

**Peter Sigsgaard:
Report
(Draft)**

Impact Monitoring Without Indicators

MSC Pilot Study in Mozambique

June 2001

(Draft by PS 25.6.2001)

Table of Contents

Summary	5
The MSC Approach and the Method.....	5
Pilot Study in MS Mozambique	5
Previous test in Zambia	6
Aims of the test in Mozambique.....	6
The set up of the study.....	6
Outcome of the pilot study	6
MSC stories collected.....	7
Methodological experiences.....	7
Prioritisation of the partner stories	8
PAB's choices	8
Choices of the MS Office	8
Organisational Learning	9
Conclusion.....	10
Annex 1: Monitoring without indicators in MSiS. Proposal for a process	11
Annex 2: Lessons Learned	15
Annex 3: List of stories recorded	19

Summary

The Most Significant Change exercise was undertaken as a pilot by MS-Denmark in collaboration with MS-Mozambique in June 2001. The exercise aimed at assessing the workability and appropriateness of this new approach as an alternative and/or supplementary monitoring and evaluation tool to those already in place within the MSiS system. A test of the method had been conducted earlier in Zambia.

In Mozambique the method was conducted in another methodological way than in Zambia. It was also of interest to see whether differences in language, culture, etc. would influence the outcome of the method, which had proven useful in Zambia.

Data were collected in ten partnerorganisations in Maputo, the Nampula Province, and in the Cabo Delgado (Pemba). Besides this, a number of individuals were asked to answer the questions. Three of the partners were NGOs; the remaining seven were governmental operating on a provincial or a district level.

The overall result based on the test is that the method will work, and that it can be easily introduced in the MSiS. It will not be an added burden to the partners and the busy COs as it simply substitutes reporting and programme discussions that already are meant to take place.

We recommend the following:

- MS Mozambique will continue to use most significant change approach as a supplementary data collection method. Once in a year, instead of a narrative quarterly report (which rarely is written), the partners will be asked to present a most significant change story in at least the domains of Poverty Reduction and Organisational Performance.
- Some short training of POs, Partner Representatives, and DWs responsible for the collection should be organised by the Training Officer.
- MS Mozambique should also use the method as an element of the Partner during Review Workshops.

The MSC Approach and the Method

The MSC method is a participatory and simple method; its approach is qualitative and subjective. Basically it builds on asking people directly about their perception and ranking of importance of changes in given areas. It does not attempt to “measure” on predefined indicators, but it tries to elicit peoples’ own indicators or evidence of the changes having actually taken place.

The method is meant to produce information relevant for monitoring purposes *and* to support organisational learning.

The method resembles in many ways the different forms of PRA methodologies, but its fundamental difference is that it focuses on *actual changes* rather than “problems” or wished for conditions.

A description of the method and the reasons for MS to try to apply it are found in the paper in Annex 1.

Pilot Study in MS Mozambique

At a Programme Development Meeting in January 2001 MS decided to test the method in two programme countries, preferably two countries that could be said to be different. It was, for different reasons, not practical to do the studies in Central America or Nepal. The two countries chosen were Zambia and Mozambique. We felt that the two MS programmes were conducted in different cultural and historical settings; differences could be seen especially in language and the way the partnership approach was implemented.

Previous test in Zambia

The test in Zambia was conducted in late April to early May 2001. Ten partners were visited in Southern and Eastern Provinces of Zambia. These included community based organisations, district councils, and national non-governmental Organisations.

Overall, the results were promising. However, the method used in Zambia was costly in terms of facilitation. Working with large groups demanded a skilful, outside facilitator. It was also difficult to explain the concept of “Intercultural Co-operation”. Some other lessons learned (including later findings in Mozambique) are found in Annex 2.

Aims of the test in Mozambique

Firstly, we wanted to see whether the method also worked when applied in the Mozambican setting. Secondly, we wanted to conduct the method as close to future realities as possible, i.e. using partner representatives and DWs as interviewers and facilitators, and working with few respondents.

Thirdly, different wording and explanations concerning Intercultural Co-operation, was tried out.

The set up of the study

Thirteen partnervisits were arranged by the CO. Three of them were not able to participate or simply did not show up at the arranged meeting. The remaining ten were distributed in Maputo, Nampula Town and District, and in Cabo Delgado (Pemba Town). Three of the partners were NGOs; the rest were local government institutions working at provincial or district level. Furthermore, a special study was conducted with 28 directors of “Zonas de influencia pedagogica” (school clusters) in the Nacaroa and Memba districts in Nampula. They answered the questions set up in a questionnaire form in pairs. No probing or facilitation took place. The main aim of this special study was to produce stories of change in an area where the Operation Day’s Work had been influential. The partners visited were:

Name	Province	Organisation
AJUDE	Maputo	NGO (Workcamps)
DPOT	Cabo Delgado	Government (Environment)
ADEMO	Cabo Delgado	NGO (Disabled Persons)
DPE	Cabo Delgado	Government (Education)
ARO Juvenil	Cabo Delgado	NGO (Young People)
DIMAS	Nampula	Government (Environment)
AMR	Nampula	NGO (Women)
DPMCAS	Nampula	Government (Social Service)
DDADR	Nampula (district)	Government (Agriculture)
DDE	Nampula (district)	Government (Education)

Outcome of the pilot study

- We are now convinced that the method will work and that MS can gain considerably by introducing it as a standard monitoring tool. It provides us with information and learning, which is not provided by the present reporting system.
- All respondents can identify changes - but nearly no one communicated them as stories. Specification can, however, easily be produced by asking for examples. Some sort of training of the interviewers is, however, needed.
- Changes pertaining to Poverty Reduction and Organisational Performance were easily identified, but we had extreme difficulties in eliciting changes within the domain of Intercultural

Co-operation. We tend to believe that such changes are not readily perceived by the partners because the partnership process has given this domain very little attention so far. In Mozambique there may also be a cultural precondition – the society is in a certain way very relaxed when it comes to noting and perceiving differences across racial or international borders.

- In Mozambique, it was not difficult for respondents to identify specific reasons for choosing a given change as most significant.
- The method provided us with added insight, especially about the importance that community-members attach to the observed changes. It also sometimes elicited unexpected dimensions and perceived relationships between issues. We have compared the information gained in the field with the content of partner-files in MS' Maputo office. Very little of the information related to us is available in already existing reports. This goes for both the changes in organisational performance and for more general changes in the wider community settings.
- It was said in many places that the group discussions had given the partner (staff and others) an opportunity to collectively reflect about their work in the communities. In some cases it naturally led to instant discussions about the appropriateness of the strategies and means, which they were currently using. Partners told us, that they rarely had that type of discussion.
- We recommend the following:
 - MS Mozambique will continue to use most significant change approach as a supplementary data collection method. Once in a year, instead of a narrative quarterly report (which rarely is written), the partners will be asked to present a most significant change story in at least the domains of Poverty Reduction and Organisational Performance.
 - Some short training of POs, Partner Representatives, and DWs responsible for the collection should be organised by the Training Officer.
 - MS Mozambique should also use the method as an element of the Partner during Review Workshops.

MSC stories collected

26 statements about significant change were recorded. Many more “stories” were actually told, but as the method demanded that the respondents identify *one*, most significant, change, the total became limited. Stories told in the district administration of education, Nacaroa, are listed together with the results from Memba (directors of school clusters).

The 26 stories are tabled in Annex 3. An additional list of the answers given by the school cluster directors is also found there.

Methodological experiences

At the time of writing, all experiences have not been analysed yet. However, a few central observations can be made here:

- In general, it was difficult to immediately get the respondents to answer in a relevant way. Most did easily fall into talking at length about activities conducted. This also applied to the interviewers, who had difficulties in grasping the idea, did not always probe, did not ask for examples, and sometimes even put the answers into the head of the respondents. We believe that it is necessary to train the interviewers.
- In the beginning respondents often told their stories in a very flowering, formal and circumvent way. This may be due to the Portuguese language inviting to such diversions; it may also

be due to a tradition of being very “formal” when you are to report to officials or other like persons.

- Field Officers (extensionistas) proved to be the best respondents. Beneficiaries or group members directly involved in the activities also gave very relevant answers. Officials working at office level and in superior positions tended to be more unspecific and hazy in their answers.
- Intercultural Co-operation was extremely difficult to grasp for most respondents. We gave up during the pilot, and did not pose the question during the last third of the interviews. Interestingly enough, some of the directors of the school clusters did produce relevant answers without all our explanations and instructions. This in spite of being instructed to leave out the question.
- ?
- ?
- ?

Prioritisation of the partner stories

The Method supports organisational learning through communication to all partners of statements related to choices made by PAB (and maybe CO). The rationale for this prioritisation and the criterion that PAB should use are described in Annex 1

PAB's choices

As PAB did not have a meeting close to the period of the study, this report does not contain PAB's comments to the data collected. The CO will, however, conduct the exercise when the next meeting is held. The office (Information DW) will also make sure that the results of this study and the PAB choices are communicated through the MS Mozambique Newsletter to all partners and DWs.

Choices of the MS Office

The list of 26 stories collected was presented to a group consisting of CO-staffs, DWs, and one PAB member in Maputo. They were asked to choose one story from each domain. Criterion for the choice was that the story should be the most significant illustration of the situation in MS Mozambique today. The group had no difficulty in choosing and justifying their choices.

a) Poverty Reduction Domain

Story no. 7, quoting members of farming groups in Nacaroa:

“During the previous years we did not complain about the lack of possibilities to sell our products – because we had nothing to sell. Today we complain.”

We have seen some small change towards the better in terms of production this year. This is partly due to the help (input: seeds and tools) we get from the DDADR and the visits of the cooperant. People have produced a little surplus of peanuts, cashew and maize, but we have a problem in selling the products. Prices are low and we are far away from the route of the buyers.

It is important to us to sell and get some income, because we want to be able to send our children to school. You could say, that the change is that we now have **hope** (esperanca) for the future, we are expecting to advance in terms of development. It is, however, too early to say that our expectations are met.

Justification: The story brings to life a reality, which is often hidden in the ordinary, statistically oriented "valuations" The farmers quoted know what they want to accomplish, and they are realistic about development being a gradual process. This is promising if you think in terms of sustainability. The story also expresses a paradox in development: new problems (marketing) arise when the initial ones (increased production) are solved. Some will lose, others will win. Story no. 9 (getting second most votes) is also about this.

b) Inter-cultural Co-operation

Story: Há mudanças porque antes tudo era garantido pelos outros ou seja tudo era doado. Agora há troca de experiências e aprendizagem mútua. Por exemplo, tivemos troca de experiências no sistema de crédito. Antes os doadores impunham o tipo de actividades que gostariam de ver realizadas. Mas agora participamos na tomada da decisão em relação ao tipo de projeto por implementar.

Justification: The story illustrates an important change of attitude and strengthened self-confidence due to shared learning and a changed, more participatory framework for international co-operation.

c) Organisational Performance

Story: Existe maior dinamismo no cumprimento dos planos e acções propostas, bem como existe um intercâmbio positivo entre as instituições.

Justification: This story about more dynamic implementation of plans and better co-operation between institutions is very general and unspecific in its formulation. We have, however, chosen it because we believe that it describes what is in fact happening now.

Organisational Learning

Besides the learning that can take place through the prioritisation of the stories, the research method itself led to learning both at partner and MS level.

Again and again the partners told us, that they found the method valuable because it gave them a chance to reflect on impact and discuss their strategies. In one organisation, the director (acting as an interviewer) thanked the respondents (his own field staff) for having told about issues in the field that he simply did not know existed. In another, the staffs became aware of a mismatch between resources invested and own actual priorities. They clearly found the HIV/AIDS problem most the most pressing social problem, but they invested most of their resources in some rather traditional income generating projects. Many partner organisations said that they would try to use the method in their daily work.

At the MS level, there is no doubt that the information rendered is better for monitoring than what exists at present. However, the stories also seem to be valuable as triggering programme discussions about strategies, policies, and the way to document the impact. Just some examples: Story no. 5 tells us that self-esteem is an important factor for the beneficiaries, maybe more important than what is offered in terms of concrete learning. Some indicators for successes are not so good (e.g. *enrolled* students in adult education), or empty cardboard box, which was full of preservatives. We also learn that there is a risk of undermining people's attitude towards voluntarism, if MS is visible (story 17)¹ – how can that risk be minimised? We learn that farmers have a lot of hope and expectations for the future, but that the "project" is not sustainable (story 7 combined with 23).

(Roberto: Elaborate on this, please – maybe after discussing it in the office)

¹ This risk was actually found described in details in the former DW's report on file in the office. No one, however, seem to have used the information until now.

Conclusion

It has been a most encouraging experience to visit the 10 partners. We worked very well together in this pilot exercise, and we believe that we all gained. It is now clear to us that this very simple method is very powerful because we ask questions about the reality as perceived by the people themselves. It reveals ongoing and unforeseen change and burning issues in the communities where the partners work.

There is no doubt that *we* (MS) got an added insight. Very little of the information given to us are actually available in the reports and files in the MS office.

However, also *the partners* benefited. The partnership process as such may also benefit if this method is applied. It gives added weight to the mutuality between MS and the partner, simply because it asks questions about what has been accomplished, instead of asking about what partners want to receive.

We believe that the method can be a valuable tool in the MSiS system.

Annex 1: Monitoring without indicators in MSiS. Proposal for a process

Rick Davies from Centre for Development Studies, Swansea, U.K. has given inspiration to this simple, learning based monitoring system².

It was first tried out on a large scale in Bangladesh in 1994. Since then a number of consultants and organisations are experimenting with the method. ActionAid U.K. uses parts of it. VSO is now adopting it as the official impact monitoring system for their volunteer programme.

I here propose that we start using an adjusted version of the method in MSiS. Some of its advantages are:

- It is involving and participatory at all levels. It thus significantly contributes to organisational learning, and it goes well together with the whole idea behind MSiS
- It is honestly transparent and free from pseudo-objectivity
- The method is demystified and understandable to all of us. The method reflects a strong epic tradition that marks many non western cultures
- It grasps unforeseen consequences of the MSiS interventions
- The method gets hold of *change* in people's and organisations' outlook and priorities
- It systematically uses information already gathered, e.g. in Progress Reports and Review Workshops
- The information is used on all levels with clear links between monitoring at partner/ "beneficiary" level, and monitoring of country programmes and the whole of MSiS
- It supplements the M&E systems already in place
- It saves us from investing considerable time and energy. As it is now, we try to invent and agree on sophisticated, pre-constructed, quantitative indicators. We then fight to the bitter end to feed these indicators into a system, which clearly lacks resources for measuring against them

Point of Departure

The system records different groups' perceptions of *Significant Changes* that can be linked to the development interventions of MSiS. Before starting, MS should identify three to four broadly defined types of change that are of interest. The MSiS Programme Document offers guidelines. It is proposed that the final decision on which *domains of change* to consider be made at the APM in the meeting with the MS Board.

For the sake of illustration the following four domains are listed here:

Poverty Reduction: Changes in people's lives (livelihood, control, etc)

Intercultural Co-operation: Changes due to people getting a broader outlook; increased contacts across cultural or national barriers

Organisational Performance: Changes in partners' ability to accomplish their goals, sustainability of people's institutions and their activity

Any Other Type of Change: Open category for informants to use for changes they find significant

Another prerequisite is to decide on which groups at what levels should participate in the monitoring process. Here, the following groupings are proposed:

² Davies, R.:

An evolutionary approach to facilitating organisational learning:

An experiment by the Christian Commission for Development in Bangladesh.

<http://www.swan.ac.uk/cds/rd/ccdb.htm>

Partner representative(s) and DW(s) placed with partner	Partner level Collection of data	Country Office staff has a facilitating role
PAB	Country Programme level	
APM (PAB chairpersons, Coordinators, representatives from Secretariat and MSiS PC in DK) and MS Board	Global Programme level	International Department has a facilitating role

Reporting

Twice a year³, each partner (together with the DW if applicable) has the responsibility of collecting at least one “story” of perceived, significant change within each of the above domains. The partner representative and the DW are free to decide whom to consult, it may be a group of beneficiaries, participants in a review workshop, it may be colleagues, it may in some cases be the DW and the partner representative only. The important thing is to report the source of the information. See the attached example of a datasheet.

The questions to ask are given on the datasheets. They are deliberately broad, but try to focus on changes, which can be seen as happening because of the MSiS intervention. The Programme Officer will guide the partner representative and the DW on how to use the simple datasheet, probing techniques, and the understanding of the content of the domains.

For each domain, the group will be asked to *describe* - preferably in the form of a very short story - the most significant change that has been observed. After this, the group will have to shortly *explain* why especially the given change is considered the most important. This last explanation is maybe the most important part of the data, as it indicates priorities and often states the perceived causes for the change.

The stories and their justification is written down and delivered to the CO - preferably in electronically form.

What happens at the CO?

During the year, about 150-200 stories are collected. Especially in the beginning of the process, the stories will vary a lot in information quality. It is safe to guess that a relatively big proportion will be difficult to interpret, understand, and be about issues that are of little interest to the programme.

Therefore, a screening at CO should take place, for example in a programme meeting⁴. Those stories, which have little information value, are discarded, the remaining are fed into a *database* for future use. Some future uses could be to compare the perceived changes with the stated aims of the partnership, to look for unforeseen results of the intervention, to discuss possible adjustments and clarifications of the partnership activity.

CO also selects a few stories that seem to be significant and interesting. These stories are further *verified* for example when the Programme Officers visit the given partners next time. The aim is not so much to control whether people’s perceptions are indeed correct, or that the changes have actually taken place.

³ The number of reporting sessions is here arbitrarily chosen. One could think of quarterly reporting together with accounts, or yearly reporting connected to review workshops.

⁴ An important effect of this is, that the staff gets a good overview of what is happening in the country programme.

The idea is more to deepen an understanding of the processes leading to the changes, to detail and enrich the story. The resulting report from the programme officer is also stored in the database.

PAB uses one or more of its meetings to go through the reports retained (now probably around 100). PAB's task is now to select one or two reports from each domain, which *to the PAB* are illustrating the Most Significant Changes. PAB should justify its choice, i.e. issuing statements like "We have chosen report X as describing the most significant change within Poverty Reduction, because this change is perfectly concordant with the aims of the country policy paper." The choices and the arguments for them should be noted in the database.

CO (or the DW Information Worker?) reports (through Newsletter?) to the partners about the outcome of PAB's deliberations. It is of course important that as many as possible of the original reports are shared, and that PAB's motivations for the given choices are described. This secures continuous learning about programme policy among partners, and it will influence the further process. Next time partners may tend to focus more on issues and changes that are relevant to the overall policy - they may even strive towards bringing about relevant changes that can be perceived and reported.

For a given year, PAB has chosen 4-8 reports as significantly describing effects brought about by the country programme. These reports with the supporting justifications are forwarded to International Department in DK - well ahead of the APM.

Global Programme Assessment

MS in Denmark will by, say, April, have received about 36-72 reports from the country programmes and the regional programme in Central America. These papers document those changes, which the PABs have chosen as relevant. They can be analysed as such, categorised, and be prepared for presentation at the APM.

The APM and the MS Board will have the task to select one or two cases from each domain of change, as those cases that most significantly describe relevant effects of the MSiS. It is also here important that the meeting specify its reasons for choosing a given case.

The chosen 4-8 cases are made widely known throughout the MSiS with these accompanying justifications. Thereby, global policy concerns are communicated through examples coming from the grassroots to all the agents of MSiS. Organisational learning takes place!

Other Use of the Information

The sifting out of cases throughout the process may seem harsh. The rich material is, however, not lost. It can be used for many different purposes in programme development and in general information to the public and Danida.

If special needs arise, one always can revisit the bulk of the reports in the database (which, therefore, need to have a facility for searching on keywords or concepts). After the first year, the database will contain more than 800 descriptions of developmental changes observed by partners or the people with whom they work. It will be a resource not only for MS in Denmark (for example in recruitment and information), but as much an inspiration for country programmes and partners. The material is suitable for different types of categorisation and content analysis⁵, and the data are as suitable as any for both qualitative and quantitative analysis. A tempting method is to ask different groupings to rank the cases or their justifications according to criteria that are found relevant.

When the process is well under way, it also lies near at hand to analyse the information over time and across countries: What change does the pattern of reported changes show? Does one find variations in justifications given for those reports that are selected by policy makers? Why?⁶

⁵ EDB based tools (e.g. Nud*ist) can be used for this analysis.

⁶ At country programme level, one has the same possibilities for analysing the material.

FAQs⁷

What about objectivity? This methods seems to be based on a very subjective foundation?

Yes! But it does not hide its subjectivism in pseudo-objectivism. I will argue that most of what we do, including the external, "scientific" reviews and evaluations, is basically subjective.

What about validity?

It is perfect. We claim that we are measuring perceptions and value-laden expressions of the same. And no one can dispute that this is what the methods in fact registers.

What about reliability?

Maybe not so applicable in this connection. As a learning based method it will, however, promote increased consensus among actors about how to interpret data - and thereby attain same results by repeated "measurements".

This seems to be a very qualitative method

It is not. Many "stories" may contain a wealth of objectively verifiable quantitative data, and the stories can also be analysed by using quantitative methodologies.

Is it not a danger that people will only describe successful stories, positive changes?

The method is good for catching unforeseen changes, but not necessarily the negative or harmful effects of interventions. Experience shows that up to 95% of the stories will be positive. The method can, however, be applied so that one asks specifically for changes that are valued negatively by the respondents (searching for unforeseen, negative consequences of the intervention). By the way; what is wrong with looking for positive effects of what we do because we want to do something good? Is it also not what we are doing when constructing indicators in the traditional, management-inspired logframe system?

Etc. etc. etc.

Peter Sigsgaard 5.1.2001

⁷ To be fundamentally reworked and elaborated upon. Here just written to indicate that the final paper will include such a list

Annex 2: Lessons Learned

Group interviews	These need very skilled facilitation if a story or a change has to be prioritised.
Perception of importance or significance	It is difficult for respondents to give reasons as to why they have chosen a given story as significant
Giving reasons for choosing exactly the story told	In Mthila it proved once again difficult for respondents to give a reason other than e.g. "This is because this area of activity is important to me" or "This is what was significant to me".
Sharing of experiences	Respondents said in Mthila Kubili that it had been a useful exercise to listen to each other's stories and to reflect about what had actually changed during the last six months. A retired schoolteacher was very outspoken about it. He for the first time heard about how it was going with the increased influence by the parents: "This is something new and interesting to me to hear about, it was not like that before."
Group decision on prioritisation	It was not possible to force the group to choose among 7-8 different stories of significant change given by the group members. They are all interrelated, they said.
DWs as an element in Cultural Co-operation	<p>DWs are rarely mentioned spontaneously neither as carriers or facilitators of cultural exchange, nor as somebody having stimulated programme activities. When probed, most people say that DWs were good to have and that they helped a lot, especially with transport.</p> <p>An explanation may be that the DWs are rarely perceived by partners as "culture agents", but more as professional assistants.</p> <p>If this is the case, the method put to regular use would help stimulate this other perception of the DW as an element in Intercultural Co-operation. It would also be enforced by a conscientious effort by the programme to stress this part of MSiS programme.</p>
Identification of respondents (informants)	Up to the persons responsible for collecting stories (partner/DW). We recommend individual interviews, or maybe tiny groups of 2-3 people.
Confidentiality	<p>See SlamU.doc</p> <p>See also KYPT, Management</p>
PAB prioritisation	

Wording of Questions	
Grasping Cultural Co-operation as a concept	
Guidelines for noting down the statements	Record verbatim, or rather: write in form as a person telling the story and use characteristic formulations
Storytelling	Did not work, and it is also not important as long as instructions to respondents state that there should be given at least 2 examples to each change communicated
Probing and explanations of domains of change	Some general guidelines for those producing the stories need to be made - guidelines about common interview technique matters
The problem of "how"	If not related by examples given, one could ask for answers to the question: How did this change come about? What made this change occur?
Broader outlook than that confined to MS matters	<p>Respondents tend automatically to report about changes that are exclusively related to their own organisations' interventions and aims.</p> <p>This was overcome by stating clearly in the beginning that we are interested in the change in the lives of people in the community or those that the organisation work with. It was further stated that we would ask questions related to the organisation's performance at the end of the interview.</p>
Qualifying statements, specifying information	<p>Often statements are given in a very general form: "Many people changed attitude", "There are signs of gender equity" and the like.</p> <p>Interviewer should always try to get specification on such statements asking like this: "How many would you say have changed attitude?", "Which signs?", "If you are to prove what you just said, how would you prove it?"</p>
What did we learn from the pilot, overall impressions.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All can identify changes - but nearly no one communicated them as stories. Changes performing to daily life and organisational Performance are more easily identified than changes within Cultural Co-operation. (changes in this domain may take place over longer time, and as very little attention has been put to it, the changes may not be readily perceived. 2. Participants benefited (see separate row) 3. The method provided us with added insight, especially about the importance connected to the observed changes. It also sometimes pointed to new dimensions. By browsing files in CO we have validated the information - very little of the information related to us is available in already existing reports. 4. "Workable it is" (the method), it can also be sup-

	plemented with other means. But it will work, and should be introduced as a system.
The benefit to the partner of using the method	<p>It was said in many places that the group discussions had given the partner (staff) an opportunity to discuss and reflect about their role and the wider setting they were operating in. Partners told us, that they rarely had that type of discussion In one case (Chipepo) it led to an instant discussion about strategy in combating malnutrition in their area.</p> <p>If/when we choose to use the method by interview respondents more individually, that opportunity (benefit) may not materialise.</p>
What distinguishes this pilot from other's using the MSC method?	<p>We used many "ordinary" people as informants. In Bangladesh informants were field officers, in VSO they are the volunteers, in Australia they also used field officers.</p> <p>We have used beneficiaries and ordinary members of partner committees, staff etc.</p>
"Changes in general"	When asking for changes in general, we did not get much. Future format should just ask about the first three changes.
The meaning of "Culture"	In Mozambique it was difficult to explain this concept of intercultural co-operation, it did not easily ring a bell. In one case it was perceived as having to do with "fine arts". Cooperants are perceived as any other person, part of the set up, not as agents of intercultural dialogue. MS Mocambique name them "tecnicos Cooperantes" today. When the programme started we were perceived as "Internationalistas", "Solidarity Workers", connecting Mozambique to the situation in other parts of the world (in a united fight against oppression and.....)
Time frame	We have persistently asked for changes during the last six months. We most often get changes dating back several years, especially in the area of Intercultural Co-operation. It might be considered to ask for "recent Changes" or using a timeframe of one or two years.
Intercultural Co-operation	It seems that the examples rendered are not as important or "significant" as expected. Maybe the whole area of interest should be left out in this exercise? An argument against it is that we - by asking the question - focus more on the issue and thereby contribute to learning about MS priorities - and force MS to plan according to its own overall objectives.
Gender	It was proposed in Pemba to make a separate question on gender issues, this was considered more important than the Intercultural Co-operation. The motivation for its inclusion was also that there was a tendency to forget the gender dimension, by having a separate question we could direct attention to the issue. (try to see how many of the stories on poverty reduction are about gender issues, cf. Zambia. If a considerable number is elicited without us asking specifically - then it may be more significant.)

Annex 3: List of stories recorded

MSC Mozambique

No.	Change mentioned	Comments
Poverty Reduction		
1.	<p>A mudança mais significativa nas vidas da população com que trabalhamos é o grande afluxo de mulheres aos centros de alfabetização e Educação de Adultos. Exemplos:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Em 2000 haviam se inscrito 4044 mulheres dum universo de 7005 alfabetizando inscritos • Em 2001 se inscreveram 6.230 mulheres dum universo de 10357 de alfabetizando inscritos. <p>(Comment from PS: Balance between women and men is stable, respectively 58% and 60%)</p>	
2.	Redução de queimadas descontroladas no distrito de Pemba Metuge	
3.	Mais água potável na vila de Mueda. - Foi possível por causa da instalação dum motobomba com maior capacidade e por causa da participação dos consumidores	
4.	Construção de duas salas de aulas na escola de Aguiar localidade de Xinavane, província do Maputo. Muitos miúdos estudam debaixo da árvore. Nos dias de chuva não há aulas. A população pede escola ao governo. Entretanto, a Ajude vai ao local e constrói duas salas de aulas. Hoje, 200 crianças têm acesso às aulas. A população festejou.	
5.	Para mim é muito importante a construção de salas de aulas por ADEMO. Porque até nos distritos onde não há possibilidade de adultos receberem aulas de alfabetização agora já é possível. Muito recentemente os deficientes não eram nada perante as outras pessoas não portadoras de deficiência e nossa própria auto-estima era baixíssima. Mas através das palestras de sensibilização e educação, somos válidos porque temos vontade de trabalhar e melhorar a nossa própria situação.	
6.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mudança Negativa – Desemprego - Mais Significativa – Maior número de Jovens com acesso a Educação, Conscientização de Jovens sobre o Perigo do HIV/SIDA, Redução de número de Jovens que vendem Produtos do Artesanato descontroladamente, Sensibilização sobre o Planeamento Familiar, Redução de Grávidas indesejadas nas Jovens, Mulheres Solteiras, Mães desempregadas e Viúvas com o acesso a alfabetização, Costura e curso do secretariado. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Ex: No ano 2000 a Escola Secundária de Pemba tinha 20 desistências por gravidez indesejadas enquanto no igual período do ano 2001 não registou – se nenhuma desistência. ❖ No ano 2000 as Escolas de Alfabetização de Adultos da ADEMO e da 	

	<p>AMODEFA tinha matriculado perto de 150 alfabetizadas e destas desistiram 12 - enquanto em 2001 ainda não há desistencias. (Comment from PS: The number is far below what ADEMO actually related, maybe ARO Juvenil just counts the young people in literacy classes).</p>													
7.	<p>“PS” Summary of the individual stories (very much alike in all three cases): A significant change is: “During the previous years we did not complain about the lack of possibilities to sell our products – because we had nothing to sell. Today we complain.”</p> <p>We have seen some small changes towards the better in terms of production this year. This is partly due to the help (input: seeds and tools) we get from the DDADR and the visits of the cooperant. People have produced a little surplus of peanuts, cashew and maize, but we have a problem in selling the products. Prices are low and we are far away from the route of the buyers. It is important to us to sell and get some income, because we want to be able to send our children to school.</p> <p>You could say, that the change is that we now have hope (esperanca) for the future, we are expecting to advance in terms of development. It is, however, too early to say that our expectations are met.</p>													
8.	<p>Aumento da produção agrícola</p> <table style="margin-left: 40px;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Antes</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Agora</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Milho</td> <td style="text-align: center;">300kg</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1.500kg</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Feijão</td> <td style="text-align: center;">50kg</td> <td style="text-align: center;">700kg</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Gergelim</td> <td style="text-align: center;">----</td> <td style="text-align: center;">9 sacos</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Por isso conseguimos resolver as necessidades básicas da casa tais como: matrícula das crianças, compra de material escolar, medicamentos e a nossa própria roupa.</p>		Antes	Agora	Milho	300kg	1.500kg	Feijão	50kg	700kg	Gergelim	----	9 sacos	
	Antes	Agora												
Milho	300kg	1.500kg												
Feijão	50kg	700kg												
Gergelim	----	9 sacos												
9.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Carência de água potável nos bairros de Muatala e namicopo. Anteriormente a comunidade servia-se de fontenários públicos, que actualmente encontram-se avariados. Esta situação é agravada pelo fraco poder de compra por parte da comunidade, visto que as famílias que possuem água canalizada vendem-na a preços elevados. 2. Combate a erosão nos bairros de Muatala e Muhala. A população está bastante sensibilizada que não espera a intervenção da DIMAS ou de outra qualquer entidade, pois reconhem a neccsidade de defesa das suas casas por exemplo. 3. Deploráveis condiçOes de saneamento do meio em Muatala, acentuadas pelo fecalismo à céu aberto, devido ao fraco apoio de algumas instituições na compra das lages, contrariamente ao que se verificava antes. 													
10.	<p>Maior acesso à informação em toda a província sobre a problemática HIV-SIDA. Como resultado das campanhas nacionais e palestras promovidas por nós DPMCAS. E consequentemente regista-se uma mudança de comportamento no seio das comunidades quanto à importância do uso do preservativo. Por exemplo quando se deixa uma caixa com preservativos à disposição passado algum tempo a caixa fica vazia.</p>													
Intercultural Co-operation														
11.	<p>A presença de Tusristas em Pemba Porque com a presença dos turistas nas cidade e a sua frequencia e utilicao da Praias desta cidade arrastou a muitos cidadãos a frequentarem as praias acto que a um passado presente não era usual as praias serem utilizadas nos tem-</p>													

	pos de lazer.	
12.	Melhor acesso aos meios de comunicacao electronicos - melhor systema de telecommunicacao, melhor acesso á televisoes....	
13.	Estrangeiros e moçambicanos juntos de mãos dadas a trabalhar voluntariamente na construção de escolas. Brancos e pretos viveram e trabalharam juntos sob condições locais muito simples. Isso criou impacto nas populaces conheceram melhor os ocidentais e revalorizaram o trabalho voluntário.	
14.	Através de contacto com as outras pessoas como por exemplo canadianos temos sentimento que não estamos sozinhos. Temos colegas nos outros paises. Por isso não podemos sentirmo-nos marginalizados na nossa comunidade. A nossa associação não está sozinha, precisamos de troca de ideias com outras pessoas portadoras de deficiência	
15.	<p>- Mais Significativa – Troca de Experiência na área de conhecimento; uso de preservativo; Formação em Democracia para a Juventude, Actualizamos a Assessora sobre os hábitos e Costumes locais, ensino das Línguas Locais `a assessora.</p> <p>❖ Ex: Participação de Dois Jovens da Aro Juvenil em Pemba ao Workshop sobre a Democracia para a Juventude realizado na Dinamarca e Assessora já sabe como lidar com as diferentes pessoas locais com base na cultura (Bom Dia, Como Estás, Nhavo e Salaama), Mudança de Comportamento dos jovens e da Sociedade em geral no uso do preservativo.</p>	
16.	Há mudanças porque antes tudo era garantido pelos outros ou seja tudo era doado. Agora há troca de experiências e aprendizagem mútua. Por exemplo, tivemos troca de experiências no sistema de crédito. Antes os doadores impunham o tipo de actividades que gostariam de ver realizadas. Mas agora participamos na tomadad da decisão em relação ao tipo de projecto por implementar.	
17.	A cooperação intercultural traz aspectos positivos devido a possibilidade de acessoria que os técnicos estrangeiros fazem aos trabalhos da DIMAS, e a troca de experiência. Entretanto, quando os técnicos cooperantes vão até junto das comunidades beneficiárias, estas pensam que os técnicos trazem muito dinheiro, assim sendo, recusam-se a fazer certos trabalhos gratuitamente. A cooperação interculturalpermite a realização e/ou implementação de projectos de grande dimensão.	
Organisational Performance		
18.	A criação da NUCODE (Nucleo de Coordenação e Desenvolvimento de Educação em Cabo Delgado). Porque criou condicoes para unificação e coordenação das actividades que as ONGs tanto Nacionais como Estrangeiras trabalhavam duma forma dispersa para o sector de Educação. A NUCODE condensa duma forma abrangente todos os aspectos educacionais da Provincia, ajuda aquelas ONGs a utilização racional dos recursos tanto financeiros como humanos disponiveis.	
19.	A passagem do Servico Provincial Planeamento Fisico (SPPF) para Direcção Provincial para Coordenação da Accção Ambiental (DPCAA) A autopromocão da instituição é melhor. Os bens próprios são melhores do	

	que antes mas não em relação a DPCAA's em outras provincias	
20.	Muitos membros de Ajude sem tarefas, não aproveitamento dos membros em areas específicas o que ditou a fuga de cérebros. A Ajude decide um processo de reestruturação e capacitação dos seus recursos humanos que resultaram na melhoria no desempenho da organização nomeadamente participação activa dos membros em tarefas e na vida da organização; pagamento de quotas, aderência de novos voluntaries e a criação do website.	
21.	Nós achamos que existe uma boa colaboração entre a Direcção da ADEMO, assessor e outras associações de deficientes. Por isso há muitas novas infra-estruturas incluindo escolas.	
22.	- Maior aderência de Membros, em 2000 tinhamos 423 e em 2001 a Aro Juvenil passou a ter 528 associados , <i>Existencia de Jovens nas Escolas capazes de Produzir Jornais de Parede .</i> Ex: A Aro Juvenil promove cursos de Formação em Jornalismo Básico, Saúde Sexual Reprodutiva do Adolescente e Jovem, Palestras e Debates para além de realização de trabalhos sobre a problemática do HIVSIDA	
23.	It is a major change that we now work in groups with the aim of increasing our agricultural production (one found the collective work more rentable). We have changed from working individually to communal work. It has also been a change in the performance of the organisation that we this year got "instrumentos"(seed and tools) on a credit basis. The help we get from the técnico cooperante is that he assists us in diversifying our production. Contribution from cooperant: DDADR is not sustainable. I am doing all the extension work myself, co-operation with the DDADR is not good. When I leave, what then? There are many structural problems.	
24.	Sinto que há mudança. Antes tudo era doado ou seja que os outros tinham que garantir tudo. Entretanto nesta fase trabalhamos contando com os nossos próprios esforços, através das nossas contribuições monetárias fazemos a manutenção das nossas viaturas, instalações e a compra de insumos. Por lado, por outro, ao nível da família isto é no lar a mulher participa nas decisões inerentes ao uso de recursos e sua priorização pois agora tenho acesso ao salário do meu marido o que não se verificava anteriormente.	
25.	A recente parceria com a MS trouxe uma maior mudança, pois tornou possível a realização de dois seminaries à volta da problemática do HIV-SIDA e está em via de realização o seminário sobre o género. Os quais permitiram: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elaboração do plano provincial de combate contra HIV-SIDA • Elaboração dos planos distritais ao longo do corredor de Nacala. • Melhor coordenação, comunicação e troca de experiências entre a nossa instituição e as restantes existentes na província sobretudo o forum GOPAM – Grupo operativo para o avanço da mulher. 	
26.	Existe maior dinamismo no cumprimento dos planos e acções propostas, bem como existe um intercâmbio positivo entre as instituições.	

--	--	--