

**Report of a Survey of Members of
'Partners for Communication and Information for
Development'.
Andrew Lees Trust**

Nicola Harford, February 2007

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Acronyms | 3 |
| Objective of survey | 4 |
| Methodology | 4 |
| 1. General information | 4 |
| 2. Training | 6 |
| 3. Production | 7 |
| Programme production within and outside PCID | 10 |
| 4. Radios | 12 |
| 5. Participation of target populations | 13 |
| 6. Observations on the impact of broadcasts | 14 |
| Monitoring and evaluation activities | 14 |
| Impact on Groupes d'Ecoutes | 16 |
| Impacts on the villages and general audience | 17 |
| Which programmes were responsible? | 19 |
| How the radio helps project activities | 19 |
| 7. Strategic analysis | 20 |
| Benefits of working with Projet Radio | 20 |
| Problems encountered | 21 |
| Changes in the organisation due to PR | 22 |
| Lessons learned | 22 |
| Performance of Projet Radio | 22 |
| Support required in the future | 23 |
| PCID network | 23 |
| Future role of PR in the network | 23 |
| PCID partners commitment to communications activities | 24 |
| Partners overall recommendations | 24 |
| <i>Groupes d'Ecoutes</i> | 24 |
| <i>Monitoring and evaluation</i> | 25 |
| <i>Radio stations</i> | 25 |
| <i>Communications</i> | 25 |
| <i>Other recommendations</i> | 25 |
| 8. Conclusions and recommendations | 26 |
| Impact of Projet Radio on partners | 26 |
| <i>Role of communications</i> | 26 |
| <i>Skills building</i> | 26 |
| <i>Production</i> | 26 |
| <i>Networking, exchange and collective action</i> | 27 |
| <i>Sustainability</i> | 27 |
| Impact of Projet Radio on partners' projects | 27 |
| <i>Monitoring and Evaluation</i> | 28 |
| <i>Radio distribution</i> | 28 |
| <i>Going beyond radio</i> | 28 |

Acronyms

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| ACORDS | EC initiative for commune-directed rural infrastructure projects |
| ALT | Andrew Lees Trust |
| ANGAP | Association Nationale pour la Gestion des Aires Protégées – National Association for the Management of Protected Areas |
| ASOS | Association Sante Organisation Secour |
| BLU | Bande Laterale Unique - Single Side Band (high frequency radio system) |
| CARE | Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere |
| CD | Compact Disk |
| CEL | Centre Ecologique Libanona – Libanona Ecology Centre |
| CIREEF | Circonscription de l'Environnement, des Eaux et Forêts |
| CISCO | Circonscription Scolaire – School Enrolment |
| CNA | Malagasy National Anti-locust Centre |
| CPP | Cycle Production Participatif - Participative Production Cycle |
| DFID | Department of International Development (UK) |
| EC | European Commission |
| FAFAFI | <i>FAnentanana FAmbolena Flompiana</i> – local NGO focuses on providing communities with agricultural training |
| <i>Fokotany</i> | Smallest administrative unit in Madagascar |
| GE | Groupes d'Ecoutes - listening groups |
| GRET | Groupe de Recherche et d'Echange Technologique |
| GTZ | German Technical Cooperation |
| KIOMBA | <i>Yes, I accept.</i> – local NGO focusing on Community Development |
| MCDI | Medical Care Development International |
| MDP | Maison des Paysans – local NGO working with communities |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organisation |
| PACT | Private Agencies Collaborating Together |
| PAM | Program Alimentaire Mondiale – World Food Programme |
| PCID | Partners for Communication and Information for Development |
| SRPAH PECHE | Ministry of Fishing |
| PR | Projet Radio – Project Radio |
| PSDR | Programme Soutien de Développement Rural – Support Programme for Rural Development |
| SAP | Systeme Alerte Precoce – Early Warning System |
| SATRAHA | <i>'Powerful'</i> - Local development, environment, agriculture and education |
| SISAL | <i>Sambatra Izay SALama</i> - HIV / Health NGO |
| SRSAPS | Service Régionale de la Santé Animal et Phytosanitaire - Regional Service for Animal and Plant Health |
| SSD | Service de Santé du District – District Health Service |
| UADEL | Unités régionales d'Appui pour le Développement Local |
| <i>Toko Mitsitsy</i> | Fuel Efficient Stove |
| VK | <i>Voronkodohodo</i> - Elephant bird |
| VOLA MAHASOA | Micro Finance Association |
| WWF | World Wildlife Fund |

Objective of survey

The objective of this small scale survey was to obtain feedback from 'Partners for Communication and Information for Development' (PCID) member organisations on their activities within the PCID network, as well as perceptions and ideas on the operation of the network up to the present day and into the future. It is primarily aimed at informing and complementing the institutional review (Orengo, 2007) in which the Projet Radio (PR) model is described and analysed. A key intention is to assess the influence and impact of the project on the communication activities and related institutional processes of their NGO partners. The research was conducted between August and December 2006, in order that the work fitted around other research and operational activities of the project.

Methodology

A semi-structured questionnaire was developed jointly by PR staff and the DFID-funded evaluation consultants. The lengthy form contained both closed and open-ended questions divided into seven key sections. The questionnaire was in each case administered by a staff member from PR: although it is appreciated that this may have introduced an element of bias in the responses relating to PR's performance since the Malagasy are reluctant to criticise openly, logistically speaking there was no alternative. Also the main interviewer is the project researcher and has not been with the project for very long and is not involved in radio programme production and training, or radio distribution, and so is not associated with the key activities of the PCID network members.

Whilst the questions were initially designed in English and translated into French for printing, interviews were conducted in a mixture of French and Malagasy. Responses were entered in French by hand and later typed up. 10 completed questionnaires were translated into English to aid analysis, and the data was entered into an Excel database (the other 18 were entered directly from the French original): although in some cases response categories had been pre-coded (and the interviewer instructed whether or not to read out the options), in others the response categories were post-coded. This was partly done at the initiative of those tasked with data entry resulting in variations in interpretation of responses. In addition, despite conducting a pre-test of the questionnaire at the start of the research to iron out problems and ambiguities, it became clear at the analysis stage that some remained. A further problem was caused by the use of slightly varying versions of the questionnaire by different researchers at different times during the research, resulting in a need to re-check 50% of the data entry. These constraints arose largely from the difficulty of travel and communications within Madagascar and between the evaluation consultants and the project researchers.

In some interviews, e.g. with PSDR (Programme Soutien de Développement Rural) whilst the organisation may have been a member of PCID for several years the respondent had not been with the organisation for very long so his/her knowledge of the relationship with PR and the activities undertaken was limited. This is reflected in those answers that were only partially or even incorrectly completed.

1. General information

The total number of PCID partners in August-December 2006, the period during which the survey was conducted, was 34, of whom 28 were interviewed, representing 82% of members at that time. The six who were not included in the survey were deliberately excluded because they had not been active for some time and it was therefore felt that their responses would not be representative of the network. The number of partners has since increased to 49 with the expansion of the project to Fianara. The location of PCID partners interviewed was as

follows: eight in Fort Dauphin (Anosy region), seven in the Androy Region (Ambovombe and Tsihombe) and eight in Toliara town.

The type of organisation was not defined in the questionnaire but they include government or local authority directed partners such as CISCO (Circonscription Scolaire) and PSDR, local NGOs such as Satraha and Voron Kodohodo, international NGOs such as WWF and PACT and donor-funded projects such as Objectif Sud (operated by GRET, a French NGO). Two questionnaires were completed by staff of UADELs. These are usually an NGO such as CARE or GTZ designated and funded by the EC to accompany local communes through their proposal and implementation processes for funding from the EC ACORDS programme. The ACORDS programme provides finance to the local communes – via the Mayor – for infrastructure supports such as roads, bridges dams etc. The UADEL is therefore not an organisation per se – except that it is a team within CARE or GTZ – but an administrative arm of the EC ACORDS process.

The PCID was launched in 2000 initially as a platform and in Phase 2 of Projet Radio (2002-2006) work focused on building a regional network with PCID and affiliate stations, and the most recent members joined in 2006. On average the respondent organisations had been partners for three and a half years. Some members were already working with the project during its Pilot Phase in 1999 before the PCID was formally launched. For the purposes of analysis those who joined in 1999 were deemed to have been members for seven years, whilst those who joined in 2006 were deemed to have been members for zero years. When the PCID was launched in 2000 it had a membership of 16 which continued until the start of Phase 2 in 2002.

Table 1: PCID membership in Anosy and Androy regions

| 2006 | 1999-2000 and at launch of PCID |
|-----------------------------|--|
| ANOSY – Fort Dauphin | |
| ANGAP | - |
| ASOS | ASOS |
| No longer an active member | CEL |
| CISCO | CISCO |
| FAFAFI | FAFAFI |
| PACT | PACT |
| PAM | PAM |
| PECHE | Since 2002 |
| SSD Fort Dauphin | SSD Ambovombe |
| WWF | WWF |
| CIREEF | - |
| UADEL | Since 2005 |
| CARE | CARE |
| AMBOVOMBE - Androy | |
| GRET | Since 2002 |
| KIOMBA | KIOMBA |
| SAP | SAP |
| ALT DMP | ALT ENERGY |
| UADEL | Since 2005 |
| ELEVAGE SR SAP | - |

In addition Projet Radio has worked with members of the Lutheran mission and began discussions to launch a station at their hospital in Ejeda from 2000 Thus 11 out of 19 current

members in Anosy and Androy sub-regions have been associated with the project since 2002 or before.

The key reason cited for becoming a member of PCID was to support field activities (90% or 25 of the 28 partners mentioned this) whilst other important reasons included radio programme production (57%), access to training and equipment (46%) and access to stations (43%). Only six partners (21%) cited access to Freeplay radios for distribution as a reason for joining.

The vast majority (90%) of partners had some history of communication activities prior to joining the PCID network including interpersonal communication through field agents - FAFIFI for example – *'We only had animateurs to sensitise and inform people through interpersonal contacts with individuals and group.'* and Information, Education and Communication (IEC) materials but few of these included radio production. Some had recognised the potential of radio already – for example WWF, and MCDI in Toliara, a community health organisation which was established in 1998, played a key role in setting up a radio station, Radio Radio Feon'ny Antsimo (RFA) in Betioky, subsequently upgraded by ALT. An agreement stipulated that MCDI financed the station's equipment in return for broadcasting MCDI's programs free of charge (this was part of a wider health initiative in this area with funding for the stations from USAID via MCDI).

2. Training

One measure of the influence of ALT and PR is whether as a result of the collaboration, the partner organisation had designated someone responsible for communications. When the PCID was started in 2000 members agreed with PR that they would nominate one member of staff to take on the communications work, someone who could regularly attend trainings and make programmes. 21 (75%) partners reported having a designated person responsible for communications within their organisation. By comparing the date when responsibility for communications was allocated to a specific staff member with the date of joining the PCID, it seems that typically the position was created on joining or after joining PCID (although note that this does not necessarily imply a fully funded communications officer).

Having identified with PR that part of problem of getting programmes produced monthly was lack of time of the field agent to concentrate on this properly, partners saw the need to designate someone whose key responsibilities were communications rather than allocating such tasks to an agent such as a health worker or agronomer who had multiple other responsibilities. From about 2002 PR started encouraging their partners to put a budget line in their proposals to fund a full time communications person – in this survey 6 members (21% of total surveyed and 33% of those who have already included communications budget lines in proposals) said that they use funds for this purpose.

The direct influence of Projet Radio is captured by the words of the communications officer at the GRET project, Objectif Sud: *'Following the signing of our agreement with Projet Radio we assigned someone to do communications work.'*

Respondents were asked how many trainings the person responsible for communications had attended, as well as the number of trainings received by the organisation as a whole. As mentioned above, the responses do not necessarily give a completely accurate picture of the number of trainings delivered by PR and received by individual members and personnel within them. As well as the larger workshops conducted with Media Support in 2000, 2003 and 2004, each of which at least 16 members attended, there were many additional trainings on an individual level with organisations.

Table 2: Trainings received by partners

| Number of trainings | Communications person | Organisation |
|---------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| 1-2 trainings | 17 | 13 |
| 3-4 trainings | 8 | 9 |
| >4 trainings | 1 | 3 |
| Don't know | 2 | 3 |
| TOTAL | 28 | 28 |

Of the trainings received by organisations as a whole the vast majority were trainings in the CPP (86%), radio distribution and forming Groupes d'Ecoute (82%), using recording equipment (68%) and using the focus group discussion method for researching needs and pretesting programmes with the target population (54%). It is possible these are underestimated if the person responsible for communication had left and his successor did not know what trainings had been received. In some cases training was 'on-the-job' where PR staff worked alongside the person responsible for communications to make programmes.

In some interviews such as that with SRSAP/CIREL used a version of the questionnaire in which the training modules attended by the communications officer were noted, rather than those received by the organisation as a whole. If the communications agent has changed this also will not reflect the number of trainings given to each organisation as in some cases training in CPP was given up to three times because of changes of staff (e.g. to MDP in Tulear)

Some organisations had received training in digital editing (29%) and monitoring and evaluation techniques (32%). Additional skills and tools imparted to partners by PR included some fundamental changes in ways of working such as: '*Changes in ways of expressing and discussing*', and '*Gradually creating the spirit of enterprise*' (CIREEF, Fort Dauphin), planning skills (WWF, Toliara) and in the case of Voron Kodohodo full technical training following the complete outfitting of the radio station that it manages in Tsihombe.

Demand for future training mostly focused on refresher courses in CPP (in particular where trained staff have been replaced or a communications officer has been appointed recently) and more training on monitoring and evaluation: this latter demand was repeated in subsequent questions about future needs and is clearly important to the organisations concerned. Some limited training on monitoring and evaluation techniques was given in 2004.

3. Production

Production of radio programmes by PCID members has been facilitated by the purchase of audio recording devices by Project Radio. Three different models were offered to the PCID partners in 2002. There was consequently a distribution of Marantz professional cassette recorders to some because they were familiar and more robust, professional Minidisks to those who felt more technically competent or who were less worried about environmental damage such as dust and heat (PR could repair most Marantz problems but explained to partners that they would have to pay to send Minidisks for repair to Tana). Marantz solid state recorders with flash cards were also offered. This latter option was new and very expensive and no one took it up then though eight have been distributed to ALT PR staff this year.

71% reported receiving recording equipment although half of these were only distributed in the second half of 2006. Verifying this information reveals that in 2003 PR gave all the main 16 PCID members (in place at start of Phase 2, 2002) audio recording devices as requested

and following discussion about what they wanted. By the end of 2002 PR had launched Tulear PCID with 12 new members but they had to share audio recording devices as PR could not afford to buy more at that time. A further one was brought in for GTZ who paid for it. Approximately 40 more audio recording devices have been provided to partners in Tulear and Fianar (the region where ALT has recently started working).

Those organisations which did not have their own recording device, had access via the PR teams and were able to produce programmes with them: this became easier with the establishment of project studios in Tulear (2004), Fort Dauphin (2003), Ambovombe (1999) and Fianar (2006). Some said they themselves purchased tape recorders. An agreement was signed with the distribution of each machine that committed the PCID member to produce monthly programmes (initially **one per month** in contracts signed up to 2004). After a review of the situation in 2004, PR found that some partners had not fulfilled this obligation and withdrew the recording device (from PACT and PSDR for example). Previously PR had taken two away from other partners and re-distributed them to members of PCID who were more proactive. According to this survey all recorders are reported to be in good condition

In the new revised PCID equipment distribution agreement, partners are asked to make two programmes per month (to ensure that at least one is produced) – this was actually proposed by the new PCID in Fianar but was agreed by all PCID members.

Partners were asked whether it had been easy for them to produce one programme per month on receipt of the recording device. 20 (71%) responded that it was easy (but see below for contradictory information): the reasons given by the other eight included the fact that the audio recording device isn't permanently with the organisation (PAM), lack of time on the part of the communications officer (PAM), and in the case of FAFAFI due to the fact that most programmes are made to fit with the needs of target population and to accompany and publicise the distribution of inputs such as seeds: when these are delayed due to funding delays FAFAFI does not produce programmes because it doesn't want to create demand that it cannot meet.

Table 3: Total number of programmes produced by year (1999-2006)

| Programmes per year | |
|---------------------|-------------|
| 1999 | 56 |
| 2000 | 73 |
| 2001 | 59 |
| 2002 | 62 |
| 2003 | 149 |
| 2004 | 307 |
| 2005 | 443 |
| 2006 | 391 |
| Total | 1540 |

The growth in production in 2003 can be related to the distribution of audio recording devices to the 16 existing partners in 2002. Note the total numbers include those produced by Projet Radio itself for sub-projects on HIV/AIDS, Energy, etc. PR staff produced around a third of all radio programmes made between 1999-2006, whilst partners produced two-thirds.

Table 4: Programmes produced by theme (1999-2006)

| Programme by theme | |
|--------------------|-------------|
| Agriculture* | 304 |
| Citizenship | 5 |
| Culture | 22 |
| Rural development | 147 |
| Rights | 3 |
| Education | 62 |
| Livestock | 86 |
| Environment | 354 |
| Fishing | 11 |
| Health | 539 |
| Security | 4 |
| Food security | 3 |
| Total | 1540 |

*mostly produced by FAFAFI and GRET

In some cases the audio recording device had been received in late 2006 because the members (e.g. (ANGAP, SSD) had only recently joined the PCID. ASOS mentioned that the difficulties lay not in producing the requisite quantity of programmes but rather in the deficiencies in quality due to the lack of their own technical capacity for editing. Verification also shows that ASOS received a recorder in 2003 not in 2004 as mentioned (all original PCID would have received audio recording devices in 2003). SRPAH PECHE noted that it does not have the means to go to make programmes in the locations where fishermen live.

To ascertain whether restrictions on access to the recorder had prevented partners from fulfilling their commitments, they were asked who was responsible for looking after it and if it was not the person responsible for communications, then who and why. The research suggests that most partners have instituted a system for booking out equipment and in any case at least half the organisations reported that the person responsible for communications is also responsible for the audio recording device.

PCID members report having received extensive on-going support from Projet Radio to produce programmes, outside of formal training sessions: most importantly for editing, duplication and distribution to radio stations (64%), providing access to audio recording devices (57%), production tasks such as developing themes and recording programmes (39%) and conducting formative research using Focus groups (32%). Only two members did not report receiving any such assistance. Contact however is not necessarily regularised: 12 members (43%) reported meeting PR staff on a monthly basis, but 13 said that contact occurred occasionally or only when needed. The ease with which this happens depends to some extent on the physical proximity of the partner to one of the Project studios/offices. Other reasons for contact of course include scheduled meetings of partners and trainings: other types of support desired in the future included material support for recording, retraining on CPP, editing and mixing programmes, and training in or the establishment of a process for monitoring and evaluation of programmes and their impact especially on Groupe d'Ecoutes. A few organisations would like more radios to distribute.

PR's experience suggests that this variation is also because partner organisations have varying resources and therefore differing degrees of participation and demands on ALT – e.g. SRPAH PECHE had one person to manage the whole project work across Anosy.

PR does not discriminate against partners who have fewer resources and has striven to keep the platform open and support the smaller organisations who can offer less materially, but whose messages are equally important.

More exceptionally Voron Kodohodo suggested the establishment and management of a radiophonic documentation centre (PR has proposed in the current phase to start sharing documents on the radio training and techniques at a regional level) whilst Satraha, which being based in Tsihombe is particularly isolated – and this in a region where travel is difficult and telephonic communications extremely limited at the best of times - placed emphasis on support for communications equipment such as the BLU.

Individual responses suggest that some organisations interpreted the question about how easy it is to produce programmes hypothetically, e.g. CISCO said '*For the time being we are setting up the planning of production within our office of pedagogic supervision*'. SSD also had not started making programmes for the PCID CD.

Programme production within and outside PCID

To gauge the levels of production partners were asked how many programmes they had produced within the framework of the PCID in 2005, the full year before this survey was conducted. They were also asked how many radio programmes they had produced outside Projet Radio and why.

Table 5: Programmes made within/outside PCID

| Number of PR/PCID programmes made in 2005 | Number of partners | Number of non-PCID programmes made in 2005 | Number of partners |
|---|--------------------|--|--------------------|
| 1-10 | 12 | 1-10 | 6 |
| 11-20 | 0 | 11-20 | 3 |
| 21-30 | 3 | 21-30 | 1 |
| 31-40 | 0 | 31-40 | 1 |
| 41-50 | 0 | 41-50 | 1 |
| 51+ | 1 | 51+ | 4 |
| Don't know | 3 | Don't know | 4 |
| None | 9 | None | 8 |
| TOTAL | 28 | TOTAL | 28 |

Verification with the project shows that as it has grown so too has the number of programmes produced for the PCID CD each month (averaging 14 but up to 18 or more sometimes). PR has a certain number of hours agreed for broadcast with affiliated radio stations per month and can only edit and produce a limited number of CDs per month, so this in turn limits the number of programmes an individual partner can expect to be edited and put out for broadcast from the PCID CDs each month.

Some partners have sourced additional funding for communications work since they started with PR in 1999, e.g. ASOS and therefore have to meet their own funder targets on this work. They therefore buy additional airtime and make additional programmes. Also partners such as GRET have defined programming schedules that they want to meet which marry with agricultural seasons (to coincide with seed sales etc.) and so they make additional programmes and broadcast these through their local stations to ensure targets are met (sometimes there have been delays with PR edit /evaluation/broadcast cycle) .

One reason why it is of consequence to gauge the amount of non-PCID broadcasting funded by partners is that this activity presents additional income for radio stations and shows how much interest in the use of radio has grown since PR started. Very few NGOs were using

radio to educate their beneficiaries in 1999. It also shows that stations are looking at a potentially sustainable source of income in the longer term and this means the PR strategy to partner the PCID with each local group of stations and production unit is potentially a way of ensuring longer term health of the network. It is possible that partners who think the stations airtime costs are too high have probably become accustomed to having had so much free airtime for so many years through Projet Radio and may be objecting in principle rather than on grounds of unaffordability.

PR does not strictly demand that PCID deliver one programme per month as per the agreement, recognising that some partners will make lots of programmes given they have better resources than others or have accepted additional funding to do communications work see above and others will struggle to get one done every two months. Only when PR has received no programmes for say 12 months has it actually removed a recording device from a partner. PR does not refuse membership or access to facilities and broadcast network to any member of the PCID even if they have not met the production target: membership and access to benefits is open and without restrictions.

More than half the partners are making programmes for broadcast outside the PR/PCID agreement: reasons for this are varied and include the fact that at the time some were not PCID members (4), delays in the broadcasting of the PCID CD (2) and limits on the frequency of broadcasts (see explanation above). 21% mentioned this reason.

MCDI in Toliara explained that its zone of operations goes beyond that covered by the PR radio station network: *'Within our organisation there are agents in the field in Betioky, Ankazoabo, Sakaraha, Ankililoaka, Bezaha, etc. These field agents and the agents based here in Toliara must produce two programs per month. One program each month must be inserted into the PCID CD as mentioned in the contract with PR [note that the new contract 2006 asks for two programmes per month for PCID]. We also run competitions within our target groups on the themes covered in the health programs. There are other sites where the station isn't affiliated with PR like Ankazoabo, Sakaraha and Morombe. This is why we do programs outside of the PCID network and broadcast them on other stations.'*

Satraha makes additional programmes for *'personal and religious reasons'* whilst Voron Kodohodo is of course managing the local radio station so is responsible for much of the programming it broadcasts.

Partners were asked which radio stations are most listened to by their target populations. A total of **25** radio stations were mentioned:

57% (16) of partners report having direct relationships with one or more radio stations, of whom three-quarters pay for airtime, and some provide equipment. Only MCDI mentioned getting free airtime from one of the stations with which it has an agreement and this was as previously mentioned, the quid pro quo for setting up and providing equipment to Radio Feon'I Antsimo Betioky. In the case of Voron Kodohodo, the organisation runs the radio station that airs its programmes. Reasons for developing these additional agreements with stations reflect the reasons given for making programmes outside the PR/PCID agreement.

Overall 71% of partners say that they pay for airtime but only 29% report sending non-PCID programmes to Projet Radio for inclusion in the audiotèque (audio library), as stipulated in the contract with the project.

Table 6: Stations listened to by beneficiaries of PCID members

| Station name | Number of times mentioned |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| MBS Fort Dauphin | 7 |
| MBS Toliara | 6 |
| Radio Kaleta Fort Dauphin | 1 |
| Radio Kaleta Amboasary | 8 |
| Radio Feon'I Mandrare Tsivory | 2 |
| Radio Cactus Ambovombe | 6 |
| Radio Fanjiry Fort Dauphin | 1 |
| Radio Lafa Fort Dauphin | 1 |
| Radio Manambaro | 1 |
| Radio Josvah Fort Dauphin | 7 |
| Radio Josvah Toliara | 1 |
| Radio Ravenara Amboasary | 3 |
| Radio VK Tsihombe | 5 |
| Radio Etoile Beloha Androy | 0 |
| Radio Fanilo Ampanihy | 2 |
| Radio Feon'I Linta Ejeda | 2 |
| Radio Feon'I Antsimo Betioky | 3 |
| Radio Soatalily Toliara | 5 |
| Radio Mazava Ankililoaka | 5 |
| Radio Communale Ankililoaka (RCA) | 1 |
| Radio Le Buffet Sakaraha | 1 |
| Radio Ragnalahy Sakaraha | 4 |
| Radio Manamana Ankazoabo | 2 |
| Radio Taheza Bezaha | 2 |
| Radio Arc-en-ciel Betroka | 1 |
| Radio Menarandra Bekily | 1 |

Those in blue are not in the PR network (though some have asked to join)

57% of partners report conducting some form of programme review prior to broadcast: in most cases few details were provided but the main ways include listening together with agents de terrain, listening with programme directors. Only one partner reported listening by a technician from the project. ASOS appears to understand the cycle of research that should accompany programme-making: *'We do pre-testing, listening with those responsible in our organisation and the independent evaluator from PR for the programmes made for the PCID CD before broadcasting and follow up afterwards with the target population to assess impact'*, and was one of the few partners to refer to the PR evaluator. WWF also mentioned pre-testing: this is a part of the CPP but does not seem to be done systematically.

4. Radios

A key mechanism of exchange in the Projet Radio model has been the provision of Freeplay radios powered by solar and wind-up energy to increase access to radio broadcasts by the populations of Southern Madagascar. Target groups include rural producers and women: radios are distributed to listening groups (Groupes d'Ecoutes) by Projet Radio both directly, and through partners. Partners distribute the radios either to groups they are already working with, or to groups formed specifically for the purpose of listening to the PR/PCID development programmes. Details of the procedure for radio distribution, the activities involved, the outcomes and impact, and problems encountered are described in detail in the

Institutional Review (Orengo, 2007) and the Listening Survey (Vadgama, 2006). However the PCID member survey casts light on some of these issues from the perspective of the members themselves.

Of the partners surveyed 23 said they had received radios from the project, four had not: SISAL, PACT, CEL and CISCO, and one respondent did not know: the volume varied considerably from under 10 in eight cases to over 50 in four cases. In Phase 2 of Projet Radio (2002-2005) 1130 radios were distributed in total of which 811 or 71% were distributed by partners.

PCID partners agree to draw up contracts with the recipient communities, and to pass on a copy of each contract to the project. Most (19) said they had a list of recipient villages and names of those responsible for looking after the radio, and kept copies of the contracts. 16 said that copies had been sent to the project. This suggests that the majority are adhering to terms of the agreement signed with the project, and PR's own records show how many contracts are missing and by whom (up to this phase). Reasons given include the director of the PCID member being sick and unable to report status; the radios with a radio station to distribute (suggesting possible non-conformity of procedures); the contracts are currently being collected (change of Director of the PCID member organisation) or the radios are not distributed because staff need training (due to change of personnel).

Partners were asked whether and how often they made visits to the Groupes d'Ecoutes to whom the radios were given: 18 or 64% reported making visits though only 36% said that these were systematic and frequent (every one or two months). Constraints include lack of time, resources and transportation; few staff trained by Projet Radio or specifically responsible for this task e.g. SRPAH Peche: *'Our former director did not give us information regarding partnership within the PCID network, and it was only he who received training from PR'*. In some cases it was not the duty of the interview respondent or communications officer to conduct these visits; e.g. ANGAP: *'The field agents based on the ground carry out visits to every listening group. I, as the person responsible for communication, only visit once a year.'*

CISCO, which has not distributed radios, makes monitoring and needs assessment visits to their target population as necessary. CISCO follow up schools to check progress of both the teaching and the functioning of the parents' associations'.

5. Participation of target populations

A key tenet of the PR approach is the CPP which enjoins programme-makers to involve their target audience in all stages of production. One of the purposes of setting up Groupes d'Ecoutes was to gain access to community members for a variety of activities related to radio programme-making. In effect their participation is the quid pro quo for receiving a free radio and this is a condition of the contracts signed between distributing organisations and the recipient communities.

PCID members were asked why they visited the Groupes d'Ecoutes: multiple responses were allowed and their distribution across the range of response categories suggest at first glance that partners are equally motivated by the desire and need to involve target audiences in steps leading up to broadcast of programmes (needs assessment, research into presentation style, gathering material, pre-testing etc.) as by the desire to follow up listening, understanding and impact. Only three organisations did not respond at all although a total of 10 (36%) said they were NOT making visits so perhaps this question was treated hypothetically in some cases. In the listening survey 47% of the groups claimed they were visited at least a few times a year (Vadgama, 2006). This figure lies within the parameters of the partners' responses given in the section above (18 made visits of whom 10 said they

were systematic and frequent). SSD and UADEL in Anosy region have only just started their partnership with Projet Radio so had not made any visits. Notably Voron Kodohodo responded that since everyone listens to Radio VK, there was no need to make such visits, implying that the programmes will automatically reflect local needs, and they know that everyone will listen so they have something of a captive audience; this should not however preclude using the CPP approach to programme-making.

CNA mentioned visiting groups to do awareness raising about the fight against locusts that come in plagues to the south as part of a campaign to help people understand where to get products.

As well as the pre-coded responses, other reasons were given: e.g. CIREEF visits its Groupes d'Ecoutes to assess needs and impact, but more broadly to gather information on the perceptions, problems and suggestions of the groups. Interestingly some mentioned reasons related to the functioning of the Groupes d'Ecoutes: e.g. ACORDS/UADEL plans to set up new groups while ANGAP mentioned making visits: '*...to revitalise and monitor the listening groups, to resolve problems within the groups, to organise focus group discussions*' and WWF visits to collect monitoring forms completed by their listening groups.

Partners reported that checking listening was the most useful of these activities, followed by assessing information needs and determining whether there had been any impact on the target group's behaviour. Whilst clearly it is important that Groupes d'Ecoutes listen to the PCID programmes, these responses suggest that refresher training may be needed in the purpose and use of the CPP (participatory production cycle) which involves the target population at several stages prior to broadcast.

BOX 1: Examples of how information coming from the Groupe d'Ecoutes has helped partners' projects

*'Villages not targeted by our project have asked for collaboration with **SISAL** after hearing the programmes.'*

Villagers are telling **CNA** where crickets are so that they can then go and spray the fields.

Satraha: *'A test of language and format carried out in Bevitike (Ankibaimasy) showed that: listeners understood very little of the 'official prose' but they could recite word for word Tandroy poems: thus poetry was chosen as the best vehicle. Similarly information gathered on the deleterious effects of charcoal making in Anjampaly and Soamañitse led to programmes being made in the form of a satirical piece and a poem.'*

Voron Kodohodo: *'For our cultural broadcasts, listeners have asked for programmes on their respective languages.'*

6. Observations on the impact of broadcasts

Monitoring and evaluation activities

An area that Projet Radio was keen to investigate within the framework of this broader enquiry into the impact of the project, was the existing monitoring and evaluation activities of partners. On the whole, the project has received relatively little feedback from partners on the effects that the PCID broadcasts have had on the groups they work with or on the wider population of southern Madagascar. Monitoring and evaluation is in any case constrained in such a resource-poor and logistically difficult environment; and with respect to assessing communication and media impacts there are significant methodological problems (which this

wider DFID-funded study has attempted to address). It has not been an area that has received much attention in PR training (as is evidenced by the demand for training in this area), and it is almost certainly an area in which partners lack capacity. But it also was not clear to what extent partners had been attempting to include any follow up of communication and media effects in routine monitoring and evaluation systems, or indeed to set up a system aimed specifically at monitoring and evaluating radio broadcasts.

E.g. CIREEF: *'In our schedule of activities, there is M&E of all our work but there is not specific follow up of the radio programmes.'* ASOS in Fort Dauphin said: *'Follow up of broadcasts is part of our activities. We used the monitoring method of Projet Radio but not systematically. Evaluation is carried out towards the end of each sub-project because the results are incorporated into the final report.'*

Only 12 partners (43%) reported carrying out monitoring and evaluation of the impacts of their radio broadcasts in a systematic fashion¹. And even then it is clear that whilst some M&E activities take place it is not particularly rigorous. PAM: *'But each time that I do field missions, I have done surveys on the impact of our programmes and the programmes of other PCIDs to find out if they listen or not. So there is no systematic monitoring and evaluation because we are not able to.'*

MDP said *'We do not really have the knowledge to evaluate the programmes' impact though we have done a few impact evaluations by verifying whether there are any changes in the villages and whether listening groups are applying what the programmes are suggesting'* and SISAL admitted: *'We don't yet have the process to monitor and evaluate the IEC (Information – Education – Communication) programme. However, we do monitor in the field in order to check for changes in the community. This is done through surveys and observation.'*

Others describe more a methodical approach: MCDI: *'We do checks on behavioural change (even some indicators of change) – we look for or identify the sources of these changes. If there is no change we look for causes or shortcomings in the production or broadcasting of the programme. our teams only do monitoring in order to improve the production of future programmes'*.

Some members such as Objectif Sud, and WWF, say they have developed forms that the Groupes d'Ecoutes members fill in, though no details were given in the questionnaires. Kiomba conducts simple surveys with their target population, who include the groupes d'ecoutes asking the following questions:

- Are the key messages clear, well understood and easy to retain?
- Is the format effective for presenting the key messages?
- Is the information and technical advice clear?
- Does the information reflect reality and is it practical/implementable?
- What changes have you observed among the members of your group?

It is likely that the questionnaires they use are based on what the project devised in 2000 for its first evaluation as some partners requested this form some time ago

Both CISCO and CARE reported that they follow up with target populations the impact of specific programmes whilst WWF in Toliara highlighted the difficulty of attribution – *'because*

¹ Note that this is the way the question was phrased. Although normally one would talk of **monitoring** intermediate variables such as listening patterns, discussion and sharing of information heard on the radio, and opinions of listeners about the programmes' style, formats, content etc.; whilst **evaluation** is more usually linked to measuring outcomes in terms of increased knowledge, changed attitudes, adoption of new practices, cessation or modification of harmful practices, creation of demand for services, goods, inputs and information. Also, some partners reported that they were conducting some monitoring and evaluation but would not describe it as 'systematic'.

we use three communication tools (radio, posters, street theatre) for the Dry Forest Project. Instead we have made observations and a small poll to verify impact.'

In 2006 SATRAHA conducted an extensive and detailed evaluation of the literacy project it had implemented in 2005, at the request of the Andrew Lees Trust and using DFID funding, in order to find out what had motivated people to attend literacy classes, and in particular what role radio had played in prompting their desire to learn (Lellelid, 2006) .

PACT said that responsibility was given to the journalists who actually produce the programs and who undertake evaluation using normal mechanisms of listener feedback (from average citizens and decision-makers etc.). However a couple of partners mentioned that they have an evaluation team (ACORDS/UADEL and SAP). SAP also mentioned in the context of monitoring and evaluation, the review process that takes place prior to broadcast through pretesting and through the programme review undertaken by the independent evaluator employed by the project. Verification with PR records suggests that in fact SAP mostly provides market prices to the project for airing, rather than producing programmes so the respondent may have been referring to the an internal process for checking that their research is correct.

Other partners tended to mention examples of the kinds of information collected or impacts noted, although this was in fact the explicit focus of another question. E.g. FAFAFI said that since using the radio to broadcast messages, they had noted an increase in the number of clients whilst ASOS Toliara collected data on the increase in the number of contraceptive products sold.

Despite these caveats and their misgivings, partners were able to cite more than 30 different kinds of impacts observed on their listening groups and more than 20 impacts they had observed on the villages and general audiences, although not all could indicate which programmes might have been responsible.

Impact on Groupes d'Ecoutes

Impacts on Groupes d'Ecoutes tended to fall into three main categories: firstly an **increase in understanding and knowledge** about the issues that were raised and explored in radio programmes:

- SATRAHA: *' They are informed about the damage done by slash and burn, the advantages of planting trees and their many uses.'*
- CARE: *'They are able to respond to questions about a programme that has been aired or to repeat messages that we had intended to transmit.'*
- CISCO is promoting school enrolment: *'At the moment we do not have any listening groups, but we already have parents' associations at each educational establishment. So we carry out M&E of our activities and radio programmes with them. We have noticed the increased level of understanding and knowledge of the parents of school children on the importance of learning.'*
- CIREEF works on environmental issues and has noted: *'Increased knowledge about the new forestry laws and regulation including those relating to destruction of the forests and re-forestation'*.
- ANGAP, even without any monitoring and evaluation activities has noted *'Interest in the activities of the Park and openness towards innovations brought by development agents.'*
- ASOS: *'They (the listening group members) really believe in family planning.*

Secondly, a wide range of impacts were noted relating to a **change in behaviour or practice** including evidence of increased demand for an input, good or service of some kind.

- E.g. PAM (World Food Programme) noted an increase in the number of Food For Work requests and the choice of activities that they applied to get food for e.g. dunes restoration, control of raketa, from Groupes d'Ecoutes.
- Vola Mahasoia, a local micro-finance organisation, reported a significant increase in demand for micro-loans within the listening group as well as improvements in existing beneficiaries' ability to manage credit.
- KIOMBA, one of PR's oldest members gave the example of members of water users' associations who now participate in works and contribute to the scheme.
- WWF (Toliara) notes changes in behaviour vis-a-vis poaching of tortoises and land clearance. WWF Fort Dauphin also reports a decrease in the number of illegal tortoise collected (listeners frequently recall these programmes (see Androy research, Metcalf 2006) and since this project works with local authorities and the police it is probably able to gather quantitative data though none was supplied.
- MCDI reports: *'There are quite a few impacts that we have noted within the groups from listening to the programs. We have found that the major impacts related to tuberculosis (TB) to the north of Toliara and in the Miary commune and Befanamy to the East of Toliara. After the broadcasting of programs on TB, there is a significant increase in the rate of screening amongst listening groups. There is an increase in participation of listening group members during vaccination campaigns. However, there is no impact on sensitisation on the use of condoms.'* [No explanation was provided for how this was assessed].
- MDP: *'when the themes of our broadcasted programmes coincide with the local calendar of activities we have noticed that listening groups put into practice the programmes' content. For example, if we broadcast a programme on storing techniques of agricultural produce at the time of harvest they apply the instructions promulgated by the programmes.'*
- SISAL observed changes after the broadcasting of the programs in the community but is not sure how to attribute these changes since they use multiple communication methods (radio, from poster campaigns, direct sensitization). The changes observed in the field included an increase in the rate of prenatal consultation, in participation in vaccination and in the use of mosquito nets for the prevention of malaria.
- PACT reports a change in behaviour and public participation in addressing issues of the 'public interest' (citizen's rights).

Thirdly, though less commonly reported, was the **sharing of information and discussion** that took place between group members and between them and their family.

- ASOS, a health organisation in Fort Dauphin notes a change in social behaviour; *'The most interesting impact is the existence of debates between the members of the listening groups because this helps every member to understand well the key messages of the programmes. For project 'fandambagna' (vaccination campaign) behaviour change is anticipated not only among mothers who are the main target but also among family members, especially fathers who can influence the mothers' behaviour.'*
- FAFAFI: *'..the gathering of people around the radio, the improvement of exchanges between them and the application of advice '.*

Impacts on the villages and general audience

Economic impacts:

- VOLA MAHASOIA: *'There are people who come here to our office to ask for the forms for the micro-credit programme. 'When we go out into the field we can observe an increase in the number of people that know about the Vola Mahasoia micro-credit programme. We observe this in all of our areas of operation.'*
- The MDP respondent said that when the field agents are doing field visits in practically all sites of intervention they have identified impacts such as demand for agricultural technical support (storing techniques, commercialisation of products etc.).

- CIREL Ambovombe (Elevage SRSAP) notes an impact on vaccination of cows *'which has been very effective.'*
- SATRAHA (presumably referring to the impact of programmes made about the advantages of growing trees): *'The rate of demand for the project to plant indigenous, economically valuable trees has risen by a ratio of 25:1 compared to projects for constructing roads or drains, or pulling up poisonous cactus.'* This also belongs in the environmental category of impacts.

Environmental impacts:

- World Food Programme reported that rehabilitated tracks and *'raketa mena'* (red cactus) removals are very clear throughout the region as a result of its radio broadcasts.
- As above WWF again reports reduction in illegal collecting of tortoises.
- ASOS Toliara: *'Increase in the use of improved/fuel-efficient stoves (Toko Mitsitsy).'*
- CIREEF: *'Reduction of rate of forest-related offences such as clearance in the peripheral zones of the protected areas, pollution of the rivers and ponds. In contrast the rate of deforestation has increased especially here around Fort Dauphin.'*

Educational impacts:

- PAM also cited the impact of radio on the collaboration with *Tahantane* (now known as Satraha) in terms of creating demand for the adult literacy programme.
- PACT reported that it had had some good feedback from listeners from the North of Manantenina in response to programs about parents' responsibilities with regard to development and education. This was in early 2005.
- CISCO mentions the increased level of school attendance in nearly all areas reached by the enrolment campaign.

Health impacts:

- MCDI notes, that just as with the listening groups, there was a general increase in the rate of TB screening in several zones of operation, as well as an increase in the rates of participation during the vaccination campaign. The respondent said it was true that there other communication tools used by other people but feel that radio programs have the biggest impacts in the villages. And that this accounts for the increased rate of participation of women in prenatal consultation in the region of Betioky and Toliara.
- SISAL also reported increased participation in vaccination programmes, and not just by the target groups. *'For this year there is a vaccination campaign against tetanus for children and women up to 49 years of age only. In Mahaboboky there are quite a few men who would also like to be vaccinated against tetanus.'*
- ASOS Fort Dauphin reports *'Impacts of programmes on listeners' behaviours in villages around Behara. We saw an improvement in hygiene, sanitation and family planning after broadcasting a programme using testimonials from families who had already adopted new methods.* ASOS Toliara also reports increased use of contraceptive methods.
- Voron Kodohodo: *'Relating to the presence of HIV/AIDS, Tsihombe is the region which uses the most condoms in the region.'* Verification of this impact questions whether this apparent impact is actually due to a shortage of supplies or whether stocks ran out because of increased demand.

Impacts on information dissemination and participation in development:

Some wider impacts of the radio programmes have been captured by partners:

- ACORDS says the radio programmes brought about the training of communal moderators which has been a success (because they assist communities to access funds for infrastructure projects).

- MDP also mentions an increase in listening groups – whether the respondents mean that other organisations have been distributing radios or these independently set up by villagers with a battery operated radio, is not known.
- And KIOMBA reports impacts resulting from programmes made in 2003 by one of its agents, Celestin, on the collection of charges and community participation in excavating irrigation channels, that were very effective in mobilising and sensitising the target population and leading to behaviour change.
- Voron Kodohodo mentions: *‘As well as condoms, the region of Tsihombe sells the most radios. The shopkeepers who sell radios in Tsihombe can be testify to that.’*

Which programmes were responsible for these impacts?

Some partners could actually name the programmes they thought had resulted in the impacts observed.....

- PACT: This (impact on parents related to importance of education and development) was a series of programs called *‘Tafajery’* produced with *Fanjiry* [local singer].
- WWF, on the impact on knowledge and behaviour relating to protecting tortoises: *‘A dialogue between two people, close friends, one Antandroy who does not eat tortoises and another who does. One says to the other that he should not eat tortoises since doing so is taboo for the Antandroy. Moreover, eating them is prohibited by law and can lead to paying a fine or imprisonment. Another programme concerned forest legislation, which took the form of interviews with staff from the forestry service and the gendarmerie’.*
- SATRAHA: *‘the one which begins "Hasirity" and brags about all the ways in which literacy helps to conquer his enemies, the principal one being the finger print’* [the programme encouraged people to go to literacy classes so they would not be embarrassed by having to use a finger print rather than writing their name on documents].

Whilst the majority could at least describe them in broad terms:

- VOLA MAHASOA said that the programmes responsible for the impacts noted were about their micro-credit process, explaining all the steps to follow from the beginning until reimbursement.
- World Food Programme referred to announcements and interviews on literacy and specific programmes produced in collaboration with a programme assistant at CISCO, another PR partner, on good management of school canteens.

Other partners simply referred to the broad topic of the programmes:

- KIOMBA: *‘I do not remember the titles but the topics are: participation in payments and the need to participate in community work and in maintaining facilities.’*
- ASOS Fort Dauphin recalled a series of programs on hygiene, sanitation and family planning whilst ASOS Toliara mentioned programmes on the usefulness of adopting family planning methods and the use of a *Toko Mitsitsy*.

Voron Kodohodo emphasised the presentation of the programs rather than the content: *‘We speak Tandroy dialect. We broadcast a lot of Tandroy music, that is sufficient.’*

CIREEF highlighted the difficulty of attribution to one communication activity: *‘One doesnt know whether it is the programmes or meetings or posters which have brought about impacts on the ground.’*

How the radio helps project activities

50% of partners could elaborate on how the radio helps their activities. The main way in which the radio appears to help partners’ activities is to **expand their coverage through transmission of information and education**, which organisations simply could not do on the ground due to limited resources (staff, transport and time).

- Vola Mahasoa: *'We have not been able to go into all villages because our means are limited; for example, insufficient staff and transport means as well as time constraints. It is therefore a big advantage for us to work with PR as since we have been members of PCID there have been big changes in our program.'*
- MCDI: *'Our program is based on education in the community in the area of health. More than other communication activities, radio programmes cover more sites, even very isolated sites that are not our areas of intervention, so the production of radio programmes is a high priority for our project.'*
- SISAL: *'It is difficult to conduct sensitisation on a village by village basis given constraints of time, finance, equipment etc. However our objective is to raise awareness and to change behaviour in the community on human health. The only way to reach this objective is by using the radio to communicate our messages.'*
- MDP: *'The radio enables us to transmit information to all peasants anywhere in our target areas, whereas in the field our reach depends on finances.'*
- PACT: *'For us, radio is the best tool for implementing IEC activities related to issues of the public interest [citizens' rights] because we can reach many people at once and thus have a very widespread impact.'*
- KIOMBA: *'In one shot all our target populations (and even those who are not) are informed and sensitised.'*
- ASOS Fort Dauphin: *'Radio has helped us spread information and education quickly with considerable impact.'*

It also means that **sensitisation of the community to issues can take place continually**, not only when field agents make visits and that communities are aware of and prepared for on the ground interventions, including new policies and laws:

- World Food Programme commented on: *'... permanent sensitisation of the community regarding our activities especially the choice of activities in the Food For Work area. And also the community knows in what cases PAM can intervene.'*
- ACORDS/UADEL: *'it makes it easier to mobilise project beneficiaries by convincing them of the necessity of their participation and by making communal deliberation more transparent.'*
- SATRAHA: *'the radio awakens a hidden desire in people to want to know, to read and write.'*
- SRPAH PECHE: *'Our Listening groups are fishermen who often listen to the radio to get information about fishing regulations above all concerning the langouste season.' [Fishing for certain crustacea is restricted to certain times of the year to prevent stocks becoming depleted.]'*

Finally **radio is suitable for a largely non-literate population**. SAP: *'The radio helps us to broadcast information for the population of whom the majority are illiterate.'*

7. Strategic analysis

Benefits of working with Projet Radio

When asked to indicate the benefits of working with Projet Radio partners' responses highlight the value placed on training and free airtime for programmes as well as the perceived impact on their beneficiaries and the effectiveness of their project. The means to make programmes – technical support for editing and provision of recording equipment - ranked higher than radios for distribution to potential listeners, although slightly more partners had actually received radios to distribute (82%) than had received audio recording devices (71%).

Table 7: Benefits of working with Projet Radio as perceived by PCID members

| Benefits of working with PR | Number of respondents | Percentage of total respondents | Ranking |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------|---------|
| | N=28 | 50% or over highlighted | |
| Freeplay radios for distribution in target communities | 11 | 39% | |
| Free equipment (e.g. Audio recording devices) | 16 | 57% | 5 |
| Training | 23 | 82% | 1 |
| Support for in-studio editing and post-production | 14 | 50% | 6= |
| Better access to production equipment (e.g. in studios) | 10 | 36% | |
| Free broadcasting of radio programmes | 19 | 68% | 2 |
| Increased coverage of stations | 10 | 36% | |
| Access to network of stations across southern Madagascar | 13 | 46% | |
| Increase in the impact of their existing project | 17 | 61% | 4 |
| An increase in villagers' knowledge and awareness | 18 | 64% | 3 |
| An increase in villagers' willingness to participate in projects / activities | 9 | 32% | |
| Membership of the PCID network | 14 | 50% | 6= |
| Audiothèque | 3 | 11% | |
| Methodology | 2 | 7% | |
| Others | 5 | 18% | |
| No response | 3 | 11% | |

Only 3 partners did not respond so 90% could cite benefits (usually multiple) of working with PR. For example, Voron Kodohodo said that it has received technical and material support and through Projet Radio 'Voron Kodohodo has become known in the region'. MDP benefited from the practical knowledge of their agents on programme production and planning, and increased capacity in ways of working with communities, especially using the focus group discussion method. MDP also said that one programme per month was too little for their needs, implying that perhaps they did not realise that this is a minimum figure and not a maximum. ANGAP mentioned the reinforcement of staff capacity and promoting a positive image to their target population.

Problems encountered

75% of respondents had encountered one or more problems in implementing PCID activities including radio distribution, establishment of listening groups, programme production, planning regional communication strategies, monitoring and evaluation and participation in an overall communication platform. It is not clear what was meant by the latter 'activity'- some partners did not think they had been invited to participate or that one did not exist whilst others seemed to think this meant the PCID network itself.

Many partners explained these problems as being due to their own constraints of time, resources, personnel (and changes in personnel) although several suggested that some activities were not relevant to them, e.g. they had not been invited to participate in regional planning meetings or that they had not been given the means (e.g. lack of audio recording device) [but see earlier section for explanation of distribution of equipment].

Table 8: Constraints to implementing PCID activities

| Constraints to implementing PCID activities | Number of respondents | | Percentage of total respondents |
|---|-----------------------|----|--------------------------------------|
| | | | 50% or over highlighted |
| Problems encountered (yes) | n=28 | 21 | (of total interviewed) 75% |
| Radio distribution | n=21 | 12 | (of total encountering problems) 57% |
| Establishing Listening groups | | 10 | 48% |
| Radio programme production | | 14 | 67% |
| Planning regional communication strategies | | 8 | 38% |
| Evaluation of impact | | 16 | 76% |
| Participation in a communications platform | | 5 | 24% |

With radio distribution the main complaint was that they had been given insufficient radios to distribute, whilst some of the practical difficulties in establishing listening groups included the fact that sometimes all the group members were of the same family or that the President of the *Fokotany* was often chosen to be the custodian despite his many other duties making him unsuitable for the job [this in any case goes against the distribution policy that partners sign up to and suggests that partners may be finding it hard to implement the policy because they have not fully understood all its aspects).

A few partners suggested that there were insufficient programmes or they were not broadcast often enough through PCID/PR (which reflects the fact that many have independent contracts with radio stations). PAM complained that programme broadcasts don't always coincide with the activities on the ground.

Again and again the request came for specific training and support to conduct monitoring and evaluation whether or not the organisation had conducted any such activities. Finally some partners felt that the PCID network itself was not dynamic enough.

Changes in the organisation due to PR

68% of respondents perceived changes in their organisation as a result of the project, of which the majority related to improved internal communication – increased appreciation for the role of communications and skills-building in programme making (ASOS, PAM, MCDI, PACT, SATRAHA) - or external communications – mostly improvements in methods of interacting with the target communities (e.g. SISAL, KIOMBA).

Lessons learned from the experience of the PCID/PR network

Although left completely open-ended this question was interpreted practically rather than strategically or analytically and the responses elicited were mostly couched in terms of the benefits gained, and the skills and understanding imparted through training, and so simply repeat and reinforce earlier responses. However some partners added that they had learned to appreciate the need for certain activities and steps in communication-related activities, such as putting procedures in place to establish listening groups and to do follow up. Others had noted increased levels of openness of their staff towards other PCID members, local authorities, communities etc.

Performance of Projet Radio

Similarly, when asked how Projet Radio had performed vis-a-vis its agreed activities and objectives some respondents focused on what Projet Radio had done, rather than commenting on the effectiveness of the support. This may be due to the way the question was interpreted but it may also result from a reluctance to openly criticise which is a common

trait of the Malagasy. But where the responses corresponded to the question they often included praise and constructive criticism:

- ASOS Fort Dauphin: *'Certainly there are some problems such as delays in repairing or replacing broken radios. But PR has done its tasks well, and has helped PCID members a lot in communications (training, equipment, radios etc.).'*
- PACT: *'Project Radio always honours its commitments. Many PCID members trained by ALT PR have mastered the necessary skills and have produced interesting radio programs.'*
- CIREEF: *'The actions of PR are very important for the development of the Region but they must definitely coordinate actions within the PCID network.'*
- SATRAHA; *'...we need a dynamic person who can instill a sense of competition in the PCID members among their peers as well as a sense of mission in their audience.'*
- SISAL: *'The impacts observed in the field are due to PR. But there is a problem of lack of audio recording devices and radios, and insufficient number of our programmes on the PCID CD.'*
- Vola Mahasoa: *'The inclusion on CD, evaluation and editing of the programmes by the PCID members of Toliara is now done in Toliara. That is not like before when there was a delay in broadcasting of programmes. Every time we ask for technical support from PR they provide what we need (increase in PR's approachability).'*
- WWF: *'Since JIRAMA started power cuts the programme schedule has altered which confuses the listening groups. PR has not been able to inform PCID of the schedule changes. My opinion is that the relation between PR, radio stations, listening groups needs to be reinvigorated.'*

Support required in the future from Projet Radio to individual organisations

Recording equipment heads the list of wants, followed by training in M&E, refresher training in production/editing and CPP, increase in the number of PCID programmes or broadcasts of PCID CDs and provision of more radios for distribution.

A request for a solar energy system was made by Voron Kodohodo – the lack of power for the radio station at Tsihombe is a problem faced by other stations. In Ankililoaka the station has a small generator which is used to power the transmitter and freezes ice cream which is sold from the station building to raise funds to buy fuel. This concern with power sources is reflected in a request made by SATRAHA for *'access to solar mini-panels as well as to replacement parts for Freeplay radios.'*

PCID network

17 respondents said they already cooperate with other PCID members, principally to plan campaigns on common themes, to conceptualise and produce programmes, to exchange information, and for training purposes. 90% of partners are prepared to contribute to improve the PCID network (25/28) and some mentioned specific ways such as provision of material or financial support, technical guidance for programme-making and logistical support to meetings. Changes they would like to see in the PCID network include increased communication between PCID members in order to exchange experiences of CPP and the realities of field work and for monitoring impacts of the programmes. Some would like to see sub-groups meeting more regularly in the different areas (Toliara, Ambovombe, Tsihombe, Fort Dauphin) which would be easier to arrange than big round tables of all members. Many partners feel there is room for increased professionalism and capacity amongst the network.

Future role of PR in the network

50% of partners felt that Projet Radio should continue to play the role of network facilitator. ASOS FD reflects the feelings of other respondents: *'we talk of sustainability its true, but we think that it will always be necessary for someone to play the role of Leader and PR is well placed to do that.'* Others highlighted Projet Radio's technical and training role to increase

the capacity of the PCID in communications including production, editing, monitoring and evaluation. 11 mentioned the provision of recording equipment. The issue of liaising between partners and radio stations, in particular to secure favourable airtime rates, was mentioned. The responses largely echoed the requests for and appreciation of benefits already made available by PR.

PCID partners commitment to communications activities

18 members (65% of those surveyed) are currently including communications as a separate budget item in proposals, the main activity being payment of airtime (14 members or 77% with a communications budget) whilst 65% budgeted for equipment or training. A third mentioned funding a full time communications officer against Just 2 and 3 partners respectively included funds for radios and radio station equipment.

Partners overall recommendations

Partners commonly mentioned wanting more training in CPP, training in monitoring and evaluation, continued facilitation and coordination by Projet Radio of activities of PCID and increased radio distribution.

- CIREEF: *'By assessing the weaknesses of each PCID in every field of communication will allow PR to reprise in two or three trainings, refresher courses for PCID in CPP or other topics.'* CISCO: *We think that it is better to reinforce the coordination of actions within network PCID. For training, it is better to identify the needs of every PCID on production before determining a training programme.*
- With respect to radio distribution, SATRAHA said:
 - a. *Research suggests options: solar mini-panels and rechargeable replaceable batteries. Les recherches propulsent des options: panneaux mini solaires externes, piles rechargeables remplaçables.*
 - b. *Consider supplying enough radios (even ones that take AA batteries) for optional purchase by individuals or partners who want more than their quota (of Freeplay radios presumably] and stop giving them away for free.*

Whether these are realistic demands is subject to debate: whilst realising that other technologies exist and may be suitable in southern Madagascar, equally other models of distribution including the open market place, may be better suited for their distribution.

Groupes d'Ecoutes

Some partners indicate a desire to see a strengthening or changing of the system for establishing and monitoring listening groups. E.g. GRET/Objectif Sud: *'Many people would say that the 'Listening Group' system (i.e. an approach requiring communal listening followed by discussion), which you have made a project of promoting, is not appropriate because people are more likely to discuss something which interests them when they are returning from the fields, rather than expressly discussing a radio program; it's possible that people get bored or tired of the requirement and stop meeting as Listening Group or meet only rarely, and so maybe which should replace this system. Another system must be found because people prefer to have discussions when they return from working in the evenings, rather than getting together to listen to the radio.'* However the results of the Listener survey (Vadgama, 2006) would suggest that in many places group listening to communal radios is both practical and popular. It is possible that in more urban areas, such as Ambovombe where GRET is based, people encounter more difficulties with collective listening, than in rural areas.

Vola Mahosoa had ideas about streamlining approaches: *'PR should speak to members of PCID so that all development organisations can work with any of the listening groups but using the same approach. E.g. if one member gives food to the listening group when he is working with them and the other does not, there will not be any results (participation).'* This member also wanted to know how to encourage members of the listening groups who have heard the programmes to share their knowledge with other members of the community who

are not in the listening group. MDP echoed this last point as well as asking how listening groups can be encouraged to function better in terms of coming together to listen regularly.

Monitoring and evaluation

MCDI pointed out that the timing of production and broadcasting is very season specific and if the evaluation of the programme is late then this will affect the impact of the programme e.g. programmes on diarrhoea should be broadcast before the rainy season. MCDI requests PR to activate the evaluation process and suggests that all programmes should be listened to one or two technicians before sending to independent PR evaluators (note that this function is now decentralised and thus for MCDI programmes is now done in Toliara where MCDI is based).

SATRAHA suggests to: *'Add a single page of questionnaire to the newsletter (which is suggested could be distributed) that addresses a single subject which can be answered quickly and sent back to ALT-PR. Continue this monitoring bi-yearly if required. The newsletter however, could be fulfil all monitoring requirements, once the partners became used to it and see the results of their entries in subsequent months.'* SISAL proposes self-evaluation in the form of brainstorming days and surveys in the field/exchange trips with other zones. This latter point was also made by SATRAHA.

Radio stations

PR is also requested by several partners to negotiate airtime costs with radio stations. ASOS Fort Dauphin which has raised funds to pay for airtime says: *'PR has already done what it is necessary to do. It has definitely accomplished its share of the tasks. Even so there are things that could be improved in terms of collaboration with radio stations, whose airtime charges are too high. We are aware of their financial expenses but it is necessary that they to consider development activities, the notion of public interest and to lower the costs of airing programs in these categories.'* PAM wants PR to organise brainstorming days with PR staff, PCID members and radio stations to iron out any problems being encountered with broadcasting. MCDI suggests that PR increase the number of affiliated stations in very isolated sites. For example in Ankazoabo, Morombe, Beroroha, Bezaha, and to set up a station in the coastal region of Ampanihy from Beheloka to Bevoalavo where the signal from existing stations is blocked by the Mahafaly plateau.

Communications

SATRAHA, as mentioned earlier in this report, would like to see attention to other forms of communication technology such as provision of the high frequency radio system BLU, or to pressure the cellphone providers to extend their coverage through the districts covered by the PCID network, and to start a monthly bulletin where stories, new lists of programmes, technical tips etc. can be sent with the CD to partner stations as well as directly to the PCID members.

Other recommendations

PECHE; would like to be able to travel with PR vehicles to its target groups along the coast as it lacks transport

CISCO's idea is for a series of programmes to support its field activities: *'Regarding production, we want to produce a programme for teacher training to support the teachers on ground especially in isolated places where no pedagogic support is available. These programmes could last about 10 - 15 min and run in a logical sequence.'*

CIREEF made suggestions for the elaboration of a new regional communication strategy employing all communications tools including TV, workshops, conferences, video films etc.

8. Conclusions and recommendations

Impact of Projet Radio on partners

Multiple impacts have been perceived and can be noted amongst Projet Radio's partners.

Role of communications

Key among them has been the increase in awareness and understanding of the role that communications can play in supporting, extending and deepening the activities of a field-based development project. Few partners engaged in radio related communications prior to joining the PCID. This impact appears to work at an institutional level, since all questionnaire respondents, regardless of how long they had been in post, were able to cite benefits of PR and list impacts, and make suggestions and comments and recommendations.

A visible sign of impact has been the willingness of organisations to designate a member of staff as responsible for communications activities. 70% of organisations interviewed had done so, although half of these were only designated in the previous two years. Some organisations have even purchased their own recording equipment when PR has not been able to provide it. However perhaps due to the added attraction of technical support a number of partners still go to PR to borrow recorders rather than buying their own. Since this type of equipment is not routinely available, there is a role for PR in procurement. But it may be worth considering whether the financial outlay could not in future be made by the partners themselves.

Skills building

Specific capacities have been built in individuals employed by PCID members in planning, researching, developing, recording and editing radio programmes: whether any kind of cascade effect can be detected is debateable since an oft-mentioned constraint to effective participation in activities is the changeover in staff, or lack of staff, suggesting that trained individuals do not necessarily pass on their skills to others on the job or at handover to a successor. This reflects on internal management and is outside the scope of Projet Radio's remit, although it makes a strong case for delivering training to more than one person at a time, or developing a strategy to help ensure skills are passed on and not simply invested in a single individual in each organisation. The value of training institutionally would be increased if partners had to make a financial contribution.

Refresher courses in CPP and in editing are particularly desired. Partners want training needs assessments to be carried out which will enable PR to tailor the training to the individual needs of each partner. From both this survey and a reading of a sample of the programme reviews it may also be necessary to include more practical application of the participatory methodology of conducting research, gathering material in villages, pretesting with target audience members, and evaluating impact, as well as encouraging best practice in recording and editing.. There is also a need to cultivate an attitude of self-reflection and constructive criticism among trainees, so they learn from feedback, and desire to constantly improve their performance. The introduction of the Andrew Lees Trust awards for programme production is one way of motivating organisations and individual staff members to strive for better quality productions.

Production

Partners were asked how many programmes they produced in 2005; this may have delivered somewhat misleading results as it was a transitional year for the project and for various reasons production may have been lower than in other years. Notwithstanding this caveat it should be noted that as many (16) partners that produced programmes for the PCID CDs also produced other programmes, so the limitations may not have related to PR per se. A number of organisations referred to the need to follow the CPP process and the need for 'recyclage' suggesting that it is not always followed methodically. Programme evaluations by

PR independent consultant show that there are quite often technical problems as well as editorial ones but respondents rarely mentioned the latter, focusing more on technical skills' needs and deficiencies.

Networking, exchange and collective action

Although there was relatively little indication that membership of PCID was the reason for organisations to form links with other PCID members, partners clearly appreciate that a network has great potential. Almost every partner wants to actively contribute to improve the network and to continue funding communications activities for its own projects. The creation of smaller sub-networks within the different zones may assist in regular meetings and exchanges and in organising training and support that is locality-specific. Individual partners are able to broadly identify the type of training needs their organisation or employees require, but the next step of pro-actively and collectively taking responsibility to make a strategic analysis and commission ALT to provide requisite, tailored training, has not yet been taken. This is not entirely surprising given that the use of radio to support and extend project coverage is a relatively recent enterprise for many members.

PCID members are able to articulate requests for ALT support individually at the occasional round table meetings organised by PR, and through regular contact with PR staff in the regional offices: however much of this contact is made by field agents responsible for making programmes who may not have strategic oversight of their organisation's communications needs.

Although the survey did not capture many details, there is evidence that among PCID partners there are interactions independent of PR relating to communication needs, plans and activities. Whether they are a direct consequence of the project is not known but seems likely. Again, further steps to actively pool resources to facilitate other communications related activities such as Monitoring and Evaluation, are yet to be taken.

A number of members expressed a need for PR to be involved in negotiations with stations although the PR radio station members have themselves formed a network or association which could be approached directly by the PCID. Not one partner mentioned looking for commercial sponsorship and few have strategically engaged with radio stations on a partnership basis. The majority simply pay for airtime.

Sustainability

PCID members are now routinely integrating communications activities and budget lines in new proposals submitted to other donors, but it does not seem that a shift, necessary for sustainability, towards regarding ALT as a service provider whose costs should be at least partly met by partners, has yet happened. Programmes produced outside the PCID agreement would appear to be in part fulfilling requirements of other funders as a result of building media outputs into new projects. If donors require greater commitment including regular reporting than PR does it is possible that these programmes will get priority over the ones destined for the PCID CDs.

Sub-regional PCID groups would, with some initial support from PR for planning and coordination, be able to intercede on their own behalf with the radio stations, as well as with suppliers of radios in the market place, or design joint monitoring and evaluation activities. All of these activities would contribute to greater sustainability of the activities and processes initiated by Projet Radio. PR has already started the process of partnering the PCID with each local group of stations and production unit.

Impact of Projet Radio on partners' projects

Partners are able to give evidence of impact on their projects of participation in Projet Radio. There is no question in their minds that the payoff is considerable. Concrete examples of

changes in behaviour and practice were cited representing potentially significant health, environmental, livelihoods and educational gains for people in southern Madagascar. The indirect contribution of radio to development, through information exchange, increasing openness of beneficiaries to interventions and outside influences was also reported.

However although these assertions are in many cases made strongly, the respondents were not able to quantify impacts, and questions about monitoring and evaluation systems revealed that evidence is not collected systematically, or disaggregated from measurements of the wider project impact.. PR acknowledges that this has been a relatively minimal part of training and support provided to partners to date.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The need for M&E and the lack of capacity among partners was a repeated theme. Partners clearly want training and support in such activities in the future. Ideally partners would have been able to report that they have:

- Established criteria for assessing quality and quantity of programmes made
- Collected information for own use
- Collected information as requested by ALT
- Used feedback from beneficiaries

However whilst monitoring and evaluation training could be of use to the partners, it is unlikely that there will ever be the time and resources for their designated communications officers to design, conduct or supervise rigorous research. Again, training should be tailored to the needs and resources of partners and include practical application; there is also a need for partner organisations to build communications activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts into existing management information systems (MIS) and monitoring and evaluation frameworks and tools. Projet Radio itself may have to continue playing a role in evaluation, both because of having greater expertise and to provide some independence and objectivity, and even look forward to a situation where partners may be persuaded to contribute towards this either in cash or kind (e.g. field agents, transport). Pooling of resources might allow for greater coverage and larger samples than could be achieved by individual organisations.

Radio distribution

Whilst greatly appreciated, it is not a priority for all organisations, partly because of the difficulties to establish groups and the difficulties of following them up which some organisations expressed. However some partners have identified more groups that would benefit from the Freeplay radios, so clearly demand has not been exhausted. But the points made by a couple of members, that individual listening may increasingly be preferred and that to aid this it may not be necessary to provide radios free of charge, but instead to facilitate the sale of small radios that are battery powered or solar powered (through small units that cost one or two US dollars only) should be further investigated.

Going beyond radio

A number of partners mentioned technical needs that lie beyond the scope and the funds of Projet Radio, but which if met would allow greater operational efficiency, and ultimately should lead to greater impacts of radio interventions – e.g. solar energy sources to power transmitters and high frequency radio (BLU) for telephonic communications. A strategic analysis might reveal additional needs such as mobile phones where the network exists, or the possibility of bringing together mobile phone operators with radio stations to use the same masts, and even the provision of VSAT or Immarsat for internet connections. Again, whilst PR could play a role in assessing needs, liaising with providers and even supporting procurement, the financial onus should eventually rest with partners to the extent possible whilst recognising that the smaller less well-resourced organisations will have less leverage than bigger ones. But if the regional authorities are prepared to see this kind of need in a strategic light then perhaps private/public partnerships will be feasible.