

# Christian Aid

## Central America governance programming – video methods note

This note summarises the approach used to make two short videos contrasting the work of Christian Aid funded governance programmes, one in Guatemala and the other in El Salvador. It sets out the challenges, learning and insights from the process from the perspective of the producers of the videos – and makes recommendations for how to approach similar projects in the future.

### Who we are

The videos were produced by Robert Stern, a documentary maker and former TV news journalist; and Rupert Widdicombe, a journalist and communications consultant with experience of international development, governance programming and of living and working in Central America.

### What we set out to achieve

We were commissioned to produce a 10-15 minute video documentary showing the reality of Christian Aid's governance programming in El Salvador and Guatemala, showing how these programmes work from the perspective of individual programme participants, as well as the challenges and successes faced. By looking at two governance programmes in neighbouring countries, this offered the chance to look at how the programmes responded to and were shaped by the different political contexts in the two countries.

Our bid proposed working in a participatory way – to the maximum degree possible within the time available and the budget. We wanted to feature, if possible, video shot by participants in their communities. We wanted to involve programme participants – as well as the programme team and CA country officer – in making editorial decisions about what the videos should focus on; and, if possible, review the raw video footage and help to select the important moments. We also proposed working in a way that would build capacity in the programme team, by involving them in production, if that was something that the partners wanted.

This way of working is different from a 'documentary' approach in which the film-makers are the authors of the final product, using journalistic criteria to decide what the story is about. This also is different from a promotional video where the client identifies the important aspects of the project to feature which shows the work in a positive light.

*The key aspects of the brief we agreed with CA was that the videos:*

- would be principally for a non-specialist audience with an interest in and some understanding of international development
- should bring to life what governance programming looks like on the ground
- should use programme participants experiences to explain the programmes
- would show the good as well as the bad / would not seek out only the positive
- would be made with as much participation from partners and participants as possible
- would avoid narration and 'editorial view' devices as much as possible
- would avoid reliance on talking head interviews as much as possible

- would explain through action / things happening as much as possible
- would be subtitled rather than dubbed

We had several discussions prior to travelling about what video's strengths and weaknesses were, what could and could not reasonably be achieved in a short video:

- strengths of video are impact and immediacy, showing action, people doing things, things happening
- weaknesses are that video is not good at handling / explaining complex things quickly, screen time runs fast so narrative needs to be simple and clear, which real life is often not

We expressed concerns about how much of the detail of the context of the programmes could be explained within the videos and how much contrasting between the two countries would be possible.

## **What we did and why**

### Pre-production

Ideally, you do not begin videoing until you have a very clear idea of what you are going to film and what the 'story' is. The research phase in pre-production, initial interviews and scoping, are used to develop a 'shooting script', a rough script of the actual film you want to make, and a detailed schedule of what to film on each day. In this approach, many of the key editorial decisions are taken before the camera is turned on. This makes best use of a budget – it cuts shooting days, which are usually the most expensive days, and it reduces the time needed to edit the material.

For a team based in the UK, the need to work in this way for important practical reasons inevitably works somewhat against the aim of working in a participatory way. We decided to do as much research and planning before travel as possible, develop a 'shooting script' and schedule based on our understanding, and then reality check this and re-work in a participative way in a kick-off workshop in each country before videoing started.

Through a review of documentation and a series of Skype calls with the CA team in Central America, the country officers and the partner officers close to the programme, as well as CA staff that had knowledge of the programmes, we tried to get an understanding of the programmes, how they worked and what we could realistically film.

This was hard to do remotely by Skype and through programme documents (which speak to funding results framework logic and not narrative). The result was that we were not able to understand what we could film in a way that made sense to us. As such we couldn't develop the kind of detailed shooting script and schedule we wanted. Interestingly, the feedback from the CA staff in each country and the partners shared this frustration.

In both countries, the teams said it was a shame that the videoing had been scheduled for a time when no programme activities were taking place. The preparatory calls and emails, didn't seem to work for either us or the in-country teams. For instance, in El Salvador, Guadalupe Cortes Vega said that a lot of time was spent in Skype calls and emails beforehand, but it wasn't until we arrived in the country that we were able to grasp how the programme worked (which we did quickly once there). Our reflection on this point is that we were talking at cross purposes in some way - the kind of understanding needed for making a video (the basic mechanics of a programme and what it is possible to actually see) didn't match the kind of explanations that people close to the programmes were able to make.

However, working with the country and programme teams we did develop a rough schedule for each day, there were some vague ideas of things that could be filmed. We understood that there were no workshops or other programme activities planned during the time we were going to be there, though there did seem to be some scope for generating equivalent activities. Crucially, the partners had found what sounded like ideal programme participants – a man and a woman for each programme – that we could focus on.

We explored the idea of getting programme participants to use smartphones to video their activities ahead of our trip. In El Salvador, the participants didn't have smartphones according to the programme officer. We were told they did in Guatemala and with elections underway and mass protests in many places, we were hopeful they would be able to get some clips of themselves in active citizen mode. We sent some simple how to instructions but the participants weren't able to make any videos before our trip.

#### **Smart phone video basic guidance – key points**

- Hold the phone horizontally rather than vertically
- Hold it as steady as you can, pan as smoothly as possible
- Plan out what you want to capture, video in short sequences
- Sound is very important - put the phone close to any person you are interviewing

#### *Production process and participation*

Not including travel to Central America and between the countries and to reach the locations, the schedule allowed for a little more than four days in each programme location.

We planned to hold a half day mini-workshop to kick off the filming process in each place, and a second 'wrap' workshop at the end.

We went to Guatemala (Quetzaltenango) first, then to El Salvador (Morazán). The trip took place in September 2015.

#### *Kick off workshops*

These had three objectives:

- to offer a brief training in how to use smartphones to capture video of reasonable quality (eg hold horizontally, get close to capture clear sound, etc)
- to talk about how video making works, to talk about story structure, to talk about the components of a short video, to show an example short video; (in particular we stressed the importance of videoing action and things happening and avoiding talking heads)
- and to then talk about the video we planned to make, to discuss what we could film, to understand the participants and programme team views of what was important etc

In both Guatemala and El Salvador, the idea of using the workshops to reality check and develop the filming schedule, and to develop our understanding of the story and what was important worked quite well.

In the case of Guatemala the partner view of the programme was somewhat different from what we had gleaned from the briefings and written material supplied by CA. Our understanding had been that prevention of violence was central to the programme rationale,

whereas the role of violence was much less prominent in view of the partners. Everyone we spoke to had a different understanding of this issue, and even of what constituted 'violence' – was it physical, or was it institutional repression, or a societal sense of insecurity. We were not able to explore the subtlety of this theme in the video.

In both, it turned out that our visit fell within the 'off season' for actual programme activities – and we had to work hard with the team and participants to think of situations where things happen to film, in addition to the planned interviews.

Less positive, was that in both kick-off workshops only one of the two participants (the young man in both cases) was able to take part. This meant that we had less idea of what we would film with the female participants on the days scheduled for them.

In the workshops, we offered the chance to work closely with us for partner capacity building (the partner in El Salvador, ISD took us up on this and a comms person accompanied the filming) and also offered the video materials for the partners and CA country team to use (in neither case did the partners seem interested at this stage).

### Filming

In both countries the compressed filming schedule and restricted pre-production phase meant we were having to improvise and make decisions on the spot. Some of these worked out, some did not. We ended up filming far more than we could ever use, because of our uncertainty about what we would get from any situation.

Even though we had stressed in the workshops how little screen time there was and the need for interviewees to speak in brief (editable) phrases, we quickly found that it was very hard to get people to be brief, to the point and to avoid qualifying statements or repetition. For key interviews, we tried to get certain key points from the interviewees as far as we felt consistent with the participatory spirit of the project, but in very few did we feel we get the concise, focused sound bites that would be optimal from a 'journalistic' perspective. (Speaking concisely on camera is innately hard to do, though practice, training and preparation can help. Even taking this into account, and the fact that Spanish tends to run longer than English, our interviewees in Central America were particularly prone to long sentences).

In both countries, the partner team and CA country officer were enormously helpful, willing and supportive. They put in long hours and were flexible as plans changed. Most evenings, there were discussions and a continued evolution of the focus of the videos.

In Guatemala, the partner rep and CA country officer did not get involved in the interviewing, leaving us to ask the questions – although they could have. We did not insist and they kept in the background. In El Salvador, the partners and CA person listened and participated in the interviews, and provided additional or follow up questions, or facilitated explanation or dialogue with the interviewees. The methodology of the programme in El Salvador was more formal and complex and there was more for us to understand.

### Wrap workshops

In both countries there was only a few hours available to review video material and to talk again about story structure and key focus, key themes for the video.

In Guatemala, we were able to show a few hastily edited sequences and bites selected from key interviews. We did a table exercise using sheets of different coloured paper to organise the different elements we had captured. We had a useful discussion using this method to hone in on the key themes.



In Quetzaltenango, the group identified key narrative themes and used the table space to group those that were related. The themes fell into three groups (See pic above), linked by the central theme of **Dialogue**:

Power  
Violence

Poetry festival  
The power of culture / art  
Xela's tradition as a centre of culture  
The new city Culture Policy

Lack of resources  
Repression and expression  
Voice of young people / empowerment

One development was that, having had a taste of the material, the partners and CA country officer were now keen for a Spanish language version to be made and for access to all the interviews so that additional video products could be made. (This has been done).

The same happened in El Salvador – having been involved and seeing a taste of the material the potential value of the video to the local partner to support their work was recognized.

In El Salvador, a similar table exercise was used to organise and prioritise the themes, constructing a draft narrative. Most of the time in the 'wrap workshop' was used to review the video interviews to identify the key quotes. This was helpful when it came to editing.



In both countries, the partners and / or the CA country officer had early on expressed concern that the focus on the participants stories (the amount of time spent interviewing them and filming them in action) would mean that the programme / partner view would not come across or be sufficiently explained or covered. In both countries, this didn't seem to be an issue once the raw material was seen. In Guatemala, for instance, when asked what could not be left out (in editing), the partners chose to keep the powerful sequences showing the participants doing things as a result of the programme.

In both countries, the partner teams said they had learnt from the process.

In Guatemala, for instance, Ana Arellano, the CA country officer, said she had benefitted from the deep dive into a particular programme, something that was not ordinarily possible. Her understanding of the programme had changed and deepened. In El Salvador, Guadalupe Cortes Vega said: "Normally, my workload means that I cannot immerse myself to such an extent during monitoring visits, so the video allowed me to get a better understanding of ISD's work in Morazán".

In El Salvador, the ISD comms person who accompanied the filming said she had learnt about the documentary process (having had video experience in advertising before). She was interested in participatory video techniques and we sent her an online resource in Spanish on approaches to doing this.

The partners provided photos and videos taken during programme activities. The quality of these and other practical considerations meant that we weren't able to use any of this material in the videos.

### Editing

We returned with 17 hours of video and a target maximum running time of 15 minutes. This was a lot more material than we wanted or needed and it was a consequence of:

- long interviews due to difficulty in getting short quotes
- long interviews to cover all options due to uncertainty
- going into situations blind and not being sure what we were going to be able to use or not
- needing to have a lot of images to 'cover' the expected cuts we would have to make in people's quotes

The editing process was hard and took much longer than we expected (even when we knew the kind of challenges we would face with people's quotes). For Guatemala, developing a narrative through line was particularly challenging because there were two CA-funded partners involved, the two stories did not divide neatly, and the fact there was a poetry festival at the heart of it all, which did not simply link with the partner objective to support youth participation in shaping a culture policy

We showed some short work-in-progress extracts at a CA workshop for all those involved in the evaluations and CA's governance work. The session was useful for developing a broader understanding of this work in a variety of contexts. It would have been better to talk about the process and to develop a powerpoint presentation using still rather than show unfinished video material without a clear narrative – much of the feedback seemed to assume that this was a rough version of each entire film rather than a few example elements.

Our original aim was to avoid authorial devices like narration or a lot of captions. The need to explain the context and to stitch together sequences meant many more captions were required than we had planned. This, and the subtitles, meant viewers are asked to do a lot of

reading as well as processing what they are seeing. This is not ideal, but was necessary to make a stand-alone video that would work for the client's particular audiences.

We weren't able to be participatory in the editing, by opening the review process up to partners and programme participants – this was due to time and geography. Time was limited because the edit was proving difficult and opening up rough cut versions to review by CA country staff and country partners would have slowed the process and possibly made it more complex. Geography / location and slow internet in the two countries was another factor – adding to the difficulty of quickly getting input on versions as the edit evolved.

Ideally, for someone to participate meaningfully in video editing they need to work alongside the people editing. This is because they need to have a good knowledge of all the material available, to understand the challenges and issues (ie why some material is hard to use or unusable), to understand the hard choices (ie leaving good stuff out), and to be involved at regular intervals as the narrative evolves.

In the end, after various rounds of feedback and re-edits, the video were finalised, running to 8-9 minutes each and were presented as a single video and as well as two separate country 'case studies'.

We have received positive feedback from CA about the videos. We hope the videos will be widely used and shared to get maximum value from the investment made.

## **Personal reflections on the process**

- Making these videos was a very rich and stimulating experience for us.
- We were very impressed by the commitment of CA's country partners to their work, and to the quality of engagement with programme participants and local decision makers and key stakeholders.
- We had excellent support from the CA country officers before, during and after our trip, who invested their own personal time beyond working hours.
- The partners and the CA country staff had very recently supported a formal evaluation of their programmes – and this video project was an additional and time-consuming drain of people's time.
- By the end of process the partners and CA team seemed to recognize the value of the project and see the potential benefit to their programme.
- We feel the people involved did learn from the process, though how useful that will be in supporting future work we couldn't say.
- In El Salvador, we saw a clear, methodical intervention with many points of attack.
- In Guatemala, the programme was more organic – but also guided by a clear objective.
- In both countries, the programmes chose good leaders / active citizens for us to work with. We guess that they chose the best people they could, so they may not be representative.
- Even though there was no 'promotional video' agenda, we inevitably went looking for the positive and sought evidence of impact rather than looking for what did not work or exploring the challenges. Nothing we saw suggested this was not appropriate.
- The biggest compromises we had to make in both videos were related to the need for a simple narrative line or due the need to keep the videos short. We knew that we would have to leave a lot of good material out.
- For instance, in El Salvador the partner works with local government (as well as with community groups) to ensure government officials understand two different recent reforms that oblige them to 1) make information such as budgets and spend public and 2) allocate seats and key posts in municipal government in proportion to votes

won by each party. We weren't able to capture the partner working with local officials and probably wouldn't have had time to include it even if we had; and we weren't able to tackle the issue of plural local governments even though several interviewees mentioned it. The context in El Salvador was complex – dictatorship, civil war, and only recently a government with a reforming agenda. The area we were working in was heavily affected by the long conflict. The family of Fatima, one of the participants we followed, fled to a refugee camp in Honduras and she returned as a young adult. Some of the social capital in her community (and the level of organisation) was developed through that shared experience of flight and return. Deeply ingrained inequality between the sexes and high levels of domestic violence were other aspects that we weren't able to reflect. A few captions were all we were able to use to capture this.

- We underestimated the complexity and additional time needed that long Spanish phrases would cause and also how challenging subtitling would be.
- Our concerns about pre-production (not getting what we needed before we travelled) were justified and this was a factor in the length of the edit.
- Our experience and instincts on the importance of capturing action, things happening and seeking to avoid talking heads were better understood by the participants when they saw the footage at the end of the shoot than when explained at the start.
- We would like to have been able to have worked in a more participatory way – using video captured by participants, involving them more in editing choices etc – but this was not possible.
- Truly participatory projects, which involve the contributors at all stages from planning to editing, would require more time and resources, and need to be completed on-site. This way of working would be a good thing to integrate into programmes – and would be particularly suited to voice and accountability, advocacy and governance programming. One reason is that video products could be created through participation that could scale up the work, spreading inspiration or insights beyond the programme's immediate reach. The fact that the products are made by 'people like us' with a deep understanding is a factor in the potential power. Making a video capturing learning, a process which requires developing clear and simple messages, can be a useful process for any programme.
- The final videos are pretty good considering the challenges. We reached an acceptable quality according to our (high) personal and professional standards, but there are many compromises we have had to take to make them work: lots of captions, harsh editing of quotes and audio in particular.
- To our eyes, the limited pre trip preparation shows in the filming, which was more hasty and improvised than we would have liked.

## **Feedback from CA staff and partners**

Detailed feedback from CA staff and from partners can be found (in Spanish) in an annexe on page 11. The main points they made were:

- The videos accurately represented the programmes and would be useful in promoting their work.
- Metafora, one of two partners in Guatemala involved in the programme, said the video would be used for fundraising
- ISD in El Salvador plan to show the video to community leaders in the region and to showcase the video on their website.
- All involved felt the videos would have been better if they had featured actual programme activities – any future project should be planned well in advance so videoing can coincide with planned activities or can be scheduled to suit video production.

## Recommendations for future video projects

We think that video can be powerful in bringing programmes to life, even complex ones. To overcome some of the challenges we faced and other issues we identified, our recommendations are as follows:

To avoid overloading country partners and CA country teams either don't make a video of a programme already that has been evaluated recently or seek to **integrate making the video with the evaluation visit** (or at least integrate the pre-production / research phase), if the two very different agendas could be made to work together.

Allow the **longest possible lead time** ahead of filming to allow for careful preparation and pre-production.

If possible, invest in a **preparation / research trip to proceed the video production** phase.

- This trip could allow more meaningful participation from programme participants and partner teams.
- It could allow the participatory / co-development of a detailed 'shooting script' and a list of things to film (i.e. the basis for a filming schedule).
- Having a shooting script would mean interviews could be more focused and would help interviewees be very brief and clear.
- This level of preparation would also allow for training of participants or programme teams in video techniques, so that video capture could go on ahead of the production visit.
- It would also allow the identification of key future moments in the programme or intervention so the video production visit could be scheduled for the optimal time.
- This preparation would also allow for the video project to be designed to deliver video products that could support the programme or intervention, as well as acting as a valuable resource within Christian Aid.

*More information on participatory video can be found here:*

[www.participatorymethods.org/resource/insights-participatory-video-handbook-field](http://www.participatorymethods.org/resource/insights-participatory-video-handbook-field)

*A powerful example of community video being used to spread learning beyond a programme's immediate location can be found here:*

[www.spring-nutrition.org/sites/default/files/publications/reports/spring\\_community\\_led\\_video\\_miycn\\_india.pdf](http://www.spring-nutrition.org/sites/default/files/publications/reports/spring_community_led_video_miycn_india.pdf)

Consider **combining video case studies with scripted audiovisual materials**. The scripted audiovisual material could be a powerful and immediate way role of explaining complex issues, analysing, comparing and contrasting, summarising. The script for these could be developed as a collaboration between audiovisual professionals and topic specialists.

Taking the idea of the Christian Aid annual deep dive into a particular programme area, the scripted video could be an overview of this area of work, feature analysis of the issues, explanation of the rationale, details the range of contexts, the scale of the effort in different countries. The related video case studies would be specific examples of approaches that show good impact or strong scope for learning.

Scripted audiovisual materials such as:

- Powerpoint animation / sequence of slides with an audio soundtrack (low budget)
- Hand drawn animation with audio soundtrack (higher budget)
- Other combinations of images and a scripted audio track.

*Examples:*

RSA Animate videos – taken from edited versions of talks at the RSA. Would be better if scripted to work well with the images, rather than images developed after.

<https://www.thersa.org/discover/videos/rsa-animate/>

No budget example that RW created and scripted for ed.space project. Script developed first, then homemade video made to illustrate.

<http://www.edspace.ws/>

These examples are meant to demonstrate the potential of this audiovisual approach to communicate more complex topics than narrative video; and the potential to complement narrative video.

<b>Quetzaltenango, Guatemala</b>	<b>Ana Arellano, CA staff, Guatemala</b>	<b>Marvin Garcia, Metafora</b>	<b>Fredy Batres, Caja Ludica</b>
<b>¿Aprendiste algo útil durante el proceso de hacer el video? (Sobre el programa en Xela, sobre video?)</b>	<p>-Si, lo complejo de poner en imágenes/secuencias sobre temas sociales y politicos</p> <p>-Lo necesario de coordinar con organizaciones de base que tengan reconocimiento local y contacto con comunidades</p> <p>-Creo que las suposiciones iniciales sobre el tipo de violencia que se filmaría en Xela (que es más violencia estructural y menos explicita) significó un reto. Hubiera sido positivo discutirlo antes.</p>	<p>La importancia de documentar todos los procesos, así hay una evidencia más clara de lo que se ha realizado.</p>	<p>El proceso nos sirvió para tener un acercamiento diferente con Metáfora y las diferentes instancias en las que inciden, es una forma muy creativa de presentar lo que se hace en las comunidades y en los municipios.</p>
<b>¿Cómo podríamos hacerlo mejor o más fácil si fuéramos hacer otro video?</b>	<p>Lograr que coincida con procesos en curso, para aprovechar actividades y trabajo en vivo.</p>	<p>Planificarlo con más tiempo y en una temporada en la que los procesos son más fuertes, por ejemplo, durante los días del festival.</p>	<p>Coincido con los compañeros de Xela en que debería realizarse en el tiempo en el que se hacen las actividades, ya que esta situación se constituyo en una limitante que no permitió conocer las actividades en tiempo real y el trabajo de las y los jóvenes de Metáfora.</p>
<b>¿Qué te parece del video finale? ¿Se represente el programa bien? ¿Algún comentario?</b>	<p>Considero que la versión final capturó mucho de lo que se discutió con Metáfora y Caja Lúdica, también con Christian Aid. Fue representativa del diálogo que tuvimos.</p>	<p>Me parece bien, creo que hizo falta tomas de nuestras actividades, para ello, hubiese sido mejor que su visita se realizara dentro de los días del festival, a lo mejor este año si se pueda.</p>	<p>Es más tiempo del que originalmente se dijo y me parece bien porque ayuda a presentar mejor la propuesta sin ser demasiado extenso, en este sentido, se explica muy bien el trabajo que se hace en Quetzaltenango desde diferentes percepciones; si hace falta ver más las actividades del grupo, por lo que se debe procurar que el material</p>

			audiovisual que se edite, se realice en el tiempo en el que se desarrollan las actividades.
<b><i>¿Te parece que el video será usado por los socios de Christian Aid? ¿Cómo lo van a usar?</i></b>	Sí. El video ya ha sido compartido al interno de Christian Aid con otros programas para visibilizar el trabajo que se hace en Centroamérica y será compartido con donantes.	Lo vamos a usar para poder buscar fondos que puedan ayudarnos para darle continuidad a nuestros procesos.	<p>Va a ser muy util para visibilizar el trabajo de Metáfora en el departamento, par impulsar la política de cultura y la gestión de fondos para el Festival de Poesía; así mismo posicionara aún más el trabajo de Metáfora a nivel local.</p> <p>Es un documento que se puede usar para dar a conocer los avances que se han tenido en Quetzaltenango en otros municipios en los que trabaja Caja Lúdica. Para motivar a los otros grupos a seguir buscando formas de incidir a nivel local. En los otros municipios se lleva procesos similares a los de Quetzaltenango, en ellos tambien se busca la incidencia en las autoridades, y se puede usar como material didáctico para facilitar discusiones sobre el trabajo que hace o puede hacer la juventud para que se escuchen sus necesidades y propuestas.</p>

<b>Morazán / El Salvador</b>	<b>Guadalupe Cortes Vega, CA El Salvador</b>	<b>Roberto Castro, ISD</b>
<b>¿Aprendiste algo útil durante el proceso de hacer el video? (Sobre el programa en Xela, sobre video?)</b>	Aprendí que en un video de esas características, los mensajes han de ser pocos, claros y estratégicos. No hubiera funcionado tratar de meter mucha información. Es clave escoger bien a las personas que lo van a protagonizar. ISD acertó en la elección de Fátima y de José. Normalmente, debido a la carga de trabajo, no puedo profundizar tanto en las visitas de monitoreo así que el video me permitió conocer mejor el proyecto de ISD en Morazán.	Reflexionando en el mismo proceso, comprendí que es bien importante grabar videos cortos de las actividades importantes que implican proceso.  Hay que planificar actividades que demuestren acción para el proceso de filmación con los beneficiarios.  Hay que grabar bastante para hacer un producto pequeño y muy bueno.
<b>¿Cómo podríamos hacerlo mejor o más fácil si fuéramos hacer otro video?</b>	La principal limitante que tuvimos fue que no se programaron actividades del proyecto para los días de la visita de ustedes a El Salvador porque entendimos que había que enfocarse en las historias de Fátima y de José. Para la próxima, habría que mejorar la planificación de la grabación programando algunas actividades en las que participen activamente las personas protagonistas del video. Por el mismo motivo, no pudimos reflejar en el video la participación de Fátima y José a nivel departamental y nacional, y sólo les vimos en el nivel municipal.  Por otra parte, me dio la impresión de que ustedes lograron meterse en el video y en el proyecto de ISD estando ya en El Salvador. Y lo hicieron rápido y muy bien porque tienen mucha experiencia. Pero me parecieron algo perdidos antes de viajar a El Salvador e invertimos quizá demasiado tiempo en skypes y correos previos a su visita. Hoy que ya conocen El Salvador y conocen más de Christian Aid, creo que sería más fácil para ustedes trabajar en un siguiente proyecto.	Ponernos de acuerdo con anticipación de que es lo que se quiere mostrar en el video y de esa forma preparar las diferentes actividades en el terreno.  Eso implicaría que ustedes deben saber lo que hacemos antes de llegar a filmar y de esa forma elegir mejor lo que se quiere hacer.

<p><b><i>¿Qué te parece del video final? ¿Se represente el programa bien? ¿Algún comentario?</i></b></p>	<p>Me gusta el video final. Explica de forma muy sencilla y a partir del testimonio de dos líderes comunitarios una parte del programa de gobernabilidad que apoya Christian Aid en El Salvador. Y le pone rostro humano a problemas y soluciones que forman parte del proyecto de ISD. Las preguntas y las respuestas escogidas para formar parte del video fueron las más idóneas desde mi punto de vista.</p>	<p>Me parece muy bien, parte del programa, ya que lastimosamente no se pudo hacer la conexión entre lo municipal, regional y nacional.</p> <p>Pero a nivel municipal representa el trabajo que se ha realizado con el programa.</p> <p>Los videos los he compartido con Fátima y José y me han mostrado su satisfacción con el trabajo que se muestra.</p>
<p><b><i>¿Te parece que el video será usado por los socios de Christian Aid? ¿Cómo lo van a usar?</i></b></p>	<p>No sé todavía cómo va a usar ISD el video. Me parece que es un video diseñado, sobre todo, para público del Norte, de países desarrollados. Es una buena herramienta para fundrising y para rendición de cuentas ante el donante.</p> <p>Quiero destacar el respeto con que ustedes (en especial Rupert, que maneja mejor el español) trataron a todas las personas con las que se relacionaron durante la grabación del video. Ello creó un buen ambiente de trabajo.</p>	<p>Si, como modelo del trabajo que se realiza, a finales de año lo presentamos a los líderes y lideresas de la región, aún no lo hemos publicado, pero esperamos ponerlo a disposición del público en general que visita la página web o Facebook, e inclusive puede servir como muestra del trabajo de ISD para la cooperación internacional.</p>