



DECISION MAKERS DO WANT COMMUNICATION -BUT THEY MAY NOT WANT PARTICIPATION

Wendy Quarry



How to build communication in such a way that the people to whom it is directed actually gain or have a say in the countless messages thrown their way? In this article, Wendy Quarry discusses the gaps between rethoric and implementation of the communication strategy for Afghanistan's National Solidarity Program (NSP).

In May 2005, in an interview with the World Bank Resident Representative in Afghanistan on the subject of Development Communication, the interviewee opened by pointing out that that very week a team would be coming from Washington to help develop a communication strategy for Afghanistan's National Solidarity Program (NSP). It would be an attempt, he said, for people's voices and concerns to be heard around NSP.

The interview left me thinking – did that strategy ever get developed? And if so, what did it look like? Was it implemented? If not, why? These questions made me want to explore the relationship between the rhetoric of a program as important as the NSP and the reality of its implementation. It seemed to me that a clearer understanding and acknowledgement of the gap between rhetoric (what was planned) and implementation (what actually happened) would enable us to identify the opportunities; challenges and obstacles to a more fully integrated development communication approach.

INTRODUCTION

The 2006 World Congress on Communication for Development (WCCD) was devoted to the theme of attracting decision-makers to the importance of communication*. I think that the WCCD's theme raised the wrong question. Decision-makers are interested in communication. No hard sell needed there. I see a growing interest in the power of communication so long as it is one-way information dissemination, awareness raising and public relations. What is sorely missing, however, is in-depth knowledge of how to build communication in such a way that the people to whom it is directed actually gain or have a say in the countless messages thrown their way. At stake is the kind of planning and research that must go into a

ISSUE 10
February 2008

communication effort to make it truly effective. In short, what is missing is any notion of putting in place what is commonly known as *participatory communication*.

COMMUNICATION APPROACHES

Good communication is like a good conversation –it is respectful, mutually beneficial, gives both parties a chance to negotiate and clarify points and leaves people feeling as though the conversation was worthwhile. Sending and receiving is not a good metaphor for communication – communication is not a linear process, it is the dynamics of interaction and negotiated understanding that need to be addressed by communication professionals (Feek 2002)1.

This quote sets the tone for understanding the difference between communication for dissemination and participatory communication.

It is possible to create a long list of communication functions outlining communication uses for a wide variety of needs. Neils Roling (Roling 1994) simplified this list by boiling it down to three main functions: policy communication to make new rules known, educational communication about issues or processes, and facilitative or participatory communication where different stakeholders are brought together to negotiate agreements.

1. *Making policies known and relevant:* The increasing trend towards interactive policy making moves away from the more persuasive advertising approach. This requires careful communication planning for public meetings, consultations and round tables for stakeholder engagement.
2. *Communication for sharing knowledge:* Explaining scientific information with the aim of creating new perspectives rather than transferring pre-packaged solutions.
3. *Participatory communication:* Giving a voice to different stakeholders to engage in platforms where negotiation among different parties can take place.

This can be collapsed even further by dividing communication functions into two frameworks: the diffusion model of communication and participatory communication. Servaes and Malikhao (2004) in their paper for the 9th Development Communication Roundtable emphasize the difference between these two models. They note that despite the evidence of changed practices, most communication initiatives still focus on message delivery, informing the population about projects, illustrating the advantage of these projects, and recommending that they be supported.

Mass media, they point out, is important in spreading awareness of new possibilities and practices, but at the stage where decisions are being made about whether to adopt or not to adopt change, personal communication is far more influential.

The participatory model's point of departure, they continue, must be the community. It is at the community level that the problems of living conditions are discussed, and interactions with other communities are elicited. This principle implies the right to participation in the planning and production of media content. Participation is made possible in the decision-making regarding the subjects treated in the messages and the selection procedures. This, they point out, can be threatening to existing hierarchies. However, it only means that the viewpoint of the local groups of the public is considered before the resources for the development projects are allocated.

DECISION MAKERS AND COMMUNICATION

Is the goal and purpose of the project matched by appropriate communication initiatives, or conversely, do the type of communication initiatives employed reflect the true goal of the project?

It is against this thinking that this paper explores the assertion that there does exist a great deal of interest and support on the part of decision-makers for the idea of communication, particularly where it supports policy development and information dissemination. What is missing is communication initiatives designed to foster participation. To explore such assertion, it is useful to look at the very substantial communication support given to Afghanistan's flagship program, the National Solidarity Program (NSP), which constitutes the centre-piece of the government's efforts for reconstruction and development.

THE NATIONAL SOLIDARITY PROGRAM

The goal of the NSP is to reduce poverty through empowering communities with regard to improved governance, and social, human, and economic capital. The objectives of the program are to lay the foundations for a strengthening of community level governance, and to support community-managed sub-projects comprising reconstruction and development that improve the access of rural communities to social and productive infrastructure and services. The outcomes that the NSP aims to achieve are:

(i) the establishment of a framework for village level consultative decision

making and representative local leadership as a basis for interaction within and between communities on the one hand, and with the administration and aid agencies on the other, and

(ii) local level reconstruction, development, and capacity building which will lead to a decrease in poverty levels.

The NSP is executed by the Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development (MRRD) in partnership with Facilitating Partners (FPs) made up of national and international NGOs, as well as UN Habitat, already operating in the country.

In the first year of operation (2003), three districts in every province were targeted to reach 6000 communities. In 2004, the target was expanded to reach another 4500 communities. In 2005, another 6000 communities were added to the coverage.

In May 2002, before the program started operating, the NSP Design Team had signed a contract with UN- Habitat to produce a detailed and comprehensive Operational Manual outlining the exact steps that the FPs would be expected to follow to properly implement the NSP process at the community level. Initially, the manual was to build on Habitat's five-year Action Research² to determine best methods for community mobilization and development within Afghanistan. Over time, this was superseded by the World Bank's experience in implementing a similar project in Indonesia. It is not clear why the designers of the NSP felt they had to start from scratch and develop a model where "one size fits all" instead of building on the existing base of varied community development experience already strong within the country.

The Operational Manual produced in 2003 spelled out a method for community mobilization expecting the FPs to follow a time-line that would take them and their selected communities through a process that began with an introduction to the community and ended with a completed infrastructure project, *all in the space of four months*³.

It is hard to imagine how the stated goal for community "empowerment" could actually be achieved in such a timeframe. But moreover, what exactly is empowerment? To some, it is the process of gaining control over self, over ideology and over the resources that determine power. It can also mean challenging the traditional power structures within a given community, resetting the balance to give voice to those who normally do not have a voice. In the NSP, empowerment is said to have happened when a community selects its own infrastructure project and manages it to completion.

NGOs most able to manage the guidelines and tight time-frame were those that already had a rich experience with those communities assigned to them by the NSP. Those NGOs had already gained trust within the region and were better able to fast track along that road from introduction to project completion⁴.

The majority of FPs, however, needed to start from scratch and build up an NSP relationship with communities, while others needed to make a qualitative change from their earlier methodologies. Some of the larger national NGOs, for example, used to a more 'service delivery' mode of interaction at the community level, had to learn a new approach and new skills to enable them to facilitate the NSP mandate⁵.

Little training was provided to the FPs at the beginning of the program. Later on, training was initiated through the Oversight Consultant (OC)⁶ brought on board several months after project start-up (October 2003). The OC utilized the cascade method of training (one batch would be trained in Kabul and expected to train the next and so on out to the field). The result, as one OC member commented, resembled the game of Chinese Whispers –by the time the training got down to the field level, it was barely recognizable vis-à-vis what it was at the beginning. An unfortunate outcome, since experienced practitioners in community mobilization emphasize the length of time necessary for building in successful participation processes. Much of this time should be spent in preparation within organizations promoting initiatives before contact is made with a wider community (Wilcox, 1994)

Those NGO Facilitating Partner staff members who speak highly of the NSP, claim that the program has helped provide a model of governance at the community level. That it has touched a deep need for those who wanted “desperately needed” infrastructure projects, and that the chance to elect local councils set the tone for the future parliamentary elections. Others see it differently, claiming the spending of money at the community level is nothing short of “institutionalized bribery” (we have \$20,000 in our pockets, if you put together a CDC and identify a project – it is yours), and that the model of Community Driven Development in this kind of time-frame cannot possibly produce any form of sustainable development.

The communication potential - Communication mapping, planning and strategy building

A person with training in Development Communication could easily read the NSP documentation and “map” the need for communication initiatives within the program’s structure. The text box below illustrates a quick mapping of potential communication inputs with selected audiences. It is not exhaustive, and has been put in place to illustrate where a communication initiative could enhance implementation. It might also be useful in pointing a future direction for the NSP Communication Unit (PCU).

Communication Function	Target audience	Methods/tools
Getting policy known Rules and principles of NSP Purpose of NSP Potential benefits	Government officials, public at large – rural and urban	Mass media – radio, TV, print
Information Steps and processes How it works	Government, public	Mass media – radio, TV, print Meetings and consultations
Educational – helping people understand process of democratic elections, banking functions	Segmented community audiences Men, women, disabled, ethnic minorities, youth, students, teachers	Combine mass media with training of FPs to facilitate face to face interpersonal communication to supplement media information
Participatory communication – around issue of CDC and traditional power structures - open opportunity for listening to elder views	Community leaders – traditional, religious,	Provide platform for discussion on relationship between traditional power structures and new CDC structure
Participatory communication Listening and exchange	Segmented community audiences	Create opportunities for dialogue between disparate groups within communities
Participatory communication Peer learning	Community leaders – CDC members	Create opportunity for dialogue between communities
Participatory communication for conflict resolution	Segmented community groups	Dialogue, interactive video

After identification of specific audiences, the next step in a thorough communication planning process would be the facilitation of rudimentary research into the knowledge, attitudes and practice of the different audiences (around issues such as the role of traditional leadership systems; their attitude to government programs; their sense of security; their trusted sources of information, etc.). This would also involve understanding best modes of communication for the individual audience groups. It is only after such basic work that it becomes possible to sketch out an overarching communication strategy for the program.

THE NATIONAL SOLIDARITY PROGRAM COMMUNICATION SUPPORT

At the eighth Communication for Development Roundtable (2001), much of the debate focused on the need for long-term strategies which integrated both behaviour and social change approaches, and a shift towards developing communication strategies that provide people with a voice as well as sending them a message. While there are important statements and expressions of intention by funding agencies, there is only occasional

evidence that funding patterns and expenditures of resources have decisively altered to reflect this shift (Deane, 2004).

Three main actors were involved in NSP communication (2003–2006). Two of these, the NSP PCU and *Equal Access*, are media organizations and recognize themselves as communication actors in the program. The third is the group of Facilitating Partners. They may not recognize themselves as playing an overt communication role, but undeniably have contributed to whatever participatory communication does exist within the program.

The Program Communication Unit (PCU) -Public relations and information

The strategy of the PCU is to assure a broad knowledge of the principles and goals of NSP throughout the rural areas of Afghanistan. In order to do that and to broadcast the achievements of NSP among a general public and to create a broad understanding of the importance of rural governance as part of nation building in Afghanistan (from a PCU Power Point presentation)

The PCU is the recognized communication arm of the NSP. Its very existence indicates a willingness on the part of NSP decision-makers to recognize the importance of communication for the process. It was started in November 2003, several months after program start-up. The PCU mandate clearly fulfils the communication function of public relations and information. “The minister wanted a public relations machine”, said Christian Marks, the unit’s manager, “and we are a public relations machine. We have a product and we have a market and we are taking that product to market”⁷.

To fulfil this mandate, the PCU put together a surprising number of programs and products, including radio feature programs, a radio soap opera, television features and news feeds, print, a web site and most recently a congress bringing together members of the newly formed Community Development Committees (CDC). The Unit boasted a staff of 30–40 people with the ability to turn out public relations and informational material on the principles, values and methods of the NSP.

***Equal Access* -Information and education**

Equal Access (EA), an NGO from San Francisco, was the next organization officially recognized to offer communication support to the NSP. It offered an exciting and innovative possibility to media communication in Afghanistan. It was in the unique position of being able to provide

information to hard-to-reach communities through satellite radio receivers (run by batteries) that can download programming broadcast over the Asia Development channel ⁸.

In July 2004, EA signed a contract with UNAMA and DFID (two main donors to NSP) to supply a total of 7000 radio receivers to communities with established CDCs. This was to be facilitated by the FP social organizers who received training in radio receiver usage. Included in this was EA's commitment to broadcast NSP radio programs through their network program, *Radio Danesh*, six days a week.

There is no doubt that the idea behind EA could and should be very effective. Afghanistan is certainly a country with hard-to-reach communities, and the possibility of getting radio access to those communities is provocative. EA had the intention to provide not only NSP information (the government's voice), but also educational programming and training cassettes on how to use the radio, for the CDC radio holder to record programs and play them at different times (the radio receivers can also record and play back). Unfortunately, these good plans and intentions were not backed by sufficient follow-up to ensure that no one other than the CDC custodian actually got access to the programs, nor did it facilitate women access to the programs. Only eight monitors were assigned to support a program covering as many as 6000 villages –four from MRRD and four from EA. In addition, EA lacked the personnel to both prepare and back up a program to make it more than informational.

The Facilitating Partners and their innovative role: participatory communication in action

The next official partner engaged in communication for the NSP was the group of 24 Facilitating Partners responsible for implementing the project. Although they may not think that some of the innovative approaches they took were actually communication initiatives –the label is not important, some of the new ideas facilitated by this group (despite the above mentioned manual) have created a window of effective participatory communication approaches within the NSP.

UN Habitat, for instance, went beyond the production of the Operation Manual to produce a series of comic books and cartoons to enhance facilitation at the community level. In addition, they ran a literacy program parallel to the NSP with the view of strengthening people's ability to participate in planning through literacy. The International Rescue Committee (IRC) was particularly innovative in its ability to instinctively develop sound communication practices to facilitate their work. For example, before IRC staff got to Stage One (enter community and introduce NSP program), they did an in-depth profiling of each community (audience research), identifying the power holders and the disadvantaged –profiling the commanders, unemployed youth and

widows. They next took the precaution of first inviting community traditional leaders to a meeting to solicit their advice on the aims and objectives of NSP. This was not merely the usual type of consultation where people are called to hear government tell them what to do. Instead, IRC found the space to enable real discussion and dialogue around the community leader perception of strong and weak points of the NSP process. In addition, IRC set up two advisory councils at the provincial level. The first group comprised political leaders (provincial and district governors, provincial ministries, Jihadi commanders and tribal leaders. The second group was made up of religious scholars and leaders. These groups were called to a two-day workshop to discuss and understand the NSP rules, responsibilities and documents. They were encouraged to discuss the core values of the NSP and see where these fit within their own core values. They were also given the opportunity to offer advice on the NSP and create their own action plan to implement it (Kakar, 2005).

Another example of innovative work is the way several FPs decided to institute the idea of *peer learning* amongst their CDC partners. These NGOs sought to find new ways to cope with a variety of misinformation about the NSP.

Previous regimes had also instituted the idea of Community Development Councils (CDCs), causing people to be extremely suspicious of any new approach (Kakar, 2005). This air of suspicion forced the FPs to develop innovative ways to communicate with traditional leaders and with other community groups, giving rise to the understanding that more *horizontal communication* techniques would be needed to bring together those communities that had accepted the CDC idea with others that remained fearful. The FPs quickly saw the importance of bringing newly formed CDC members together with CDC members from other communities to share experiences, resolve problems and generally learn from a collective discussion. In essence, they tried to provide a platform for horizontal communication to take root. The idea initiated by the FPs within their districts was soon taken up by a larger assembly, which brought together CDC's from different provinces, and gradually spread across the country, leading to a decision to hold a grand Jirga (meeting) of selected members of all CDCs.

The CDC Congress (Jirga) took place in August 2005. Arrangements were completely handled by the FPs, with the PCU coming in to record the proceedings. This became the point where the top-down (vertical) communication approaches instigated by the PCU were able to merge with the more bottom-up (horizontal) communication approaches facilitated by the FPs. The Congress represented a broad form of participatory communication, since it became the vehicle for providing a platform for discussion, debate, dialogue and dissent around the pros and cons of NSP implementation. It also opened an opportunity for the NSP organizers – the government and the World Bank- to listen to the CDC voices and concerns, and allowed the CDC members to meet with central

government.

You would think that this happy convergence between government's need for *vertical* public relations and information dissemination and the more *horizontal* and participatory approaches generated by the Congress and civil society organizations would be something to nurture and enhance in subsequent stages of project implementation. However, the following year, when it was time for FPs to put in a new proposal and budget for their role as NSP Facilitating Partners, IRC's submission contained plans for further communication initiatives (including Terms of Reference for a person to spear-head the process). This was removed from the draft. IRC was told to stick to the NSP original guidelines without funding for communication support.

This is puzzling. Government officials and the PCU had *acknowledged* the value of the CDC exchange and indeed facilitated the CDC Congress as a culmination of that exchange. Yet, in the final analysis, they removed the tools required to allow FPs to further experiment with the process. What was it, one wonders, that the government really wanted from the NSP?

DECISION-MAKERS' VIEW OF COMMUNICATION: WHAT IS THE INTENTION?

Recently, a leader of one of Afghanistan's largest national NGOs commented that in Afghanistan, good communication could bring peace⁹. Certainly, he was referring to the kind of communication that encourages dialogue between groups, opens up discussion around issues and seeks debate and negotiation to help both parties arrive at a jointly satisfactory conclusion.

Why is that kind of communication approach not found within the substantial official communication support given to the NSP? There may be several answers to that question.

The first one relates to timing and the actual goal and intention of the program *at a given point in its development*. The second one refers to the lack of knowledge and understanding on the part of both the decision-makers and the communication teams of the effort that must go into communication planning to make a communication initiative truly effective. The third one relates to the nature of participation itself and its place within government programming.

Timing

The NSP was put in place at a time when the reach of the Karzai government barely extended beyond Kabul. At that time, the government

and the World Bank felt the need for a program that could quickly and efficiently imprint the government's reaching out to the rural and often disaffected areas. The World Bank had tried a similar approach with the Community Empowerment Program (CEP) in East Timor, and with the Kecamatan Development Program in Indonesia. One observer made it clear. They literally decided to implant these experiences onto Afghanistan¹⁰.

Because the *intention* behind this initiative was “state-building” rather than *participation* or *empowerment*, the methodologies put in place to implement a “fast-track” approach to the program, literally mitigated the possibility of deeper participation, empowerment and good governance. To be specific, this imposed time-frame did not allow for the type of discussion and debate which is a prerequisite of participation and empowerment. Indeed, it did not allow for dissent. Rather, the NSP was *rolled out* (their terms expressed in press releases and publications) relentlessly across the country checking off the formation of CDCs and disbursed funds like an invasion. Cases have been reported of FPs imposing projects on communities that were not moving fast enough to meet the rigorous time-frame, or of contractors brought in to design proposals to fast-track the process within a certain district and CDC councils elected for the sake of election. The fall-out for this particularly affected women, who were less able to become involved within the steamroller effect (Wakefield and Bauer, 2005).

Most telling, however, is the curious choice of indicators to measure results. Despite the rhetoric of community empowerment, good governance and community driven development, those responsible for measuring the NSP's performance (decision-makers from donors and government) chose only quantitative indicators to measure success, such as number of CDCs formed, number of projects approved, or amount of block grants spent. To date, they have made no effort to develop process indicators on quality of mobilization; role of CDC; sense of empowerment and so on. There is a “push–pull” here that ends up giving mixed messages both to the FPs and to the community at large. The government says that the NSP is about governance and empowerment, but then becomes project (supply) driven by imposing a rigid time-frame and indicators that are based on products rather than process¹¹.

Where indeed is the evidence to show that communities have been *empowered* as claimed? Who within each community has actually been empowered, and how is empowerment defined? Is *empowerment* really the goal?

One answer to the puzzle of mixed messages within the NSP may lie in the timing. As noted, in the beginning, despite the rhetoric, the goal of this project was really about getting government to reach out to the countryside. That this was achieved is not in dispute. The NSP was a good starting point. It was put in place to help re-build the social fabric that had been partially destroyed through war and internal conflict. This was

an outstanding success in a country where many development professionals are simply content with getting the project done, rather than worrying about results¹².

It is perhaps not surprising that the communication initiatives put in place to support the NSP reflect the early goals and aims of the program. Government perceived of the necessity of “getting the policy known,” of building a constituency of support amongst other government ministries and politicians. In addition, the need was to strengthen the NSP messages sent out to the constituencies –to promote the need for democratically elected CDCs and the importance of teamwork, of the integration of returnees, of providing information to the participants. The need was to tell them what the government expected them to do!

At present, NSP officials are extremely pleased with the results –“What we have done is legendary”, claims a senior government official, “we have now covered 50% of the country and intend to cover the rest”. “But”, he went on to say, “what we have done needs to be improved”.

MRRD is now ready to tackle the more difficult issues surrounding sustainability of the approach and the long-term role for the CDCs within the government structure. The government has ambitious plans to institutionalize the CDCs through regulation and obligate all government ministries to work through the CDCs. In effect, CDCs will become service providers for their own communities. Government funds will continue to be channelled directly to these entities. Clearly, if this approach is to succeed, there will be a need for much broader communication initiatives to help effect a wider opportunity for exchange.

Lack of knowledge and understanding of the planning process

A second reason to explain the quality of the current NSP communication initiatives is related to lack of knowledge around the planning process. There is a widespread belief in Afghanistan that all that is required to bring about change is “to get the message out” through whatever means are available -radio being the medium of choice in Afghanistan. Seldom does one encounter communication professionals trained in the process of audience research, the provision of platforms for dialogue and discussion, or monitoring and evaluation for impact. The closest the media gets to broaden the idea of “messages” is the widespread adoption of the radio soap made popular by the BBC, *New Home, New life*, started in Peshawar in the 70s.

The nature of participation and its role in government programming

The third reason, very much related to the first one, requires that we look at the nature of participation and question the role that the government (and some donors) may be expected to play to facilitate the process. It has been said that the NSP is the most participative government program that this country has ever experienced¹³ and it may be true. NSP may be the “most participative” approach to a program so far put in place by any government in the country. But is it in itself truly “participative?” And is government really the right vehicle to implement a fully participative program, or is it rather the role of government to provide the space to enable others (civil society) to facilitate deeper participation for its citizens? Does the political agenda require something other than participation? Does timing, as already mentioned, play an important role in the decision?

The NSP is participative as far as the government allows it to be participative at this point in time. And for the moment, *participation* means that the community is to democratically elect a council which will in turn decide on how to spend its block grant within narrowly defined parameters (defined by what is *not* allowed rather than by what may be allowed)¹⁴. The speedy election of a CDC is as important as the speedy construction of an infrastructure project.

CONCLUSION

This article has focused on decision-makers' interest in and support to communication. It presented the case that decision-makers clearly value the role of communication in their development work, but stop short at the entry point for participatory communication. In all probability, it is argued, this may be due to lack of knowledge or to the fact that governments and some donors (particularly those who only work through government) simply do not have the intention, mandate, time, money or space within their own agendas to apply a fully participative approach.

If this is the case, it might be a good idea to first acknowledge that all decision-makers are not created equal, and it would prove useful to take this into account. Moreover, we should acknowledge that some decision-makers simply do not have participation within their mandate - governments for reasons of state, and banks, well, because they are banks. Next, we should consider changing our own agenda. Instead of expecting a better participatory approach from those institutions that do not really have participation within their mandate, let's work with them to help widen their understanding of what others may need to make participation effective. It is well within their mandate to foster this approach. An understanding of the importance of space for slower and longer time-frames for others to enhance participation ultimately ends up beneficial to

society.

** This article is based on Quarry, Wendy (2006) "Decision Makers do want communication – what they may not want is participation", paper prepared for the World Congress on Communication for Development.*

Wendy Quarry has worked in development communication for over 25 years for various aid agencies (CIDA, World Bank, UNICEF, FAO and UNDP), governments and NGOs, facilitating initiatives across sectors. wquarry@magma.ca

1 *The Communication Initiative*, October 29, 2002.

2 UN Habitat work is focused on community shelter and water and sanitation.

3 UN-Habitat discussion on how manual was put together.

4 CARE, UN-Habitat, DACAAR.

5 Wali Farhodi from Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance (CHA) described the new learning for CHA through NSP.

6 GTZ.

7 In conversation with Wendy Quarry, February 2006.

8 This system, operated by WorldSpace, is similar to the Sirius and XM satellite radio system operating in the United States.

9 Dr. Fareed Waqfi in conversation with Wendy Quarry.

10 Discussion with UN Habitat on change of operation manual.

11 The Afghan government is not alone in this. In a similar case in Mozambique, the World Bank spent many years working with the government to develop a Rural Water Policy that called for demand-driven community management of all rural water points. However, when it came time to implement a demonstration project on this approach, the government's Project Manager was criticized for spending time on the softer aspects of community organization without drilling boreholes. The following year, when he switched to only drilling water points, his initiative was rewarded. The number of boreholes became the indicator of success - not the process indicators of community mobilization.

12 Conversation with Najib Malik from ICARDA.

13 February 21, in the NSP office.

14 Conversation with OC Lyn Wan.

Deane, J. (2004) *The Central Role of Communication in the Millennium Development Goals*. Produced for the 9th Communication for Development Roundtable, Rome. 6 – 9 September 2004

Kakar, P (2005) *Fine-Tuning the NSP: Discussions of Problems and Solutions with Facilitating Partners*. Kabul: AREU

Roling, N. (1994). Communication support for sustainable natural resource management. Special issue: Knowledge is power. The use and abuse of information in development. IDS Bulletin 25(2): 125-133

Servaes, J and Malikhao, P. (2004) Communication and Sustainable Development: Issues and Solutions. Produced for the 9th Communication for Development Roundtable, Rome: 6-9 September 2004.

Wakefield, S. and Bauer, B. (2005) A Place at the Table: Afghan Women, Men and Decision-Making Authority. Kabul: AREU

Wilcox, D (1994) "Community Participation and Empowerment: putting theory into practice." <http://www.jrf.org.uk/knowledge/findings/housing/H4.asp> August 1994 (accessed January 30, 2006)

SUBMITTED BY: FLORENCIA ENGHEL

2008-02-18



© GLOCAL TIMES 2005
FLORENGHEL(AT)GMAIL.COM
ISSN 1654-7985