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Why did we apply the method?

> New method: client was involved in development

> Opportunity:
  - collecting information about various aspects with a variety of beneficiaries in a short period of time
  - Programme evaluation: collecting comparable type of information in different countries and through different projects/partners
  - Type of information requested by the ToR: changes in lives of target group and influence by ICCO (attribution)
  - Schemes to collect, process and analyse data

> Advanced version of focus group discussions
Set-up

> Two villages:
  - same composition participants,
  - Village 1: PADEV, more holistic picture and generation of hypotheses to be checked
  - Village 2: focus group discussion, focus on ICCO/programme interventions

> Participants: 4 groups X 7 people (men/women; young/old), each group with facilitator and secretary

> Identification of participants by NGO partner
  - criteria, process and representativity to be verified

> Course PADEV sessions (per module)
  - discussions in small groups, plenary, discussion on disagreements, consultant resumes for each module
**Set-up (2)**

> 5 modules (2 days)

- History: events influencing on FS in community and changes (availability, access and utilisation) (1,5 h)
- Capabilities of community (natural, physical, human, economic, socio political, effects (+ -) on FS and changes (2,5 h)
- Wealth categorisation (names and attributes) related to FS and perceived distribution over wealth classes (1,5h)
- List of development efforts related to FS and their impact (2 h)
- Relations between most important interventions (worst and best), changes in capabilities and wealth classes (3h)
Processing data

> Quick resumés in the evening of main output with specific attention to different perceptions and main trends

> Synthesis and analysis by consultant facilitated by some questions:
  * Is ICCO mentioned and in what way?
  * Sustainability of changes and risks for FS
  * Relation between ICCO strategy and issues brought forward: is the strategy relevant?
  * Relation between the programme and changes: how has the programme influenced changes

> No formal reporting or statistical data processing

> Triangulation with other stakeholders/data
## Stronger and weaker aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stronger</th>
<th>weaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-receiving information on attribution and inclusion/distribution of effects over different groups</td>
<td>-Finding the right questions: e.g. on capabilities: what determines what you eat and how? e.g. on wealth classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-flexibility (modules are building blocks)</td>
<td>-Time: for doing exercise (language/distances) and for processing and discussing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-experience and observe interaction and dynamics in groups and subgroups</td>
<td>-management of discussion in sub groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-opportunities for groups to articulate their specificity and perception (gender and generational)</td>
<td>-Analytical capacity needed (how to connect data to ToR of the client</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-representativity of participants (and inclusion of the poor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>