

Capacity building of disabled people's organisations in Mozambique

Jabulani M Ncube
May 2005

Jabulani M Ncube
Phanda Investments CC, t/a Phanda Consulting
PO Box 10783, Khomasdal, Windhoek, Namibia
Tel: 00 264 61 249980 (office) 00 264 61 219920 (home)
00 264 61 249905 (fax) 00 264 81 281 2939 (mobile)
Email: jabuncub@iway.na

Edited by Eleanor Stanley

Abbreviations and acronyms

ABILIS	ABILIS Foundation, Finland
ACAMO	Association of Blind People
CBR	Community-based rehabilitation
DDPVT	Department of Disabled People, Violence and Other Traumas
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
DPO	Disabled people's organisation – a grassroots-based, democratic, membership organisation of disabled people
FAMOD	Forum for Mozambican Association of Disabled People
FIDIDA	International Development Association of Disabled Persons (Finland)
FRELIMO	National Liberation Front of Mozambique
IDEA	International Disabled Equality Agency
INE	National Institute on Statistics
KaR	Knowledge and research
KEPA	Service Centre for Development Co-operation (Finland)
MIM	Miracles in Mozambique
MWSA	Ministry of Women and Social Action
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
N'HLUVUKO	Theatre Group of Disabled People
RENAMO	National Resistance Movement of Mozambique
SAFOD	Southern Africa Federation of the Disabled (a regional umbrella federation of national umbrella organisations of disabled people)

Contents

Abbreviations and acronyms	2
Executive summary	4
1 Introduction	6
Methodology.....	6
Participating organisations	6
2 Mozambique: basic facts	8
Table: Key indicators for Mozambique.....	8
3 Disability in Mozambique	9
Key issues facing disabled people in Mozambique.....	9
Resulting impacts on disability and their organisations.....	10
4 Contrasting perspectives	11
Capacity building as defined by Mozambican DPOs	11
DPOs' goal of capacity building	12
Biased reliance on Northern experts.....	12
Vision of the meaning and goal of capacity building	13
5 Approaches	14
Northern NGOs' approaches.....	14
Northern DPOs' approaches	14
6 Particular problems and gaps	16
Limited level of openness between Northern NGOs and their DPO partners	16
Office-sharing dynamics.....	16
Theory/practice divide	16
The need for broader networking	17
Limitations of the Ministry for Women and Social Action (MSWA).....	17
Lack of collaboration between Northern NGOs.....	18
7 Examples of good practice	19
Principles of good practice	19
Conclusions	20
References	21
Annexes	
1 People and organisations met.....	22
2 Positive examples of capacity-building activities.....	23
3 Agendas for one-day workshop with DPOs.....	24
4 Questionnaire for Northern DPOs/NGOs	25

Executive summary

This report examines the role and efficacy of capacity-building initiatives of disabled people's organisations (DPOs) and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in Mozambique. It compares and contrasts the different approaches taken by the Northern DPOs and NGOs that are active in disability and development within the country, and seeks to identify which have been the most effective, and why.

Methodology

The process involved two visits to Mozambique in January and March 2005, meeting Northern NGOs with headquarters in Finland and the UK, and local offices in Mozambique. Northern DPOs based in Finland and the UK were also sent questionnaires. A one-day workshop was held with 16 leaders from eight DPOs, at which the key research questions were discussed.

Mozambique: basic facts

In 2003, the World Bank put the population of Mozambique at 18.8 million people, of whom about 10 per cent were disabled people. Other key indicators for the country are available in Section 2.

Disability in Mozambique

The situation of disabled people is characterised by extreme levels of poverty, low levels of education and illiteracy, and low self-esteem. These factors present particular challenges to disabled people when it comes to organising around their issues and influencing policy makers and other development actors about disability issues.

Contrasting perspectives

Mozambican DPOs stated clearly that for them, capacity building means strengthening their organisations to be effective in their work and to achieve results for their members. They understand capacity building to be a process that gives them "legs with which to walk, or on which to stand". They felt clear that the processes of capacity building should increase their skills to plan, implement, monitor and evaluate their work. However, the acquisition of skills alone is not enough. Technical support should be accompanied with the resourcing of their organisations, financially, and in terms of human resources.

However, they see some of their Northern NGO partners as concentrating their limited support on technical inputs, without paying attention to how organisations survive from day to day. Meanwhile, other Northern NGO partners are reported as striving to provide more balanced forms of support, and this is highly appreciated by DPOs. The Mozambican DPOs reported an over-reliance of the Northern NGO partners' on Northern experts for training inputs as opposed to local resource people, and saw this as unhelpful.

The Mozambican DPOs particularly appreciated the Northern DPOs for their empowering attitude, which aims to treat Southern counterparts as equals, who are respected and listened to. The shared values of the disability movement contribute to this more equal relationship.

Nevertheless, they also expressed anger at what they saw as unequal power with their Northern NGO partners. They commented that although the money is raised from the

North in the name of disability, the organisations do not discuss openly and flexibly how those considerable resources should be spent. In this role, DPOs reported feeling as if they are treated more like clients or objects than the primary constituency to legitimise outside intervention in the sector.

Mozambican DPOs viewed the government ministry responsible for disability issues as a helpless spectator. They reported that it has no resources for disability work, and that it actually seeks funding from the same few agencies that are involved with disability work in Mozambique.

Conclusions

The key findings of this research are as follows:

- Mozambican DPOs are very clear about what they want from capacity building. They understand capacity building as creating “legs with which to walk”.
- Southern DPOs believe that the approach of some Northern NGOs to capacity building is limited. Some partners see capacity building only in terms of training, while DPOs see the need for complementary support through covering core costs to enable them to implement what they have learnt.
- Southern DPOs are concerned about over-reliance on foreign experts instead of using local capacity.
- There are feelings among Southern DPOs that they are treated as clients or objects of capacity building rather than equal partners.
- A shared understanding of the philosophy of the disability movement between Southern DPOs and Northern partners helps to level the playing field between partners while minimising top-down approaches to relationship building.
- Considerable confusion exists over roles with the Ministry of Women and Social Action, which is responsible for disability issues.
- DPOs are not being empowered sufficiently to stand independently in order to approach donors in their own right.
- The lack of effective collaboration between different Northern NGOs operating in Mozambique promotes unnecessary duplication, waste and confusion with DPO partners.
- There is a need for commitment to open, frank discussion and experience sharing on an ongoing basis among Southern DPOs themselves. The DPO workshop held during the second visit was a response to this need, and all indications are that the organisations greatly valued the very frank exchanges that characterised the event.

1 Introduction

This report examines the role and efficacy of capacity-building initiatives of disabled people's organisations (DPOs) and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in Mozambique. It compares and contrasts the approaches of Northern DPOs and NGOs that are active in disability and development within the country, and seeks to identify which have been the most effective, and why.

Methodology

The process consisted of two visits to Mozambique. The first was undertaken in January 2005 for five days (20–24 January 2005). This brief visit was intended to familiarise the lead researcher with the disabled people's organisations, and with the Northern NGOs supporting them. Meetings were held between the researcher and a total of five Mozambican DPOs, plus two Northern NGOs: one from Finland, and one from the UK.

The second visit, which lasted for seven days (March 29–4 April 2005), enabled the key research questions to be addressed. During this visit, meetings were held with the national umbrella of DPOs, in addition to the two Northern NGOs and the Ministry of Women and Social Action. In addition, a day-long workshop with DPO leaders was held on April 1.

During this research, semi-structured interviews, a questionnaire, and a workshop were utilised to gather information. During the day-long workshop, the key research questions were discussed.

The end-of-workshop evaluation revealed that the workshop was roundly commended for having:

- facilitated free and frank expression of DPOs' views in a conducive venue and atmosphere
- increased DPOs' understanding of capacity building
- helped to clarify the different roles of DPO's Northern partners, government, and of the DPOs themselves, culminating in a call for a workshop bringing together Northern NGO and DPO partners, the government, and Mozambican DPOs in order to share perspectives and bridge existing gaps relating to capacity building and any other issues.

At the end of the second visit, a feedback workshop was held. Unfortunately, this was attended only by the Finnish NGO.

Participating organisations

- **KEPA** is a Northern NGO from Finland that provides financial and technical support to disabled people's organisations in Mozambique, with a base in Mozambique.
- **POWER** is a Northern NGO from the UK that provides technical support to disabled people's organisations in Mozambique. Like KEPA, it operates from a base in Mozambique.
- **ABILIS Foundation and FIDIDA** are Northern DPOs from Finland. In addition to undertaking local programmes in Finland, they have established partnerships with their DPO counterparts in Mozambique, which they provide with financial and technical support

- **FAMOD** is the national Mozambican umbrella organisation of all associations of disabled people
- **IDEA** is a UK-based DPO that has provided technical support to Mozambican DPOs.

2 Mozambique: basic facts

Mozambique became independent in 1975, following its colonisation by Portugal. Following independence, until 1994, Mozambique was governed by FRELIMO as a one-party Marxist socialist state. Following the negotiated end of the civil war between the government and RENAMO in 1992, a multi-party system with a market economy was introduced.

According to the World Bank, in 2003 Mozambique had a population of 18.8 million people, with an annual population growth of 1.9 per cent (World Bank Group 2005). The data on the proportion of the population with a disability is not available, except for the World Health Organization (WHO) estimate of 10 per cent, which would put the population of disabled people at 1.9 million. However, studies of the prevalence of disability elsewhere in the region indicate a significant downward variation of this WHO estimate, to 5 per cent or below (Sintef 2003). Among other reasons, these variations may result from the instruments utilised in the surveys, and how disability is defined.

Table: Key indicators for Mozambique

	HDI rank 2002 (177 countries)	Life expectancy at birth (years) 2002	Combined primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrolment ratio (%) 2001/02	HPI-1 value
	171 (with HDI index of 0.354. Seychelles, in the same region, ranks first, with value of 0.853.	38.5	41	49.8%, ranks 89th among 95 developing countries
Best performer in Sub-Saharan Africa (Seychelles)	35			

Source: United Nations Development Programme (2004)

In 2002, GDP per capita value in Mozambique was US\$1,050. This compares to the average GDP value for Sub-Saharan Africa of US\$1,790, with the best performer in Sub-Saharan Africa being at US\$18,232 (World Bank Group 2005).

3 Disability in Mozambique

Mozambique does have a policy on disability, but it remains unimplemented. With the support of the UK NGO POWER, a plan of action has been drafted to help with the implementation of the policy. However, there is no specific law on disability in Mozambique. The Ministry of Women and Social Action is the government body charged with the responsibility of overseeing disability issues in the country. Besides the Ministry, the other main actors in disability are:

- the Mozambican Forum of Associations of Disabled People (FAMOD) – the national umbrella organisation of more than a dozen DPOs
- the main donors (KEPA, FIDIDA and ABILIS Foundation from Finland, and POWER from the UK.)

Key issues facing disabled people in Mozambique

There were many similarities in the nature of issues identified by the DPOs themselves, by their Northern NGO partners, and by the Ministry of Women and Social Action, including its Northern DPO partners. These included:

- extreme levels of poverty
- very low levels of education and illiteracy
- lack of income and employment opportunities
- low self-esteem
- unstable membership bases due to unmet needs
- the gap between leaders and ordinary members (which reduces the effectiveness of DPOs as representatives of the wider constituency)
- little involvement of disabled women in training activities
- the need for the disability movement to be decentralised away from Maputo to the outlying, rural areas of the country. The growing focus on the provinces is seen as a challenging opportunity for FAMOD in terms of the requirement to co-ordinate with provincial structures, as well as to share information with them.

Few donors are available in the disability sector, so DPOs are over-dependent on the few NGOs that are involved: mainly the Finnish organisations, and the UK NGO POWER.

Need for more 'noise' from the sector is required in terms of demands directed at the government and other players. KEPA confirms that FAMOD is learning to use the media to advance its cause. However, consolidating the unity among DPOs remains a major goal that will contribute to strengthening the disability movement's collective advocacy efforts, and efforts to mainstream disability in HIV/AIDS work of other organisations is also required.

The commonality with which different parties, ranging from Northern NGOs to local DPOs identified and named the issues that characterise the life of disabled people in Mozambique was striking. Northern NGOs and DPOs involved with the sector should draw on this common understanding of the key factors influencing disabled people's lives to help to inform a deep, broad search for ways of addressing and responding to the needs of disabled people, going beyond simply describing the problems.

Resulting impacts on disabled people and their organisations

Given the situation facing disabled people in Mozambique, the following factors describe the impact on disabled people:

- There is a limited understanding of the bigger picture (in other words, the inter-connectedness of conditions in which disabled people live, and the active forces of underdevelopment, including those that marginalise them). This could be said to particularly affect DPOs given the prevalent lack of education available to, and poverty among, the leaders and members.
- In some cases, ability to network effectively and relate with other organisations was limited.
- The ability to organise and influence policy makers and other key players assertively needs to be strengthened. The gap between policy makers and disabled people is huge, and effectively keeps disabled people down and out as a result of gaps in knowledge, skills and language.
- A dominant image of disabled people as beggars militates against their ability to assert themselves as advocates of their cause, and to be taken seriously as such.
- There are difficulties in traversing the bridge from welfare to development. The 'charity' ethic is said to run deep among disabled people in Mozambique, as in other poor developing countries.

4 Contrasting perspectives

This section examines and contrasts the perspectives of Mozambican DPOs and Northern NGOs and DPOs.

Capacity building as defined by Mozambican DPOs

Capacity building is defined by the DPOs in Mozambique within the context of two organisational arenas:

- building the internal institutional capacity of an organisation (the internal environment)
- using that internal institutional capacity to service an organisation's membership (the extent of its ability to influence the external environment through acquired competencies).

The DPOs that were consulted for this project were emphatic on one level that capacity-building activities should aim to free the organisation, enabling it to become increasingly able to pursue autonomous actions, based on competencies that derive from within itself. One DPO described this activity as “creating legs with which to walk”. These competencies include the ability to identify the support an organisation needs, and to seek and enlist the relevant support from development partners. There is recognition that the achievement of such capacity is a lengthy process, and that member associations of the umbrella organisation are at different levels on the scale of such capacity.

Put differently, the DPOs were clear that the internal institutional capacity (based on its access to needed human, material and financial resources) has to be linked to the use to which the organisation puts such resources in the service of the members. The question that the DPOs suggest needs to be raised continually is: “How are we using the resources and capacity to benefit the membership?” So, the strength of an organisation has to be seen to relate to its ability to address the needs of its constituency – the members.

At the one-day workshop held as part of this project, DPOs expressed an overwhelming concern that some development partners understand capacity building only in the context of “endless” training inputs (about which DPOs claimed to have little say or choice) without this being accompanied with the means to kick-start practical organisational activities. The lack of institutional support (including cover of some basic operational costs) of the organisation is seen as limiting a DPO's ability to put into practice the new knowledge and skills, which DPOs understood as a lost opportunity, and leads to frustrations and eventual loss of the knowledge that may have been acquired.

It appears that there is a need to follow up training activities with well-thought-out follow-up support that taps into the knowledge and skills acquired, leading to the development of a range of programmes that make use of the skills and other resources available to a DPO. Training that is not followed up to enable its practical utilisation was described roundly as “training for nothing”.

Capacity building is intended to enable the provision of necessary resources to allow the efficient and effective operation of an organisation. Participants were firm that capacity building should include training and skills-building inputs, as well as the institutional

resources (including core costs cover) that give the organisation the means to practice and learn from the experience of (planning and managing its activities and money, among other things). The Mozambican DPOs felt that Northern NGOs could be more supportive of this process since the DPOs' needs shape this demand.

DPOs' goal of capacity building

Some Mozambican DPOs understood the goal of capacity building as enhancing an organisation's ability to effectively serve its constituency and create an environment of opportunities that can be utilised by the generality of disabled people, through advocacy and other operational programmes.

Others saw the goal of capacity building as ultimately relating to changing the lives of disabled people (the primary constituency of the disability movement) through the work carried out by DPOs, individually and collectively, to create an enabling environment, while ensuring that the central organisation (the instrumentality that primarily drives and influences the development of disabled people) survives and continues to grow in its effectiveness.

The Mozambican DPOs were firm that the goal of capacity building should be about enabling the organisation to identify its needs, build its abilities to be effective, and seek partners that can help it address those needs. They therefore see the goal of capacity building as enabling organisations to enter into, and maintain meaningful, mutually beneficial dialogue with donors and other development partners.

Biased reliance on Northern experts

The Mozambican DPOs were very concerned with what they saw as over-reliance on foreign experts on the part of their development partners. Examples were given of 'experts' being imported for non-essential inputs, even where local experts were available. One example was given of a computer expert who was brought in by a Northern NGO to conduct a two-hour session on basic computer function. On another occasion, a foreign expert was chosen to facilitate the development of a National Plan of Action on Disability against the Mozambican DPOs' preference for someone who was locally available. Repeated complaints were made about one of the Northern NGOs failing to consult with honesty and trust.

The Mozambican DPOs appreciated the value of exchange of experiences through interaction with external people. However, they argued that the consistent importation of Northern facilitators or resource people against the cheaper, and perhaps more appropriate, local resource people does not create sustainable, local synergies with the disability movement in Mozambique.

On the other hand, regional co-operation between DPOs in Mozambique and their counterparts in Southern Africa was seen as having valuable potential. By virtue of their membership of the Southern Africa Federation of the Disabled (SAFOD), FAMOD and its member associations may already be benefiting from this networking opportunity. The challenge is to identify appropriate DPOs in the region to match up with DPOs in Mozambique, so that experiences are shared more closely over and above any co-operation that SAFOD may directly foster.

In Southern Africa, it is clear that the co-operation enjoyed by the different national disability movements under SAFOD has contributed immensely to experience sharing,

confidence building, and mutual support, while opening and utilising avenues for closer co-operation between organisations.

Vision of the meaning and goal of capacity building

Following on from these points, the next question to ask is whether the DPOs and their development partners share the same vision regarding the meaning and goal of capacity building. Do differences exist, and if so, do they matter? What is more, are there any particular problems or gaps that need attention?

The Mozambican DPOs described a difficult relationship between themselves and one of their Northern NGO partners, which they perceive to generally adopt an insensitive and inflexible stance in its dealings with them. The DPOs perceived an unequal power relationship with this partner and felt that it was not committed to listening to disabled people. In contrast, they saw the Northern DPOs as equal partners with their Mozambican counterparts, sharing much in common. The reasons are explained in Section 5: Approaches.

Unfortunately, the Mozambican DPOs saw the UK-based DPO IDEA only within the context of having been brought in as consultants by its Northern NGO partner to undertake specific tasks. FAMOD stated that it had not had a more direct opportunity to relate with IDEA independently of its Northern NGO partner. As a Northern DPO, IDEA itself identified the limitations of working through a Northern NGO led by able-bodied people. IDEA's own independent identity and value may therefore be compromised by this association.

5 Approaches

This section looks at the different approaches taken by Northern NGOs and Northern DPOs. The following section then addresses particular problems and gaps.

Northern NGOs' approaches

The approach of the Northern NGOs includes a mixture of training inputs to build skills, as well as making financial resources available in order to build the institutional capability of the DPO umbrella.

One of the two Northern NGOs is seen as more flexible and tends towards being democratic. The umbrella organisation submits its plans to the Northern NGO and then, once the Northern NGO approves them, it transfers the funds (including some to cover overheads) to the umbrella organisation's account. Periodically, the umbrella organisation submits financial and narrative reports of progress.

The Northern NGO confirmed that this autonomy has greatly helped the umbrella organisation to build good financial and administrative systems, thus providing further evidence that the financial management training inputs are effective. The Northern NGO believes that the umbrella organisation is gaining strength.

The umbrella organisation appreciates the approach of the Northern NGO as sees it as empowering and trusting, and as contributing to building a more equal relationship between the two organisations. The Northern NGO is, however, aware of the power inherent in its role as a donor, in addition to its other development-facilitating role.

The umbrella organisation's Strategic Plan (2005–09), adopted at the recent General Assembly, was largely drawn from the organisation's own inspiration and direction. Its Northern NGO partner was invited as an observer of this process. The participation of the umbrella organisation in the earlier strategic planning exercise of its Northern NGO partner was an important learning opportunity for the umbrella organisation.

In contrast, the other Northern NGO directly administers the funds to the specific activities that it supports, even though it depends on the umbrella organisation to undertake certain tasks and arrangements, such as contacting participants for training activities. The approach of this second Northern NGO is predominantly concerned with the delivery of training inputs. It describes its approach as being concerned with "training DPOs how to fish, and not to give them fish to eat". This is contrasted with the willingness of the other Northern NGO to make financial resources available in addition to facilitating training inputs.

Northern DPOs' approaches

As a DPO, the umbrella organisation's experience and understanding of its Northern DPO partners is that the two types of organisations share much in their outlook and feelings, and in the manner in which they appreciate issues. For example, the umbrella organisation stated that the Finnish NGO's mandate is broader than disability, so this NGO is not focused on disability issues in the same way as the Northern DPOs are. The umbrella organisation cited the following reasons for particularly appreciating its relationship with its Northern DPO partners:

- The relationship brings a different feeling of closeness and honesty.
- Northern DPOs are more sensitive to issues of illiteracy and poverty that are experienced by disabled Mozambicans, and understand how this affects volunteerism of ordinary members, even leaders, to the organisation (including their ability or constraints to attend meetings).
- Northern DPOs understands the structure of the umbrella organisation (as both are organisations of disabled people).

According to the umbrella organisation, these factors have affected the Northern DPOs' approach to capacity building in the following ways:

- Northern DPOs genuinely try not to impose on the umbrella organisation.
- They listen to local people, and are empathetic to local needs (deriving from a common culture of the disability movement).
- They are more flexible to negotiate with.

Overall, the umbrella organisation's experience is that Northern DPOs have been transparent, and are less complicated to understand than Northern NGOs. They are generally regarded by the DPOs as closer comrades who have earned the trust of the disability movement in Mozambique.

6 Particular problems and gaps

This section highlights particular problems and gaps raised by Mozambican DPOs in relation to the provision of Northern NGOs and their DPO partners.

Limited level of openness between Northern NGOs and their DPO partners

The Mozambican DPOs complained that they had not been provided, in their capacity as partners of their Northern DPO partners, with financial reports of how funds raised for their activities are spent. They perceived that their Northern NGO partners had access to considerable financial resources, and they felt that their use should be discussed between them and their Northern NGO partners more openly and flexibly in order to explore a number of options for helping solve the wide range of problems faced by disabled people. The DPOs did not see training inputs as being the only way of moving disabled people out of poverty. There is therefore a key concern about access to, and control over resources intended to support DPOs.

The DPOs were particularly incensed with what they perceived as examples of inflexibility and insensitivity on the part of some Northern NGO partners. In response to DPO requests for financial support, a standard response from one of the Northern NGOs is that it is “not a donor but an implementer”.

Office-sharing dynamics

The national umbrella organisation shares offices with its Northern NGO partner. It comments that follow are worth noting in relation to this geographic proximity. The umbrella organisation enjoys access to offices, furniture, transport, fax, email and photocopying, electricity, and security services. The relationship is generally a very good one.

However, other aspects are less positive, as follows:

- Some of the Northern NGO staff have negative attitudes to disability, although this is seen as a problem of individuals, not of the NGO *per se*.
- The visibility of the umbrella organisation as an independent organisation is compromised by being housed in backyard offices in the large premises of a big organisation and using an outside shed for meetings.
- The Northern NGO's office is located in a rich area that is not easily accessible to poor disabled people and is not directly serviced by public transport.
- There are occasions when the umbrella organisation prefers to be alone to discuss issues privately, freely and confidently.
- Other partners of the Northern NGO visit the offices, and this at times is disturbing where facilities have to be shared.
- Other donors tend to regard the umbrella organisation as a protected ‘baby’ of its Northern NGO partner, given the office arrangements. This tends to affect the dynamics when it comes to relating with other agencies.
- As the umbrella organisation grows, it may be difficult for it to remain accommodated at this location.

Theory/practice divide

A divide in theoretical and practical approaches are seen to be arising from increased training inputs but reduced levels of practical support.

The experience with the Finnish NGO has been that workshops and seminars tend to focus too much on theory. To bridge the gap between theory and practice in partner organisations, it plans to evolve a mentoring programme through which people skilled in organisation development and other specific aspects of organisations will be placed in a particular organisation for a certain period of time. Efforts will be made to ensure that the mentors are recruited from Mozambique, thus allowing effective accompaniment of beneficiary organisations. However, details of this programme are still to be worked out.

The duration of such mentoring needs to be correctly balanced so that the organisation does not rely too heavily on the mentor. To be effective, mentors need to be good facilitators themselves so as to give the organisation space to practice and gain confidence.

The need for broader networking

DPOs are themselves encouraged to seek and find useful networks from which they could derive value. These would include the national NGO forum, among others. The mentoring opportunity cited by the Finnish NGO would be considerably enhanced by broader knowledge about which of the key actors is where, and doing what.

Limitations of the Ministry of Women and Social Action (MWSA)

The Mozambican DPOs were united in decrying the lack of government support for disability work – both politically and financially. This suggests a need for united action by DPOs to lobby government on specific issues, in addition to targeting some key officials to raise their awareness of disability issues. The latter is seen as being of particular importance, as it is recognised that at times, government officials and other targets are simply ignorant of the issue of disability. DPOs' advocacy and lobbying skills need to be developed and sharpened through a deliberate process of training and practice. Among key issues noted as facing disabled Mozambicans, on a number of occasions MWSA and Northern NGO officials mentioned the need for more “noise” from the disability movement.

A national policy on disability was passed in 1999, but remains unimplemented. With the support of its Northern NGO partner, the MWSA has been developing a plan of action based on the national policy.

Due to its resource-poor standing in government, as evidenced by its perennial lack of funding, DPOs regard the MWSA as a competitor for funding from the same donors that fund them, and yet no one DPO is convinced that it does anything that benefits disabled people. For example, it used to facilitate the following services through the community-based rehabilitation (CBR) programme:

- information, reference and transport
- transit centres where disabled people would be accommodated temporarily while awaiting the provision of appliances
- orthopaedic centres.

However, these no longer operate due to lack of funding. For the same reasons, the funding of income-generating projects has ceased too. The DPOs see the MWSA's perceived competition with DPOs for donor funding as compromising the objectivity of the MWSA in its relations with Northern DPOs and local DPOs.

Accusations have been thrown at the MWSA for interfering in inter-DPO and intra-DPO conflicts, seen by DPOs as stemming from a possible conflict of interests. Furthermore, some Northern NGOs, aware of the MWSA's dire need for financial resources, have sought to establish direct agreements with it. Not only does this cause jealousy within the DPO community, but DPOs interpret it as efforts by some Northern NGOs to manipulate the government and secure a position of advantage for themselves. DPOs further interpret this as denying necessary resources to the sector, considering that they do not get any funding at all from the government. Not unconnected to this analysis, KEPA has decided that from 2006 onwards, it will not work through the MWSA but directly with civil society organisations, including DPOs, following a review of the support it has provided through the MWSA.

The MWSA official who was met during the second visit to Maputo in (April) believed that the MWSA is very much a "junior member of the government", and that hence its influence on other ministries is very limited. Its existence, however, provides a perfect alibi for other ministries to avoid any engagement with disability issues. This naturally raises the question of where disability issues should be located in government for maximum influence on the rest of government ministries, agencies and offices. The Africa Decade Continental Plan of Action advises that this needs to be either in the Office of the President, or Office of the Prime Minister, where this exists.

Lack of collaboration between Northern NGOs

While attempts have been made between the Finnish and UK NGOs to periodically compare notes, share plans and generally collaborate their strategies since they both support the same constituency, this is not happening.

7 Examples of good practice

The Mozambican DPOs were asked whether there was anything with which they were happy in their existing relationships. They mentioned the following points. These should be read in conjunction with Annex 2: Positive examples of capacity-building activities.

They praised the UK NGO for:

- funding consultation towards the elaboration of the National Plan of Action
- contributing towards the costs of the recent General Assembly
- funding awareness-raising activities
- facilitating and funding the exchange visit to the UK
- funding representatives to the World Youth Congress
- funding some micro-projects.

They praised the Finnish NGO for:

- having a more democratic attitude and practice
- providing funds directly to the umbrella organisation for institutional or core costs as well as activities. There are current discussions between the two organisations to support FAMOD through 2005–08
- giving FAMOD the opportunity to formulate its own plans and strategies for action. This is seen as helping the organisation grow in its self-esteem, and providing a signal that their Northern partner trusts them to solve their own problems without being paternalised. It is welcomed as empowering FAMOD, an approach to its capacity-building work that the Northern NGO itself states is predicated on empowerment.

Principles of best practice

The Mozambican DPOs summed up their perception of good practice in capacity building as follows. These activities should be accentuated within Mozambique: Disabled people must be trusted, and not just described as “incompetent”.

- Disabled people must be treated as equal partners, and not like children.
- Mistakes must be used – not to punish people, but to draw lessons.
- Disabled people must identify their own needs, discuss how they can solve their own problems, they ask for support to fill any gaps, and take decisions themselves. While their Northern NGO and DPO partners are understood as providing this space, some of their Northern NGO partners are seen as doing things in a paternalistic manner for disabled people.
- The experience of disabled people must be valued, and used to draw lessons in development.

8 Conclusions

The key findings of this research are as follows:

- Mozambican DPOs are very clear about what they want from capacity building. They understand capacity building as creating “legs with which to walk”.
- Southern DPOs believe that the approach of some Northern NGOs to capacity building is limited. Some partners see capacity building only in terms of training, while DPOs see the need for complementary support through covering core costs to enable them to implement what they have learnt.
- Southern DPOs are concerned about over-reliance on foreign experts instead of using local capacity.
- There are feelings among Southern DPOs that they are treated as clients or objects of capacity building rather than equal partners.
- A shared understanding of the philosophy of the disability movement between Southern DPOs and Northern partners helps to level the playing field between partners while minimising top-down approaches to relationship building.
- Considerable confusion exists over roles with the Ministry of Women and Social Action, which is responsible for disability issues.
- DPOs are not being empowered sufficiently to stand independently in order to approach donors in their own right.
- The lack of effective collaboration between different Northern NGOs operating in Mozambique promotes unnecessary duplication, waste and confusion with DPO partners.
- There is a need for commitment to open, frank discussion and experience sharing on an ongoing basis among Southern DPOs themselves. The DPO workshop held during the second visit was a response to this need, and all indications are that the organisations greatly valued the very frank exchanges that characterised the event.

References

Strategic Plan for KEPA and the Finnish NGOs in the Disability Sector in Mozambique. KEPA, 2004

FAMOD (2005). *Strategic Plan 2005–09.* Maputo: FAMOD.

Ojampera S, Farinha F (2002). *Evaluation of KEPA's Disability Activities of the Volunteer Programme and Partnership Programme in Mozambique 1991–2001.* Final report. Helsinki/Maputo: KEPA.

Sintef (2003). *Study on Living Conditions of People with Disabilities in Namibia.* Oslo: Sintef.

United Nations Development Programme (2004). *Human Development Report.* New York: UNDP.

World Bank Group (2005). *World Development Indicators(2003 and 2005).* Available at: <http://web.worldbank.org>

Annex 1: People and organisations met

First visit

AJODEMO	Justino Joao Januario, President
	Geraldo Manuel Muyambo, Member
ADESO	Elsa Lameira, President of General Assembly
	Manuel Lazaro, President of Association
	Jose Sumindila, Academic Representative
ADEMIMO	Manuel Viloso, Secretary General
	Antonio Tique Chamboko, Co-ordinator, HIV/AIDS Programme
ACRIDEME	Anida Nurmamade
	Maria da Conceicas Vaz
	Rogério Moises Manjate, Co-ordinator
ADEMO	Farida Gulamo
KEPA Service Centre for Development Co-operation	Leena Vaaranmaa, Co-ordinator
	Katja Kari, Liaison Officer
POWER	Eileen O' Dwyer

Second visit

FAMOD	Executive Committee, attended by Lead Researcher
POWER	Dezi Sitori, Project Manager
KEPA	Katja Kari, Liaison Officer
	Severino Ngole, Programme Officer
FAMOD	Francisco Tembe, Co-ordinator
ADEMO	Farida Gulamo, Secretary General
DDPVT, MWSA	Muchave Antonio, Technician

One-day DPO workshop attendees

ADEMO	Luis Chicune
	Eufemia Amela
	Farida Gulamo
	Renato Paulo Maculuva
ADESU	Jose Bacar Hunene
	Elsa Lameira
ACAMO	Felizardo L Menete
	Timothy Mandlate
ADEMIMO	Hassark Amuza Francisco
ACRIDEME	Joao Mabunda
N'LHUVUKO	Joao Magaia
AJODEMO	Geraldo Manuel Muyambo
	Justino Joao Januario
	Verna Alice Saite
FAMOD	Manuel AF Lazaro (President)
MIM (English/Portuguese Translator)	Shareef Malundah

Annex 2: Positive examples of capacity-building activities

The following capacity-building activities are cited as examples only.

Activity/workshop	Participants	Funders	Comments
Social and traditional models	135	POWER	Took place in three regions covering 45 people per region
Proposal writing and project implementation*	32	POWER	Held in two regions, 16 people per region
Priorities identification/analysis	35	POWER	
Project management*	50	KEPA	
Management	25	KEPA	
Drafting a strategic plan	15	KEPA	
First national workshop of disabled students	55	POWER	
Listening clubs	64	POWER	Organised in all regions
Awareness campaign	Communities surrounding Maputo	POWER/KEPA	
General assembly*	50	POWER/KEPA	

* Examples of good activities for which DPOs especially appreciated the support of their development partners in realising their objectives.

Annex 3: Agendas for one-day workshop with DPOs

This annex sets out the broad and detailed contents of the one-day workshop for DPOs held on Saturday 2 April 2005 at ADEMO conference hall.

General agenda

Why the workshop?

Introductions

Expectations

- The message from this workshop must reach partners in order to serve as a springboard for action by all interested stakeholders.
- Increase DPOs' understanding of capacity building, and enable them to leave the workshop with a clear vision that helps them engage with foreign partners when they talk about capacity building, and to choose the right partners.
- Ensure that the discussions are conducted in a manner that safeguard the main interests of DPOs.
- Help the process of NGOs to genuinely support DPOs, not just to use them in the name of capacity building.
- Ensure that readers of organisations do not expect to be excused for failing to project the true reality of ordinary disabled Mozambicans.

Ground rules

- Need for honesty, frankness and openness
- Active participation of all, emphasised by the participants.
- Reception of all ideas, emphasised by participants.
- Avoiding criticising people, but sharing ideas.

Open discussion of key issues

Recommendations (carried out in small groups)

Evaluation and closure

Specific agenda

This specific agenda is based on the fifth item of the general agenda, above ("Increase DPOs' understanding of capacity building, and enable them to leave the workshop with a clear vision that helps them engage with foreign partners when they talk about capacity building, and to choose the right partners").

Defining capacity building

- What it means for you
- The goals you wish to achieve with capacity building

Your partners

- Do they share the same perception about capacity building?
- Are there differences in approaches, and do they matter?

- What specific problems have you encountered?
Exploring activities which have been carried out (in small groups)
- Are there gaps that need to be filled, and who must fill them?
- What makes you happy about your current relationships?
- Are there other things that make you angry?

What would you call good practices in capacity building?

Discuss the role of the Ministry of Women and Social Action (in small groups).

Annex 4: Questionnaire for Northern DPOs/NGOs

1 Introduction

Samaita Associates of East London, South Africa have been contracted by Healthlink Worldwide to co-ordinate and provide management support to small-scale research processes in Uganda, Mozambique and South Africa.

The Disability Knowledge & Research Programme (KaR) is funded by the Central Research Department of the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and managed by Healthlink Worldwide and the Overseas Development Group at the University of East Anglia in the UK.

The focus of the programme is to develop knowledge and research around the issue of mainstreaming disability issues in the development process. The programme comprises several components (for further details, see the programme website at www.disabilitykar.net), including the Disability Policy Project.

The Disability Policy Project has thus commissioned a piece of small-scale research on the following topic: Capacity building of disabled people's organisations in Mozambique.

2 About the questionnaire

This questionnaire is to facilitate the collection of data from those Northern DPOs and NGOs with whom it will not be possible to have face-to-face meetings.

The research project to which this questionnaire relates aims to examine the role and efficacy of DPO capacity-building initiatives in Mozambique. It compares and contrasts the approaches of Northern DPOs and NGOs that are active in disability and development within the country. It seeks to identify which have been the most effective approaches, and why they have worked.

As an organisation that has ongoing commitment and interest in the growth and development of the disability movement in Mozambique, we request you to read the following questions, and take some time to respond to them.

3 Key research questions

Meaning and objectives of capacity building

1. What does capacity building mean for your organisation, and what goal do you aim to achieve in building the capacity of Mozambican DPOs?

Capacity building approaches, methods used, problems and challenges faced, gaps needing to be closed

2. Explain the approach your organisation has taken to help build the capacity of Mozambican DPOs, and what methods you have used (specifically, what have you done?).

3. In terms of the capacity-building work you have done with Mozambican DPOs, which have been the most effective approaches that you have used?

4. Are there some approaches which have presented particular problems/challenges, and why?

5. Why do you think some approaches have worked well, while others have not?

6. Do you see some further gaps, and how could they be filled?

Key issues facing Mozambique DPOs

7. From your experience, identify and explain two-to-three key issues facing Mozambican DPOs.