo Tomás of the National Polytechnic Institute, Mexico. E-mail: jasilva@ipn.mx

³ PhD in Environment and Development. Researcher and professor at the National Polytechnic Institute - IPN of Mexico, Mexico. E-mail: rodrigo_florencio@hotmail.com

cual no es exclusivo de México, sino de diferentes países de Latinoamérica y el Caribe; por lo que esta investigación brinda herramientas a los tomadores de decisiones y vislumbra nuevos escenarios para investigaciones futuras.

Palabras clave: Desarrollo territorial. Innovación social. Políticas públicas. Sustentabilidad.

Introduction

Inequality, poverty, diminishing water reserves, soil contamination, destruction of the ozone layer, food shortages, increasing hazardous waste, and technological gaps, among other factors, call into question the capacity of the capitalist economic system. The debate is opening on the contradictions of territorial public policies that promote the mobility of actors who favor social innovation in the face of social problems.

Social innovation emerged during the 19th century. However, it was not until the end of the 20th century that public policies were integrated into territorial development in order to reconcile the environment with economic growth, recognizing the complexity of social structures in the transformation of the territory (ROMER, 1992; NORDHAUS, 1994) as a strategic element in combating the effects of climate change. In this scenario, sustainability drivers combine knowledge and technology to create shared value (PORTER; KRAMER, 2011). Through social innovation, radical changes in local and regional spaces that transform the territory acquire strategic value.

In this sense, the study's objective is to explore the implications of social innovation in territorial public policies with a sustainable approach based on the experience of two business organizations that operate in Salina Cruz, Oaxaca, to fight poverty and social exclusion. For this purpose, the literature review was enriched by analyzing the experiences of the two business organizations as characterized by their capacity to respond to the community's social demands.

The article is comprised of four sections. The first section defines the contradictions of territorial public policies with a sustainable approach among economic, social, and environmental factors based on the review of official documents from international and national organizations. In the second section, a review was made of the literature that addresses sustainability as a philosophical paradigm that makes visible the compatibility among economic, social and environmental value in territorial development. In section three, based on the analysis of two companies' experiences, social innovation is described as a critical component of sustainable territorial development. Finally, the last section presents the conclusions.

Contradictions of territorial public policies with a sustainable approach

A territory is delimited by different social, political, and geographic factors and unites and maintains them in a social bond. A territory as a social construction of a physical space is the product of a set of interrelations that assign it a meaning. Conflictive or collaborative interrelationships, according to the meanings that the intervening actors establish, are a means of identity and associativity. This dynamic involves the different actors that build the territorial agenda (FERNÁNDEZ; FERNÁNDEZ; SOLOAGA, 2019), which is the basis for public policies.

A territory, a management component and core of public policy, plays a role in social cohesion (CAMPOVERDE, 2020). From the above, social innovation energizes individuals' participation to make decisions in economic, political, social, and cultural affairs based on the principles of equality and justice (LOBELLE, 2017; BECK; VAN DER MADSEN; THOMESE WALKER; 2001). Then social progress is a function of developing local potentialities starting from exogenous processes based on public policies (DE LA TEJERA HERNÁNDEZ, GARCÍA; SANTOS., 2006; ECHEVERRI, R; ECHEVERRI, A, 2010; ECHEVERRI, R; GONZÁLEZ; CHEVERRI, A; MIRANDA, 2011) and endogenous processes supported by the capacities of the actors and the resources available in a territory.

A priority of territorial policy in the Latin American region (MAYA; CABERO, 2000) is the insertion of sustainable development principles as the core of public policies. Therefore, many possible social configurations have been proposed to overcome the shortcomings in Latin America and the Caribbean, which are still not a solution due to the lack of efficient coordination among

different sectors and insufficient participation of the social sector (NACIONES UNIDAS, 2018). Territorial public policies must prioritize social inclusion criteria as a critical element of sustainable development. In this regard, the 2030 Agenda has been taken up in planning at the national, state, and local levels in Mexico (HERRERA, 2013) in response to the United Nations' recommendations (U.N.).

In this scenario, Mexico committed to moving towards a sustainable society, as established in constitutional articles 2 and 25 (DOF, 2019) and expressed in the National Development Plan (PND) for the six-year term 2019-2024 with the "incorporation of the transversal axis 3, Territory and sustainable development, following the territorial construction, embodied in articles 42 to 48 of the Federal Constitution, as well as the relevance of a healthy environment provided for in article 4 of the Constitution mentioned above" (GACETA PARLAMENTARIA, 2019, p. 38).

The PND, indicates that, for the good of all, particularly the poor, it emphasizes "leaving no one behind, leaving no one out" (GACETA PARLAMENTARIA, 2019, p. 26) and being "respectful of the original peoples, their uses and customs and their right to self-determination and the preservation of their territories" (GACETA PARLAMENTARIA, 2019, p. 26).

The territorial approach in communities must include synergies between institutions at the three levels of government, particularly local ones, as well as local self-management (through social innovation). The Sustainable Rural Development Law, published in 2001, institutionalized the territorial approach to development, which impacts the implementation of territorial public policies linked to aspects of community participation (HERRERA, 2013). However, this law never went beyond theory because each of the state Secretariats implemented actions with their sectorial logic without interlinking shared activities (GÓMEZ; TACUBA, 2017).

According to Gómez and Tacuba (2017), the territorial approach requires a strategy that transcends government support, including the various public and private organizations in active economic roles in the territories. This process should include, in a complementary manner, different programs, direct economic resource transfers, capacity building, infrastructure, and institutional development. In this tenor, public policy has two weaknesses: a) inequality between producers and regions and b) equity as a principle (GÓMEZ; TACUBA, 2017).

Public policies for territorial development aim to link a technical-productive, economic, institutional, socio-cultural, and political-administrative perspective with those involved. However, the pragmatic approach is based on collaboration and self-management capacities that transcend the creation of public policies to carry out institutionalization in the territories. In this way, the territory is supported by resources, socioeconomic factors and social capital (ECHEVERRI et al., 2011; PÉREZ, 2008), giving rise to public policies and territorial institutionalization (GONZÁLEZ; GARCÍA-VELASCO; RAMÍREZ-HERNÁNDEZ; CASTAÑEDA, 2013). Within this framework, the decentralized political-administrative factor becomes vital to the inclusion of autonomous territories and their economic-productive system based on diverse actors' subsystems of action (ALBURQUERQUE, 2003; CÁRDENAS, 2002).

Territorial management in communities, starting with their natural resources, focuses on studying common-pool resources (OSTROM, 1990). The argument is that institutional structures do not remain fixed, nor are they exogenously determined, but that there are endogenous factors that shape them over time. Here the communities that have created, applied, and supervised their own rules for managing their resources play a decisive role, ensuring that the institutions created are maintained over the years (LARA, 2002). Therefore, it is necessary to propose alternative solutions to those formulated by officials or people in business by establishing binding contracts between all the actors involved (LARA, 2002).

According to the PND 2013-2018, the results of the end of the period indicate high poverty rates, at 43.6 % of the Mexican population (CONEVAL, 2017); the rate of illiteracy in the population is 5.5 % (INEGI, 2015), and indicators of nutritional status discouraging as rates of "overweightness and obesity, in children aged 5 to 11 years, is 33.2 %" (INSP, 2016, p. 8) and in "adults over 20 years, 72.5 %" (INSP, 2016, p. 8), which can trigger chronic diseases (INSP, 2016). From this, it follows that the social dimension of public policies requires the conjunction of the economic and environmental spheres with a territorial approach (GOBIERNO DE LA REPÚBLICA, 2013). The dilemma lies in the fact that public policies, public programs, and governmental institutions have not impacted economic, social, and environmental factors to improve communities in Mexico.

Research method

The approach followed in this work has been exploratory because it addresses a novel topic in the literature that seeks to integrate social innovation in communities with territorial public policies with a sustainable approach. The analysis was carried out through categories of the literature review and fieldwork in two business organizations.

A qualitative two-part research method was used. First, we reviewed the literature related to territorial public policies and sustainability within social innovation dynamics. For this, primary and secondary sources were reviewed as well as gray literature with the construction of search chains with keywords "territorial public policies," "sustainability," "social innovation," and "communities" in different academic and governmental databases. Then, we collected qualitative data in two social organizations to determine the processes of social innovation, in the community of Salina Cruz, Oaxaca, as a response to the contradictions of territorial public policies and commitments to sustainable development.

Phase one began with a focus group to determine the contradictions between the formulation and execution of territorial public policies with a sustainable development approach. Nine experts participated in the focus group; collectively, they had experience in social economy and productive projects for highly and very highly marginalized sectors of the National Institute of Social Economy (INAES), Institutional Trust Fund for Agriculture (FIRA), Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (CEPAL), Ministry of Social Development (SEDESOL) and Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Rural Development, Fisheries and Food (SAGARPA).

In the second stage of this study, qualitative data was collected, with a focus group of experts and a semi-structured interview with managers of two business organizations in order to determine the processes of social innovation in the community of Salina Cruz, Oaxaca, as a response to the contradictions of territorial public policies and commitments to sustainable development.

Subsequently, two organizations located in Oaxaca were selected for their outstanding trajectory and work in response to the community's socio-environmental problems that attended the "Workshop on social innovation and sustainable business models." Finally, a semi-structured interview was conducted with the directors of two social organizations.

Literature review

Sustainable development as a philosophical paradigm

Sustainable development has acquired prominence in the integration of economic, social, and environmental aspects. According to CEPAL (2012), there is an interrelation and interactive links between territory and sustainable development. The relationship between territory and communities is strengthened by generating work and income alternatives through solidarity activities and self-management in adverse conditions (MOREIRA, 2007). The relationship between the associative and collective power of work and the territorial and regional dimensions is highlighted. Melo-Souza (2009) insists that through the collective coexistence of the social actors involved, the reconstruction of the territoriality of these social subjects with their space and the meanings socially produced in the interrelation between community and environment provide evidence for the link between the relationship of life and the environmental dynamics of productive activities in terms of environmental impacts.

The human-environment relationship, faced with continuous industrialization, becomes harmful due to the intense degradation caused by modern production systems. Hence, the minimization of environmental impacts is associated with the use of new technologies that offer maximum positive results (KHAN; AHMAD; MAJAVA, 2021). The role of regulatory instruments concerning the promotion of sustainability in the context of social and environmental viability for the near future is fundamental (SANCHEZ, 2010). Environmental degradation, ecological depletion, and the imbalance caused by the current era's progress bring with them the commitment to sustainability.

Loureiro (2014) explains that sustainability opens multiple possibilities of unfolding the term and enables many relationships between social actors since it comes from the biological sciences and is rooted in politics and economics, proposing a collective community. In other words, it is a way to rethink production and the economic process, to reflect on the reconfiguration of identities, breaking with the barriers of global distribution systems and with the closure of history imposed by economic globalization (LEFF, 2010). Alongside globalization, sustainability is the trend that

recognizes the severe threat of the effects of climate change and the depletion of natural resources in the last four decades.

Lorenzetti (2011) argues that there are international mechanisms for the protection of the environment; a legal system of its own is being built, arising from public initiatives of the most diverse instances of the state or interstate organizations. Contributions are also being received from private actors globally, including transnational corporations like companies and NGOs. In the current perspective, the need arises to guarantee generations, not only current but also future generations, a healthy environment using resources that meet human needs, while also preserving the environment (JIA; CHEN, 2019; SRIDHAR, 2011).

Sánchez (2010) points out that it would be unfair to state that the capitalist system continues to believe in profit at all costs when sustainability is completely repressed and forgotten. Bellido (2017) mentions that today, we are living a transition process with various societies, companies, and governments directed towards sustainable processes. However, many factors hinder sustainability due to hunger, food shortages, and education, among others. With this same perspective, Almeida (2002) indicates that there is a need to unite economic welfare, social equity, and environmental protection with management practices and strategies.

According to Gudynas (2011), there is a trend of super-strong sustainable development, which is considered a realistic alternative option to development, indicating progress. In this same direction, Accinelli, Brida, and London (2007) point out that technology and other options such as the reduction of consumption, the use of clean energies, and recycling can be adjusted to the level of development of contemporary society and, in particular, to the conditions of each community as a mechanism for intergenerational justice, guaranteeing the preservation of nature and waste management. Therefore, reflecting on the complexity of sustainability, by integrating environmental preservation with social justice, economic development, appreciation of culture, education, and ethics, we can create the necessary framework for the development of the capabilities and expansion of the freedoms of each individual, thus improving the welfare of humanity and environmental protection (DETROIT; NASCIMENTO, 2004).

Public policies were developed for a participatory environmental management model, strengthening institutions and human resources, and supporting the implementation allied to integrated and sustainable local development. In addition, cooperation was developed in a vast network of agreements that includes local governments, NGOs, universities, centers of excellence, private sectors, and other international organizations that are also part of the Mexican environmental policy (LÓPEZ-VALLEJO-OLVERA, 2014). Micheli (2012) explains that Mexico's environmental protection generated a need for protection changes at the national level. In the last decades, the country's participants discussed in the United Nations Conferences and the fulfillment of the goals established in international agreements in public policies. It is possible to verify that Mexico was gradually incorporating the subject into the national agenda. Currently, the country has an essential role in encouraging advances in the international environmental agenda.

Daroit and Nascimento (2004) argue that innovation is often associated only with the economic approach, whose sole objective is profit and competitive advantages, without a greater understanding on behalf of organizations about the role of innovation and its effects on society and the environment. With the growing involvement of companies in social innovation processes, the ability of organizations to contribute to sustainability is recognized.

(DOS SANTOS; HENN; SEHNEM; SOUZA; CASAGRANDE, 2016). In other words, companies that integrate the social and environmental dimensions into their business strategies contribute to the reduction of social inequalities, inequities, and exclusion, generating an opportunity for them to have a better quality of life.

Social innovation, the key to sustainable territorial development

Social innovation as the route to achieving sustained results, for social organizations in particular and society in general, emerges in the society of the 21st century as part of the transition towards strengthening cooperation between alternative decision-making systems that incorporate environmental and social demands of stakeholders (BREUER; LÜDEKE-FREUND, 2017). Social innovation assumes as a basic principle the creation of shared value that motivates new interactions by addressing problems such as social, financial, and labor inclusion, seen through the logic of the market (AGUINAGA; HENRIQUES; SCHEEL; SCHEEL, 2018; AFSEER; JOSE; THOMAS, 2017).

Halme and Korpela (2014) indicate that the challenges of 21st century society are multiplying and transforming. Hence, the relevance of strengthening cooperation mechanisms, based in territories and their communities, together with the configuration of disruptive processes in the social sphere, is fundamental to the reconceptualization of the management of community relations. Additionally, the formulation of social projects is adapted to social needs and efforts to strengthen learning processes in the context of a highly complex context (CHEN, 2018; DAVIDSSON, 2015). The communities played a key role in the definition of the actions of responsibility. Results showed the collective action within the framework of the principles of sustainable development in the two companies exerted a direct influence which reinforces social innovation as a strategic resource to obtain local development while including the collaboration of various actors, embracing community initiatives and praxis (PHILLIPS, ALEXANDER; LEE, 2017; PHILLIPS; LEE; GHOBADIAN; O'REGAN; JAMES, 2015).

Therefore, it is the communities that are leading the change and the following aspects coexist as a result. First, the primary motivation is the purpose of achieving social good; additionally, they have governance criteria in line with the type of property in question, as evidence of the attention paid to the demands of society, expressed in the 2030 Agenda, formulated at the United Nations Summit on Sustainable Development in 2015.

Alternative economic models encourage the implementation of mechanisms to combat poverty and exclusion as part of a solidary and alternative practice that is promoted with social innovation processes to guarantee the standards of quality of life (HUGGINS; WILLIAMS, 2014) and improve learning capabilities with a social management approach (KLIKSBURG, 1999). Here the central focus is to plan alternatives to solve the problems of social exclusion intentionally.

In this scenario, by integrating vocations with regional development schemes (LEWANDOWSKI, 2012), social structures are the forces that counteract inequalities, which requires the community to appropriate the principles of sustainable development towards the construction of the common good, placing the commitment to future generations at the center of all decisions (PITZ; MADDEN; MAY, 2018). It is therefore important to deepen the development of the proposal in order to generate value networks and encourage processes of disruptive changes in the social order and territorial development policies that promote the creation of social value through the concept of territory as a space for social cohesion connected to society and nature. In this way, social progress is based on local potentialities, starting from the communities' social innovation processes.

In synthesis, in the processes of disruptive changes in the social order, certain dynamics are internalized, leading to reflection on the drivers of economic development, as well as the valorization of natural resources and cultural and landscape heritage as intangible assets of territories at the service of social progress; these process require us to recognize new forms of organization and operation that reject the exploitation of natural resources and rescue identity and humanitarian values as components of territorial development.

Analysis and discussion of results

Mexico has been responding to international agreements and at the same time projecting its image on the international scene through the development of programs in collaboration with international organizations. Despite international recognition, and based on López-Vallejo-Olvera (2014), the country is still in the consolidation phase of an environmental foreign policy. What is perceived is a range of public policies developed over the years but with little efficiency and oversight. Furthermore, there is no constant evaluation of these policies (*idem*). It is possible to say that sustainability can currently be provided by employing new technologies created and implemented to curb environmental degradation without generating a negative impact on the economy.

Sustainable development has the mission of trying to link economic growth with environmental concerns, that is, to interconnect three fundamental aspects: human, economic and social behaviors, which are the subject of economics and other social sciences; the evolution of nature, the subjects of biology, physics, and chemistry; and the social configuration of territory, studied by human geography, regional sciences and the organization of space (VEIGA, 2010). Thus, the basis of the paradigm of sustainability is the search for and improvement of ecologically correct, socially just, and economically viable forms of development that apply the concepts and criteria of sustainability in public and private management, promoting democratic, accessible, and sustainable

governance in public administration. This is the objective that humanity should move towards to ensure a decent future.

In this sense, we examined the actions of the two business organizations that have been recognized for their trajectory and efforts to respond to the community's socio-environmental problems, promoting social innovation to facilitate the development of social solutions that fit the contexts of their communities. These are two organizations that operate in the state of Oaxaca; their background and evolution as businesses respond to different business growth dynamics. The study suggests the relationship between social innovation and local development that changes are achieved in communities through collective action by establishing priorities relevant to the common good. Some of the characteristics of these enterprises provide elements to promote new territorial development schemes with a sustainable approach.

Organization 1 has implemented services with volunteers and community members (with an assigned salary paid for with voluntary contributions from service users) to meet the needs of vulnerable groups such as the elderly and school children of different ages. In the provision of services, the providers are local. The community support services offered by Organization 1 are a dining hall for low-income children, homework workshops, music and visual arts classes, physical activities and health care campaigns.

In addition to the above, the company donated land and managed economic support with government agencies to construct a housing unit with electricity, sewage, drinking water, and access to schools. Organization 1's management of relations with the community has had positive effects on promoting productive projects that include diversity, giving shape to new social structures and trade dynamics for handicraft products.

In the case of Organization 2, with the internationalization of the agroecological products it produces, it has positioned the Eco Tierra brand. In the national market and the country's southern region, they have promoted an organizational culture focused on complying with quality standards to obtain certification of their organic products. The creation of value through combining artisanal work with sustainable production practices guarantees both the renewal of orchards and crops, as well as the social welfare that is a function of the management of community relations with this cooperative.

Table 1: Social innovation from two organizational experiences

Key aspect	Organization 1	Organization 2
Business activity	Commercialization of groceries, processing, and sale of handmade food products.	Production of organic sesame, pasilla chili, and tamarind oil and derivatives
Social investment	Assumes economic and financial risks through social responsibility programs	Assumes the economic and financial risks that exist in its environment.
Community involvement	Solidarity and volunteer behavior in the execution of community projects with resources from other non-profit associations.	The community has supportive behavior based on the social mission of the organization.
Social objective	Achieve social inclusion of vulnerable groups in the community, promote higher education levels, health, urbanization, employment opportunities based on productive vocations.	Rescue and conservation of customs and traditions through collaborative work and social inclusion. They are valuing the activities of farmers for conserving the land.
Continuity of initiatives	Systematic actions aligned with community benefit goals and international social programs and projects	Structured actions through social projects with an allocation of resources that guarantee the reduction of community migration over time.
Accountability	Autonomy and voluntary participation of community members in social projects and programs with a commitment to be accountable for their actions.	Reinvestment of profits with accountability in the distribution of social benefits
Degree of autonomy	Decisions and independent management	Decisions and independent management
Nature of corporate actions	Through consultation, active participation with the community is incorporated into social responsibility programs and community support.	Definition of social actions by the community's demands with its involvement in economic, social, and environmental decisions.

Source: Based on information provided by the president of the foundation of organization 1 and personnel from the production area of organization 2.

From the business experiences described above, certain criteria of social innovation can be extracted, such as building consensus to meet social and environmental needs, increasing the creation of shared value among these groups, and improving the quality of life of the most vulnerable groups. In other words, these organizations are socially competent and aware, and make socially framed decisions that respond to business requirements. A substantial part of innovation processes is the generation of collaborative networks based on solidarity and trust in order to consolidate actions in response to the communities' challenges and problems, based on the recombination of products, processes, and resources specific to the territorial space.

In the experience of these two organizations that are supporting communities in the Isthmus of Tehuantepec in the state of Oaxaca, both promote the generation of social and environmental value with the active participation of the communities in social programs as a mechanism for long-term continuity and with a high degree of autonomy (see Table 1). It means that organizations that make social investments for the common good consider social and environmental financial factors, prioritizing long-term benefits to the community. Therefore, when building a more equitable society by considering strategic social issues as part of the business, the efficiency of social spending should be of concern to the authorities and senior management of companies; they should take advantage of their knowledge in the implementation of intelligent, efficient, and technical processes and apply it in social investment projects.

The outcome of the focus group discussion is aligned with what was raised by Gómez and Tacuba (2017) regarding the inequality that prevails in the communities' territories, illustrated by the lack of formulation and implementation of effective public policies (NACIONES UNIDAS, 2018), which impedes the growth and development of the local communities and, ultimately, of Mexico. Herrera (2013) analyzed what was affirmed because the territorial approach needs the collaboration of multiple actors for its development. Undoubtedly, the coordination of diverse actors represents a substantial advance for the formulation of public policies that can transcend the endogamic approach allowing collaboration with the academic sector, the private sector, and social organizations. Collaborating with others is not an easy task for governments. There was consensus that territorial development policies are undermined by different factors that include the lack of trust in actors from various sectors of the population, particularly interesting in this work; an example is the use of shared public resources and clientelistic management practices. These are elements that do not encourage the different levels of government to work as a team.

From the community perspective, the relevance of initiatives aimed at vulnerable groups that respond to social demands not met by governments is heightened. In Latin America and the Caribbean, corporate social investment often replaces the role that innately corresponds to governments. Thus, it is perceived that on repeated occasions, the work coordinated by local actors in the communities tends to be successful, without the proactive participation of the government (DELGADO-SERRANO; MISTRY; MATZDORF; LECLERC, 2017). However, the government should play a primary role through the formulation of public policies that promote social inclusion for the solution of common problems (LOBELLE, 2017). In this sense, the empowerment of the most vulnerable groups is required in order to make them participants in decision-making, since inclusion in territorial dynamics must be sustained by coalitions that come from local actors. Thus emerges the interest in addressing social and environmental concerns through social innovation.

Business activity transitions from financial results to something that contributes to the development of communities through social innovations, as shown by business actions that aim for the solution of a social problem that prioritizes social value rather than profit. Businesses can deliver accessible and critical goods and services to increase living standards through participation, learning, and well-being.

The experts affirmed that the possibility of growth and development conditions in a given territory through coordinated work among different actors is linked to managing, where the government plays a significant role as a regulator of the multidimensional factors resulting from endogenous and exogenous elements. Furthermore, in this dynamic, it is vital to have a long-term approach that allows for modifying the current form of operation.

Some of the conclusions of the focus group coincide in the process of social dynamization as a builder of sustainable development incorporated to the territorial approach described by Fernández, Fernández, Soloaga, (2019) and through the perspective of public policy formulated by Balza-Moreno (2017). According to Gómez and Tacuba (2017), this perspective favors the correspondence between the formal and the natural. It is then that social innovation marks

disruptive patterns of transformation in the interrelation of the various stakeholders; the management of everyday resources and community co-management acquire a strategic role in the coordination among authorities to achieve social welfare and the revaluation of natural resources.

Thus, social innovation is a necessary process of territorial development using a planning methodology that operates, monitors, and evaluates the impact of companies' social investment and their relationship with sustainability principles for the design of public policies.

Conclusions

Like other countries in Latin America and the Caribbean, Mexico has a set of public policies, public programs, and government institutions that intervene in territorial development; however, it has not significantly impacted the economic, social, and environmental components that strengthen communities. Furthermore, integrating environmental preservation with social justice and economic development with the valuing of citizens' capabilities and freedoms are conditions for environmental protection, and this can shape the improvement of a community's well-being.

In short, one of the main challenges facing a company is the management of relations with the community, based on active participation in decision-making, as a platform for territorial development and social welfare. Therefore, it is essential to establish the route for the systematization of actions that allow the use of community resources and capacities, giving way to the configuration of social innovation processes as a condition for territorial development with a sustainable approach, so that governments can design public policies that broadly incorporate the new dynamics of the communities. The challenge is evident because:

- There is a disarticulation between public policies aimed at territorial development with a sustainable approach and the socioeconomic characteristics of the communities that occupy these spaces.
- The impact of public policies has not significantly changed the realities of communities in terms of generating changes that favor labor inclusion, poverty reduction, and support for infrastructure development, which is insufficient but does not integrate natural resources as strategic assets to promote sustainability.
- The environmental and economic crisis has emphasized the creation of shared value as a condition for social innovation processes to deploy the use of resources and knowledge from a dimension of community participation, according to the experiences of the two companies that manage their relations with the community to promote social projects aligned with the value proposition aimed at satisfying the requirements of market segments.
- The main contribution of the sustainability debate of the last 40 years is that it is possible to harmonize economic, social, and environmental objectives with the active participation of communities in territorial spaces with a collective logic that is sensitive to all social problems and capable of minimizing environmental impacts through the development of community capacities that improve the quality of life and generate opportunities.

Finally, the debate on the contradictions of territorial public policies from the perspective of sustainability and the processes of social innovation in the communities that, in addition to their usefulness for decision-makers, serve as a reference for future research related to the topic, is not exclusive to Mexico, but also to other countries, particularly most countries in Latin America and the Caribbean.

References

- ACCINELLI, E., BRIDA, J. G., LONDON, S. Crecimiento económico y trampas de pobreza: ¿cuál es el papel del capital humano?. *Investigación económica*, v. 66, n.261, p. 97-118, 2007.
- AFSEER, K. P., JOSE, S., THOMAS, L. Budding Social Entrepreneurs through Social Work Education: A Prospective Analysis. *Journal of Social Work Education and Practice*, v.2, n.3, p.1-8, 2017.

AGUIÑAGA, E., HENRIQUES, I., SCHEEL, C., SCHEEL, A. Building resilience: A self-sustainable community approach to the triple bottom line. **Journal of Cleaner Production**, v. 173, p.186-196, 2018.

ALBURQUERQUE, F. **Teoría y práctica del enfoque del desarrollo local**. Coquimbo: Consultoría de Capacitación-Desarrollo Territorial y Gestión del territorio, 2003.

ALMEIDA, F. **O Bom Negócio da Sustentabilidade**. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 2002.

BALZA-MORENO, L.F. Policentrismo, planificación y desarrollo territorial en la política pública de Venezuela y Argentina. **Revista Geográfica Venezolana**, v. 58 n. 2, p. 282-305, 2017.

BECK, W.; VAN DER MAESEN, L.; THOMESE, G.; WALKER, A. **Social Quality: A Vision for Europe**. The Hague/London/Boston: Kluwer Law International, 2001.

BELLIDO, N. E. P. Cambio climático, pobreza y sostenibilidad. EHQUIDAD. **Revista Internacional de Políticas de Bienestar y Trabajo Social**, v.7, p. 81-116, 2017.

BREUER, H., LÜDEKE-FREUND, F. Values-Based Network and Business Model Innovation. **International Journal of Innovation Management**, v. 21, n. 3, p. 1750028-1 - 1750028-35, 2017.

CÁRDENAS, N. El desarrollo local su conceptualización y procesos. **Provincia**, v. 8, p. 53-76, 2002.

CAMPOVERDE, P. E. Pensamiento indígena en defensa del territorio. In F. D. Arrué; J. L. Valle; C. Andrada Zurita; P. E. Campoverde Tello; D. S. Carpio; W. Chasi Domínguez; N. E. Espinoza Saquicela; M. Á. Angulo Gaona; H. Ruiz Rengifo (Eds.), **¿Qué nos lleva a actuar como lo hacemos?: Otra vuelta de tuerca al pensamiento social**. Forcif CL Publicaciones, p. 41-48, 2020.

CEPAL. **Población, territorio y desarrollo sostenible**. Available at: https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/22425/1/S2012034_es.pdf. 2012. Accessed on: mar. 20. 2021.

CHEN, C. W. Guidance on the conceptual design of sustainable product-service systems. **Sustainability**, v. 10, n. 7, 2018.

CONEVAL. **Medición de la pobreza en México y en las Entidades Federativas 2016**. Available at: https://www.coneval.org.mx/Medicion/MP/Documents/Pobreza_16/Pobreza_2016_CONEVAL.pdf. 2017. Accessed on: mar. 20. 2021.

DAROIT, D., NASCIMENTO, L. F. **Dimensões da inovação sob o paradigma do desenvolvimento sustentável**. Anais 28º Encontro Nacional da ANPAD, Curitiba, PR, Brasil, p. 25 a 29, 2004.

DAVIDSSON, P. Entrepreneurial opportunities and the entrepreneurship nexus: A re-conceptualization. **Journal of Business Venturing**, v. 30, n. 5, p. 674-695, 2015.

DE LA TEJERA HERNÁNDEZ, B.; GARCÍA, R.; SANTOS, Á. **Desarrollo rural: reconstruyendo una utopía**. In C. RAMÍREZ; M. NÚÑEZ; C. GUADARRAMA; A. CRUZ (Eds.), **Desarrollo rural regional, hoy** (v. I, p. 45-68). Texcoco: Universidad Autónoma Chapingo. 2006.

DELGADO-SERRANO, M.; MISTRY, J.; MATZDORF, B.; LECLERC, G. Community-based management of environmental challenges in Latin America and the Caribbean. **Ecology and Society**, v. 22 n. 1, p. 4, 2017.

DOF. **Constitución Política de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos**. Available at: http://www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/pdf/1_110321.pdf. 2019. Accessed on: mar. 20. 2021.

DOS SANTOS BERNARDES, L.; HENN, S. A.; SEHNEM, S.; SOUZA, S.; CASAGRANDE, J. Sustentabilidade e inovação social: o lixo que gera oportunidades. **Revista Gestão & Sustentabilidade Ambiental**, vol. 5, n. 2, 785-813, 2016.

ECHEVERRI, R.; ECHEVERRI, A. **Marco Teórico. Avances y tendencias en el enfoque territorial del desarrollo rural**. In R. ZAVALA; A. CARACUDÁ; G. HORMAZÁBAL (Eds.), *Hacia una gestión territorial: institucionalidad y concurrencia en la operación de los Consejos Municipales de Desarrollo Rural en México* (p. 20-38). Distrito Federal: IICA. 2010.

ECHEVERRI, R.; GONZÁLEZ, H.; ECHEVERRI, A.; MIRANDA, A. **La institucionalidad de lo territorial gestión y política pública**. In J. FORERO; G. GORDILLO; A. GONZÁLEZ (Eds.), *Mundos rurales y transformaciones globales: desafíos y estrategias de respuesta* (p. 1-24). Bogotá D. C.: Pontificia Universidad Javeriana. 2011.

FERNÁNDEZ, J.; FERNÁNDEZ, M. I.; SOLOAGA, I. **Enfoque territorial y análisis dinámico de la ruralidad: alcances y límites para el diseño de políticas de desarrollo rural innovadoras en América Latina y el Caribe**. Available at: https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/44905/1/S1900977_es.pdf. 2019. Accessed on: mar. 8. 2021.

GACETA PARLAMENTARIA. **Plan Nacional de Desarrollo 2019-2024**. Available at: <http://gaceta.diputados.gob.mx/PDF/64/2019/abr/20190430-XVIII-1.pdf>. 2019. Accessed on: mar. 7. 2021

GOBIERNO DE LA REPÚBLICA. **Plan Nacional de Desarrollo 2013-2018**. Available at: http://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5299465&fecha=20/05/2013. 2013. Accessed on: mar. 15. 2021

GÓMEZ, L.; TACUBA, A. La política de desarrollo rural en México. ¿Existe correspondencia entre lo formal y lo real?. **Economía UNAM**, v. 14 n. 42, p. 93-117, 2017.

GONZÁLEZ, J. G.; GARCÍA-VELASCO, R.; RAMÍREZ-HERNÁNDEZ, et al. La territorialización de la política pública en el proceso de gestión territorial como praxis para el desarrollo. **Cuadernos de Desarrollo Rural**, v. 10, n. 72, p. 243-265, 2013.

GUDYNAS, E. Desarrollo y sustentabilidad ambiental: diversidad de posturas, tensiones persistentes. **La Tierra no es muda: diálogos entre el desarrollo sostenible y el postdesarrollo**, p. 69-96, 2011.

HALME, M.; KORPELA, M. Responsible innovation toward sustainable development in small and medium-sized enterprises: A resource perspective. **Business Strategy and the Environment**, 23(8), p. 547-566, 2014.

HERRERA, F. Enfoques y políticas de desarrollo rural en México: Una revisión de su construcción institucional. **Gestión y política pública**, v. 22 n. 1, p. 131-159, 2013.

HUGGINS, R.; WILLIAMS, N. Entrepreneurship and regional competitiveness: The role and progression of policy. **Entrepreneurship and Regional Development**, v. 23, n. 9-10, p. 907-932, 2014.

INEGI. **Encuesta Intercensal 2015**. Available at: https://www.inegi.org.mx/contenidos/programas/intercensal/2015/doc/eic_2015_presentacion.pdf. 2015. Accessed on: mar. 20. 2021.

INSP. **Encuesta Nacional de Salud y Nutrición de Medio Camino 2016: Informe final de resultados**. Available at: http://transparencia.insp.mx/2017/auditorias-insp/12701_Resultados_Encuesta_ENSANUT_MC2016.pdf. 2016. Accessed on: mar. 20. 2021.

- JIA, K., CHEN, S. Could campaign-style enforcement improve environmental performance? Evidence from China's central environmental protection inspection. **Journal of environmental management**, Vol. 245, p. 282-290, 2019.
- KHAN, I. S.; AHMAD, M. O; MAJAVA, J. Industry 4.0 and Sustainable Development: A Systematic Mapping of Triple Bottom Line, Circular Economy and Sustainable Business Models Perspectives. **Journal of Cleaner Production**, p. 1-58, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.126655>
- KLIKSBERG, B. Hacia una gerencia social eficiente: algunas cuestiones clave. **Revista mexicana de ciencias políticas y sociales**, v. 44, n.175, p. 15-29, 1999.
- LARA, H. El gobierno de los bienes comunes. La evolución de las instituciones de acción colectiva. **Región y sociedad**, v. 14, n. 24, p. 263-269. 2002.
- LEFF, E. **Discursos sustentáveis**. São Paulo: Cortez, 2010.
- LEWANDOWSKI, J. D. Capitalising Sociability: Rethinking the Theory of Social Capital. En R. Edwards, J. Franklin; J. Holland (Eds.), **Assessing Social Capital: Concept, policy and practice**. Cambridge Scholars Publishing in association with GSE Research, p. 14-28, 2012.
- LOBELLE, G. Políticas públicas sociales: apuntes y reflexiones. **ARCIC**, v. 6, n. 14, p. 81-96. Available at http://scielo.sld.cu/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2411-99702017000300006&lng=es&tlng=es.2017. Accessed on: mar. 7. 2021
- LÓPEZ-VALLEJO-OLVERA, M. La agenda ambiental mexicana ante la gobernanza global y regional. **Revista de El Colegio de San Luis**, vol. 4, n. 7, p. 102-130, 2014.
- LORENZETTI, R. L. **Teoría del derecho ambiental**. Madrid: Temis, 2011.
- LOUREIRO, C. F. B. **Sustentabilidade e educação: um olhar da ecologia política**. São Paulo: Cortez Editora, 2014.
- MAYA, A.; CABERO, V. El desarrollo rural integrado como estrategia territorial y posible alternativa económica. **Revista de Economía y Finanzas de Castilla y León**, v. 4, p. 11-29, 2000.
- MELO-SOUZA, R. **Território, planejamento e sustentabilidade: conceitos e práticas**. São Cristóvão: Editora UFS, 2009.
- MICHELI, J. Política ambiental en México y su dimensión regional. **Región y Sociedad**, vol. 4, n. 23, p. 129-170, 2002.
- MOREIRA, R. J. **Terra, poder e território**. São Paulo: Expressão Popular, 2007.
- NACIONES UNIDAS. Ruralidad, hambre y pobreza en América Latina y el Caribe. Available at: https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/44371/4/S1801207_es.pdf. 2018. Accessed on: mar. 7. 2021.
- NORDHAUS, W. D. **Managing the global commons: the economics of climate change** (Vol. 31). Cambridge, MA: MIT press, 1994.
- OSTROM, E. **Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action**. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- PÉREZ, A. **Políticas públicas para la promoción del desarrollo económico territorial. Una aproximación desde la práctica**. Available at: http://www.dhls.hegoa.ehu.eus/uploads/resources/4735/resource_files/Politicapublicas-DET-APP.pdf?v=63736617747. 2008. Accessed on: mar. 7. 2021.

PHILLIPS, W.; ALEXANDER, E. A.; LEE, H. Going It Alone Won't Work! The Relational Imperative for Social Innovation in Social Enterprises. **Journal of Business Ethics**, v. 156, n. 2, p. 315-331, 2017.

PHILLIPS, W.; LEE, H.; GHOBADIAN, A.; O'REGAN, N., JAMES. P. Social innovation and social entrepreneurship: A systematic review. **Group & Organization Management**, v. 40, n. 3, p. 428-461, 2015.

PITZ, T. G.; MADDEN, L. T.; MAYO, D. Catalyzing Social Innovation: Leveraging Compassion and Open Strategy in Social Entrepreneurship. **New England Journal of Entrepreneurship**, v. 20, n. 2, p. 37-52, 2018.

PORTER, M.; KRAMER, M.R. Creating Shared Value. *Harvard Business Review*, 89(1/2), 62-77, 2011.

ROMER, P. M. Two strategies for economic development: using ideas and producing ideas. **The World Bank Economic Review**, 6(suppl_1), p. 63-91, 1992.

SÁNCHEZ, N. A. Pobreza, medio ambiente y desarrollo sostenible. Nómadas. **Critical Journal of Social and Juridical Sciences**, vol. 26, n. 2, 2010.

SRIDHAR, K. A multi-dimensional criticism of the Triple Bottom Line reporting approach. **International Journal of Business Governance and Ethics**, vol. 6, n. 1, p. 49-67, 2011.

VEIGA, J. E. **Desenvolvimento sustentável: o desafio do século XXI**. Rio de Janeiro: Gramond, 2010.



Esta obra está licenciada com uma Licença Creative Commons Atribuição 4.0 Internacional.